served in the Municipal Museum of the Moravian town of Polička, Martinu’s birthplace. Regarding the stay in Gottesgab, she reproduces Kazantzakis’ touching, Franciscan-style entry in his hosts’ guestbook, previously unpublished (but now printed also in Folia Neoellenica 5 [1983], 217), attesting to the splendid conditions for work and peace of mind that attracted Kazantzakis to this location at a crucial period in his life, when he was elaborating the *Odyssey*:

Hier, in diesem begehrten Haus... habe ich zwei von den schönsten, ruhigsten und fruchtbarsten Jahren meines vielgereisten Lebens erlebt.

Hier habe ich das größte Werk meines Lebens, die “Odyssee” geschrieben.

Hier meine Seele, mein Geist und mein Körper haben die höchste Harmonie erreicht...


The second article dealing with Kazantzakis and Martinu, by Jaroslav Mihule, also of Prague, is called “Kazantzakis and Bohuslav Martinu’s Opera *The Greek Passion*.” It reproduces their correspondence, which shows an exemplary working relationship between the two artists. Kazantzakis helped with details such as the correct pronunciation of Greek names, made suggestions about the costumes (“... ce ne sera pas un opéra folkloriste; les costumes doivent être simples sans aucune nationalité spéciale; en tout cas costumes médiévaux”), and in general allowed Martinu the liberties required if the opera were to obey its own aesthetic requirements:

Je comprends bien Vos difficultés; le dernier acte doit être rapide, d’un rythme accéléré; par principe je suis d’accord avec Vous qu’il faut tâcher de trouver quelque chose qui difère du roman; au point de vue du spectacle c’est bien Votre idée de faire mourir Manolios là où vous dites; notre but est de faire sortir du roman un opéra très bon; travaillez donc comme Vous croyez le mieux et venez un jour avec votre manuscrit me voir; nous prendrons [sic] alors des décisions.

The remaining communications are Anneliese Malina’s “Some Remarks on Nikos Kazantzakis’s Sojourn in Berlin and His Image of the Soviet Union”; Kálmán Szabó’s “Thought-Association in Kazantzakis’s Novels”; Johannes Irmscher’s “Kazantzakis’s *Fratri-cides*”; Silvia Riedel’s “Thoughts on Some of Kazantzakis’s Female Figures”; L. B. Tsybenko’s “A Modern Interpretation of an Ancient Mythological Form: Kazantzakis’s Drama *Odysseus*”; and Evangelia Tsarucha-Szabó’s “Kazantzakis and Hungary.” In the last two, the notes remind us of the extensive bibliography dealing with Kazantzakis’ work—and more generally with modern Greek literary and political subjects—in Hungarian and Russian, unfortunately out of bounds for most researchers outside of the socialist countries.

PETER BIEN
Dartmouth College


Falling somewhere between a pedagogical grammar and a reference grammar, Olga Eleftheriades’ *Modern Greek: A Contemporary Grammar* provides a fairly comprehensive description of the grammatical systems of the modern Greek language. The resulting grammar is “contemporary” in its choice of the variety of Greek to describe, for no artificial separation is made of *katharevousa* elements and *dimotiki* elements, and learned features are included in the description in those areas where Greek speakers, under conditions of ordinary usage, clearly use them (e.g., fixed phrases with genitive objects of prepositions, such as *apó hrónou, meta háras*, etc.). This work is not, however, “contemporary” in its linguistic orientation, i.e., in the theoretical assumptions that underlie the description, for it is very much a traditional grammar, focussing on the various word-classes of the language largely as defined by function. The book thus suffers from some of the same problems that traditionally-based grammatical descriptions generally do, for example, vague definitions of parts of speech (nouns are said [p. 88] to “name,” among other things, “conditions,” but then so do verbs, said [p. 250] to “indicate,” among other things, “conditi-ns of being,” and a similar case could be made for adjectives as well).

