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](#)

Gildersleeve's *Latin Grammar* Gildersleeve's *Latin Grammar*. Third edition, revised and enlarged, by B. L. Gildersleeve and Gonzalez Lodge. (University Publishing Company: New York, etc. 1894. Macmillan & Co.: London. 1895.)

E. A. Sonnenschein

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 01 / February 1896, pp 63 - 66

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00203181, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00203181

How to cite this article:

E. A. Sonnenschein (1896). The Classical Review, 10, pp 63-66 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00203181

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

favourable judgment is passed on Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzen and Cyril of Alexandria.

The next question of importance discussed is the general frequency of the use of prepositions in the different species of prose and poetry. The inquiry leads to the general law that prose is polyprothetic and poetry oligoprothetic. The gradual development from extreme oligoprothesis to considerable polyprothesis, in the Tragic writers, is especially dwelt on and fully demonstrated, according to the author's method, by statistical tables. This point is further minutely discussed for various groups of writers of all periods. An interesting chapter follows on the preponderance of particular cases governed by prepositions. As a general result of this investigation, it would appear that the dative predominates in the older and more poetical language; the accusative in that of later generations and in prose generally; the genitive prevails in the rhetorico-philosophical elements of prose and poetry. Thus the tendency of the accusative ultimately to oust its rivals shows itself already before the close of the classical period; in Modern Greek it is the only oblique case in use after prepositions in the language of the people. Space will not allow us to discuss the very interesting treatise on 'favourite prepositions' (*Liebings-Präpositionen*) which must have cost the author immense labour.

In conclusion the question forces itself on us, What is the value of results thus laboriously won? Certain it is they must ever possess an interest of their own for the student of Greek as so many linguistic facts, apart from any ulterior use to be made of them. They help to determine and differentiate the styles of various classes of authors and of the different periods of Greek literature. They may also serve as implements of critical dissection, whereby to eliminate interpolated portions of works otherwise open to the suspicion of corruption. It may be admitted that the author's method

is on the whole safe, and his general results reliable, though in the majority of cases resting on a very incomplete induction. Thus for most of the later writers Prof. Mommsen restricted his researches in each case to an examination of from 40 to 50 pages of the smaller Teubner texts, and, in the case of the Epic poets, to from 750 to 1,500 lines. He himself has not failed to perceive the many objections which may be raised to this mode of inquiry, but nevertheless holds 'die Hauptresultate für gewiss.' So much may be conceded as regards the general results referred to. The particular conclusions however, which he has deduced from certain of his statistics are not so felicitous. Thus he would deprive St. Luke of the middle portion of his Gospel (9, 33—19, 23), because forsooth it has no *σύν*, whereas *σύν* and *μετά* occur side by side in the other parts. I am of opinion he ought not to stop there. The first five chapters of this same Gospel (at least 1-5, 9) contain only 4 *σύν* to 7 *μετά* whilst the last chapter (24) has 7 *σύν* to 4 *μετά*, i.e. in the inverse ratio. Hence our author ought to conclude that these portions also are not from the same hand. Further from 1, 58 to 2, 5 there is no *σύν* at all; consequently neither can this part belong to the same writer.

It follows that the Gospel of St. Luke must have had three different authors: so great is the power of statistics!

The eight valuable excursus appended to this bulky volume (it contains 824 octavo pages)—especially the lengthy dissertation on the peculiarities of the style of Euripides and also that on Anastrophe—will be most welcome to students. Lastly let me remind the reader that, inasmuch as the author spent upwards of twenty years in the compilation of this work, it is not to be wondered at if, within the narrow limits of a review, I have not succeeded in giving more than a very slight and inadequate sketch of the treasures of learning stowed away within these unpretentious pages.

J. DONOVAN.

GILDERSLEEVE'S *LATIN GRAMMAR*.

Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar. Third edition, revised and enlarged, by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE and GONZALEZ LODGE. (University Publishing Company: New York, etc. 1894. Macmillan & Co.: London. 1895.)

