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Characterizing clauses.

In my treatment of this subject I shall make frequent allusion to the (1) essential clause, (2) determining clause, and (3) qualifying clause. Hence in order to avoid any confusion which might arise, I shall first define these terms as they will be used in this paper.

(1) An essential clause is one which cannot be omitted without materially affecting the sense of the sentence.

In explanation of this definition I would say that the antecedent of such a clause is usually indefinite and requires the clause to make an intelligible sentence. So a natural definition for such a clause would be: An essential clause is one which completes an indefinite antecedent. Such a definition would include cases like, "nulla sunt qui ..." but not all the clauses which are really essential.

Sometimes the main clause makes by itself complete sense but the dependent clause as modifies the meaning of the sentence so that if it were left out the meaning of the sentence would completely change. Thus while the sentence "Curni Gallia gesta
Morini Menippique superavit" is complete in sense, yet a few different meaning is expressed when the clause, "qui in armis insert" is added. Hence although the
the antecedent of the qui is apparently definite, the clause is since the less essential to the idea which the writer wished to express. There can be no rule to tell you when such clauses will be essential and subjective and when not, for that depends entirely upon the feeling of the writer.

(2) A determining relative clause is one essential clause which need a fact, subject to be already known to the reader, primarily to tell what person or thing is meant.

(3) A generalizing relative clause is one which can be turned into a condition without altering the meaning of the sentence.
The following list of type sentences, all of which are included among the characterizing clauses by one or more of the grammarians, I shall exclude from this paper because I do not consider them characterizing. The first two, which are indicative, are universally admitted to be not characterizing clauses but are often unintentionally included among the characterizing clauses by the inaccurate statements of the grammarians. The following seven examples are subjunctive and are sometimes included among the characterizing clauses by the grammarians because they believe them to be such. By reasons for excluding them I shall state later in my paper.
1. Usque in hispensionem legatæ se litterae mult ad est ducet, quibuscum tunc bellum gerebantur. Nov. Iuc. 4-9
2. Deinde est remo, qui ea legem vexit. Phil. 1:4-35
3. Illi autem qui omnium se publica praecelsa sentint, negotium susceperunt.

Cat. 3-2-3-

4. At herculi, aliquot annos anterius ante legem Habinianum, ille populus Romanus esse usque ad nostram Memianam consuetudinem in navibus Siciliae permanentem. Nov. 2. 18-34.
5. Iam enim imperatori presentem nullo in numero juxta erunt usque in exercitus centurialius veniunt atque venierint. Nov. 2. 18-35.
6. Insæc res est latum unum castrorum ripi fluminis muniebat et præsum quæ secta tuta ad hostibus reddebat. Brut. 2-3-5.
7. Servum est remo, qui modo tolerabili condicionis sit servitutis. Cat. 4-5-16.
8. Attisti aliquid humanum hominum ræcentium, quæque quam dictum ad ipsos illis, quod seiam hic nunc. 2:26, 82.
The following list of type sentences I shall not include in my treatment of the characterizing clauses although I recognize them as such. They present no special difficulty for they are translated by the various forms of the subjunctive and if the proper force of the subjunctive is recognized it is not of any vital importance whether one calls them characterizing or not.
12. Nascetur pulchra Troiamque origine Caeasar imperium Oceanus, famam qui terminet actis rec. 1.286.
13. Hoc erat in vales modo agri --- hortus --- est pulchrum Silva super Libris post
   Hier. Sat. 2.6.1
14. Quum Augustum et difficile visit qua singuli censi decreuerunt. B. H. 1.6.1
15. Nunc erit idoneus qui ad bellum mittatur. Q. Q. 66.
The following list contains the type sentences of the characterizing clause of ideal certainty and of actuality, which my paper is to treat. And the term characterizing will be used in this paper from this point on, only to apply to such clauses. The characterizing clause of ideal certainty and of actuality are so closely united that any effort to separate the two would be futile. A number of the examples may be either one or the two, depending entirely upon the interpretation put upon them. This is a natural confusion for the subjunctive of actuality was developed from the subjunctive of ideal certainty.
16. Nunc enim est tam senex, qui se annum
num justet posse vivere. De luc. 7-24
17. Nilla est tam facile nec quam invitus
justit. Tert. Tract. 8-13
18. Ille tam difficile est qui --- posset. In tnt. 6-75
19. Nec vero illa vii infserit tanta est
--- posset. Off. 2-7-25
20. Ilia justit esse tam aversa est vero
--- qui regent. Cat. III 7-21
21. Ecquid referis et tam longa oratione
rex, qui te respondere posse suspicarse let. 21
22. Hic longius hostis aberrat quam quis
--- posset. Ob. IV 21-23
23. Mainus alterius sese habent quam quae
peste vulna furent. In 33-5
24. Si in nulla sidebatum optio pserna quae
de illa aceta loquere fuerit. Luc. 1-4
25. Causa itaque stabile est, in quae oratio decere
numinim posset. Marc. 1-3.
26. Est incerta adfinis lati animi quae
murest reminix. Luce. 3-5
27. Et (natur) deit larem meum quem omnem
virtutem accipit posset. Titus. 5-57
28. Nec tamen ego in sum qui nequeam falso
advertem quem nequeam absented, qui
vitam posset. A. 2-66
29. Ego sum in, quia dieum me non desper.
T. 3-80
30. In se in sum qui lie delator. Nav. 9-18
31. Ille est enim, qui siculum plebem exasperat
et in verticie jugat. Dei. Eph. 2.2-8.
32. Hunc est belli sine modi, quod maxime
vetere animae excitare atque inflammare
ad persequendi studium debet. Vuln. I. 2-6