After a brief history of the Greek language, Eleftheriades presents, in 15 chapters, including a mammoth (176-page) chapter on the verb, not only the generalizations and rule-governed aspects of the grammar of modern Greek but also considerable detail on matters concerning individual words, forms, subclasses, etc. Thus—as an essential part of any work aiming to be comprehensive and one of the real merits of the present book—a fair bit of space is devoted to
irregularities and idiosyncrasies, and quite a number of tables and lists of relevant forms (e.g., of different kinds of adverbs, of the principal parts of most irregular verbs, etc.) are provided. The topics covered in the 15 chapters are: the sound system, the writing system, introduction to morphology and syntax, articles, nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections, words with more than one usage, and word order in modern Greek sentences.

Except for the chapter on word order and comments scattered throughout on usage, e.g., in the verb chapter concerning the use of the moods, especially the subjunctive forms with *tha, na, as*, however, little is said about Greek syntax. For example, the construction of comparative and equative clauses deserves more than the few pages Eleftheriadias devotes to them, as does also the syntax of reciprocal expressions, and even the chapter on word order contains some weak points (e.g., vague statements such as "indirect questions are attached to the main clause either in their original form or slightly changed and adjusted" [p. 529], no mention of the possibility of inversion of subordinate clause elements to the left of *na*, etc.). This absence of clear information on syntax is a shortcoming, to be sure, but it is one that this book shares with most traditional grammars of Greek.

While *Modern Greek* contains generally a good, sound description of the facts of Greek grammar, nonetheless there are a few points throughout, generally matters of detail still important, to which one might take exception, among these are the following:

p. 1: ancient Attic Greek was not "an offspring of the Ionic," but rather a "sibling" dialect to it (other facts about the ancient dialectal situation are simplified to the point almost of being misleading and not very useful)

p. 2: the ancient Doric dialect survives to a certain extent in the modern Tsakonian dialect of the Peloponnese

p. 4: nothing is said about the period around 1821 in the discussion of the formation of *katharevousa*

p. 38ff.: the discussion of intonation would benefit from contours drawn in over the example sentences

p. 209/220ff.: the expression *ton eisbl* + POSS.PROO is called a reflexive "pronoun," but though it functions as true pronoun do in some languages, from a structural standpoint, it is actually a fully nominal, not pronominal, expression

p. 242: similarly, while *pu* may function in ways parallel to true relative pronouns (such as *o epitos*), structurally it is not truly a pronoun

pp. 263ff. (passim): the discussion of verb mood—admittedly a very messy area for definitive categorizations—is somewhat problematic; labelling the verbal element that occurs with *tha* to form the future tense as a "subjunctive form" leads to the confusing consequence that a subjunctive form is used in creating indicative mood forms (for Eleftheriadias throughout refers—rightly in my opinion—to the future tense as indicative mood)

p. 480: the distinction Eleftheriadias draws between derived and phrasal conjunctions (e.g., *opi* versus *ya na*) may not be a valid one, since the parts of *ya na* (if indeed it is synchronically analyzable) are just as inseparable as those of *opi*

p. 511ff.: all of chapter 14 ("Words with More Than One Usage") begs the important question of how one can tell that two functionally distinct forms are in fact the "same" word; I doubt that deictic *na* and the subordinating conjunction (subjunctive particle) *na* are the same word in any meaningful sense of "same," and similar considerations hold for the various *ya*'s (preposition, disjunctive conjunction, and emphatic particle)

p. 525: the *mi* that negates individual words (e.g., *mi andaalaximos*) never occurs with a final -*n*, and thus is probably to be kept distinct from the other negative particle(s) *mi(n)*

Even with the shortcomings noted above, Eleftheriadias has created here a useful and useable descriptive grammar of modern Greek. The thoroughness and the wealth of detail, in particular, are the two most significant virtues of this book. Careful cross-referencing of related sections, a detailed table of contents, and an index all enhance the book's utility. Moreover, I myself learned something from it, and trust that most students of the language—at all levels—would be glad for such a work to turn to when necessary. Eleftheriadias is to be commended for her efforts in producing this volume.

Brian D. Joseph
The Ohio State University
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