JOHNSON ON THE SUBJUNCTIVE AND OPTATIVE IN EURIPIDES.


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 ὧν rather oftener than the other particles, Euripides somewhat more than the other two, and Sophocles considerably more than Aeschylus; (2) ἦν alone in adverbial clauses they used a little oftener than ἦν with ἓν, ὧς, ὧς ὧς, 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, ἓν, before ἦν, or rather he first returned to the old way of expression; (6) ὧς ὧς ἦν 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 ἓν and ὧς, but ἓν never except metri causa, while the form ἓν does not occur; (2) Euripides never used the Subjunctive with ἓν; (3) Euripides much oftener, Sophocles a little less often, used ἓν with the Subjunctive than ἓν with the Future Indicative, while Aeschylus almost always used ἓν with the Future Indicative. Euripides therefore of all the tragedians most nearly followed the speech of the people; (4) Euripides often used ἓν with the Optative in general conditions.

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