33. Et hunc tota opera circumdedit quae per

inter se distarent. D. 4. 72-4

34. Quamia enim a me in te profita sunt,

quae ad tuum commodum, quae ad

honorium, quae ad dignitatem pertinent.

Vuln. 5-5-2

35. Decet, eam continuae complures dies

tempestatis quae — continent. 13. 4. 4. 34

36. Ha ex animo, cui — prospexit, sum

Vuln. 2. 12-33
37. Tuit qui quadam appellacionem moneas
Augusti in Lytrzym Transpenderam. Sue Ap. 12
38. sunt qui -- putunt. Luc. 1:9
40. Sic est qui relit. Eccl. 15
41. Inimicarigit, qui non se aut morti, aut servitutis periculum committeret. V.m. 1:1-31
42. Tibi autem est molestenum, quod num
decideres. C.i. Sen. 14-17
43. Nihil, quod: ipse ex silicio, committerit. Eccl. 2:2
44. Regemque legatus habere sod qui sacrific
per se habituri sint rationem dignitatis
45. Multi quasi qui -- se removerunt.
Off. 1:20-69
46. Sunt autem quidam e notius qui -- reliet 7:1-9:31
47.num sunt qui mun vi deunt. T. v. 16-52
48. Sunt num ad sua causa quae plane
efficient. C.i. Eccl. 3:19-5:9
49. Sacri est multi sunt amici homini qui
enti sient. Paudit. Pseud. 38
50. Reliqui sunt qui mortui sunt Brut. 76-265
51. Eunt numis duo iterius quibus itineribus
dixi esse prosect. 13. V. 1:1-6-1
52. Eum num saltus, per quos inde eruder
possunt, habebant Roman. Lig. 44-6-3.
53. Velleus est qui num inuidiunt nec secundam
optiminis. Paudit. Bae. 5:11
54. Velleus dolor est quem num languititas
tempius minimat. C.i. Eum. 5:13-6
55. Nce elerant, qui pro multaque tinte
inter oblectamenta regia spectari egerent. Lex. Ann. 14-16
56 Aude nuncem togas mi pretium qui siti omni optime sideret, Lucr. 5-22-63.
57 Repulsus est reus, qui sub maris dicerit satius esse. Ven. II. 86.
58 Si quia autem est qui justitiam dicit
Vet. 12-3-4.
60 Nunc rem adhue emmenire me voluit, qui quern invenisse Dei ser. 32.
63 Exortus est sermo qui, quem in seculo appellare non posset, cum acciderit solution. Lex. Deist. 3.
64 Inibus e municipalia viam iam qui currem. Intereaisset reperiantur.
Cie. Planc. 23.
66. Audax et eutius passet quae ferre vivorum
J. 6-39-9

