

# 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](#)



---

## Antoine on Modal Attraction *L'Attraction Modale en Latin* By F. Antoine. Reprinted from *Mélanges Boissier*. Paris: Fontemoing. 1903.

Tenney Frank

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 08 / November 1904, pp 411 - 412

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990760, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00990760](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990760)

### How to cite this article:

Tenney Frank (1904). The Classical Review, 18, pp 411-412 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990760

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

of the words forbids us to govern *manus* by *per.* vi. 49. 2.—*adsentationibus atque luxu* is hard to recognise in 'her amorous advances.'

*Cesserunt prima postremis*: my fault-finding has taken too much room. Let me therefore say in conclusion that Professor

Ramsay's translation seems to me a good and useful piece of work. Its faults are not many for its size, and they may be removed in a second edition—a cheaper and handier edition, it is to be hoped, than the first.

E. HARRISON.

### ANTOINE ON MODAL ATTRACTION.

*L'Attraction Modale en Latin.* By F. ANTOINE. Reprinted from *Mélanges* Boissier. Paris: Fontemoing. 1903.

M. ANTOINE here proposes to throw new light upon one of the obscure rules of Latin grammar, the rule regarding attraction of mood. He first states that he would not apply the term to subjunctives that are due to dependence upon infinitives, after which he draws a much-needed distinction between the construction of *oratio obliqua* and that of attraction. He then explains under what circumstances one may reasonably expect the occurrence of the construction. He rightly remarks that the grammars are not correct in concerning themselves only with subjunctives that follow dependent clauses; independent subjunctives may also attract. After dependent clauses, he finds that the tendency to attract varies with certain conditions that hold between the governing and the governed clause ('la proposition régisseur,' 'la proposition secondaire'). The conditions are favourable for attraction when both are in the same time-sphere, especially if that be the future; when the second is bound up with the former ('est intercalée dans la proposition subjunctive régisseur': *Volo ut QUAE FECERIM scias*) or follows it closely; and when the second clause is of an indefinite and generalizing nature. These general principles are then discussed in detail and illustrated by examples, taken mainly from Plautus and Cicero.

The task that M. Antoine set himself was one that needed to be done. The results of his study show clear thinking and a correct feeling for the construction, which in turn implies a thorough knowledge of the usage. It enlightens so far as it goes, but it leaves something to be desired.

In the first place, facts are needed. A complete array of the material for some

given period, intelligently presented, and segregated from all extraneous material of *oratio obliqua*, and the like, would do more to clear away the vague impressions one gets from the grammars than any discussion, be it even as elucidating as that of M. Antoine. Not only has he not given any such list, but he cites few examples, and these often not the surest. For example, he calls attention to the cases of attraction by independent subjunctives, which the grammars usually omit. Plautus alone could furnish a score of good illustrations (Cf. *Most.* 1100; *Pseud.* 570; *M.G.* 1037; *Aul.* 491; *Pseud.* 936). Few of those offered by M. Antoine are convincing: *simus* of *Aul.* 747 as he himself says is conditional; the same is true of *placeat* in *M.G.* 614; while *capiam* of *Bacch.* 67 is involved in too many difficulties, one of which is that an indicative intervenes.

Nor has M. Antoine always rightly read the meaning of his facts. He sees that attraction is frequent when the governing and dependent clauses both refer to the future, and he attributes the fact to similarity of time-sphere. This is partly correct, but the anticipatory subjunctive must also be reckoned with in such cases (see Hale, *The Anticipatory Subjunctive*, p. 63, footnote). He recognizes the fact that generalizing clauses are attracted more frequently than the determinative, and attributes this to the greater precision of the latter. It is a more important consideration that the generalizing clause is *necessarily* an integral part of the main conception, whereas the determinative clause is so only at times. For example, if the relative clause of a sentence like *volo ut mittat eos qui parati sint* is generalizing, the desire necessarily includes it. The desire is: *mittat eos qui parati sint*. If, however, the relative clause is determinative, the desire-concept, as it assumes shape in thought or spoken phrase,

may often not include it. The definite concept may simply be, *mittat eos*, accompanied by a less clearly conceived idea which might express itself, let us say, by a gesture towards certain persons who are ready (*parati sunt*).

The reader looks in vain through this paper for a solution of many troublesome problems of long standing. For instance, he is not told what classes of subjunctives attract, what connectives are involved, what is considered a close dependence, whether the dependence must be upon the verb or upon any part of the governing clause. Such questions can be answered, if not by definite negation or affirmation, at least with statistics illustrating general tendencies.

Finally, in giving the orthodox explanations that this construction is merely one phase of indirect discourse, and, again, that it is a part of the general phenomenon

that reveals itself in assimilation of consonants, M. Antoine betrays an incomplete theory of its origin. These considerations do have their place in the explanation of the construction, but they do not of themselves alone afford an adequate explanation. The habit of mechanical attraction is a product in which several constructions are factors, and that of indirect discourse is by no means the most important one (see the reviewer's *Attraction of Mood in Early Latin*, Chicago, 1904). In fact, M. Antoine's arguments are often weakened by his employment of illustrations that involve indirect discourse, rather than attraction of mood in the proper sense of the term. Some of these are Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 1, 1; *Div.* 1, 57; Caes. *B. G.* 1, 34, 4, on p. 32; and several of the illustrations on pages 33-5.

TENNEY FRANK.

*The University of Chicago.*

#### BRUGMANN'S *SHORT COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR*.

BRUGMANN'S *Short Comparative Grammar*.

Parts 2 and 3. 7s. and 4s.: the whole (three parts) 18s. (bound 21s.). 8vo. Pp. xxviii, 777. Karl J. Trübner: Strassburg, 1904.

A CORDIAL welcome will be given to the completion of this delightful book. In moderate compass and with wonderful lucidity it sets before us the best fruit of a lifetime spent in discovery. Those who have attempted, in any department, to keep pace with the progress of Philology will feel, perhaps, the keenest gratitude to the veteran author. But the classical scholar who has made no special study of this subject and finds himself often in need of safe guidance in linguistic matters will be hardly less thankful. The book makes it possible to arrive quickly at the facts in kindred languages which bear on any important question of Greek, Latin, or German Grammar; for if they are not all given in the text, they are easily accessible from the references to the *Grundriss* and other books,—references few and carefully chosen.

But though the book is thus a guide to Philological literature in general and the *Grundriss* in particular, it is also something much better. This *Short Grammar* is the latest and most perfect presentation of

Brugmann's teaching as a whole. There can be no doubt that the time had come for such an ingathering of the harvest. The period of destruction, of fierce and combative enquiry, which began in 1879 with Brugmann's discovery of the Sonant Nasals, and Johannes Schmidt's of I.-Eu. *e* and *o*, may be said to have ended with the publication of the second edition of the Phonology (Vol. I) of the *Grundriss* in 1897. It has been succeeded, not by stagnation but by 'eine gewisse Ruhe' (p. iv), a certain degree of general agreement on the main lines of the subject. For example, we may venture to feel assured that no serious change will ever need to be made in the general scheme of Ablaut laid down in the first part of this *Short Grammar* (pp. 138-150), though it is eminently suggestive and certain to lead to fresh discoveries in detail. A tone of calm, reflective, exposition pervades the book, and makes it, in truth, as notable a contribution to literature as it is to science.

The most important changes in the parts we are now concerned with are the complete re-writing of the Morphology and the new sketch of Comparative Syntax. In the former the rather dreary chapter of Noun-formation is abridged and enlivened by treating the meaning and usage of the forms side by side with their development, and by