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It is stated by Professor William Earnest Hale in an article on the Sequence of Seneca which appeared in the American Journal of Philology, that the Latin Indicative acts in the same manner as the Subjunctive with regard to sequence. After an examination of all subordinate Indicatives and Subjunctives in view of the 'Quaestiones' of Cicero ('De Divinatio Prima' 18 secundum; 'De Dominio Crassii Conditi'; and 'Pro Anhini oris') I have concluded that Mr. Hale is mistaken.

He has undoubtedly proved his point that every subordinate Subjunctive has its individual meaning—tells its own temporal story, not depending on a principle new for its time. However, I hope to show that the conclusion which he draws from this, namely, that 'no such thing as mechanical sequence exists,' does not necessarily follow.

Since it is on these two arguments chief by that Mr. Hale bases his theory of the non-existence of sequence, that theory would be seriously weakened by data showing that the Indicative does not act like the Subjunctive, and that the retention of meaning by subordinate Subjunctives does not impede a feeling of mechanical sequence. The Rule of Sequence as stated in school grammar says that in the Subjunctive.
made primary tense are followed by primary and secondary ones by secondary.

Thirdly, the student to infer that the subordinate subjunctives have no way of expressing time through themselves, but are wholly dependent in this matter on their main verbs. This is the form of the theory which Mr. Hale at first attacked, but as none could be found to dispute it, he went further, using it as an argument to prove that there is no such thing as sequence. I hope to show that the conclusion is not verified from this argument.

As regards the tense meanings in the indicative, there are three possible points of view from which an act may be regarded, the past, the present, and the future. For each one there is an aoristic tense, which simply states the act as an occurrence, and two more definite tenses: e.g., there is an aoristic perfect which simply tells that a given act took place in the past, and there are two tenses, the imperfect and pluperfect, which give a descriptive picture of the act at that past time. These definite tenses convey to the hearer three distinct ideas: 1. The point of view from which the speaker puts the act, i.e., the time sphere (past, present, or future). 2. The stage of advancement at that point of time (completed, progressing,
yet to be). e. The temporal relation of the
certainty, ontogenic, i.e., ontogeny, or the unitary). The
manner tense differs from the duem
 definite ones in that they fail to give
the stage.
To learn of the tenses of the stage, one
may say that they state an act at one
and, so, in which act at a certain time, expressing
both time sphere and stage, and implying
temporal relationship. They are: for the
past, the perfect, the imperfect, and
the perfect. for the present, the
present perfect, the present, and the
perfect. for the future, the perfect,
and the perfect. In my classification I have regarded
the infinitive alone of the perfect.
A brief explanation of the use of the
tense prefix necessary. In narration the
story advances by the successive mention of
successive events, by use of the perfect;
the historical, present, or the historical
infinitive. The writer selects certain points
which stand forth as the main events of the
story, and states them in independent sen-
tences. He events of minor importance fre-
quent themselves to his mind. He states in
the narrative, turning aside, to describe a
state of affairs, perhaps, as it was at the
time of the main act; such description is
given by imperfects and pluperfects. Since
Cicero conceded himself very little with
narration, his main verbs are by no means
limited to the past, there being a plentiful
number of presents and futures. The pres-
ent tense has two auxiliary tenses, the
descriptive present and the present perfect,
expressing a state of affairs in the present;
the future has the descriptive future and
the future perfect, expressing a state of
affairs in the future.
Modifying circumstances are generally
seen by a writer or speaker in temporal
relationship to the acts which they modify,
and so are expressed by the tenses which
are appropriate to their main verb. This
natural temporal relationship may be re-
garded as logical sequence. However, the
verbs may be in the same time sphere
and the subordinate one be an avocative
instead of a descriptive tense. It is quite
feasible to combine different time spheres
in the same sentence, and here also any
tense may be followed by either a De-
scriptive or an avocative tense. Logical
sequence embraces only three sentences in
which the verbs are in the same time sphere,
the subordinate one being descriptive.
Thus, to treat the Indicative as if it were
the Subjunctive, any tense may be fol-
lowed by a present, present perfect, future,
future perfect, and also by the perfect with an adverbic meaning. These combinations come within the bounds of an Indicative Law of Sequence as far as form is concerned, but the adverbic perfect is not a descriptive tense and therefore cannot be in logical sequence with any primary tense on which it depends. Any of the other tenses mentioned follows a primary tense of a different time-sphere, the sequence is again at fault logically, though the verbs are still formally in sequence. If, however, one of these primary tenses follows a secondary tense, it is clearly out of sequence as far as both form and time are concerned.

