detailed, and scholarly. The arguments in this area are crucial; since language so often is seen as emblematic of all human culture and even as a marker of human status itself, it matters very greatly whether we owe language to the gods as a gift or whether, more democratically perhaps, we were able to invent language for ourselves without divine aid. Again, whether it was necessary for a first-discoverer of language to grant this new-found ability to other, lesser humans, or whether language evolved in just the same way as the other arts and technologies, by the application of human ingenuity by trial and error over time, is a question that fundamentally affects the very nature and basis of human culture and society.

The final chapter examines anomalous cases that seem to challenge received ideas of language as a marker of humanity and as our highest cultural possession, with speaking animals, non-speaking savages, and 'people' such as the Dog-heads of India, who not only have no spoken human language, communicating by gesture and barking, but whose status as either humans or animals is in doubt.

Overall, this is a very useful book, scholarly and very thoroughly researched. My only real criticism is that often the analysis of particular passages (e.g. the place of language in the great myth of Plato's *Protagoras*) is so thorough that it can have a rather laboured feel. However, this carping aside, I have learned a good deal from G.'s book and I can thoroughly recommend it both to those who have not studied the field and to those who have already engaged with ancient questions of the origins of language and its place in human culture. Both will find this book valuable.

National University of Ireland, Maynooth GORDON CAMPBELL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni264

KRÜGER'S SYNTAX REVIVED

G. L. Cooper III (after K. W. Krüger): *Greek Syntax*. Vols 1 and 2, *Attic Prose Syntax*. Vols 3 and 4, *Early Greek Poetic and Herodotean Syntax*. Pp. 3512. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998–2002. Cased, US$295 (set of four volumes). ISBN: 0-472-10843-3, 0-472-10844-1, 0-472-11294-5, 0-472-11295-3.

> It is . . . a great shame that the single best all round presentation [of Greek syntax], distinguished by its practical and inductive organization, that namely by Karl Wilhelm Krüger, has long been unavailable. In fact Raphael Kühner's work, despite its awkward inductive [*sic*] organization, has, due primarily to the elaboration which Bernhard Gerth gave it, largely displaced Krüger's exemplary treatment. I am attempting to remedy this situation, at least for English speaking students.

Thus writes Guy L. Cooper III on pp. 2–3 of the preface to the first part of his stupendous four volume *Greek Syntax*, entitled *Attic Greek Prose Syntax* after K. W. Krüger. More than thirty years ago, C. had already announced a plan to write a 'neue umfassende und kritisch fundierte Darstellung der griechischen Syntax'.[1] Krüger's *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen* was, during the greater part of the nineteenth

[1]Preface to his dissertation *Zur syntaktischen Theorie und Textkritik der attischen Autoren* (Zürich, 1971), p. 2.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni265 Published online by Cambridge University Press

century, a widely used book, both in and outside the German-speaking classical world.[2] Is Krüger's treatment of Greek syntax indeed 'exemplary'? The answer must be 'no'. The work has serious shortcomings, both as to presentation and as to contents. In what follows I will simultaneously discuss a number of aspects of Krüger's syntax and of C.'s version thereof. I conclude with a few remarks on other aspects of C.'s work.

First, the presentation. One of the conspicuous features of Krüger's grammar is that it is divided into two parts: 'Erster Theil: Ueber die gewöhnliche, vorzugsweise die attische Prosa' and 'Zweiter Theil: Ueber die Dialekte'. In both parts there are further subdivisions, which relate to 'Formlehre' and 'Syntax', respectively. The syntax of the first part is simply called 'Syntax', that of the second part 'poetisch-dialektische Syntax'; the latter is devoted mainly to Homer, the Attic dramatists and Herodotus. This division has been taken over by C. His syntax therefore consists of an *Attic Greek Prose Syntax*, in two volumes, and an *Early Greek Poetic and Herodotean Syntax*, again in two volumes. The volumes are numbered consecutively; the page meter stops at 3512. Now the prose syntax is the basis of Krüger's treatment; here the main analyses of a given phenomenon appear. The other syntax simply adds remarks about the same phenomenon in the poets and Herodotus, as well as a number of peculiarities. This organization means, first of all, that the 'poetisch-dialektische Syntax' can hardly be used without the simultaneous use of the prose syntax. And although after some training the system of cross-references loses part of its unattractiveness, it never makes for easy consultation. The same verdict applies to C.'s syntax. Second, it is by no means the case that the poetic material is only discussed in the poetic syntax. Krüger must have realized that in the end a too rigorous division between the genres would have led to a completely artificial construct. This problem is acknowledged *expressis verbis* by C. (p. 4), and his solution has been to add a great number of examples from Herodotus and drama to the first part (the number of all examples in the first part alone is approximately 59,000!). Inevitably, perhaps, the same passage appears both in the first part and the second. Unfortunately, however, the explanations may differ. Thus, Krüger considers τίκτει at E. *IT* 1319 a perfective present in Part II, Chapter 53, 1.A.3 (p. 88), but a historic present in Part I, where it accordingly appears in a different note (Chapter 53, 1.A.11, p. 164). And while C. avoids mentioning τίκτει at E. *IT* 1319 in two places, he considers another instance of τίκτει (E. *Ba.* 2) a perfective present in Volume I § 53.1.3C (p. 611), but a historic present in Volume III § 53.1.10B (p. 2358).

