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PREFACE.

The present work is the result of an attempt to revise the much smaller book which was first published under the same title in 1860, and again, somewhat enlarged, in 1865. When it falls to the lot of a writer to revise, under the greater sense of responsibility which doubled years and more than doubled experience have brought him, a book written in the enthusiasm of youth as an ephemeral production, he is sure to be his own severest critic; and what he begins as a revision inevitably becomes, as he proceeds, more and more a new and independent work. I cannot forget that this book is addressed in great part to a different generation of scholars from that to which the former one was offered; and a treatment of the subject which was permissible in 1860 would be far from satisfactory now. I then attempted chiefly to give "a plain and practical statement of the principles which govern the relations of the Greek Moods and Tenses," avoiding theoretical discussions as far as possible. At that time prevailing theories, based chiefly on abstract speculations, had obscured some of the most important facts in the syntax of the moods, and perhaps no better service could be rendered by a new writer than the clearing away of some of the clouds. Few younger scholars are aware how modern are many of the grammatical doctrines which are now taught in all classical schools. It is hard to believe that so elementary a principle as that by which the aorist infinitive is past in ἔργον ἐπιλέγειν and future in βούλεται ἐπιλέγειν was never distinctly stated until 1847, when it appeared simultaneously in the Greek
Syntax of Professor Madvig at Copenhagen and in the Greek Grammar of Professor Sophocles at Harvard University. Something more than mere statement of facts has been attempted in the present work, although nothing has been further from my thoughts than a complete theoretical discussion of all the principles which govern the use of the moods. He who ventures far upon that sea is in great danger of being lost in the fog or stranded; for, while Comparative Philology has throw much and most welcome light on the early history of the Greek language, it has also made us more painfully aware of our ignorance, although it is a more enlightened ignorance than that of our predecessors.

Since the publication of the first edition, many most important additions have been made to our resources. Of these I can undertake to notice only a few. Delbrück's elaborate treatise on the Greek Subjunctive and Optative (in his Syntaktische Forschungen, vol. i.), with a comparison of Greek and Sanskrit usages, is familiar to all scholars. Whatever may be thought of Delbrück's main thesis, the distinction of the subjunctive as the mood of will from the optative as the mood of wish, none can fail to be impressed and instructed by his attractive and original treatment of the subject, which has made an epoch in grammatical science. Lange's unfinished work on the Particle έι in Homer is a model of careful and thorough investigation. When I think of my deep and continued indebtedness to Lange's learned discussions, which include a treatment of all the 200 examples of έι with the optative in Homer, I am grieved to dissent so frequently from his most important conclusions. His chief argument is discussed in Appendix I. Schanz, in his Beiträge zur Griechischen Syntax, has undertaken a work of immense extent, involving an amount of labour which it is hard to over-estimate. His plan is to give full and accurate statistics of the use of every construction bearing on the history of Greek syntax, and thus to make a true historic syntax of the language a possibility. The work of collecting, classifying, and discussing the examples of different constructions has been assigned by him
to a large number of colleagues, and every year testifies to substantial progress. The following treatises bearing on the construction of the moods and tenses have already been published by Schanz: Weber, Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze; Sturm, Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Constructionen mit ἰπό; Schmitt, Über den Ursprung des Substativesatzes mit Relativpartikeln im Griechischen; Grünwald, Der freie formelhafte Infinitiv der Limitation im Griechischen; Birklein, Entwicklungsgeschichte des substantivierten Infinitivs. The amount of patient labour devoted to these compilations, in which the exact number of examples of each construction in each Greek author before Aristotle is given, while the most important passages are quoted and nearly all are cited, will be most gratefully appreciated by those who would be least willing to undertake the work themselves. The results of such dry enumerations are often interesting and surprising. No one knows whether statistics will be dry and barren or not, until they are collected and classified; and though it may seem a useless task to count the examples of each of the final particles in all Greek literature before Aristotle, it is interesting to know that in all the Attic prose, except Xenophon, ὁς final occurs only five or six times, while ἧν occurs 999 times. Some of the results derived from Weber’s statistics of the use of the final particles are given in Appendix III., and an account of Xenophon’s peculiar use of ὅς, ὅς ἦν, and ὀπός ἦν in Appendix IV., for the benefit of those who have not Weber’s book at hand, or want the patience to follow his elaborate historical statements. Monro’s Homeric Grammar is one of the best results of recent English scholarship, and for the study of Homeric usages in the moods it is invaluable. I regret that the new edition of this book, soon to be published, has not come in time to benefit the present work. It seems a mere form to acknowledge my obligations to the standard Grammars; but I must repeat my former expression of thanks to Madvig, Krüger, and Kühner, not to mention a host of others. To Madvig I am indebted for the first conviction that the syntax of the Greek moods belonged
to the realm of common sense. To Krüger I have been indebted in the study of every construction; and I have still retained most of the remarks on the tenses of the indicative which were originally borrowed from him. The revised edition of Kühner's Griechische Grammatik has supplied a large store of examples, to which I have frequently had recourse. I am under especial obligation to him for many of the examples which illustrate the uses of the Supplementary Participle, and the corresponding uses of the infinitive with many of the same verbs. Frequent references are made in the notes to the authorities which I have mentioned, and to many others.

