

# UC Berkeley

## UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

**Title**

A New Greek Grammar for Students and Teachers

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2x9991qd>

**Journal**

Mnemosyne, 73(3)

**ISSN**

0026-7074

**Author**

Mastronarde, Donald J

**Publication Date**

2020

**DOI**

10.1163/1568525x-12342854

Peer reviewed

Review of Evert van Emde Boas, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink, Mathieu de Bakker, *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2019.

Donald J. Mastronarde  
University of California, Berkeley  
djmastronarde@berkeley.edu

In the United States and some other countries, the vast majority of students learning ancient Greek begin the process only after reaching college, and in many cases not even in the first year of college. Those who decide to make a career of classical studies may be faced with a daunting task with many facets: to bring their language skills (mainly, reading and comprehension) rapidly to a much higher level; to expose themselves to different authors, styles, genres, and periods of the surviving written record; to familiarize themselves with many aspects of the ancient Greek and Roman worlds; to learn about a plethora of traditional as well as innovative and interdisciplinary methods and theories. The starting-point is the first course in Greek, where by necessity teachers have to limit what is taught because of constraints of time and the limits of what a learner's brain can effectively absorb within that time. Typically, curricula move immediately to courses in which particular original texts are read, and consolidation of language skills occurs unsystematically within such courses. Such reading courses often assemble a group of students who have different preparation, having learned from different textbooks or with more or less supplementation of the textbook from the instructor, and having experienced different levels of success in mastering or retaining what was taught.

When I began teaching in the 1970s, it was standard practice to have the second-year students of Greek purchase H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* in the 1956 revision of G. M. Messing and to expect them to use it for review and for explanation and illustration of new points of morphology and syntax. Nowadays, apart from the fact that Smyth has not been updated since 1956, it might be considered too dense, too detailed, too intimidating. What, then, can an instructor recommend to the student who asks how to make up for gaps in past learning and how to raise their skills to a level suitable for graduate study? *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek* (hereafter *CGCG*) aims to provide an answer to that question, and largely succeeds in doing so.

The incorporation of modern linguistic approaches into classical studies has burgeoned in the past several decades, and one of the main centers of this movement has been the Netherlands, so it is only natural that *CGCG* has been compiled by scholars from that tradition who have or had connections with universities in the UK. This new presentation of classical Greek benefits from refinements (or even revolutions) in approaches to tense and aspect, to particles, to cognitive aspects like speaker's epistemic state or commitment to a claim, to word order and discourse types. One would eventually like to

see similar updating incorporated in a revision of, or replacement for, Kühner-Gerth or Smyth, neither of which *CGCG* claims to be. This grammar has been deliberately limited to classical Attic Greek (with ancillary attention to Ionic, that is, Herodotus) and essentially to phenomena that are not confined to high-style poetry (the examples taken from tragedy are normally for usages also seen in Aristophanes and one or more prose writers). The needs of the learner in a relatively early phase of study have been given priority in the economy of the information provided; in the provision of English translations for all Greek phrases or sentences; in the occasional overviews and the (not entirely consistent) inclusion of parenthetical reminders about alternative usages or constructions; in the segregation of some points (rarer or more abstruse) in paragraphs set in smaller type, or in notes also in smaller type and set off from the main discussion by horizontal rules; and in some features of format (wide interlinear spacing of text, even in the bibliography and three indices; wide vertical spacing between sections and paragraphs; principal parts listed in column format).

The layout of the *CGCG* is largely the traditional one. The Preface (pp. xxxi–xlii) contains essential information of which all readers of the book should make themselves aware. Part I is Phonology and Morphology (pp. 3–304), Part II is Syntax (pp. 305–654), and Part III is Textual Coherence (pp. 655–748). The first section (pp. 3–82) deals with the alphabet and, at considerable length, phonology. Sections 2–10 (pp. 83–107) cover the morphology of nominal forms, including adverbs, with the dual being omitted from the paradigms and presented on its own in the final section of this group (with one cross-reference earlier, p. 38, 2.7, after the Table of Endings showing only singular and plural). Sections 11–22 (pp. 108–259) cover the morphology of verb forms. At the close of Part I, Section 23–25 (pp. 260–304) deal with word formation, accentuation, and Ionic and other dialects. The dialect section deals mainly with Ionic literary prose (Herodotus), but also gives a brief review of the major dialect families and their geographical regions and of literary dialects and the authors who use each, with half a page on the so-called Doric alpha in choral lyric. In the Syntax, Sections 26–32 (pp. 307–403) introduce the simple sentence and progress from agreement to the article and pronouns to case usage, prepositions, and comparison. Sections 33–37 (pp. 404–473) present the verb, and Section 38 (pp. 474–490) is devoted to questions, directives, wishes, and exclamations. Sections 39–50 (pp. 491–579) provide an introduction to complex sentences and finite subordinate clauses of the usual types. Sections 52–53 (pp. 580–635) deal with the infinitive and participle, and Sections 54–57 (pp. 636–654) provide overviews of subordinate constructions, of moods, of ἄν, οὐ/μή, and ὥς. In Part III, textual coherence, text types, particles, and word order are explained, with a final Section 61 offering four sample passages with introduction, text, translation, and comments (these are *Lys.* 12.5–12, *Xen. Anab.* 1.5.1–4, *Pl. Gorg.* 484c–485a, *Soph. Aj.* 1120–1141).

