

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](#)



Dittmar's *Studien Zur Lateinischen Moduslehre Studien zur lateinischen Moduslehre*, Dr von Phil. Armin Dittmar. 1897. Leipzig, Teubner. Pp. xi. and 346. 8 m.

F. W. Thomas

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 09 / December 1898, pp 458 - 460

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00033734, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00033734

How to cite this article:

F. W. Thomas (1898). The Classical Review, 12, pp 458-460 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00033734

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

DITTMAR'S *STUDIEN ZUR LATEINISCHEN MODUSLEHRE*.

Studien zur lateinischen Moduslehre, von
DR. PHIL. ARMIN DITTMAR. 1897.
Leipzig, Teubner. Pp. xi. and 346. 8 m.

THE subordinate subjunctive still remains the great crux of Latin syntax. It may be questioned whether with our present terminology it will ever be satisfactorily explained. But the present work, in spite of serious defects, certainly makes an advance in the discussion.

It is in the first part (pp. 1-76), devoted to a criticism of Hale's theory regarding the subjunctive after *qui* and *cum*, that the author is seen at his best. With great force and acuteness he assails one after another of Hale's positions, and it must be admitted with regret that one more elaborate theory has followed those of Hoffman and Lübbert. According to Hale the subjunctive in *sunt qui* clauses, and in *qualitative* clauses generally, of which the *causal* and *adversative* clauses are special cases, is in origin consecutive; the narrative *cum*-clause derives its subjunctive from the *tum, cum* construction, which in its turn is due to the analogy of that following *is, qui*. Thus *qui c. indic.* defines the person, *qui c. subj.* describes him; *cum c. indic.* gives the date, *cum c. subj.* expresses the time-quality, or situation. As regards chronology, the narrative *cum c. subj.*, like the *qualitative is, qui c. subj.*, was developed in the period between Terence and Cicero. This theory Dittmar attacks on both its historical and its explicative side. His first object is to show that apart from differences of style the Latin usage remained unchanged from Plautus to the Augustan and the silver age, and that therefore no development can have taken place. Even the narrative *cum*-clause, in denying which to the comedians Hale could rely upon the long and careful monograph of Lübbert, is supported by examples from those writers. [Cf. also Hoffmann's reply to Hale p. 41.] Further, historical and other inconsistencies are urged against Hale's theory. It must be admitted that, though not all the examples quoted are to the point, the probability of a historical development in the time between Terence and Cicero is reduced to a minimum.

Next, Hale's terminology is subjected to criticism. By the terms *essential* and *unessential* Hale distinguishes the relative clauses in such cases as 'the man whom you mention,' as compared with 'Caesar, whom also you

mention.' This is a real distinction, expressed in English by difference of sentence-accent: but Dittmar urges that it does not correspond to the distinction between subjunctive and indicative in Latin. The term *predicative* (implying that the subordinate clause plays the part of a predicate in the sentence) as an explanation of the subjunctive is also questioned. But when we come to *qualitative* we are really on wider ground, since the theory that in *sunt qui non habeant*, and *vatem egregium, cui non sit publica vena* the *qui*-clause *qualifies* is the property of all Latin grammarians. Nevertheless it is not only unproved but untrue. *Sunt qui non habeant* does not mean *sunt homines tales ut non habeant*, nor even *sunt homines quorum ea ratio est ut non habeant*. It means simply *sunt qui non habent*, and the problem is to show how it comes to do so.

Thirdly, the consecutive origin of the subj. in *nemo est qui faciat* is discussed. We see that (1) there is no reason why 'there is no one who *would do*' should come to mean 'there is no one who *does*'; (2) that the transition is no easier in the cases with a negative (*nemo* &c.) than with a positive antecedent.

Two things now are plain. In the first place we must, as is generally assumed, derive the subordinate subjunctive from an independent traceable use of the mood. Secondly, what we really require is a *habeant* which practically means *habent*. This is the business of Dittmar's second and constructive part, occupying the bulk of the book, pp. 79-208. The terms employed are 'polemical' and 'sovereign.' In replies of the types

(1) A. Bonus est hic vir.