PROFESSOR GILDERSLEEVE's work as a grammarian has been before the world for more than a quarter of a century, and has exercised so important an influence on American scholarship that it might be

thought unnecessary in a review of a third edition of his *Latin Grammar* to do more than call attention to its appearance. At the same time the present issue is in many respects practically a new work, and the great amount of labour and thought which has clearly been devoted to it makes it the duty of a reviewer to express as best he may his opinion of its merits, especially as the book is not as widely known in England as it deserves to be. Professor Gildersleeve is a commanding personality in the field of grammar; Professor Goodwin, whose work is better known in England, has handsomely acknowledged the extent of his indebtedness to his brother Professor, 'whose writings have thrown light upon most of the dark places in Greek syntax' (Preface to *Moods and Tenses*, 1889, p. viii.); and it would be difficult to estimate the number of enthusiastic admirers of Gildersleeve among the younger generation of American scholars, whom he has trained and stimulated to independent research as grammarians. In England too there must be many who, like the present writer, owe to Prof. Gildersleeve a debt of gratitude for guidance through the mazes of Pindaric diction and metre.

The present grammar is eminently a work of high learning and refined scholarship, and the views propounded in it are no ἀρελὴς σοφίας καρπός. The edition of 1884 consisted of 400 pp., the present edition has 550 pp. (including indices). In the work of revision Prof. Gildersleeve has associated with himself Prof. Lodge, of Bryn Mawr College, 'who is responsible for nearly everything that pertains to the history of usage; the office of the senior collaborator has been chiefly advisory, except in the Syntax' (Preface); obligations are acknowledged to a large number of American scholars, who have contributed by criticism and suggestion to the perfecting of the work. The most recent researches on Latin etymology and syntax have been carefully studied and utilized.

To discuss the details of a grammar of this compass—especially a work at the back of which lies so much learning and experience—is obviously impossible within the brief limits of a review. All that the critic can do is to select for notice some few points in which he is specially interested—with the full knowledge that the points selected may not be equally interesting to others, and cannot be really representative of the work as a whole.

A striking instance of the influence which research may exert upon grammatical prac-

tice even in the simplest and apparently most obvious matters is the new doctrine of prohibitions. Gildersleeve, following Elmer's article in the *American Journal of Philology* (vol. xv. 1894), gives the following list (§ 275): *ne audi* (poetic), *ne audito* (legal), *non audies* (familiar), *ne audias* (chiefly ideal), *noli audire* (common), *ne audiveris* (rare). This will be a startling revelation to many schoolmasters; does not Cicero say *hoc facito, hoc ne feceris* (*de Div.* ii. 61, 127)? Yes, but if Elmer's statistics are right, there are in elevated prose from the beginning of the Ciceronian period up to near the end of the Augustan period only seven instances of *ne* with the perfect subj. in prohibitions, and these are all in Cicero. This enumeration excludes the *Letters* of Cicero and disregards *nec* with the perfect subj., which Elmer considers to stand on a somewhat different footing. Personally I am inclined to accept the conclusion that *ne* with the perf. subj. in prohibitions must be regarded as colloquial and peremptory (e.g. in Horace *tu ne quaesieris*).¹

In regard to the classification of conditional sentences I am sorry to find that the view which Mr. Inge forbids me to call mine, but which I have never seen expressed in any grammar except my own, has not found favour in the eyes of Gildersleeve. He still divides into (i.) logical, (ii.) ideal, (iii.) unreal—according to the character of the protasis. This is open to several objections; but I will content myself here with asking: (1) Why is *si id credis erras* more 'logical' than *si id credas erres* or *si id crederes errares*? (ii.) Does not the division into 'ideal' and 'unreal' as two separate genera ignore an essential point of unity in the apodoses of these sentences (marked in Greek by the use of ἄν and in English by *should* or *would*)? The difference between *si credas* ('if you were to believe') and *si crederes* ('if you believed') I regard as simply one of time. Under 'ideal' Gildersleeve classes sentences like *otia si tollas, periere Cupidinis arcus*, and in so doing is consistent with his principle of classifying according to the character of the protasis; but to me this sentence is much more akin to the 'logical' group. However it is satisfactory to find some recognition of a class of sentences which has been too much ignored by grammarians, or even declared by some to be bad Latin (subjunctive in protasis, indicative in apodosis—without

¹ In regard to the question of the negative in deliberative questions some pronouncement on Elmer's theory might have been expected (in § 265).

anacoluthon): why does not Gildersleeve quote some instances from classical prose like Cic. *ad Att.* vii. 10 *si in Italia consistat, omnes erimus una* (where there is no question of the 'ideal 2nd pers. sing.' raised)? The subj. I should here call 'prospective' ('should he make a stand in Italy, we shall all be with him').