As regards secondary tense, an imperfect or pluperfect may depend on any secondary tense and be both formally and logically in sequence, since in any case a descriptive verb of past time-sphere depends on a verb of that same time-sphere. Of one of these secondary tenses depends on a primary, it is logically as well as formally out of sequence, since the time-spheres are certain to be different.

The great majority of Indicative examples are in sentences where the same time-sphere is preserved and the subordinate verb is descriptive. Satisfactory explanation can be given for a large proportion of those ant
of sequence either logically or formally. Though the number greatly exceeds the exceptions in the subjunctive.

Coordinate, determining, and parenthetical clauses are favorite places for exceptions to occur, there being formulæ in coordinate clauses, in determining, and in parenthetical from a total of. Of logical exceptions are in coordinate clauses, in determining, and in parenthetical.

It is so natural for any coordinate clause to be out of sequence that this clause of exception may be regarded as accounted for without discussion. I shall proceed to consider, then, special idioms and the thought combinations that would naturally result in exceptions to sequence.
1. Present defective truth.

A fact that is true in all time may be related by a dependent present or imperfect when the main verb states a past event. As in English, these tenses may be used interchangeably in this construction, depending on the feeling of the speaker. It is possible, therefore, that no exception will occur, but equally possible that the subordinate verb will be either logically or formally out of sequence, or out of both ranks, as the feeling of the speaker or writer varies. The large number of exceptions found in this class is surely that there is not, in the indicative, a mechanical feeling for sequence.

Example: sed aequus, quod extimo removam

A. Formally out. (In Catilinam I) Admirandum

act, III;

(De Cat. II) video, III; nntent, III; fulgent, III;

(Den. Com.) set II; est, II; amant, III; obstentant, III;

polent, XIV; arbitrantur, XIV; fact, XIV; content, XI;

vult, XX; duavit, XV;

(Lat. Past.) officia, III; confirmat, V; indicat, V;

salet, III; oblivint, V;

Total, 18.
2. Congruence.

When two acts take place at the same time, the one continuing through exactly the same temporal space as the other, they are expressed by the same tense, although one is subordinate. If the narrative is in past time both may be domestic perfects, and will thus be out of sequence both formally and logically.

Thus late mihi ---- incidiatur es, non publice me executis, sed privato diligentia defendi,
(In Cat. I. 5).

A. Formally ant. (In Cat. I) -- incidiatur es, I;
patini, III;
(de Imp. 2. 2) dili tis, XX;
(lun. Inf.) frui, V;

Total, 4
§ - Coincidence.

If two clauses are synonymous expression of the same act, one being the exact equivalent of the other, they are expressed by the same tense, although one is made subordinated to the other. As in the case of Conjugation, if aoristic perfects are used, an exception to sequence results.

Tantum propter tum, cum te a consulatu repelle, non est. (In Cat. I, 10)

A. Formally, not —
(In Cat. I) repelle, X;
(In Cat. II) depulam est, I; conicentum, I;
perfectus est, VII; vsa est, XII; Total, 5.

An exception may arise from two syntactic perfects in this construction. The subordinate verb must be pro parte, nullo, debere, or diest, and its subject must be the same as that of the main verb. The sense must be such that the main verb may be added to the subordinate one in the infinitive form, superius illa, quanquam sequi nova fecissent, tamet, ut futuri, futuri.