The *CGCG* deserves high praise for its clarity and thoroughness and for the effective incorporation of modern developments in linguistics without losing

sight of the traditional terminology that students and scholars will find in existing scholarship. Among the features I appreciated most are the distinctions and observations made about tense and aspect in Section 33, such as absolute tense vs. relative tense, subjective determinants of choice of aspect vs. the objective property of the action (lexical aspect), use of the imperfect in narratives; the sections on particles and word order (the latter should now count as the best convenient summary of pragmatic analysis of word order in Greek, to be recommended to every learner who has advanced to any substantial reading of continuous texts). As examples of smaller gems of insight offered to the user I would mention the following: the difference between article-head-article-modifier and head-article-modifier (p. 331, 28.11 n. 2); ἐκεῖνο when used cataphorically (instead of the more usual τοῦτο/τόδε) seems to emphasize the remoteness of the following content, its being unimaginable (p. 354 39.31); the contrasting emphases of ἄλλος and ἕτερος, although they have to concede that the distinction described does not always hold—a concession that unfortunately applies to so many distinctions a teacher would like to pass along to the learner (p. 359, 29.48); the iconic ordering of clauses in a sentence with a temporal clause, namely, ἐξ ὅ clauses tend to follow the matrix clause, clauses with ἐπεὶ and the like tend to precede (p. 539, 42.7 n. 2); the different nuances of participle vs. infinitive construction with verbs of knowledge (p. 619, 32.22ff.); the ordering of multiple postpositives (p. 704, 60.9).

This endorsement of the high quality of the *CGCG* should be kept in mind as I make the transition to enumerating points where I disagree or was surprised by a choice made by the authors. I will also remark on places where I felt there was an omission, where I think a cross-reference would have been very beneficial to the target audience, and where I would like to have seen greater clarity provided (sometimes it seemed to me that the authors' effort to be concise went too far). I do this in the hope that minor revisions may at some point be possible.

First, on the matter of terminology, the authors negotiated with considerable success the difficult problem caused by the gap between the descriptive language of modern linguistics and the traditional terminology found in commentaries, dictionaries, etc. (and found not just for Greek, but also for English, French, etc.). For instance, one of the most annoying divergences is in the confusing similarity to the novice of 'perfect' and 'perfective' and 'imperfect' and 'imperfective'. There are preliminary remarks about terminological problems in the Preface, and at various points they duly record alternative terms, and help the student understand the traditional terms and how they do and do not map onto the alternative system. To my taste, the authors have made things unnecessarily complex by banning 'imperfect indicative' from their usage (though they often list the imperfect among indicatives and particularly among secondary indicatives). What is important is not that someone learn to say 'imperfect' instead of 'imperfect indicative', but that they understand the place of the imperfect within the present system of the verb and realize why one should not expect to find a

separate subjunctive, infinitive, etc. so named. Similarly, the authors avoid the term 'intransitive' for the reasons that they explain in a small-type note in the section on voice (p. 449, 35.3). I find this avoidance quite inconvenient and a little confusing, since the abbreviation for the word is included in the list of abbreviations and it is applied to some English verbs that are given as definitions of Greek ones: e.g., with translations of *τρέπομαι* (p. 167), but not on the same page in connection with *ἕστην*, where the aorist translation 'came to stand, stood still' perhaps obviates the need for the term, but the connection of this to intransitive English 'stand' when used to translate forms in the present middle-passive and in the perfect systems of *ἵστημι* would actually be helpful. In my view, it is more important for the student to recognize the limitation of the term (or rather, the possible narrower and wider applications of the concept) than to avoid using the term.

On the other side of this kind of question, I think 'short diphthong' is a misleading term and better avoided, unless it is always written 'short' diphthong (as they in fact print it once in n. 1 on p. 10). It does not take that much more space to say 'diphthongs beginning with a short vowel' and 'diphthongs beginning with a long vowel' (reserving the term 'long' diphthong or so-called long diphthong for *ᾱ/α*, *ηι/η*, *ωι/ω*). And with such precision being practiced in most of their choices, I do not understand why they stretch the term quantitative metathesis so that it applies to vowel shortening when there is no transposition of vowels. I was initially concerned that their use of 'nasal infix' (p. 137, 12.30, p. 142, 12.39) was similarly stretched in that it refers both to infixes as in *πέπονθα* and what I take to be suffixes as in *αὐξάνω*, *δείκνυμι*. My colleague Andrew Garrett, however, has explained to me that diachronically such suffixes were in fact developed from what were originally nasal infixes. So the authors have simply been cryptic (at least to me, and to anyone who thinks about what 'infix' normally means), and there is also some potential confusion in that they use 'nasal suffix' in n. 2 of 12.30. By being only slightly more expansive here, they could have made their usage clearer, or they could simply have alluded parenthetically to the historical development that justifies their broader sense without going into the details. According to their own usage, they should have used 'infix' rather than 'suffix' in the notes on principal part no. 146 on p. 253, no. 172 on p. 256, but in fact 'suffix' is more helpful to the learner. There is a similar inconsistency in that they avoid using the term 'temporal' augment to label the discussion in 11.37–38 (p. 122), explain their avoidance in n. 1 of 11.38 (the type "is sometimes, somewhat unhelpfully, called 'temporal'"), but nevertheless themselves employ the traditional term (without scare quotes) in the cross-reference at 11.42 on p. 123.