This leads me to ask to what extent the doctrine of the 'prospective subjunctive' is countenanced by Gildersleeve. All grammarians have of course recognized it to some extent; e.g. in the conversion of *si id credes, errabis* into *dixi te si id crederes, erraturum esse* (Gild. § 656, 3); and the general doctrine of the kinship of the subjunctive and the future is fully insisted upon by Gildersleeve in this as in the previous edition (e.g. § 277, 2 and 4; § 515, 3, where we read 'of course the deliberative subj. is future'). But something more than this was intended in the article which I wrote in the *Classical Review* for Feb. 1893 and in the treatise by my friend Prof. Hale on the 'Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin' (*Studies in Classical Philology*, 1894).¹ As Hale says (note on p. 10), 'the distinction on which the whole matter of classification turns does not lie between a present sense and a future sense—it lies between a *volitive* future sense and an *anticipatory* future sense; in other words, between the conception of an act as willed and the conception of an act as expected or imminent.' How far then does Gildersleeve recognize the latter as distinct from the former meaning of the subjunctive? Crucial instances are most readily found under the head of Temporal Clauses; the question here is whether the subj. with *donec, antequam*, etc., denotes purpose or merely marks the act as in prospect. The answer is given by §§ 572 and 577: '*dum, donec, and quoad*, "until," take the subj. when suspense and design are involved'; here 'suspense' (=anticipation?) and 'design' (=purpose) are coupled together as both present in the subj.: '*antequam* and *priusquam* are used with the subj. when an ideal limit is given'; what is meant by an 'ideal limit' is explained by the sentence which follows, 'when the action is expected, contingent, designed, or subordinate'; here expectation appears as an alternative to design. These statements do not quite satisfy me; it appears unnecessary to speak of purpose at all in connexion with these subjunctives; the idea is inapplicable to many instances and, I think, not essential to

any. The subj. here steps into the shoes of the future and future perfect indicative, which it has almost entirely ousted (in the classical period) from the construction in question.² In the translations of the examples given in § 577 I miss the use of the word 'should,' which is the English equivalent in past time; the sentence *Scipioni Silanoque donec revocati ab senatu forent prorogatum imperium est* (Livy xxvii. 7, 17) is put under the head of Oratio Obliqua; I doubt the obliquity of the subordinate clause, and should call the subj. prospective ('till they should be recalled').

The definition of mood in § 253 ('mood signifies manner') is probably intended for the young student; but even so I doubt whether it is satisfactory. On the definition of the subjunctive in § 255 ('the subj. represents the predicate as an idea') one feels inclined to appeal to Gildersleeve himself in the *A.J.P.* iv. reprint p. 11 ('What is the subjunctive? It is the mood of the will.') But no such shorthand definition is really adequate to all the meanings. On the same page there is a curious note referring to *nostras iniurias nec potest nec possit alius ulcisci quam vos* (Livy xxix. 18, 18): 'in this unique passage *nec potest* denies with the head, *nec possit* refuses to believe with the heart.' I feel sceptical about translating *possit* 'can well have the power,' and prefer Weissenborn's rendering. On one small matter this grammar is behind the age; *hem* does not mean *h'm* (§ 534).

The *Accidence*, which occupies 142 pp. of the book, is worked out on a philological basis, and contains a number of valuable remarks (in small print) on early Latin forms. It is not intended for absolute beginners, but rather for that intermediate class of learners who have mastered the rudiments but require a grammar to accompany them through the remainder of their course. Still I am struck by the absence of practical rules, e.g. as to the declension of participles (§ 82, 'the participles, as such, have *e*; but used as substantives or adjectives, either *e* or *i*, with tendency to *i*'), and of adjectives of the 3rd decl. (§ 77, cf. § 82, where the consonant stems are said to have *i* and *-um*). Whether the classifica-

² This is recognized so far as the future indic. is concerned in note 2 to § 571, but without saying that the imperfect as well as the present subjunctive may represent the future indic. These historical notes ought in many instances to have produced more reaction upon the rules given in the text, and there ought to have been more of a line of demarcation between the usages of different periods in the text, Livian usage being treated apart.

