The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Prospective Subjunctive and Optative

J. Donovan

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 04 / April 1894, pp 145 - 145

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187840, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187840

How to cite this article:

J. Donovan (1894). The Prospective Subjunctive and Optative. The Classical Review, 8, pp 145-145 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187840

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

stopped—the decree of the magistrate; why, in short, the ‘iudicia ordinaria’ and the ‘quaestiones’ should have been exempted from its control.

(2) That the Republican theory was never so thoroughly reversed in the ‘principate’ that the magistrate became the recipient of

the ‘provocatio’ in the place of the people; the true magisterial power of the ‘appellatio,’ with the modification independently (almost accidentally) introduced, being quite sufficient to account for the new order of things.

A. H. GREENIDGE.

THE PROSPECTIVE SUBJUNCTIVE AND OPTATIVE.

MR. SONNENSCHNIEDER deserves thanks for his contribution to grammatical terminology in the shape of the word ‘prospective.’ In temporal clauses this term may be of great service to mark off the definite-time clause from the indefinite-time clause, present or past. Thus in the following sentences—

μάχης ἄρξονται ὅπότε ἂν βούλωνται.
μάχης ἀρχεσθαι ἐμελλον ὅποτε βούλονται—

the former may be accurately described as ‘prospective present,’ the latter as ‘prospective past’ (prospective=relatively future). These are perhaps good substitutes for ‘indefinite following on a primary’ and ‘indefinite following on an historic tense.’

It may be questioned however whether the extension of this term to other than temporal clauses will tend to clearness. Will not confusion ensue if it be applied indiscriminately, as it may be, to almost every species of subordinate clause? Thus for example in the sentence *misit milites qui victoriam nuntiarent*, we may say that *nuntiarent* is ‘past prospective’ or ‘relatively future in the past.’ For is not the announcement of victory relatively future to the despatch of soldiers? But every one sees that such a description of the mood in *nuntiarent* would be most inadequate; because futurity is not what is uppermost in the writer’s mind, though it is necessarily attendant on the mode of expression. Mr. Sonnenschein is of course at liberty to call this ‘a special kind of futurity’; but herein lies what would seem to be a flaw in the extended use of his term. Futurity—at

least relative—will be found in many final, consecutive, causal and conditional clauses, but in distinguishing between these it is the ‘special kind of futurity,’ not the genus futurity, that will help. Thus as a criterion between the various classes of subordinate clauses the ‘prospective’ is practically valueless. To take another instance. In the passage quoted from Soph. (*Trach.* 903) *κρύψας’ εαυτήν ἔνθα μή τις εἰσίδει* it may be said that *εἰσίδει* is ‘prospective past,’ inasmuch as the action of being withdrawn from view is relatively future to that of hiding. But surely it is not the idea of indefinite future time but rather of indefinite place to which expression is here primarily given, the idea of relative futurity being only concomitant. The place—and in so far the clause—may be said to be indefinite, inasmuch as it answers the general description of ‘a place such as would secure the result or end of concealment.’ In other words we have here that species of indefiniteness which grammarians term *consecutive* or *final* relative.

There is however another sense in which this clause may perhaps more appropriately be termed prospective. It describes a place ‘*in prospect*,’ i.e. which offered the prospect of hiding. But that is only putting *objectively* the *subjective intention* of the speaker, and thus once more we are thrown back on finality. Hence a further danger of ambiguity in the extended use of the term prospective, unless its definition ‘relatively future’ be strictly adhered to and within the limits of the temporal clause.

J. DONOVAN.