A. Formally cont.

(In Lect. I) futuri, VII.
(In Lect. II) voluit, I.

Total, 2.
0. Damn. classes of situations.

This is a settled idiom in which the tense is regularly the present, no matter what the tense of the main verb may be.

Hoc audem nostrui colligunt undiae diligenter, rectissime et mensibus effugit. (De Imp. Oth. II.)

1. Formally out:
   (De Imp. Tom.) Colligunt, IX.; Total, 1.

2. Logically out:
   (In Cat. II) Redigient, IX.; Delectantur, IX.; Total, 2.
6. Narrative clauses withubi, ut, praeptum, 

or primum atque. 

These introductory words are followed 

by the perfect master. 

Nam aut primum et præpess execeit Anchias, 

esse ad omnem et studium contulit. (A, III) 

A. Form and use: 

(De Cat. I) - adeo certi, VII; 

(De Cat. II) - incursus est, VI; commovam, II; 

(De Imp. Form.) - venit, X; perspective cest, XII; 

(Concl.) - execeit, III; 

Total, 6.
7. *ilīs* type.

Such expressions as *ilīs* are often slipped in by licentiae parenthetical and determinative clauses. They may be used in any
notion of any time, but from the nature of
the phrase the sent- must remain a perfect
assertion, and is thus likely to cause confusion.

4. Formally ant:

(De Inf. Pont.) *dīsī, II*

Total, 1.

8. Logically ant:

(De Cat. I) *dīsī, XIII; dīsī, VIII; dīsī, IX;*

(De Cat. II) *dīsī, X;*

(De Inf. Pm) *Cephenium, XIV; (Same uses - might be asserted)*

Total, 5.
8. "ut aiunt."

This is a phrase of the same type as the preceding; i.e., from its very nature the verb must remain present, though it may be introduced parenthetically into narrative of any time.

Deut. xiv. 15: "daba quodam deklinatione et, ut aiunt, eun港区 effugis! (cuius)

\[ \text{Formally: } \]
\[ (\text{In Cat. I}) \text{ Quaient, } \text{II}; \]
\[ (\text{De Imp. Com}) \text{ dicuntur, } \text{IX} \]

\[ \text{Total: 2.} \]

\[ \text{Logically: } \]
\[ (\text{In Cat. II}) \text{ aiunt, } \text{II}; \]
\[ (\text{De Imp. Com}) \text{ abiturum, } \text{XIX}; \]

\[ \text{Total: 2.} \]
9. Present used freely for the future.
   In conditions the present is sometimes used as it is in English where a future would
be necessary if exactness were the standard.
   This may denote logical exceptions to
   sequent.
   Convincam, si negas. (Ex Cat. I, IV)

Logically not:
(Ex Cat. I) negas, IV;
(le Imp. Com) Rhetoric, xxiii;

Total, 2.
10. Past tense following a present or future.
   a. Subordinate tense a perfect audit.

   This is the most common logical ex-
   ception in Cnus, almost every kind of
   clause furnishing examples of it. Although
   a speaker's mind is concerned with the
   present or future, he may very naturally
   give scene descriptive setting which was
   some only in a time past with reference
   to his main verb and is not now existing.

   b. Subordinate tense imperfect or pluperfect.

   When the dependent clause contains some
   such word as iam, tum, quandam, or any
   other expression which points to give a past
   point of reference, the subordinate verb
   may be in the imperfect or pluperfect
   tense, though following a present or future.

   The exception is therefore in logical and form.

   a. si eae nec, quae gressimur, publica terrar
   regionibus definitissimae. (Anсh.X)

   b. Num ubitque id me imperavit gvesne, quod
   iam tum evertit secularm

a. Anyt depending on present or future time.