67. Messalla praecert, claris maiestatis sagacium
ipse et qui solus ad id bellum artis bonae

68. Et quidem aequi quae minusverum
Equi, quam nescio et quod idem
voleat. L. 24-37

69. Multum eciatorii ordinum sed qui
multum eciatorius comprehensum. In. Ann. 13-25-

70. Sint multi qui scribunt. Q. 1-14-13
71 Vincit est enim amicitia in rebus humanis de cuius utilitate omnis nos se consentient. Scil. 23. 52
72 Non tues igitur est omnis qui prosperant, sua fortuna, sed aequum, nisi aut sociorum. Ver. 5. 126
73 Sapientia enim est qui gregem Maestitiam pecus et animad, quae non exhancesset illud non serviat. 2. 1-13-43.
74 Inter erat omnis qui sens erat solum vestrum seculum infliceret; qui seu filius deciderit, mei memoriamque, renovaret. 11-5
75 Omne adhibe post Roman emendatur, cui nos publice tosum se tradere
76 tempusque et velire coactus domentes. 2. 46. Var. 3-8.
77 Le remiss habeas quem dignum
78 regum indicem Liv. 40. 26-5.
79 Nam haec est propriis natura animi
80 atque vis, quae ci est una et omnibus
81 quae se ipsa movet, regum nata certe
82 est et aeterna. 1. 1-5-4.
83 Aut. Alie tuendum? unum est adhuc
84 discendit? 84. Dux quidem ad rem
85 pertinentem, una 1. 20-6-4.
86 Hanc aut amicition in discordia rectus
87 de quibus ipsae hic prodigios receditius
88 a Deo immortalibus admonenmus arripuit
89 est unum et patricius cui tribunus ille fieri
90 non licet. Marc. Resp. 44
Sic enim hic locus est unus, quem tibi cum Cæsare communem esse dicis.

Atque ita in hie rebus unus est solus inventus, qui ab hoc tam impetu voluntate bonorum fœlīm disiderit. Int. 15

Hunc inventus est, qui id anderet, quod omnium fugisset et reformitasse audacia. Phil 2-64

Te ergo unus, escelerati inventus est, qui, cum auctor regni esse sseunte, quem collegam habeboe dominum habere velles Phil. 2-83

Et quisque, ut de antiquissimam legum, Colophonium Hierophanem unum, qui deesse dicaret divinationem, funditus sustulit Did. 1-3-5

Et hic unus nihili testis est producendus, qui pecuniam datum dicat 2. Noc. 42

Nono unus omnium qui nodum unius errari et evolare posset in, foliostat tua est Cylinx. Livy 40-5-3

Papient eum ad supplicium dictarici, quod iste unus inventus est, qui et simplici parentum adrectum filias ad necem dicaret et parentia pretium pro sepulchro liberum procuerit Jess. 1-7.

Hic hominem, Salli ex civitate Valesiacata, quae gens una vestat, quae bellum pejus Romans fasere et proce me nolle videatur.
Sola est hic quiunicum rationes
ad rerumnum referat. B. 1-98
Soli sunt qui te salutum velint
B. 4-150
Sola, inquam, re, C. Caesar ecce in
victoria reciderit rexque vici armaturae. Deist. 34
In deo ... voluptas autem est sola, quae
nos vocet ab eis et alliciet. De. 7. 1-34
Sola te inventae et qui cum
accusatibus sedes. Ex Psal. 87
Sola rara te inventae es, cui
non satie fuerit corrigere testamenta
vivorum - Cen. 1-111.
Cesare est hucus inventa sola in qua
suum sentient numen atque idem. Cen. 4-14
Cum faciam, indica, omnium verta
praetextatam, hunc sola recutia sine
secusquam in ignifogo fiamus, ex quibus
emitteramus frere de omnibus positio
B. 5-34
Puer autem ... id solim bonum officit,
blatem autem vitam etiam solum quae
sine virtute degatur. L. 4-60
Sacerdos fames est, neque ei
solli qui sacrum abstulerit sed
etiam eii qui saecus commendum
L. 2-41
Carpe nos omnibus adjungendo
fidem sed nis solum gua jus
quandam habereit declarationes
Ac. 1-41
Neque pauci neque leves sunt qui se duo solea vidisse dicitent Phil. 1-16.

