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Part I

Language has furnished problems which have proved puzzling to the philosophers of all ages. Thinking men have ever recognized linguistic phenomena as the most difficult that could claim their attention.

What is the origin of language? Is it a faculty of communicating thoughts to others implanted in man at his creation, perfect and completely evolved? This Archbishop Trench affirms. Or is it a conventional system gradually elaborated through the ages?

Are the sounds of which it is composed natural or arbitrary? Loiseau affirms they are both.

Is language a physical or a moral science? Müller teaches the former; Whitney the latter.

Is language an endless possession of the soul or a temporary companion which will be abandoned with the body?

To most of these questions no better answer can be given than Virgil has expressed in one of his Georgies.

"Felix qui postuerit reunire cognosceri causas."

The first question admits of a partial answer and the investigation of it is fraught with interest and instruction.
I believe that man has constantly progressed from a very low state; that the systems of language now existing are of human origin and that all human institutions depend on man's condition and subject to human control.

Porter says — "Language is known at the first glance to be the expression of mental states by physical sounds". The history of language then is the history of the mind. In fact it only records what we know of the thoughts and feelings of the human race through its ages that are past is in the words by which they communicated thoughts to each other. Art may record the mind's symmetry, architecture a people's habits and customs, but language is an index of their thoughts. Feuerbach says — "On les langues sont le meilleur miroir de l'esprit humain et qu'une analyse exacte de la signification des mots feroit mieux connaitre que toute autre chose les opérations de l'esprit humain."

A careful study of the history of language must necessarily lead to some knowledge of the primitive condition of man and bring to light facts of great significance bearing on the question of the origin of language.
Whitney states that we can not define language, we can only say that it is composed of a vocabulary and grammar. The vocabulary of a language is the store of words it contains and a grammar is its rule of language forms. The history of both will lead to the same conclusions. I wish to speak only of the latter and of it but one small part - its subjunctive mode.

My subject has the possibility and potency of the greatest results and a careful study of it brings to light tales of thrilling interest.

The subjunctive is a mode of doubt and always contains a negative element. A positive assertion or denial is expressed by the indicative. Statements in which any doubt is felt by it opines ranging from almost certainty on one hand to almost positive assertion on the other, it is the province of the subjunctive to express.

Doubt is a feeling not experienced by the cruelest minds. The lower in grade of civilization is a people, the fewer are the expressions of doubt the language affords. The beginnings of a language must have been made by it expressing in sound from a nation knowledge whether derived from its efforts or through consciousness.
begin with individual objects. To express this knowledge to others we use general names. These general names are not the names of things, but of our notions of things. The notions we have are formed from attributes of the thing.

The notion then comes first in time and the word expressing the notion is the definition of the verb. It is evident that the simple name of the notion comes first. Thus in looking at the sun the notion first formed is the attribute of shining. The definition expressed this.

And in order comes the expanded notion or thought which requires the declarative statement - The sun shines. This may be positive or negative.

The third in time is the question and here we find the first direct appearance of doubt. Thoughts of knowledge are actual judgements of the speaker or thoughts which are put in questions to be decided by the judgment of the person to whom the question is addressed. That is they declaratory and interrogatory.

The fourth is doubt. Every act of knowledge concerns a thought of the speaker or a thought viewed by the speaker.
Thoughts viewed by the speaker are reached only when the mind has attained some considerable degree of advancement.

These sentences implying doubt are expressed by the subjunctive mode and by them it is evidenced the relative rank of languages that this is the correct order of development. What is often formed from the indicative is called subjunctive and conditional modes may be formed from the indicative by the addition of certain conjunctions or adverbs.

The growth of the subjunctive and its increasing demands for its rule have been gradual and slow. The growth of languages must keep pace with its advance of thought.

The history of the Graeco-Latin languages is best known. I will compare the use of the subjunctive in it Greek, in Latin, and in French.

The Greek writers used the subjunctive in many places where it Latin demanded the indicative. The principal adverbs,
First. — After verbs of sensing and asking, — for example:

Τέσμαι δὲ τοῦτο τοιεύον

"W le asservarem rogasti (Cic. Cat. I. rii.)

Second. — After verbs of teaching and exhorting.

Γέρων ἐπεόθηλ Ἀχίλληι ὀνεὶ ἀποτεθείη (Il. xxviii)

I. Latin would say. — Sicco praecipit Achilles ut semper in

fortissime gereret.

Third. — After verbs of persuading and discouraging.