It also appears to me to be unfortunate that they do not comment at the first possible opportunity (pp. 450–451) on the misleading name of 'future middle' (in contrast to the relative accuracy of the name 'aorist middle'), and a helpful cross-reference is lacking to 35.30 (p. 461), where it is explained, in a section set in smaller type, that middle future forms frequently have passive meanings. This issue spills over into their discussion of passive-only

verbs. They seem first to indicate such verbs have only passive forms in the future as well as the aorist, by adding “(and future)” after “aorist” in 35.6 (p. 451), followed by three examples of the aorist passive-only ἐβουλήθην, ἐδυσνήθην, ἐφοβήθην. But n. 2 here admits that some passive-only verbs have ‘middle’ futures, with a cross-reference to 35.31. In the latter place, the reader is told about βουλήσομαι, but not about δυνήσομαι and φοβήσομαι (both of which are classical as well as Homeric). It would have been clearer simply to address the matter of the futures in a separate sentence instead of adding “(and future)” without qualification. And a cross-reference back to this discussion would be appropriate at p. 455, 35.13, when passive futures are again mentioned.

Another area where my (admittedly more traditional) sensibilities were jarred was in the use of the term ‘dynamic’ infinitive to cover every use of the infinitive that is not ‘declarative’ (that is, infinitive used in indirect discourse). In particular, I found the treatment of the infinitive as subject of impersonal verbs or of a copula (or omitted copula) with neuter predicate adjective to be obscured by their treatment at a number of points. First, this type is not separately mentioned in list of uses in the introductory remarks in 51.2 (p. 580). Then, the discussion tends to assimilate infinitives of that type to that of ‘complementary’ infinitives. For instance, p. 581, 51.3 sentence (3) “ποιεῖν is a dynamic infinitive, complementing βουλομένους, a verb of wanting (so too πλεῖν, after a verb of deciding, impers. ἔδοξε)”: note the use of “after”. Again on p. 583 impersonal verbs are listed along with δύναμαι and ἔχω as if there is no distinction; on p. 586 “the infinitive depends on ἀνάγκη”. But at last on p. 587, 51.11 sentences (25) and (26) they reveal that the dynamic infinitive with its accusative subject and any other constituents is “the subject of” δεῖ or ἔδοξε.

I was similarly dismayed to see the bald statement in 51.4 (p. 582) that ‘the future infinitive is never used as dynamic infinitive’ without any mention of (or cross-reference to) μέλλω (the same absolute statement is repeated at 51.15, p. 588). Somewhat later (p. 598) μέλλω + inf. is treated completely separately in 51.33, a confusing position, because the paragraphs in this section are about verbs that can take either a declarative or a dynamic infinitive. I am sure they do not mean to imply that μέλλω + fut. inf. is declarative, but they insist on a distinction between that use and the one with pres. or aor. inf., which they explicitly label dynamic. Such a distinction is, to my mind, completely arbitrary and unnecessary. The fut. inf. is simply a hypercharacterizing alternative to the earlier construction with pres. (or less commonly aor.), and the implication of futurity in μέλλω is what led to the unusual use of the fut. inf. as complementary (or dynamic) with this verb alone (if we assume that editors have correctly emended away the few instances where a future infinitive is transmitted with other verbs, like βούλομαι and δύναμαι).

Similarly foreign to my own way of thinking are two other points about infinitives (pp. 596–597, 51.30–31). They regard the personal δοκῶ = ‘I seem’ as governing a declarative infinitive (as is used with δοκῶ = ‘I