Ad quemiam significatio vestra satis declarat, quid hic de re situtatis, ad litteras veniam, quae sunt a consulis et a propraetore missae, si paucis ante quae ad ipsas litteras pertinent, dixerit Phil. 14-16.

Invenit Archagathus paucos qui nolunt accipere. Verec. 4-5-3

Neque enim sunt paeci illi quidem sed tamen plurum qui ina loquentur. Phil. 6-16.

Consecutus dies paeci omnium Januarii mensis per quos secutum haberit licet. Sect. 74.
105. Iunio vero est et de quo sit memoria proditum eloquentium suisse et ita esse habitatum primus est M. Cornelius Cethegus. Cíc. Brut. 14-5-7

106. In púbibus has primum est in quo admínore, cur in gravissimis rebus suum diléctum vos servis patris, cum idem fabelar Latinas ad verbum e Graecis expressae non inniti legant. Cíc. Fin. 1-2-21

at quem virum — quem ego viserim
in vita optimum. Sen. Phœm. 367

Inde omnis Gallia sacra, Marini
Menapiique superant qui in armis
essent. B. N. 3-25-1
Although the grammarians seem to agree in a general way about the types of sentences which are characterizing, yet their various statements of the case show decided differences. Not one of them has made a satisfactory general statement for these clauses. A. E., A., A., A., A., R., and K. V. have attempted it but with unsatisfactory results. When one considers that these clauses had in all probability two separate origins and then the subjunctive spread from these as culture until it covered a wide field, it is not to be wondered that an affirmative definition seems impossible. But by giving the two origins of the subjunctive and then stating the limits—jed—as satisfactorily negative definition may yet be possible.

The definitions offered, as had been said, are unsatisfactory; first because they include clauses which are not of this type, and second, because they exclude certain types which are certainly characterizing. First we shall consider the clauses incorrectly included.

A common mistake of the grammarians is, that they do not leave clearly in mind the determining and generalizing clauses and hence in their statement of the characterizing clauses.
They include these indicative clauses. L. H. B 3
W. and B. virtually disregard the use of the
indicative in relative clauses. Their idea
seems to be that the indicative in
relative clauses is a matter for difficulty.
So Lane says: "The indicative is used in
simple declarations or descriptions introduced
by a relative" (1813). According to this statement
"there are none who do this" would be
an indicative clause. In the same way
Bentham says: "the relative clause as such—
that is as the representative of an adjective—
takes the indicative mood" (624). According
to this statement a relative clause joined to
an adjective by a coordinating conjunction
would certainly be in the indicative mood.
Bentham says: "clauses of characteristic are opposed
to these relative clauses which are used
merely to state or to assume some fact
about an antecedent already defined" (283-1). This
statement shows Bennett's confusion about the
indicative clauses. For a fact could not be
assumed about an antecedent already defined.
And as it goes in most of the grammars, I
give the three above merely as examples.
They make such statements on the above
and seem to see no difficulty. It is no
wonder then, since their ideas of the
indicative relative sentences are so vague
and inaccurate, that they include
indicative examples under their statements.
of the characterizing clauses. Roby and Holy both deal in detail with the indicative relative clauses and hence are much less confused in their treatment of the characterizing clause.

N. B. Oct. 13: all make the statement in one form or another, that clauses of characterizing follow indefinite antecedent, which is, generally speaking, true, but which must be limited. They do not seem to recognize the fact that such antecedent may be followed by indicative clauses, and that they must be in expressions of existence and non-existence before they will be followed by a characterizing clause. Thus in the sentence "beatus est nunc, qui de loco visit" Phil 1:14-33, the antecedent is indefinite and the clause following in an indicative one for it is a generalizing clause. Every attempt to classify characterizing clauses on the basis of differences of antecedents seems to be impractical. Most of the grammarians agree that these clauses follow indefinite antecedent which, though practically true, has its difficulties for sometimes the real antecedent of the clause is only implied and the grammatical antecedent of the relative is the subject of the main verb which may be definite as in example 149 where the antecedent of
the clause is not implied, while the grammatical antecedent of the qui is the Veneti and Tusci which are certainly definite.