   Logically ant-
   (2.6 Ext. IV) occidit, I; opportuit, II; fuerunt, III;
   effugimus, II; contigit, IV; venisse taceat, vI;
   reliquemmus, vII; dedisti, vIII; dixisti, vII; potuisti, vII;
   constitutum fuist, vI; interdixit, vII; tristivest, vIII;
   constitutum es, vIII; fecerunt, II; transitisti, vII;
   (In Ext. V) est situ p. egresse cut, est tuncimus, relignit,
habet, valuunt, deservenunt, III; effecturi, IV; vult, VIII; concupiscunt, constuit, X; facturit, valuunt, XII; ingressus sum, 
valuunt, XIII.
(de Inf. Com.) valuistis, potuit, dedenunt, dut-
erunt, I; tradita est, greseenunt, II; quiestis,
ssecupit, egemunt, reliquemunt, personavit, III; accidenunt, IV; necavit, fruit, II; greseenunt, VI; 
inus, dorum, VII; dixit, XIII; fruit, IX; germen, 
consensus est, explicavit, redundavit, patetfactum
est, conspexit, expetravit, XI; captus est, depresse
est, XII; dedemunt, venerunt, dexterunt, XIII; 
commissa sunt, dicta sunt, XVII; valuerunt, 
remanent, XVIII; detulit, confest, XIV; delegavit,
secutis, consenuistis, vidistis, attulisti, misimus,
XXII.

in - Vult accompanied by word of fact situation,
formally unt;

(De Cat.) - faciun, V;
(De Cat.) - dunt, II; poebant, XIII;
(de Inf. Com.) viderant, XII; snumnonunt, XII;
(Anch. Collverant, IV; Total, 6.)
11. Date clauses

An indicative verb with enn, which determines the time of action for the principle verb, is likely to be an adverbial perfect if it follows this tense.

Nam cum propter dilatationem omnium temporum primus centurio eundem remuntiatus sum, facile intellegi. In miris, et quid de me indicaretis et quid autem precursoribus?

Formally ant:
(In Cat. I) S. fugitum, I; Valvisi, II;

(de Angle. Om) remuntiatus sum, I; depopulavit.
praesentem est,

Total, 5.
12. Exceptions caused by conditions contrary to fact in present time.

The imperfect tense in this construction is equal to a present, and therefore any tense which would be in sequence with a present is logically in sequence with one of these imperfects, although formally not.

Servi me hercle mei si mea dato pacto metuent, ut metuent annos civis tum domum meum relinquendum futurum. (archaeis, vii.)

Formally not logically in:
(In Cat. I) machinaris, I; metuent, III.
(In Cat. II) legetur, II;
(de Imp. Com.) segetur, III;
(Nec.) circumscriptum set (present perfect), XI.

Total, 5.

a. A present unfulfilled obligation is expressed by the imperfect tense. In this case this imperfect which is equal to a present fulfills a present, existing a form, though not a logical, exception.

---, unde ferreus tenebrarum fotientium, vos non dum voces vulnere! (In Cat. I, xiv.)

Formally not logically in:
(In Cat. I) reponderent, IV;
(In Cat. II) ipse mement, II.

Total, 2.
13. There are a number of exceptions which can be attributed to no idiom, but must be explained by the fact that the sense of the passage demands the use of the tenses which Cicero has chosen. A probable place for these to occur is in

1. Generalizing conditions:

   quotiensque, et si tuetisti, sed me tibi adstiti. (In Cat. I. II)

A. Formally out:

   (In Cat. I) isti, I; defequent, xi;
   (de Imp. Som.) fnueunt, xii; suscepsit est, xxiv;
   [Total, 4]

B. Logically out:

   (de Imp. Som.) est, possum, I;
   [Total, 2]

2. Causal or adverbial clauses:

   Quamquam mihi semper-----hic locum-----
   ad docendum vanitas similitudine est vires, quinque,
   tamen hoc aditus hanc,-----, non mea me vol-
   nius vel adhuc, sed vitale meminisset-----prohibent.
   (de Imp. Som. I.)

   Inde ne, quantum id, quod sit primum,-----
   facere nondums andes, faciam id, etc.

A. Formally out:

   (de Imp. Som.) vires est, I; (quamquam);
   (hinc) voluit, (quod), I;
   (In Cat. I) fecunda fnueunt, (quamquam) xii;
   [Total, 3]
3. Present truths depending on future verbs.