believe') rather than a dynamic one (as is used with the impersonal δοκεῖ = 'it seems best'). They distinguish between an infinitive with the verbs of hoping, expecting, promising, swearing as declarative when the subject of the inf. differs from that of the matrix verb but dynamic when the subject of both is the same: but, at least in the cases of ἐλπίζω and ὄμνυμι, how do these two possibilities differ from ἔφην ἰέναι = "I said I would come" vs. τὸν Φίλιππον ἔφην ἰέναι = "I said Philip would come"—both declarative? The final disagreement that I will treat more than briefly has to do with the topic of accentuation. After the generous historical and technical detail of the phonology section, I was struck, first, by the fact that the topic of accentuation did not follow and, second, by the fact that the presentation of the nominal paradigms that did follow consistently made no mention of the accentuation seen in the various paradigms. E.g., in 4.5 φυγῆς and ἀδελφῆ are in one column and αἰτίας and χώρᾱ in another without any mention of the different accent or any cross-reference. Likewise, there is no cross-reference where appropriate to the effects of the σωτηῆρᾶ-rule (24.11); the paradigm for the o-declension 4.19 does not have a column to show a noun with accent on ultima; in 4.35, for third-declension nouns, no cross-reference is supplied for genitives γυπός vs. φύλακος. This general lack of attention to accentuation within the inflectional system indeed continues almost unabated throughout the morphology section, and accents are finally presented only at the end of it, in section 24 (only the short section on dialects follows it). Exceptions include a cross reference in 4.27 n. 2 for the accent of Μενέλεως; in 5.41 n. 1 for the accent of comparatives in -(ι)ων; in 6.3 n. 1, where the reader is told that καλῶς is accented like gen. pl. καλῶν and ἀξίως like ἀξίων (but anyone who has read the book in sequence to this point will have no idea why καλῶν and ἀξίων are different); at 13.30 n. 2 for the different treatment of thematic aorist participles and infinitives. At 13.13, when introducing the ending of the active inf. of sigmatic and pseudo-sigmatic aorists is introduced, there is a cross-reference to 24.20 n. 1 rather than the straightforward instruction that such aorists all have their accent on the penult and if the penult contains a long vowel that accent will be circumflex. Moreover, their two examples are παιδεῦσαι and ἀγγεῖλαι but no example of the type πέμψαι is given (by their own practice as seen with the noun declensions, they would not have had to address the different accents). Admittedly, there are traditions in the teaching of elementary Greek (especially in UK in past generations) in which accents are ignored or greatly downplayed, but I would expect something different in a large grammar like the *CGCG*.

I pass on to briefer comments on miscellaneous points:

p. 4, 4.15: The statement that Doric genitive is sometimes found ἰων proper names would better specify "proper names of Doric origin in Xen." The example Καλλία is given, but Καλλίου is the only genitive ever found in Attic inscriptions (except post-classical *IG II<sup>2</sup> 1130*, which is not written in Attic dialect); in the *TLG* the only instance is one in *Xen. Ages. 8.3 Καλλία τοῦ*

Λακεδαιμονίου, where Xen. is presumably using the form because the man is a Lacedaemonian. The other proffered example Εύρώτα is found, in all of classical prose, once in Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.28, but this was indeed the common form of genitive of this Doric proper name, Εύρώτου being attested rarely and only in a few scholia and Byzantine authors.

p. 9, 1.22: We have no way to estimate when the pronunciation of αυ in ταῦρος and αυ in ταῦτό became identical, since inscriptions could not distinguish between them; that the latter was once distinct is an inference from the analogy of the separate existence of ηυ and ευ; but ηυ was pronounced ευ by the fourth century BCE, and I would conjecture that in fifth-century Athens speakers already pronounced αυ the same no matter what its origin.

p. 25, 1.68 n. 1: The explanation that “Results such as τᾶς ... originally would have occurred only when these words were followed by a vowel” is cryptic because of its brevity. Either a few words of explanation should be added (when a consonant followed, other examples show that compensatory lengthening did not take place when νσ became σ), or the information omitted.

p. 74, 5.25: The adj. type -εντ- (-εις, -εσσα, -εν) is demoted to smaller type, and they give the incorrect impression that χαρίεις is chiefly poetic, like other adjectives of this type; but χαρίεις is not a poetic word (to be sure, it is not used in Attic oratory except Isocrates, but it is found in Old Comedy, Xenophon, Plato, and then Aristotle, etc.).

p. 79, 5.39: The entry for παλαίτερος (παλαίτατος) should have the additional remark “but also: παλαιότερος (παλαιότατος)”, as is done for σχολαίτερος, -τατος.

p. 85, 6.4: To me, it seems lax to list, in illustrating adverbs based on other cases, gen. μικροῦ, ὀλίγου without mentioning the origin of the usage as gen. with δεῖ (in the very next example, for instance, they note for dative adjectives used as adverbs that “usually feminine ὀδῶ may be supplied”).

pp. 86–87, 6.7–11: The locative and instrumental are mentioned here without any previous preparation for the novice (nor is the ablative ever mentioned, so far as I noticed). Considering the amount of historical explanation given for morphology, I wondered why there was not a little more diachronic information about topics like case usage.

p. 86, 6.10: It would be useful to note that πόρρω is also πρόσω in poetry and to give more than just ‘forward’ for its meaning (compare p. 396, 31.9).



p. 88, 6.13: It would be more helpful to list πλέον along with πλεῖον, the former being about 30 times more common in Attic (and even πλεῖν is almost as common as πλεῖον).

p. 89, 7.2: Mention should also have been made of the ‘article’ used as pronoun, or at least a cross-reference given to 28.26–28.

p. 100, 8.2: Near the bottom of the table, it appears that a line containing the English for οὕτως has disappeared, since it is unlikely that they wish to say that the only meaning of οὕτως is “in that way”. And a cross-reference to 29.29–31 is needed in the unnecessarily cryptic note below the table “The relationship between ἐνθένδε/ἐντεῦθεν/ἐκεῖθεν, ὧδε/οὕτως/ἐκείνως ... is similar to that between ὅδε/οὗτος/ἐκεῖνος”.