¹ The word 'anticipatory' seems to have been first used by Gildersleeve; see note by Hale, *op. cit.* p. 6. NO. LXXXIV. VOL. X.

tion of the principal parts of verbs according to the formation of the perfect can be called practical, can only be proved by experience. This classified list (§§ 137-167) is supplemented by an alphabetical list at the end of the book.¹ In the matter of 'hidden quantities' the 2nd edition of Marx has been followed 'for the sake of consistency' (Preface).²

That this grammar will be a welcome addition to the scholar's library goes without saying. How far it will be found serviceable in schools is a question on which different teachers would probably give very different answers. The principle on which stress is laid in the prospectus issued by the publishing firm deserves most hearty approval.

¹ Ought the supine of *sto* to be given as *stātum* (with long vowel)? There is no direct evidence for the supine at all, except that Priscian mentions it (with a short vowel); against *-stātūrus*, which alone appears in § 151, we may set the nouns *stātus*, *stābulum*, etc., and the supine of *sisto* (*stātum*).

² It must be remembered however that Marx changed his views upon the quantity of a large number of important words between his first and his second edition.

'Recognizing the importance of familiarity with one grammatical text-book, the authors have endeavoured to make a work that will serve the student from the time he leaves his Latin primer to the very end of his Latin studies.' And if this principle involves the use of a book of considerable size, this disadvantage may be more than counterbalanced by avoidance of the confusion which results from using differently planned books at different stages of learning. Of one thing teachers may feel confident, that in entrusting their pupils to the guidance of Prof. Gildersleeve they are committing them to the hands of a master of grammatical theory and method. It should be added that the book contains a useful list of 138 'Principal Rules of Syntax' (pp. 437-444), and that everything has been done in the way of good print and paper to make the book attractive. The valuable sections on versification (pp. 455-490) present the subject in the light of the best scientific research of the present day.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

GOODWIN'S GREEK GRAMMAR.

A Greek Grammar, by W. W. GOODWIN. New edition, revised and enlarged. (Macmillan & Co.: London and New York. 1894.)

PROFESSOR GOODWIN'S *Greek Grammar* is so well known in England that it would be out of place in discussing the present edition to do more than call attention to changes which have been made since the edition of 1879. The book is now no longer called an *Elementary Greek Grammar*; it consists of 451 pp. (including indices) as compared with 360 pp. in the previous edition (which had no index). The original edition (1870) consisted of only 235 pp. In the Preface Prof. Goodwin says: 'I trust that no one will infer from this repeated increase in the size of the book that I attribute ever increasing importance to the study of formal grammar in school. On the contrary, the growth of the book has come from a more decided opinion that the amount of grammar which should be learned by rote is exceedingly small compared with that which every real student of the Classics must learn in a very different way.'³ 'The chief increase in the

present work has been made in the department of Syntax.' 'One of the most radical changes is the use of 1691 new sections instead of the former 302': i.e. the subject matter of the book is better subdivided—a distinct change for the better.

In the Accidence Goodwin has adopted a more philological and scientific method of treatment on some points, and has gone a certain length in the direction of adopting innovations in the matter of forms.

The N. V. A. dual of πόλις, πῆχυσ, etc. is now given as -ει (instead of -εε, as in 1879), and of τριήρης as -ει (instead of -η). This I believe to be an improvement in the light of such evidence as the inscriptions afford (Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, pp. 108, 113, 162, etc.).

In the treatment of the Verb several changes have been made. The verbs in μι are now inflected in close connexion with those in ω; and 'the old make-shift known as the connecting-vowel has been discarded, and with no misgivings.' The paradigms are still printed without divisions of words, but the sections on tense-formation adopt the analysis into λύο-μεν, λύε-τε, etc. (§ 561; for -ω, -εις, -ει see § 623). The fact that the paradigms of verbs in -μι as well as of verbs in -ω precede the list of personal endings makes

³ That is, as the book is not intended to be learnt by heart, its scope may be extended without danger. Obviously, however, there must be some limit to the scope of a school book.