(fiat) quod id, quod id ad devinitam dennis, et ad comminum saeculum utilium. (In Cat. I–II)

logically ant;

(In Cat. I) minus, II; et, II; densus, III; abhorrunt, VIII;

In civis, VIII; compenent (green), video, centis, XII;

sentinent, XII; videntur, adflistantur, et, nunc.

inamia, XIII;

(In Cat. II) sentinent, IX; suppeditum, eget, XI;

enemici (green), video, videtur, XII; videtur, XII; futurum, XIII;

(be fing. Dom) print, VI; minantur, XII, reportet, XXVII.

(linch.) est, IX; profiteatur, et, XII; conceditur, transmittit, VII; 28.

4. It is impossible to classify some of the exceptions. They are in parenthesis for determining classes and there is often no temporal relation between the two verbs, whereas one might be put in a subordinate descriptive tense.

qui superius cum hoste conflict, quam quis.
quam cum inimico concerantur. (de Inf. Dom. i).

Formally not:
(2, Cat. I) constitutio prima, VII; solebat, VIII;
(2, Cat. II) iucis, VII; agit, VII;
(Inf. Dom.) patuit, I; denuntiavit, III; patruit, VIII;
ancus est, IX; concerantur, legemunt, concerantur, X; vidimus, ausquimus, XI; hancavit, XII;
indicavit, XII; tertulamentum, XVIII; superamentum, XvIII; voluntatem, non homines, XIX,
(Arch.) pristitus pravit, VII; effens, VII; aedaequavit, X; domavit, X; bellavit, XII; faxit, IV;
remissarius, X; ressimissae, XI; Total, 28.

Logically not:
(2, Cat. I) portius, II;
(Arch.) pristius, X.
Total, 2.

There is a logical exception in the locutions which cannot be classified with any of the rest.

... cum etc. ... inreparum, hic

Logically not:
(Arch.) inreparum, X;
Total, I.
There are exceptions not to be explained since a tense which is not the one to be expected naturally is used.

Tandem aliqvando, quod le inquitur impleuit exempla effrondata et forsum rapicenti. (Cat. 1, 10)

Formally out:
(2 Cat. 1) Sapientiat, 5;
(de Inf. Con) putariatis, 20; admonii, 15;
Total, 3.

Two verbs are formally not of sequence in a condition of fact.
Etenim, si dammi vini ... non modo se non contaminarent, sed honestament, eum venendum mihi non est, ne et.

Formally out:
(2 Cat. 1) contaminarent, honestament, 20;
Total, 2.
Summary

1. Present existing truth: 
   Formally true: 18.

2. Congruence: 
   Formally true:

3. Coincidence: 
   Formally true:

4. Pseudo-coincidence: 
   Formally true:

5. Dominance: 
   Formally true, 
   Logically true:

6. Whi, ut, fortquam idiom: 
   Formally true:

7. ut dicet type: 
   Formally true, 
   Logically true:

8. ut minum type: 
   Formally true, 
   Logically true:

9. Jascent used for future: 
   Logically true:
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10. Past tense following a present or future: Poetically; out, logically out.

11. Date clauses: Formally out.

12. Dependent on conditions contrary to fact: Formally out. (logically in)


Total: Formally out; logically out.

In sequence: 309.

Coordinates are not included in these totals. Of these, three are: Formally out; logically out.

Total: 34.

In 1.

Total: 31.
Subjunctive mode.

An examination of subjunctives shows that each tense has the temporal power of the indicative tense of the same name, and in addition, a future power. That is, the present serves as a present or future; the imperfect as imperfect or future to the past; the perfect as either perfect or future perfect; and the pluperfect as either pluperfect or future perfect to the past. The subjunctive tenses, like the indicative, indicate time, sphere, and stage.

Various feelings, such as wish, wish, etc., were expressed by the original subjunctive, and these may be regarded as its true meaning in constructions where the tense meaning is the same as the indicative, the subjunctive may be regarded as having developed these additional meanings from its true one.