As for the contents of Krüger's syntax, this is a puzzling mixture of sound and utterly strange ideas. Sound, for instance, is his treatment of the article (§ 50.2, pp. 93ff.: 'Der Artikel als solcher ist . . . deiktisch; er macht den bloßen Begriff zu einem bekannten oder kenntlichen Object, an das der Hörer oder Leser vorzugsweise zu denken Gründe hat: individuelle Bedeutung'; C.'s treatment is much less clear) but his ideas about, for example, the aorist are very strange indeed (p. 167: 'Der Aorist, welcher die Handlung nur in sofern bestimmt als er sie der Vergangenheit zuweist, bezeichnet eigentlich das Eintreten in die Wirklichkeit'; a much better definition in C.).

Due to their intense dislike of deductive presentations (and thus, one fears, of

[2]C.'s syntax is based upon the editions of 1873 (1st part, 5th edn) and 1871 (2nd part, 3rd edition).

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni265 Published online by Cambridge University Press

syntax proper) the all-pervasive organizational principle of both Krüger's and C.'s syntax is form. This has some very undesirable consequences. Thus, the prepositions are not discussed in connection with the noun, but among the adverbs, in between the negatives and the conjunctions. The section on the conjunctions itself is a receptacle of words that share just one single property: they belong to the indeclinabilia. They are simply listed, as in a dictionary, all functional differences being ignored. Thus, ἀλλά is followed by ἄλλως which is followed by ἄμα, suggesting that these words are all 'conjunctions' in the same way. Strangest of all is the appearance of ἄν among the conjunctions, with the translation 'etwa' (not taken over by C., fortunately). Again, relative clauses are first discussed in the section about the pronouns (pp. 133ff.), then in that on the moods (pp. 189ff.; a most unsatisfactory treatment), next in a very brief section on p. 278, that adds virtually nothing to the earlier treatment, and finally in the section on the negatives (pp. 289–90). Sadly, the treatment in the corresponding sections in C. is no better. In combination with the phenomenon mentioned already above this form of organization means that relative clauses are mentioned or discussed in no less than eight different sections: §§ 51.8–14 (pp. 133ff.), 54.13–15 (pp. 189ff.), 65.6 (p. 278), and 67.4 (pp. 289–90), and correspondingly in Part II pp. 78ff., 103ff., 146, and 150. Ditto for C.: pp. 526ff., 751ff., 1061ff., and 1099ff., etc. Not surprisingly both syntaxes teem with cross-references. All these features help explain why Kühner's rather than Krüger's syntax has become our chief reference-work. Anyone who might be inclined to think, like C., that Krüger has fallen into oblivion undeservedly should compare Krüger's (and C.'s) jolting treatment of the relative clauses with the well-organized and transparent discussion of these clauses in Kühner's grammar. And, I should add emphatically, not only in Kühner–Gerth but also in Kühner alone[3] (see Kühner 1870, pp. 905–46, KG 2, 399–443).