B. Hic vir *sit* bonus?

Ter. Andr. 915.

(2) A. Audistine tu me narrare haec hodie?

B. Ubi ego audiverim?

Plaut. Amph. 749.

(3) A. Vicine, auscultas, quaeso.

B. Ego auscultem tibi?

Plaut. Mil. 496.

Dittmar finds what he calls a 'polemical' employment of the subjunctive, mentioning a supposition which the speaker forcibly repels. The same polemical force is to be

traced without the idea of repulsion in the type

Mane: hoc quod coepi primum enarrem,
Clitipho.

Ter. *Heaut.* 273.

where the meaning is neither 'I should like to finish my story,' nor 'I might finish my story,' but 'I will, mark me (or 'whether you like it or not'), finish my story.' The indicative *enarro* is, on the other hand, spoken in a calm, non-controversial, or 'sovereign' tone. This difference Dittmar proceeds to follow through the whole range of the subordinate subjunctive (and indicative, pp. 209-310). It is impossible not to admire the thoroughness and courage with which this enterprise is carried out. But nevertheless it starts with a fallacy and involves endless artificialities of interpretation. A theory which must find a special insistence in every *quae cum ita sint* and *quae cum dixisset* reduces itself to absurdity. The initial fallacy, moreover, is patent. In positive sentences the polemical tone is wholly imaginary: *enarrem* means not 'I am, mark me, relating,' but 'let me narrate' (jussive or rather hortative). In the negative sentences, on the other hand, where it is really present, it is due, not to the mood, but to the context and intonation. Dittmar treats as the essential force of the mood what is the accident of certain passages. This is as if from the casual mention of black horses we should insist on all horses being black. We may therefore spare ourselves the trouble of exemplifying the errors of this method in detail.

It is however worth while to point out that there is a subjunctive which may help to explain some of the subordinate uses. The common senses of an independent *faciat* are

- (1) he may do (potential),
- (2) he might do (remoter potential),
- (3) he would do (optative),
- (4) may he do! (optative),
- (5) let him do (subjunctive),

Of these, Hale, while admitting (pp. 106-7) that there are dependent uses derived from (1) (?), (2) and (5), traces the consecutive subjunctive to (3). Dittmar, besides adding a use which we think imaginary, admits (3) p. 68 and in certain cases (*si faciam* &c. pp. 178 sqq.) a modification of (2), which he calls the optative of 'Phantasie' or, after

Lange, of imagination. But there is a sixth employment of *faciat*

- (6) suppose him to do (subjunctive).

This is derived from the jussive subjunctive, which we shall rather, cf. Dittmar p. 92, term *hortative*, since it expresses not merely *will*, but an *urging* or *exhortation*. The hypothetical sense is a weakening of this (as in *esto* ἔστω of the imperative), and is found in such cases as

- (1) Verum anceps pugnae fuerat fortuna.
Fuisset:
Quid timui moritura?
- (2) Merses profundo: pulchrior exiet
(or exilit).
Naturam expellas furca; tamen usque
recurrat.

It is clearly present in *si* sentences of the type

Si fractus illabatur orbis,
Impavidum ferient ruinae

and it may be suggested that we have the same in (1) *quod sciam* and other restrictive clauses (2) *quae cum ita sint*, (3) *quae cum dixisset* 'imagine him to have now said this,' (4) in *quod* sentences of the type *quod dicat* 'suppose him to say,' and in fact in all subjunctive sentences (not optative) belonging to what Delbrück calls the *prius* class. This would be not so far from Dittmar's view, as he admits that in some cases the subjunctive is an expression not so much of amazement as of reflection, hesitation, uncertainty (p. 206, cf. p. 192). But what of the *posterius* clauses? It is possible that the consecutive is derived from the final, sc. jussive, sense, as the two are very often indistinguishable (cf. Dittmar p. 91). Thus *sunt qui non habeant* would mean 'there are some who are not to have,' and the jussive sense passes, as in independent sentences, into the hypothetical. In the well-known line of Horace