p. 102, 9.2, 9.5: No mention is made of the fact that δύο is often undeclined (often in Thucydides, a few examples in Xenophon, Demosthenes, Dinarchus).

p. 114, 11.15: Since the introductory statement says that endings express voice only “usually”, it would have been clearer to be explicit (or provide a cross-reference) about which endings do not necessarily express voice.

p. 125, 11.48: Mention is made of reduplication of verbs in γλ- with ἐ-, but no example is given; one of the three classical Greek examples could have been offered (κατεγλωττισμένην in Aristophanes, ἐξεγλυμμέν- in Eupolis and Plato).

p. 198, 18.1: The statement about reduplication is incomplete in that it does not mention Attic reduplication (which is, however, covered in the last paragraph of the paragraph cross-referenced here).

p. 207 (also p. 209): It is odd to give the translation “have lost one’s wits” as the only or primary English for the intransitive sense of διέφθορα; the same is noted in the principal part list on p. 258, where it is misleading not to indicate that διέφθορα is usually transitive in sense, like διέφθαρκα.

pp. 232–259. The pages with the table of principal parts lack page numbers (they are set in ‘landscape’ mode): does CUP’s production software lack the capability of placing the running heads and page numbers in the usual position? Reference within the section is assisted by the fact that the principal parts are numbered as well as being in alphabetical order. The table format is of course handy for learners. The problem with such a format in a large grammar is that there is too little room for consistently helpful comments, qualifications, and cross-references. One would love to see an up-to-date revision of the verb list in the second volume of Kühner–Blass, since that list, formatted in paragraphs, was explicit about forms that are

poetic or late or dialectical (the verb list in Smyth is likewise set in paragraphs).

p. 237, principal parts no. 43 δέω ('bind') and no. 44a δέω ('lack'): The note could usefully also have given a cross-reference (to 21.17) about the wholesale contraction in the present of the former compared to the latter.

p. 238, principal part no. 48a δοκέω: The form δέδοχα listed in the perfect column should be replaced with long dash indicating that there is no perfect active in classical Greek: δέδοχα occurs once in a 14th-century text, and Cassius Dio twice uses pluperfect forms ἔδεδοχ-.

p. 241, principal part no. 40 εὐρίσκω: Neither in 1.21–22 nor in 11.37–42 is mention made of the change of pronunciation (ηυ ceasing to be distinct from ευ during the fourth century) that accounts for the 'unaugmented' forms in εὐρ- that are common in transmission except where special care has been taken to restore or maintain ηῦρ-. Thus the note here "aor. and pf. also εὐ- (without augment./redupl.; εὔρηκα, etc.)" is not very informative.

p. 255, principal part no. 161 στρέφω: The perfect ἔστροφα would better have been shown as -έστροφα since it occurs a few times in compounds, while the simplex is a form attested only in lists of principal parts in late grammarians and Etymologica. The same applies to the instance on p. 207.

p. 258, principal part no. 182 φεύγω: The future with epsilon-contraction is not absent from prose, but very rare (twice in Plato, unless one changes the text to eliminate this form).

p. 287, 24.23 n.: The explanation of why we find some feminine genitive plural adjective forms accented on the penult instead of having a circumflex on the ending (from contraction) seems very convoluted. Simpler to say that when the fem. of an adj. has short-vowel alpha-forms in the feminine singular the accent is the same as in all alpha-declension nouns (circumflex from contraction), whereas when a feminine adjective has long alpha or eta in the singular, the accentuation of the genitive plural is assimilated to the masculine/neuter form (which also conveniently allows speakers in some cases to distinguish by accentuation between a noun and adjective otherwise spelled alike, ἀξιῶν vs. ἀξίων).

p. 289, 24.26: In addition to the -κλής type, mention should have been made of named in -ῶν from -άων/-όων (Ποσειδῶν, Ξενοφῶν).

pp. 289–292: For the more abstruse rules for accentuation (with proclitics, enclitics, elision, etc.) I wonder whether there should have been some mention of the uncertainty whether the systems advocated in our postclassical sources incorporate details that were needed to fill out the

systems, for which they had no inadequate evidence, that is, some rules may have enshrined conventions (not in fact respected by many scribes) rather than reflecting realities of spoken classical Greek.

p. 341, 29.7, sentence (14): The elaboration added to the translation of Is. 2.8 is incorrect: Meneclēs is not “the accused” but the now-deceased adoptive father of the speaker, and at the time referred to in this sentence (before adoption), he was the speaker’s brother-in-law, married to the speaker’s sister (αὐτήν).

p. 355, 29.35 n. 1: Mention could also have been made of the placement of τοιοῦτος and the like in predicate position, as in Thuc. 6.43 τοσσηδε τῆ παρασκευῆ Ἀθηναῖοι . . . ἐς τὴν Σικελίαν ἐπεραιοῦντο = “such was the magnitude of the expedition with which the Athenians crossed over to Sicily”.