"Εἰ τε ἀντι, ἄφθαρτος εἰς τόν πόλιν φοινικῆς ἐθάνατον.

die illi, none illum ut scribisset.

Fourth. — After ēropai signifying application and ἐφικτορεια,

meaning "ita compossumus natura esse ut." Compare Soph.

Philoct. 88 with I. linius et cep. 5810.

Fifth. — After verbs expressing motion.

Ταύρεκα μὲ προδικα δίδασκε μένοι τάδε πάντα. (Iliad x 442)

In Latin this would be expressed — Ut miscit qui docetem.

Sixth. — After certain impersonal verbs.

I Συνέβη τὸ φέλλω νύκτα.

Contigit ut Tela vincent.
There is a peculiar use of the Infinitive often found in Greek where the Latin must use the Subjunctive after an Imperative Indicative, as in Thucyd. Dei lib. III. 77. To προφήτης ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔφη
— about — quin ignis deleret etc.

Seventh. Nothing is more common in Greek especially in Heser, Herodites, Thucydides and other and writers than the Infinitive instead of the Imperative before which must be supplied δέ, ὅτι, or ἀλλ' εἰν πρὸς. Instances of this may be seen in Herod. III. 136 and in the first book of the Iliad, line 20.

Matthewew, the grammarians, very properly say —
Ecce dicendi formules (Imperative for Infinitive) nihil esse alium quam quaedam veterum linguae vestigium, in quæ locum esse quid imperare vellet, simplicissimum facellinæique verbi formam, id est, modum definitionum, usum habebant.

The Latin however never uses the Infinitive to express command but always the Imperative or Subjunctive.

Eighth. — After many particles as εἰς and ὡρα — think the Greek idiom requires λοιπὸν εὑρίσκετε, and the Latin
— ut ita dicam. The Greek — ἐσκέτω κακὸν ἐμὸν etc. (Sop. ELic. 406)
The Latin to express the same uses — rei fallax, compare. Demosthenes pro Corona Cap. 63 with Cicero de Amicitia Cap. VIII 48. Demosthenes and Latin writers nearly always use the definite in such constructions, but in the time of Plutarch it is not an unfrequent thing to find constructions of this kind. — 

Thucyd. II 50 and Plato Cratyl. with the peculiar of Cicero's: —

"Exandal. ven est futurum esse ut Roma capere vide.

Ninth. — After certain locutions, as "'Et erat 

The Latin frequently uses the construction — ven is even qui 

The corresponding Greek con-

What the Latin ordinarily expressed by the perfect or future, 

In Greece was expressed with the definite.
Also after certain pronominal adjectives as: Toratos, Deinos, Exaros, orutheinos, apados, Hadros, varentos, It & Is and
other.

Quite frequently in Data Oblique after eren, Eren, &c., etc.
The Infinitive is written where the Latin would not allow it.

Soiron says the Greeks often use participles in place of the
Latin Subjunctive especially with verbs "quae vatahia," 
memorandum, visum, audittunm, affectionem animi significant
ut gaudium indignationem etc.

Several other cases might be given but the above is
sufficient to prove the point. This view is supported by
E. Egger (Notions de gr melee. p. 67) who says substantially that
in it most ancient times the Infinitive verb was chiefly used
and little by little it Greeks were accustomed in place of
the Infinitive to use the with a personal verb, at first
of Indication; that it more modern Greeks leaving the
Infinitive Construction now always use a finite mode
which the conjunction ro instead of &c., precedes.

All this shows with what gale, what ardor, as time went on, they
left the simplex forms of speech they in former times had used. So among the Romans who lived after the age of Augustus when the Empire was declining, "quaestus quia" with a personal mode were used where the writers who lived in the flourishing days of the Republic — as Cato, Thrasea, Scaevola, and Cicero, still used the infinitive mode.

By comparing the use of the Latin modes with that of a modern language it oustgrew of the Latin, as it French.

The Latin uses it definitive; it French a finite verb.

First. After impersonal verbs of the active form, as Omnium expedit bocis rempublicam esse salvam (Cic. Cat.)

Le est de l'intéret — — que le republique soit sauvee.

Second. After impersonals of the passive form, as —

"utvis re conjuncturum fuisse — memoriae praeestuit est" ou reçouté qui — — fuisse (or fuisse) tit ruin.

Third. After impersonals formed from adjectives, as — Simplicissim præcitus est communi, et conscientia, qui rebis

ininde movestur, eligi juro est (De Amicitia)
The French translation reads — Il est justifié que l’on choisisse un ami de moeurs simples et faciles qui pourra être comme nous.