Other features of C.'s syntax: C. has departed from Krüger's 'lapidary and Laconic style', by choosing 'a more discursive, full, convenient cast' (p. 5, bottom). 'Discursive' it certainly is. C. revels in elaborate and impressionistic expressions like 'the brilliance of this aspect of dative usage' (p. 282, on the ethical dative), the 'brilliant effect of presence and entity' of the dative in general (p. 285), 'brilliant structures' (p. 770) (on a certain type of imperatival infinitive), 'the compounds of περί taking the dative provide exceptionally brilliant and powerful plastic expressions' (p. 307), 'the brusque vigor of accusatives of relation' (p. 118), 'The subject in this construction [namely with εἰμί] is never the object of direct and deadening ownership' (p. 276), etc. In fact, this verbosity in part explains why C.'s syntax runs to four volumes.

Sometimes, C. in the second volume corrects a mistake made in the first volume, without signalling the original mistake. A glaring example is the treatment of the 'temporal sentences' in § 54.16.0, where C., perhaps misled by the, in fact, extremely lapidary German of Krüger, gives us a very strange idea of the use of some of these clauses (rather than sentences):

> *Πρίν* shows that the action of the subordinate precedes that of the principal. *Ἕως*, *ἔστε*, *ἄχρι* (*οὗ*), *μέχρι* (*οὗ*) show that the action of the subordinate precedes and extends up to the action of the principal. *Ἐπεί*, *ἐπειδή*, and sometimes *ὡς* in the sense *after* show that the action of the subordinate is successive to the action of the principal.

[3]I am thinking especially of the second edition of 1870, which was not yet revised by Gerth.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni265 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This should, of course, be the other way round, and this is indeed what we find in the second part, Volume III p. 2474, with no reference whatsoever to the first part: '*Πρίν . . . until* introduce[s] clauses [*sic*] whose action follows upon and is subsequent to the time of [its] principal', and similarly for *ἐπεί* ('. . . temporal clauses which precede their principal clause in time'), etc. The poor user who consults only the first part will have to live with the idea that the meaning of *πρίν* must be 'after'.

Misprints are legion, but rarely serious. Among the more serious ones is *ἐξ οὗ* for *ἐς οὗ* on p. 2475. The Bibliography in C., Part I hardly deserves that name. It is as if, with Krüger's death, the study of Greek syntax virtually came to an end. The Supplementary Bibliography in Volume IV is better, but why are e.g. W. F. Bakker, *The Greek Imperative*, L. Basset, *Les emplois périphrastiques du verbe grec μέλλειν*, and Ch. Kahn, *The Verb 'Be' in Ancient Greek* lacking?

In sum: an ill-considered enterprise, and a very strange book.

University of Amsterdam A. RIJKSBARON
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni265

NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

J. A. L. Lee: *A History of New Testament Lexicography*. (Studies in Biblical Greek 8.) Pp. xiv + 414, ills. New York: Peter Lang, 2003. Paper, £28.99, US$39.95. ISBN: 0-8204-3480-9.

Lee is known for his standard work *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (Chico, CA, 1983). He is currently working with G. H. R. Horsley on *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament with Documentary Parallels*, to replace H. H. Moulton and G. Milligan's *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (London, 1930). That work was inspired by the pioneering study of Adolf Deissmann (*Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World* [London, 1910]). Deissmann showed that New Testament Greek is not a special variety used by Jews of the Near East or by the Holy Spirit, but is largely the everyday *koine* of the first century. The impact of papyrus discoveries from the sands of Egypt links NT lexicography and the general history of classical scholarship.

The present work comprises a history of NT lexicons and their authors (with annotated bibliography), and case studies of a dozen words of disputed meaning. Demonstrations of persistent misunderstanding connect the second half with the first. L. does not spare his predecessors, though he is sympathetic to their difficulties. His account is sprightly in style and rich in human interest. The first chapter illustrates how long most lexicons have taken to write. The eighteenth-century Cambridge scholar John Mall spent ten years on a work still in manuscript in the library of St John's College. Lexicographers depend on their predecessors to an extent not always obvious. The modern standard work, F. W. Danker (ed.), *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Writings* (Chicago and London, 2000) proclaims itself an adaptation of the sixth edition of the Greek–German lexicon of Walter Bauer, but Bauer himself in successive editions from 1928 relied heavily on the 1910 work of Erwin Preuschen. Two following chapters illustrate how long it has taken for definition rather than gloss to find acceptance in NT

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni265 Published online by Cambridge University Press