p. 357, 29.42: among the idiomatic uses of τις there is no mention of adjectival phrases of the type δεινὴ τις, πολὺς τις (and there are similar expressions with ποτε and πως, some of which have a softening effect rather than a strengthening one).

p. 358, 29.45: Somewhat misleadingly, perhaps, no example is given of πᾶς in the attributive position with a singular noun (ἡ πᾶσα πόλις Xen., τοῦ παντὸς λόγου Thuc., ἡ πᾶσα παρασκευὴ Antiphon, etc.).

pp. 360–382, 30.1–58 on Cases: The relation of case usage with prepositions to the other uses of the cases is somewhat obscured because the prepositions are given their separate treatment in 31 and are mentioned in 30 only in the first paragraph (where the separation is announced and a cross-reference is provided) and at the end when some general comments on expressions of time and space are offered (again with a reference to paragraphs in 31). The information in 30.56 could usefully have been incorporated into the earlier paragraphs on case usage related to time and space, or at least cross-reference forward should have been supplied in those earlier paragraphs. I would like to have seen a reminder at the end of each of the sections on the oblique cases that the case is also used with certain prepositions, with a cross-reference to 31. This would be helpful to learners who skim through the list of the uses of a particular case for review.

p. 368, 30.21: λαμβάνομαι = “take hold of, hold onto” should have been included in the list of verbs taking the gen.

p. 372, 30.28 n. 2: It seems to be a mistake that no example is given of an ‘attributive genitive’ as a ‘predicative complement’ (e.g. a gen. of possession or of material with a copula verb), either here or in the cross-referenced paragraph 26.8.

p. 373, 30.32: A cross-reference to the discussion of the difference between time expressions (30.56) is needed, esp. since they say that the genitive can also express “time when”.

p. 375, 30.37: I would have expected some acknowledgment of the influence of the prepositional prefix on the use of the dative with some of the verbs of commanding. In n. 1 the important fact that κελεύω takes an acc. of the person commanded is revealed in smaller type, but no mention is made that in contrast παρακελεύομαι takes a dative.

p. 377, 30.41: It is odd that no attempt is made to explain the different nuances of the dative of the possessor and genitive of possession (30.28); it is unhelpful to leave the distinction to be inferred from the terminology ‘possession’ vs. ‘possessor’.

pp. 380–381, 30.56: For myself, I found that the figures illustrating the differences between the cases used for expressions of time and space were not immediately clear (I initially misinterpreted one aspect of the graphic) and I myself would have added more words to the accompanying text to guide visual interpretation. This may not be a problem for others, since I confess that I am slowed down (and easily annoyed) by interfaces that use many icons rather than words.

p. 396, 31.9, entry for ἔνεκα: “usually a postposition, but → 41.4 n.1, 48.2” is potentially misleading, since the cross-reference is to use as a conjunction. More correct would be ‘postposition or, less commonly, preposition; also a conjunction → 41.4 n.1, 48.2’. Likewise, on the next page, χάριν is not always a postposition.

p. 396, 31.9, entry for ἐπίπροσθεν + gen.: Some odd accidental substitution or error in editing or compositing has occurred, for this should actually be ἐμποδών + gen. (as the definition and the observation “especially with γίγνομαι” make certain), and the entry should thus be moved up to precede ἐντός. ἐπίπροσθεν itself should have been listed with πρόσθεν, ἔμπροσθεν on the next page.

p. 401, 32.11: Mention and illustration of the alternative construction of an adverbial accusative like πολύ with comparatives would not be amiss either here or in an adjacent added paragraph.

p. 460, 35.25: In a listing of γίγνομαι - ἐγενόμην as a middle-only verb expressing change of state or position, the use of ‘later’ in the parenthetical remark containing “later also aor. ἐγενήθην, ... later also mid. perf. γεγένημαι” is cryptic and inconsistent. The perfect form is ‘late’ only in reference to the language of Homer and Hesiod, for it is found in poets

thereafter and many times in classical prose as well. The aor. pass., in contrast, is rare in classical Greek (exceedingly rare in classical prose).

p. 467, 36.4: No cross-reference (to 24.34, 26.10) is provided when they note that “ἔστι (so accented)” is equivalent to impersonal ἔξεστι.

p. 470, 36.15 n. 1: For consistency it ought to be “δεῖ and μέτεστι are construed” rather than just “δεῖ is construed”, since both are listed in the cross-referenced paragraph 36.3; but it is true that μέτεστι with inf. is rather rare, a fact that is not mentioned in 36.3.

p. 486, 38.38: In my opinion, ὥς is not on a par with εἴθε and εἰ γάρ in introducing optative wishes. The latter two are hypercharacterizing particles making the stance of wishing even clearer than the bare optative, while I would interpret ὥς as “how, how much”, a wider use that coincidentally occurs at times in optative wishes.

p. 487, 38.40: ὄφελον is of course aorist, not imperfect, as labeled here by an oversight.

p. 496, 40.5, n. 1: It will confuse novice readers that the subjunctive mood (deliberative questions, 38.16) in indirect questions is not mentioned in this note along with the other possibilities enumerated.