France — After impersonal forms from substantives.

Parvis in connection Augustinus Pascaleus solum faciendum (facitus) "Le maître avait couru qu'Augustin c'était (ou le fait) fait transporter à Reanaisie.

Fifth — The subjunctive is used in Latin after verbs signifying hope, opinion, knowledge etc., as crede, fidelis, sperare dure, permittens, intelligere, peire etc.

The French after such words nearly always construe the subjunctive preceded by its conjunction "que.

Sixth — The historical subjunctive is of much more frequent occurrence in Latin than in et French language.

The statement made at the beginning concerning the development of modes in order of time for that trend substantiated. Several important conclusions may be drawn:

Doctor in the mind of man varies in its same ratio as his
intellectual development. Not doubt in its negative
reverent meaning, but in its active, broadest and best sense.
Doubt has been one of the greatest incentives that have
urged civilization to its present height.
The result of doubt on language has been the formation of a
subjunctive mode which enabled all the infinite variety of
feelings arising in a sensitive and highly cultivated mind
to find exact expression and enable a communication of
winds possible.
An old adage says: Dixit de vulgare duolatal omnia recept
By studying the use and degree of differentiation of the subjunctive
in an inflected language it is possible to know the relative
standing of a people, their civilization and even their thought and desires.
By a comparison of the subjunctive of languages contiguous
in time in order of growth, a flow process is seen in it
growth of mind and language through all the ages.
The history of the subjunctive proves three lines of forces to
more than a foot to

\[ \text{Footnote:} \]
"Causa prosperavit primus animalia terrae
Miserum et turpe fuisse, gladium atque cubilia profuit
Vinculat et prehise, dein festibus atque atque pons
Vinculabant armis, quae post fabercoerant usus
Hinc verba, quiulb voces spectaculat notarum
Vominae invenitur,"

Lucrative believed in the human origin and natural growth of language. In it Avrareum utera la say
"Quid in fas vinculis est tu
Si quid humanum, cui non et lingua vigint
Pro varia senza, variae res voces volarent.

and again

"At varios linguae potentiae naturalis
Misturae et utilitatis expressit nominas rebus."

Having traced the first form of the verb to the infinitive, from the uncomatose character of the primitive verbs, it seems
eye is enabled to pierce the darkness of the past and imagine what history has not recorded.
Part II.

The facts set forth in Part I have laid the foundation for a principle I wish to establish. It now becomes necessary to examine the Subjunctive in some language more closely, to find its original signification and use, and to trace its gradual development. I choose the Latin.

There are two theories regarding the development of the Latin Subjunctive. The first was proposed by scholars of the old school and is occasionally supported even now by scholars of acknowledged authority and ability. To Dr. Karl Ferdinand Becker and Kihler, the celebrated German grammarians, it is chiefly due the minute elaboration of this theory. I can do no better than present the main points as Becker has done.

All thoughts are expanded notions and all notions are contracted thoughts. Two thoughts are connected with each other when taken together they make one thought. The substance by which this thought is expressed being made up of two sentences is a compound sentence. The combinations of two or more thoughts into one are logical combinations. Another form of compound
Sentence results from the expansion of one or more of its members into a sentence. The subject and object being each simple notions may be expanded. The original nucleus of the sentence still remains. It is called the principal sentence.

The notions, which were its subordinate elements, continue to be as when they are expressed as thoughts. They are called accessory sentences (Nebensätze) and their relation is that of subordination to the principal. Their connection is grammatical and not logical because there is but one thought though its parts are expanded.

The relations of thoughts to the speaker are distinguished as thoughts of knowledge and thoughts of desire. The thought of knowledge (Wissen des Erkenntnisses) is a judgment or a question, that is, a thought which is to be decided by the judgment of the person addressed. The thought of knowledge expressed the speaker own knowledge of an object or a thought expressed of. Again the thought spoken of may be the speaker own thought or the thought of another person. Still again, the thought of the speaker may correspond to an actual reality or a reality assumed.
The two last cases lay the foundation of the Subjunctive and Conditional modes. In Latin the same form is service for both. The thought of desire is a wish or command. Every act of knowledge concerns a thought of the speaker or a thought viewed by the speaker, i.e. spoken of. The thought thus viewed and spoken of may be the speaker's own thought or the thought of another.

