

# 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](#)



---

**Johnson on the Subjunctive and Optative in Euripides  
*De Coniunctivi et Optativi Usu Euripideo in Enuntiatis  
Finalibus et Condicionalibus*. Scripsit Franciscus  
Johnson, Dr. Phil. Berlin: 1893. Richard Heinrich. Pp.  
70. 2Mk.**

W. J. Battle

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 05 / May 1894, pp 215 - 215

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188225, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00188225](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188225)

## How to cite this article:

W. J. Battle (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 215-215 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188225

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

## JOHNSON ON THE SUBJUNCTIVE AND OPTATIVE IN EURIPIDES.

*De Coniunctivi et Optativi Usu Euripideo in Enuntiativis Finalibus et Conditionalibus.*  
Scripsit FRANCISCUS JOHNSON, Dr. Phil.  
Berlin: 1893. Richard Heinrich. Pp. 70.  
2 Mk.

APPARENTLY Dr. Johnson has examined all the cases in Euripides coming under the heads of Pure Final Clauses, Object Clauses after Verbs of Striving, Object Clauses after Verbs of Fearing, and Conditional Sentences, treating some of the cases at length while others he merely cites. His classification, owing to its intricacy and want of clearness in arrangement, is very hard to follow, and whatever be the merits of the treatise it must be admitted that it shows carelessness in construction. For example on p. 36, section iii., on the mood after *iva*, *iva μή*, *ὥς*, *ὥς μή*, *ὅπως*, *ὅπως μή*, and *μή* alone depending on past tenses, we have first a summary of the preceding section, the first clause of which reads: *Supra ii., (iva) invenimus locos v., while in reality there are six; and finally: Itaque locis lviii. optativus, viii. coniunctivus invenitur; neque vero metrum obstat quominus hi loci viii. corrigantur. Inde concludo Euripidem coniunctivum numquam sic adhibuisse.* Now he cannot mean that he thinks Euripides never used the Subjunctive at all after past tenses, for he gives on p. 12, p. 24, &c., abundant instances to the contrary. What he does mean probably is that he thinks Euripides never used the Subjunctive except when the action of the leading verb is conceived of as continuing into the present (cf. examples on p. 12). But he does not explicitly state this, and in any case the assertion is a remarkable one.

Other instances of carelessness are as follows: on p. 41 one of his divisions (B. I. c.) is the Subjunctive after *ὥς ἄν μή*, where the example contains no *μή* at all; and on p. 64, (a ε) and p. 65 (c. ε, ααζ, εν et ccγ), where *coni.* is put for *opt.*

Dr. Johnson's general conclusions may be summarized as follows: In the use of the Subjunctive and Optative in final clauses Euripides does not differ much from Sophocles and Aeschylus, for these three poets (1) used *ὥς* rather oftener than the other particles, Euripides somewhat more than the other two, and Sophocles considerably more than Aeschylus; (2) *μή* alone in adverbial clauses they used a little oftener than *μή* with *iva*, *ὥς*, *ὅπως*, Euripides in about the same proportion as Aeschylus and Sophocles; (3) they used the Optative after past tenses when an action simply past was had in mind; (4) they used the Optative when the Optative occurred in the principal clause, but possibly Euripides preferred the Subjunctive after ideas of wishing, though this is not certain; (5) Euripides was the first poet after Homer to omit the idea of fearing, &c., before *μή*, or rather he first returned to the old way of expression; (6) *ὅπως μή* after a verb of fearing occurs once in Euripides; (7) Euripides with the other tragedians used the Subjunctive after primary tenses.

With regard to conditional sentences Dr. Johnson concludes: (1) in Euripides as in Aeschylus and Sophocles both *ἤν* and *εἰάν*, but *εἰάν* never except *metri causa*, while the form *ἄν* does not occur; (2) Euripides never used the Subjunctive with *εἰ*; (3) Euripides much oftener, Sophocles a little less often, used *ἤν* with the Subjunctive than *εἰ* with the Future Indicative, while Aeschylus almost always used *εἰ* with the Future Indicative. Euripides therefore of all the tragedians most nearly followed the speech of the people; (4) Euripides often used *εἰ* with the Optative in general conditions.

An index of passages discussed and emended would have facilitated reference to this treatise.

W. J. BATTLE,

University of Texas,  
Austin.

## ROBERTS'S SHORT PROOF THAT GREEK WAS THE LANGUAGE OF CHRIST.

*A Short Proof that Greek was the Language of Christ*, by PROFESSOR ROBERTS, D.D.  
Alex. Gardner: Paisley and London.  
1893.

PROFESSOR ROBERTS supplements his larger work of 1888 by a brief argument addressed to a wider circle of readers. The proof may be condensed as follows:—