Sunt qui non habeant, est qui non curat
habere.—*Ep.* ii. 2, 182

it is impossible not to admit that the two moods are contrasted, and the meaning will be, 'There are those who, let us agree, have not, (*Anglice* 'who shall not have') yet here and there is one who cares not to have.' It is in fact a case of protasis and apodosis. For that *est qui* does not mean a definite

person, *sc.* Horace himself, is plain from other passages, e.g., *Ep.* 2, 1, 63

Interdum volgus rectum videt, est ubi peccat,
and humorously evident, as Dittmar observes, p. 17, in the passage *Od.* i. 1

*Sunt quos curriculo pulverem Olympicum
Collegisse iuvat.*

This hypothetical subjunctive may therefore help to explain some of the subordinate constructions. Note that it explains why the Romans never used the *perfect* subjunctive after the narrative *cum*. In hypothetical sentences *dixerit*¹ is nearly equivalent to *dicat*, and is a *primary* tense.

We must however observe that the occurrence of *cum c. subj.* in other Italian dialects (cf. v. Planta *Osc. Umbr. Gramm.* ii. p. 483, Dittmar p. 323), places the construction, as well as others for similar reasons, on a new basis and requires us to trace it back to a much earlier stage than has yet been

¹ Elmer, however, seeks ('Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses' pp. 176 *sqq.*) to prove this to be fut. perf. indicative.

done. The Osco-Umbrian syntax appears to be practically identical with the Latin.

Among the details of Dittmar's work, which contains many valuable collections of examples, we may call attention to his excellent explanation of *ut c. conj.* after *non vereor*, as a case of the indignant *hoc ego ut faciam* become hypotactic. Also, his short chapter on the *acc. c. inf.* agrees with the article in the *Classical Review* for November 1897, in regarding the construction as originally exclamatory. He dismisses his work in these terms: 'And so pass forth, my book, into the world, put Error to rout, advance the Truth, for the welfare of Education and of Science! God's blessing attend you on your way!' To us the chief merit of its constructive part seems to be that it seeks the explanation of the subordinate subjunctive in the mood itself. It has therefore, the opposite merits and defects to Hale's work. For whereas Hale gives us much 'development' of the constructions and scarcely sufficient explanation of the exact force of the mood, Dittmar, in his zeal for the latter, holds to it too rigidly to allow sufficient scope for development.

F. W. THOMAS.

KRETSCHMER'S EINLEITUNG IN DIE GESCHICHTE DER GRIECH. SPRACHE.

Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache, von PAUL KRETSCHMER. Göttingen. 1896.¹ 10 m.

THIS remarkable and delightful book seems to have attracted at present very little notice among scholars in this country. It must be said at once that the book marks an epoch in the study by linguistic methods of the early development of the peoples of Europe, and does so more decisively than any which have appeared since the days when the first great comparative grammars gave form and substance to the conception of the common origin of the Indo-European languages. Kretschmer's masterly collection of evidence from every accessible source,—tradition, archaeological exploration and language,—and his brilliant but cautious analysis of its meaning have opened up a new province of research, in much the same way as did Ridgeway's application² of the

comparative method to the study of numismatics. Both books point a long way beyond their own limits.

The reason why Kretschmer's work has met with so little recognition in this country is not far to seek. The title is so modest as to be quite misleading, especially to those who knew the author only through his admirable monograph on Greek vase-inscriptions, and one or two essays on points of Greek phonology. He has indeed 'introduced' the reader 'to the history of the Greek language,' but he has done not a whit less for the ancient languages of Asia Minor, the Balkans, Italy, and Central Europe. To all these the book supplies, in outline, an historical background which is both striking and, so far as it extends, quite incontestable, though it is here built up for the first time. All earlier writers on Indo-European origins down to the laborious pages of Schrader and the fascinating guesses of Canon Isaac Taylor, have felt bound to work downwards from the beginning of things; and even Hirt's ingenious papers in *Indogermanische Forschungen* have

¹ Sent for review to this journal at the beginning of the present year.

² In his *Origin of Metallic Currency and Weight Standards*, Camb. Univ. Press, 1892.