The speaker's own thoughts are logically actual. Thus viewed thoughts must be logically possible. The leading sentence is the appropriate grammatical frame for the thought of the speaker. It accessory for the thought contemplated. To thoughts logically actual the Indicative mode of predication belongs. To thoughts logically possible the Subjunctive belongs. The Indicative pertains to the leading sentence and the Subjunctive to the accessory. Reason then from positive to, in view of these facts, there can be no doubt that the Subjunctive originated and developed in dependent sentences.

Principal sentences containing the Subjunctive are explained by making them subordinate by supplying some supposed ellipsis. Take, for illustration, the first verse of Homer's second book of Iliad.
Quinm toti certineat et haec visa regestis collect.
Res ipsa est ut in publica commode fereat.
Legibus cumduum, in publica commode fereat.
Se longa permane mox ina temporum Cassar.

The disciples of this school will explain it above subjunctives by moving it read as follows.

Quinm (res ita est ut) toti certineat——
—— armis tuleris—— moribus orum.

Legibus cumduum—— (res ipsa exit ut) fereat.
Se (res exsit ita ut) longa permane moris——.

Beauzie in bis man. general. sayz——

"Illa igitur est prope vis et ipsa modo resitio juvenis al
propositione sub alia propositione juvendoam."

Perignonius sayz——

"Subjunctivus enim dictus est modest ille, quod priori verbo
subjungitur in constuntendo."

Denuzaeus uisc liye impert——

"Alque propositione illa, quae subjunctivums continet est ex
necessitate alia subjunctissa propositioni, cui ipsa subjungitur.
Thus far this school have endeavored to prove the point by pure theory. Having ascertained the exact manner in which the subjunctive predicated thought in a differentiated language, they presume to say it has always been thus. While Breen undoubtedly proves that the subjunctive has always been logically dependent in thought, he fails to show that it has been subordinate grammatically.

So far as I know the only fact adduced to prove that the subjunctive originated in accessory sentences is that presented by Breen. He says the dependent sentence contains the true and original subjunctive because in the Old German much more than at present the "debar-fäg" used the subjunctive. I can not read Old German but I have shown incontestably in Part I that the direct opposite has been true in the Greek, Latin and French languages, that the tendency of those languages has constantly been to expand notions into thoughts and by this process the use of dependent clauses has increased and consequently the use of the subjunctive became more frequent.

But there are other and greater reasons why this view no longer receives general acceptance. Comparative Philology has made great
advances within the last few years and by the material collected through this agency a new view has been advanced bearing the face of truth. The Sanskrit has shed much light on Latin and Greek inflection forms. Scholars of today are able to trace forms to their origin and ascertain their probable primitive force.

This new school embracing nearly all American scholars believes that the Latin subjunctive was developed in principal sentences. In tracing its development I will follow Hadley, Lemm, and Harness, who are essentially agreed.

The number of present stems of verbs in all of the languages of the American Indians is quite large. To form a dubitative mode, an adverb, or preposition or conjunction signifying no doubt required was annexed to the verb. The conditional, causative, and in whole category of modes were formed in like manners from the root.

Thus also with its original of the Indo-European language many stems were used, three of which play an important part in the development of later inflections.

The Reduplicated Present from which was developed th
Indus European Perfect.

II. The present stem with the termination -a from which was developed the Indus European subjunctive.

III. The present stem in ja-i from which arose the present and future indicative.

Thus both subjunctive and indicative are peculiar developments of the present tense. To use an example cited by Bracken, the root "bhar" means simply "to bear." The various forms were inflected by means of terminal endings. "bhara" denotes simply the action of the verb "to bear." By adding a to this stem another conjugation was formed denoting the action as continuing "bhara-ta" - he is bearing. This form evidently more emphatic of the idea of effort. "bha-ra-ta" he is bearing - he is trying to bear - he desires or intends to bear.

Effort, besides desire, suggests also possibility and probability of accomplishing what one is attempting. The primary meaning of the stem then, which developed into the subjunctive were 1st Attempted action, 2nd Desired action, and 3rd Possible or Probable action. The differentiation of meaning was likely very slow.
The Latin Subjunctive also contains the Indo-European Optative developed from the present form whose formation element is
ja = i, "to go."
This stem became the basis of several important verbal inflections

I. The Present Indicative.

II. The Future Indicative.

III. The Optative.

The first use was to denote a contemplated, future, or probable action
whenever arose its potential force. This meaning suggests desire
or wish. Here are its two primitive meanings of the Optative not
differing much from those found for the Subjunctive.