It is with pride and pleasure that I acknowledge my deepest indebtedness to an Americanscholar, whose writings have thrown light upon most of the dark places in Greek syntax. I need not say that I refer to my friend, Professor Gildersleeve of Baltimore. As editor of the American Journal of Philology he has discussed almost every construction of the Greek moods, and he has always left his mark. His two reviews of Weber's work on the Final Sentence in vols. iv. and vi. of his Journal may well save many scholars the trouble of reading the book itself, while they contain much new matter which is valuable to every one. The acute observation, that the use of ἀν and κε in final constructions depends on the force of ὀς, ὄπως, and ὃφα as conditional relative or temporal adverbs, explains much which before seemed inexplicable. His article on πρίν in vol. ii. stated important principles of classic usage which were confirmed by Sturm's statistics; and this, with the later review of Sturm's volume, has done much to correct current errors and to establish sounder views about πρίν. His articles on the Articular Infinitive in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1878 and in the third volume of his Journal practically anticipated the results of Birklein's statistics. I can mention further only his article in vol. vii. of the Journal on the Consecutive Sentence, which gives (it seems to me) the clearest statement ever made of the relations of ὁστε with the infinitive to ὁστε with the finite moods. I have expressed my
indebtedness to these and other writings of Gildersleeve as occasion has required; but I have also often referred to his articles in his *Journal* by the simple mention of that periodical. I have sometimes omitted a reference where one might seem proper, lest I should appear to make him responsible for what he might deem some dangerous heresy.

I am also under the greatest obligation to my friends and colleagues in Harvard University, Professors Allen, Greenough, Lane, Lanman, White, and Wright, and Dr. Morgan, for valuable suggestions, and to most of them for important help in revising and proof-reading. I regret that I have not had the advantage of their aid in reading the proofs of the last two-thirds of the work. To my friendship of twenty-one years with Dr. Henry Jackson, of Trinity College, Cambridge, I am indebted for some of the most important suggestions which I have received since the publication of the former editions.

The Index to the Examples includes all of the more than 4800 examples quoted or cited in the main body of the work, but not those in the Appendix nor those which are given in the classified lists in the footnotes on pp. 92, 115, 152, 172, and 290. It may seem useless to index many examples which merely illustrate a common principle, like those of a simple aorist infinitive or present indicative; but it would be difficult to discriminate here, and one seldom knows what may make an example useful to another. The same consideration has induced me to give as great a variety of examples as possible, from authors of different classes, illustrating many constructions which apparently need no such aid.

Every teacher will see that many parts of this work, in its present enlarged form, are not adapted to the ordinary uses of a grammatical text-book for the recitation room. On the other hand, it is hoped that the increased fulness and the greater space given to discussions will make the work more useful for private study and for reference.

The Dramatists are cited by Dindorf's lines; except the tragic fragments, which follow Nauck's edition, and the
comic fragments, which follow Kock. The lyric fragments follow Bergk’s Poetae Lyrici. Plato is cited by the pages and letters of Stephanus, and the Orators by the numbers of the orations and the sections now in universal use. The other citations will be easily understood.

In conclusion, I must express my grateful thanks to the University Libraries of Heidelberg and Leyden, and to the Royal Library at The Hague, for the hospitality which was kindly shown me while I was correcting the proofs.

W. W. GOODWIN.

PALLANZA, LAGO MAGGIORE,
24th September 1889.

In the impression of 1897 many errors have been corrected, some forms of expression have been changed, and some new examples have been added. The most important change is that in §§ 572 and 573; this is further explained in the new Appendix VI., page 411. A list of the new examples is given on page 440, omitting those which have been inserted in the regular Index.

ROME, November 1896.