It does not go to the other extreme and throw the hard clear down by stating that the characterizing clause may follow definite antecedents which is not true as I have attempted to show above for where the antecedent appears to be definite some such word as some other takes, is clearly implied on the mind would not be constructible. See example 35-36. If one admit that characterizing clauses may follow definite antecedents, we must have no limit for the construction and it will be found in non-essential as well as in essential clauses.

Bennett in giving the list of expressions which are followed by characterizing clause, includes "is qui" which would invariable he followed by an indicative clause; he possibly had in mind "is et qui" which is generally followed by a characterizing clause. He also fail to state that the indicative is still found after affirmative antecedents in expressions of existence and non-existence, as in example 3, and thus he includes many indicative examples which are excluded by the other.

And in their statement that a "characterizing clause defines the antecedent as a person of
thing I such a character that the statement
is true of him as of all others belong to the
same class" (534), included the generalizing
clause and then proceeds to convict himself
by giving two generalizing examples to illustrate
the difference between the indicative and the
substantive clause. The indicative clause which
he cites "non potest exercitium in civitatem
imperatorem qui re ipse non eminet " Acts 13:38,
but the substantive example which replaced
the eminet by sustinent must be a substantiated
one as it would certainly be a generalizing
clause and require the indicative word.
Hildreth makes a similar mistake when he
tries to distinguish between the
generalizing and characterizing clauses after
negative antecedent. He also gives two
generalizing examples to illustrate his point
(631-2 Remini). Hence to say the least it
seems advisable to avoid a classification
of characterizing clauses in accordance with
the difference of antecedent.
B. E. R. 402 all include the causal and
adverbial clauses in their treatment of
the characterizing clauses. Roy even goes
so far as to say that the substantive get
into the characterizing clauses evenout
of the causal idea. Were this true it
would seem strange that many relative
causal and adverbial clauses are in
the indicative and that the indicative is
the regular mood in the good causal clauses. It would seem, that if the causal idea were strong enough to carry the subjunctive into clauses where there is no causal idea, it would first have become the prevailing mood in clauses where the causal idea is predominant. The very fact that the causal clauses are, for the most part, unessential in them not of the characteristic type, for this use of the subjunctive never spread to any extent beyond the fades of the essential clauses.

P, N, and W. include the restrictive clauses, which are not characterizing at all but merely analogous with them as I shall attempt to show in another part of this paper. N. T. include the quasi ut clauses often comparative, which are pure result clauses and should not be included among the characterizing clauses for they all the ut result clauses would have to be included if the arrangement of the grammar is to be at all logical.

All the grammarians by the inaccuracy of their statements, include clauses of the same, similar, and positive which are not characterizing. They leave the impression that all clauses of these words are subjunctive and characterizing which is by no means true. All say that characterizing clauses may follow these.
words but do not state when nor by any of the grammarians give us any idea of the frequency of this construction. An attempt will be made later in this paper to add to the information about these clauses.

To sum up then: the various grammarians have included among the characterizing clauses all the types of relative essential clauses, the causal and adverbial relative clauses, which are generally non-essential, and even the cut clauses after a conjunction with quem.
But not only have the grammarians, in their statements of the characterizing clause, included clauses which were not of this type, but they have also failed to include all the examples which are certainly characterizing. One of the great troubles along this line is that they have failed to recognize the two distinct types of characterizing clauses, namely: those translated by the various forces of the subjunctive and those translated by the indicative. Clarke and Kuhn both clearly recognize these two types but a statement of the fact is needed. Although such a statement is not necessary it would certainly aid clearance.

Moreover, by his name for these clauses, "subjunctive of tendency" entirely excluded the characterizing clauses. Actually, he insists on a "non-modal" translation for all of these clauses and takes away from the Roman the power to say "there are none who do think." Kuhn also fails to include the clauses of actuality and insists on the "non-modal" translation. Bennett is not consistent in his treatment of the subject and it is impossible to tell just what his idea is. In one statement he appears to exclude the subjunctive of actuality while later in his treatment he seems to include them. In the
appendix to his grammar be clearly included therein. Bennett placed the clauses following dignis, indignis, and after among the purpose clauses, but they are apparently examples of the characterizing clause translated by me if the force of the subjunctive.