p. 497, 40.9 sentence (3): παραδώσω in Ar. *Eq.* 1109 is not “I will return” but “I will hand over, entrust”.

p. 519, 45.3, sentence (3): This example is wrongly placed under “in primary sequence” (the matrix verb is διανοοῦντο).

p. 530, 45.4 n. 1: I doubt the claim of a special nuance for inclusion of ἄν in a purpose clause with ὅπως/ὥς; in particular, ὥς ἄν μάθῃς is hardly distinguishable from the common ὥς μάθῃς.

p. 534, 46.8: One could have added a note about the use of ὥστε μὴ οὐ as alternative to ὥστε μή + inf. of result after a negative matrix clause (cf. 51.36 on τὸ μὴ οὐ + inf. after verbs of preventing); but perhaps result infinitives of this kind is so rare in Herodotus and Attic prose that it is justifiable to omit the phenomenon.

p. 549, 48.5, on ἐπεὶ or ὥς beginning a new independent sentence: Mention should have been made here of ἐπεὶ followed by an imperative, and an example given, such as Pl., *Euthd.* 287c1–4 (ἐπεὶ εἰπέ ... ἐπεὶ ἀπόκριναί).

p. 554, 49.8 on potential conditions (future less vivid in other terminology): “The speaker considers fulfillment of the condition possible, but no more

than that. It is usually implied that the condition is only remotely relevant". I wonder whether 'relevant' is the right word here; at any rate, I do not understand what the second sentence adds to what is already conveyed in the first.

p. 566, 50.6 n. 2: Cross-reference to relative connection (50.16), which may be a development of digressive relative clauses, would be useful here.

p. 577, 50.29 sentence (65): The translation of Thuc. 7.23.2 should have "on board their boats and a (certain) merchant ship" rather than "on board boats and merchant ships".

p. 579, 50.38 sentence (80): In "to ward you off, if you begin hostilities, in whatever manner ... you choose" (Thuc. 1.78.4) 'choose' is not very accurate for ὑφηγήσθε; better 'lead the way, set the example'.

p. 581, 51.3 sentence (2): Coincidentally, this example contains ἀλλ' ἂν ἀληθὲς ἦ σκοπεῖτω, which is form of indirect εἰ-question (or condition used as an εἰ-question) not described or exemplified in the discussion of that topic (42.3).

p. 584, 51.8: βιάζομαι (which was used in example (6) two pages earlier) should have been included in the list of verbs of ordering, forcing, manipulating along with ἀναγκάζω. Later on the same page παύω is listed along with ἄρχομαι as a phase verb that can take a dynamic infinitive, but only ἄρχομαι + inf. is illustrated before the note reveals that phase verbs more commonly have a participle construction. For παύω there are few examples in the authors they regularly cite, but they could have used Arist. *Ach.* 634 παύσας ὑμᾶς ξενικοῖσι λόγοις μὴ λίαν ἐξαπατᾶσθαι; an instance from Herodotus in fact appears as example (95) on p. 600.

p. 616, 52.15: A useful addition would be an example of σύννοια with dative reflexive and dative supplementary participle, such as Antiphon, *De caede Herodis* 87 ξυνειδῶς αὐτῷ τοιοῦτον ἔργον εἰργασμένω; Pl. *Ap.* 22d ἐμαυτῷ γὰρ συνήδη οὐδὲν ἐπισταμένω ὡς ἔπος εἶπεῖν (an alternative to nominative, as in Pl. *Ap.* 21b ἐγὼ γὰρ δὴ οὔτε μέγα οὔτε σμικρὸν σύννοια ἐμαυτῷ σοφὸς ὢν; Isoc. *Philip.* 79 ὅταν καὶ μηδὲν σαυτῷ συνειδῆς ἐξαμαρτάνων; Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.12 ὅσοι συνήδεσαν ἑαυτοῖς μὴ ὄντες τοιοῦτοι).

p. 626, 52.33: Under accusative absolute only the use with participles of impersonal verbs is mentioned, and I did not find in the book any mention of accusative absolute with ὡς (ὥσπερ) with a personal verb (e.g., Isoc. *De bigis* 23 οἴονται καὶ παρ' ὑμῖν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις εὐδοκιμήσειν, ἦν ὡς ἂν δύνωνται πλεῖστα περὶ αὐτοῦ βλασφημήσωσιν, ὥσπερ οὐ πάντας εἰδότες ὅτι ... ; Schwyzer II.402 gives examples from Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato).

p. 634, 52.50: I myself find the category “attributive participles in apposition” (that is, a participial phrase agreeing with a noun but not in attributive position, such as Νικονίδας, Περδίκκᾶ ἐπιτήδειος ὤν, their example from Thuc. 4.78.2) to be quite unnecessary. Such a participle is in predicate position and adds an optional (circumstantial) fact about the head noun, as a non-restrictive relative clause would, and I see no reason to call it anything but a circumstantial participle.