Haver new says

"In my judgment its indiscriminate use in Latin of the subjunc-
tive and Optative forms in connection with its regular use of
these same forms to supply the place of the future Indicative
contains an important historical fact in the development of
those modes. It shows that when the Latin first became
a separate language, the forms of the Subjunctive, of the Optative,
and of the Future Indicative were used with little difference of"
meaning, a view confirmed by the etymology of the form itself.

In applying these meanings found for the primitive subjunctive to its use in the Classical period, we must begin with principal sentences and finally take up the subjunctive in subordinate clauses.

In the oldest examples of Sanskrit and in the Homeric poems, the subjunctive is often used in place of the future indicative. Thus in the Iliad and Odyssey the aorist subjunctive and future indicative are often identical in form and used without much discrimination of meaning. Also the optative with the indicative is used in a future sense (Potential Optative). The Latin did this same thing, hence the subjunctive and optative forms supply the place of the future indicative.

This, Hardner says, shows that while the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin first became separate languages, the distinction between the indicative on the one hand and the subjunctive and optative on the other, so clearly recognized in the Classical period was only partially developed, and also that among the various
meanings denoted by subjunctive and optative forms in the earliest writers, those which are most closely related to the general meaning of the indicative may safely be regarded as it earliest. We recognize as one of it most primitive uses of these modes, it potential force. Then it Latin subjunctive, like it Sanskrit and Greek, denotes desire, wish. It is thus used.

I. In Prayers and Wishes
II. In Exhortations and Prohibitions, Entreaties
III. In Commands and Prohibitions
IV. In Concessions

These meanings are readily derivable from the etymological signification of the subjunctive, since earnest effort implies desire. That it may be seen that these two (potential and optative) meanings of it Latin subjunctive are derivable from its primitive meaning of the forms themselves, that they "run through it whole range of Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin literature and embrace all it uses known to it Latin subjunctive in Principal Clauses."

Subordinate clauses are unknown in the first stages of growth of a language. An examination of most Indian languages reveals only simple and compound sentences. When one member of a compound sentence became dependent, it probably retained its original mode. Therefore in all subordinate clauses, we must ascertain whether they owe their subjunctive to its original thought or have been developed from its subjunctive character of its clause. Take its conditional sentence. The conditional particle is no necessary part of the sentence. The full force of its conditional sentence may be expressed without a conditional particle in a clause, both independent, and by all possible varieties found. Take a sentence both members of which contain its subjunctive as e.g. "improbis ferebit, uti monstrum." In its condition is its subjunctive of desire, in its conclusion, its potential subj. The subjunctive in conditions is always a subjunctive of desire, that in its conclusion is generally potential, though it sometimes denotes desire also. Concessions likewise, contain its subjunctive of desire, as it also finds clauses since purpose involved desire.
In Homer, final clauses are less developed than in Classical Latin, and there we find sentences where it is hard to tell whether they are independent sentences containing a subjunctive of desire or dependent clauses of purpose.

Result is contemplated as something desired or proposed. Consecutive clauses contemplate the result as probable or to be expected and thus are potential in origin.

To these two meanings of the subjunctive may be referred all original subjunctives in subordinate clauses. Causal and temporal clauses, dependent questions and subordinate clauses of Praecon Obliqua, all of which contain the subjunctive, did not develop with this mode while they were independent sentences, but the subjunctive was developed from it indication after the clause became subordinate.

With all these facts in view, one can not but be struck with the remarkable growth of the subjunctive, and decline in relative importance of all other modes with its advance of time and civilization. It has been shown that in primitive languages modes are numerous, nearly every different way in which a speaker makes an assertion, requiring a special mode form.
That as the mind develops, doubt increases and the subjunctive gains in use and importance; it is when the Teutonic, Greek, and Latin became separate languages, that indicative, subjunctive, and optative had become the principal moods but their use had not become to any great degree specialized, while it seems in its classical period still retained separate forms, it Latin had merged subjunctive and optative in one before the time of its "Golden Age." That in all languages derived from it Latin, the subjunctive is constantly gaining in use, often construction giving way to it, that the foregoing seems to me to show, that language forms constantly increase in differentiation and specialization and only the most important survive.

In an inflected language the subjunctive mode is most adapted to meet all the subtle discriminations of constantly growing minds. Can we say that the English language has passed by natural growth entirely through its inflectional stage and simplified its constructions to such an extent that it subjunctive is no longer necessary? If so, is it not an ideal language?