

**CORNELL UNIVERSITY. STUDIES IN
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, NO. I.
THE CUM-CONSTRUCTIONS: THEIR
HISTORY AND FUNCTIONS. PART I:
CRITICAL. PART II: CONSTRUCTIVE**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649558513

Cornell University. Studies in Classical Philology, No. I. The Cum-Constructions: Their History and Functions. Part I: Critical. Part II: Constructive by William Gardner Hale

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

WILLIAM GARDNER HALE

**CORNELL UNIVERSITY. STUDIES IN
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, NO. I.
THE CUM-CONSTRUCTIONS: THEIR
HISTORY AND FUNCTIONS. PART I:
CRITICAL. PART II: CONSTRUCTIVE**

Cornell University

STUDIES

84720

IN

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

ISAAC FLAGG, WILLIAM GARDNER HALE, AND
BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER

no. I.

THE *CUM*-CONSTRUCTIONS: THEIR HISTORY AND FUNCTIONS

PART I: CRITICAL

By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE

ITHACA, N. Y.

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY

1887

THE
CUM-CONSTRUCTIONS

74720

THEIR HISTORY AND FUNCTIONS

BY

WILLIAM GARDNER HALE

PROFESSOR OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN CORNELL UNIVERSITY

PART I: CRITICAL

JOHN WILSON AND SON

University Press

1887.

TO
TRACY PECK AND ISAAC FLAGG
IN
WELL-FOUNDED GRATITUDE

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CRITICISM OF VARIOUS THEORIES OF THE GROUND OF THE MODE IN TEMPORAL, CAUSAL, AND ADVERSATIVE <i>Cum</i> - CLAUSES.	
§ 1. The Causal or Adversative Idea as the Ground of the Subjunctive	3
§ 2. Subordination as the Ground of the Subjunctive . .	3
§ 3. Subjectivity as the Ground of the Subjunctive . .	5
§ 4. Gröhe's Theory that in the Subjunctive <i>Cum</i> -con- structions the Idea is always Temporal, and the Mode Qualitative	8
§ 5. Hoffmann's Theory of Relative Time as the Ground of the Subjunctive, and Absolute Time as the Ground of the Indicative, in Temporal Clauses, Hoffmann's Theory of the Ground of the Sub- junctive in Causal Clauses	9
§ 6. Lübbert's Theory of Relative Time as the Ground of the Subjunctive, and Absolute Time as the Ground of the Indicative, in Temporal Clauses. Lübbert's Theory of the Ground of the Subjunctive in Causal Clauses	43
§ 7. Hoffmann's Theory of the Ground of the Subjunctive in Temporal Clauses, as more fully stated in his Second Edition	69

THE CUM-CONSTRUCTIONS: THEIR HISTORY AND FUNCTIONS.

PART I. — CRITICAL.

§ 1. TWENTY years ago, Latin grammars generally taught that the mode after "*cum causal*" and "*cum adversative*" was due to the causal or adversative idea itself, and that the use of the same mode after "*cum temporal*" was due to a more or less palpable causal or adversative feeling intermixed with the temporal idea.

The mode after "*qui causal*" and "*qui adversative*," it was thought, was to be explained by the influence of the causal and adversative *cum*-clauses; the common formula being that *qui*, when equivalent to *cum is*, took the subjunctive.

The refutation of these positions always lay at hand. The subjunctive in the *qui*-clauses cannot have been due to the influence of the *cum*-clauses, since the use of the mode in the former is older than its use in the latter. Further, not only is there no conceivable reason why the causal or adversative idea as such should find expression in the subjunctive, but, in point of fact, the presence of the causal or adversative idea in its full and undoubted force, namely in clauses introduced by *quod*, *quia*, *quoniam*, *quando*, *quamquam*, is absolutely without effect upon the mode.

§ 2. A more metaphysical explanation of the subjunctive in causal, adversative, and temporal clauses makes it the result of their subordination to their main clauses, the indicative being regarded, according to this view, as the mode of independence, the subjunctive as the mode of dependence. The theory, however,

proceeds from a conception of the workings of subordination, and, in general, of the natural history of modal constructions, for which neither antecedent probability nor actual evidence can be shown.

First, as regards antecedent probability: —

The process of subordination consists simply in attaching to one sentence, in which a certain person, thing, etc., is mentioned, a second sentence containing a second mention of that same person, thing, etc., and consequently admitting of the form of summary repetition called the *relative*. But in this attaching of one sentence to another there is, *per se*, no change in the nature of the idea to be expressed by the second verb; and without a change of idea we have no right to postulate a change of mode.¹

Next, as to the actual evidence: —

It is not claimed that an effect is produced by subordination upon the mode of the verb of the relative clause in any cases except those now in question and those that come under the head of the subjunctive by assimilation. Now, the latter use is (as I have said, with supporting examples, in the "American Journal of Philology," No. 29, pp. 54-57) the psychological outcome of the fact that, in a great mass of sentences, the modal feeling which in the main clause expresses itself in the subjunctive continues to exist, either unchanged in kind or only slightly shaded, in the clauses attached to it. The use of the mode with true, but often faint, modal feeling in the great mass of clauses dependent upon other subjunctives, begets what may be called the subjunctive habit. The subjunctive by assimilation is therefore a stylistic issue of a frequently recurring phenomenon. But this usage gives no countenance to the theory just cited; for the causal, adversative, and temporal relative clauses in the subjunctive are found to be as freely attached to main clauses in the indicative as to main clauses in the subjunctive. The theory, then, is without the evidence of facts outside of the constructions which it would explain. But it is not simply without the evidence of facts, — it is contradicted by the facts.

¹ As will be seen later, I do not mean that there may not be a subsequent development of the idea carried by the construction.