Such a case is found in result clauses when the imperfect is used after an avoict where the meaning would naturally require an avoict. Mr. Dale has explained this quite satisfactorily. He says that in "tam fortiter" (4:21) and "ut vincere," the result clauses had developed the meaning so that they did "conquer" from the original "wherely they would naturally," in which the imperfect subjunctive had its true meaning. The tense and the mode remain as they originally were, though the natural mode of expression would be the avoict indicative. The
fact that as few exceptions occur in this
construction give fair to prove the existence
of a mechanical feeling for sequence in the
subjunctive.

On consideration of exceptions to sequence
in the subjunctive, a very much smaller
percentage will be found to exist than in
the indicative.
1. Consist following a present or future.

This elder has already been explained
under the indicative.

Dei re nobili dulitate, quin hic aut cum emiatio
omnia, quin inter tot ardua unius inventus sit, quem ---- venisse gaudiant. (De Inf. Tom. XXIII.)

Logically ant:

In Cat. I) egerie, fuenic, concurrenit, efenie, recueranit, IX;

In Cat. II) egerit, II; attributa sit, depref socerit, III;

consequenit, II; emicerein, eserenit, fortunamit, accident, VII;

(de Inf. Tom.) misentit, venenit, II; conserumanitio, II;

superanit, eserenenit, X; transamisent, redempti-
sunt, permanenit, grena sint, III; venetum, derenit,

reiguerit, gessenit, gessenit, peverenit, XIX;

indicanit, timenent, dilexenit, XIV; pverenit,

IX; persenit, dependerit, X; gessenit, adven-

enit, attempenit, abhederit, obsinu-

enit, XVI; edexenit, XV; esestuta sint, XX;

invenit sit, XXIII; servent, IX.

(Ohemio) contentenit, XX; duxeninnum, XII; averanit,

retandanit, abstenent, II; pvereninmut, X.

Total, 49.
1. Result clause.
   a. the assist instead of an imperfect.
      This is the construction mentioned before,
      in which the imperfect is equivalent to
      an assist and in a few cases has sacrifice
      from its meaning. (Result - Characterizing)

      Vanta diligentia justi res ad fractores
      venenit et defecit. (Anchises, 2)

      Formally ant.
      (Cat. I)
      (Cat. II) accipit, III;
      (de Imp. Dom.)
      (Anchises) viciatus, defecit, II.

      Total, 3.

2. Present result of a past act.
   divina virtus tan lucem temporis lucem ad
   senes rei publicae patuit, ut vice----mine
   andia. (Anchises, XII) de Imp. Dom.

      Formally ant.
      (de Imp. Dom.) videcantur, IV; andia, XII;
      diuitur, XIII;

      Total, 3.

3. Future result of a present act.
   ut punctum faciat in militem, nemini vis defet
   leg. ant.
   (de cat. II) adhibitum, VII; defendant, XIII;
   (de Imp. Dom.) faciat, XIII;

      Total, 3.
3. Quaestum following a future in indirect questions:

Reginuntur falsae mens quem ad medium

Reliquam posit magnum esse bellum.

 desiemp. Dict. III)

Logically ant:

(Id. Cat. II) communes, III;

 desiemp. Dom.) cessit, III;

Total, 2

4. Substantive quod clause:

As si quis est --- qui --- me --- accusat, quod

Tam capitlum hanc non comprehenderim (Cat.II-2).

Logically ant:

(Cat.II) comprehenderim, 2;

Total, 1

5. Potissimum coordinate in effect:

me --- accusata, quod --- hanc non comprehenderim putio quam emiserim.

Logically ant:

(Cat.II) emiserim, 2;

Total, 1
6. Two examples are formally out of sequence logically in:

   Minimassis me ante diem XII Kalendas
   November diei in penitus, fure in annum
   cento die, qui dies futuras essef .... (Cat. i. 3)
   (The date here gives a past situation for
    future, making it in effect past.)