p. 634, 52.51 sentence (141): The translation of Dem. 14.20 offered (“if you need a hundred triremes, sixty talents will cover the cost, but if you need two hundred, thirty talents will cover the cost”) makes the arithmetic paradoxical. The sense is better expressed, I believe, “sixty talents will be available to cover costs ... thirty talents will be available to cover costs”, thus not implying that all costs are covered, as if the per unit price of a trireme drops by 50% when you build twice as many.

p. 690, 59.49 sentence (79): The translation of κέντροισι should be ‘goad’ and not ‘whip’.

p. 699, 59.71: For καὶ μὴν used “to signal the (unexpected or unannounced) entrance on the stage of a new character”, a better example could have been offered than Soph. *Ant.* 526, where Ismene’s entrance has in fact been awaited since Creon gave the command at 491 to bring her out of the palace, and 526 is in fact the announcement of her entrance. I would say that in signaling entrances καὶ μὴν sometimes marks fulfillment of an expectation or of a wish or need (cf. Aesch. *Sept.* 372, Eur. *Alc.* 507, *Heracl.* 118, *Andr.* 1166, etc.).

p. 719, 60.33 sentence (54): It is not clear to me why the topic and focus are not marked in this examples as in the two previous ones.

The English in *CGCG* is generally very good, indeed remarkably good. I assume this is a testament to the care both of the authors and of the press, and it contrasts favorably with the odd English that appears in a good number of books from Brill and De Gruyter. There are only a few places where the English struck me as unidiomatic in one way or another:

p. 398, 32.1: I find the English superlative translation of Greek comparative forms in “Socrates is the wisest of the two of us” or (p. 400, 32.9) “For among two wretched men there could not be a most fortunate one” less idiomatic than the versions with ‘wiser’ and ‘more fortunate’.

p. 402, 32.13, sentence (23): “lifted ... on” should be “lifted ... onto”.

p. 438, 34.2, sentence (3): Not “may you provide such men well”, but “may you (generally, always) give good fortune (or blessings) to such men”.

p. 469: Literal translations of impersonal passives into English are not idiomatic in any case, but I would consider their “there has been laboured by them” less idiomatic than “it has been laboured”, and I consider “there has been a labouring” better, and “there should be a going” better than their “there should be gone”.

p. 523, 43.4, sentence (2): “defeat them” is more idiomatic than “defeat it” (referring to “the number of ships”).

p. 577, 50.29 sentence (66): “pains, such as none of my friends may suffer” is not idiomatic as a version of the cupitive optative; it would have to be “such as may none of my friends suffer” (in itself translationese rather than very typical English: better “such as I wish that none of my friends may suffer”).

A few comments can be made about format. First, the Greek font used by the Cambridge University Press is in general a fine one. But as with many modern polytonic Greek fonts used by publishers, the diacritics tend to be so small (especially in the vertical dimension) that it can be hard to distinguish between the two breathing signs or even between the acute and grave when they appear in combinations. This is particularly true in smaller font sizes, and the difficulty may be exacerbated by the low-contrast ink used in many modern books, and by the fashion for fonts with very thin stems in the character design. For those who read the eBook instead of a print copy, magnification is easy. Older eyes reading the print version may occasionally have to reach for a magnifying glass. I found it especially hard to perceive whether the breve over vowels was actually a breve because the arc is so shallow (see page 26 ὑβρίζω vs. ὕβριζον with breve on the first upsilon, macron on the second). Another font imperfection is that the underline is so placed that it makes an iota subscript, if present, barely visible (e.g., p. 297, 25.15, in the underlined dative plural ending of χώρησι). Second, the method of labeling of syntactic elements used in the section Introduction to Simple Sentences (pp. 309–320) is one familiar to linguists, who want their discussions to be accessible to other linguists who do not know the language under discussion, but this format is offputting and difficult to read for the student of Greek because the labels are in the line and separate the Greek words from each other by irregular intervals. (There exists an alternative format in which the labels are on a separate line below the example, but that is harder to typeset.) Fortunately, this method is not used very often in the book.



For a book of such length and with so much Greek in it, there are remarkably few undetected typos or compositing errors. Once again, praise is owed to the authors and the press. Here are the items I noted:

p. 30, 1.83 n. 1, line 5: read *will educate* for *strengths*.

p. 244, principal part 86a ἴστημι: the paragraph formatting of the note under ‘particulars’ needs be adjusted so the last line of the paragraph is not justified, with huge gaps between words; similarly, the last line of p. 245 for principal part 97; and manual hyphenation should have been added so that item 98b on p. 246 is laid out more suitably.

p. 343, 29.9, sentence (22): read βεκός for Βεκός.

p. 386, in right column of the first band of table: the Greek line ἐκ τῶν παρόντων has dropped out above its translation “based on the available means”.

p. 403, 32.14, sentence (30): in “accentuation and position of πάρα” one must correct “position” to “sense” or “idiomatic use”.

p. 407, 2nd line from bottom: read “whenever” for “wherever”.

p. 567, 50.9, sentence (13), last line: for καθὶ read καὶ.

Finally, it should be noted that both the paperback and the eBook version are priced at a level that will allow students of Greek to afford the purchase—another cause for praise of this ambitious, high-quality endeavor.