   Sed cum tempus凤凰 in diem, idem,
   si interfectus esset, quid different. (Cat. ii. 7)
   (The present depends on an imperfect equal
    to a present in a condition contrary to fact.)

   Formally out = logically in:
   (Cat. i) futurus esse, 3;
   (Cat. ii) cento, 7;

   Total, 10.

1. One exception results from the habit of
   considering noni a present perfect, though
   in this case it can be nothing but anttret.

   Sum quantum consilii .... valeat, ... veri, limita,
   hoc ipae et hos paene cognosco. (de Inf. Pm. xiv)

   Formally out:
   (de Inf. dixit) valeat, xiv;

   Total, 1.
Summary of Subjunctives.

1. Conect following a present or future.
   Logically ant.

2. Result clause:
   Formally ant.
   Logically ant.

3. Present in indirect question. (after future)
   Logically ant.

4. Substantive quand.
   Logically ant.

5. Coordinate in effect
   Formally ant.

6. Formally ant. Logically in.

7. Conect embedded as present perfect.
   Formally ant.

Total:
Formally ant.
Logically ant.
In sequence.

Three numbers and exclusive of sentences introduced by coordinating relations.

Conjunctions:
Formally ant.
Logically ant.
In.
This great difference in the percentage of exceptions in the subjunctive as compared with the indicative is explained by Mr. Hale by the fact that the great majority of dependent indicatives are less closely related to their principal verbs than the subjunctives are. This is no doubt true, but if a construction can be found which has exactly parallel usage in the two modes, and the unequal ratio still exists, we shall be justified in standing for the mechanical rule for sequenced. I have counted examples from these constructions on this point—they are:

1. Canonic clauses.
2. General truths.
3. When Cicero wishes to express a fact reason for a past act, he uses without apparent distinction the subjunctive with them, or the indicative with good, from, etc. But when he expresses a present reason for a past act, he chooses to use the indicative in preference to the subjunctive, though of course any exception abides in either case. Few are not many examples of this kind in the four partitions not enough on which to form a theory, but they are worth consideration.

Indicative:
Indicative.

In sequence:

(Archias) coelebant, III; (eo imp. prn.)

Formally ant.

(Archias) confirmat, indicat, II.

Subjunctive:

In sequence:

(Cat. II) viverem, II;

(kodmp. prn.) naviaret, XI;

(Archias) esset, futurum, IV.

2 - General truths.

When a general truth depends on a fact verb, it is either perfect or imperfect, if indicative, but when the general truth must be told in the subjunctive, it is invariably imperfect, evidently for the purpose of keeping it in sequence with its main verb.

Indicative:

In sequence:

(Cat. II) merito esat, II; vidiebamus, II;

(Archias) coelebant, II;

Formally ant.

(Cat. II) video, sitent, fulgent, III;

(kodmp. prn.) est, est, II; viventis, XII; solent, arbitran
tur, XII; facit, putet, XV;

(Archias) confirmat, indicat, II; solet, III; obtinet, II.
Subjunctive:

In sequence:

(Cat. I) placet, IV; viderentur, II; secem, continemur, III; praetulrentur, I; posses, nominetur, X; impiendent, putaret, XII;
(Cat. II) indicem, II;
(R. Imp. Om.) exact, X; pertinacit = imperfect, XII;
andent, XVII; videremur, XX, XIX; dependens;
 XVIII; videremur, XXIII;
(Arch.) exact, IV; putaret, IV;

My belief, then, in regard to sequence, is that every tense of the subjunctive has its own meaning; and that this meaning is inseparable from it. Besides this, as is shown by Mr. Tully’s explanation of the imperfect in recent clauses, and by the fact that in four instances of Cicero, no exception occurs in the subjunctive in Canard Clauses or general truths when they follow a fact verb. I conclude that there was a feeling for sequence in the subjunctive, that this feeling influenced Cicero to avoid exceptions when it was possible for him to attain the same end by use of the indicative.