The failure on the part of the grammarians to recognize the subjunctive for actuality would exclude a large number of characterizing clauses, if we include only those which may reasonably be translated by some force of the subjunctive.

Alluded to before and last, while apparently only including in their treatment of the characterizing clause, the subjunctive for actuality, I am inconsistent in that they place here the clauses after dignis, indignis, and after, which are certainly not clauses of actuality. Bennett, and Alwett, through, exclude a part of the result clause; that is, the place a part of the qui result clause under the pure result with the fact clause. But that is not practical, for no two scholars could ever agree on a line of demarcation. For instance, Bennett gives as an example of a relative clause a pure result: "nemo est tan- semus qui se annum non putat possi possere" and he would certainly have some difficulty in convincing all the grammarians to agree with him, that such a relative is pure result rather than characterizing.
Such an arbitrary division of clauses would lead to endless confusion. Bennett also seems to exclude a number of characteristic clauses by making no mention of such antecedents as burnt, ate, gilded, etc. in the list of expressions (283-2) after which characteristic clauses are found. Such antecedents in the omitted rules are very often followed by characteristic clauses and are commonly found in all writings and should certainly be included in any treatment of the characteristic clauses. It may here be said that a complete list of expressions after which characteristic clauses are found is indispensable to a grammar intended for secondary schools. Harkness and Hoby fail to give such a list and Bennett's is incomplete and inaccurate as had been mentioned.

A number of other omissions have been made by grammarians in their treatment of this subject, either intentionally, because they felt that the scope of their grammar did not warrant the mention of some of the rather rare constructions in detail, or because they are types which all would probably agree in calling characteristic. However, the omission of Harkness cannot be accounted for by the grimoire for he called his grammar "A Complete Latin Grammar."
Among these minor omissions are the following: Care fails to include the clause following a comparative with quantity, and Kalle includes it only by a cross reference to his treatment of the clauses of pure result. Of course the ut clause and qui clause following a comparative with quantity are naturally felt should be treated together, yet it certainly does violence to Hall's system to have a characterizing clause among the result clauses. It may here be said that although Bennett included this clause in his treatment of the characterizing clauses, he placed them as a subdivision of the clauses which follow expressions of existence and mere existence (283-2-1), while they are certainly much more closely united with the result type. Bennett's further confusion of the types is shown by the fact that he, by the numbering of five statements in his grammar, makes the various types of the characterizing clauses coordinate with his general statement of the same (283-1) while in reality ought to include the types. Bennett confused his confusion on the subject of Relative clauses when he had elenec write the chapter on Relative clauses for the appendix to his grammar.
Bennett, Parkinson, and Hale, all fail to include the characterizing clause which is joined to an adjective by a coordinating conjunctive. Bennett, Allen, and Drumright, and Polay, all exclude types like example 109, where some mood is implied by the very fact that the substantive is used.

And while we can find authority for including among the characterizing clauses all of the essential relative clauses, none of the non-essential, and a few not clauses, we can also find authority for including all the relative clauses except those following expressions of existence and non-existence after negative antecedents, or where the antecedent are not expressed. As much for the grammarian which have attempted statements.
Law and Sumer have not attempted a
general statement which would include
or unite the various types which
they recognize as characterizing clauses.
It seems, however, that there are only
two possibilities for a consistent and
logical treatment of these clauses; either
a general statement of some kind
must be made by which the various
types of these clauses are related and
bound together, or the name characterizing
must be dropped altogether. The two
largest types of the characterizing clauses,
are commonly recognized by the grammarians,
namely, those following expressions of
existence and non-existence and the
result type, appear, on the face of
them, to be two very different kinds
of the substantive and, as unless we
were aware that they are closely related,
and can make a statement which
will warrant a treatment of the
two together, we should treat them
separately and give them different
names. Dane in his grammar (1818)
illustrates very well the need of such
a statement. He gives the general
heading for the sentence "stance
of characterizing or Reret", and then
he gives the two topics. He clares, above
referred to, with their subdivisions:
and one might well question whether these two types should be designated by the same name since they seem to have no point in common and the grammarians give no reason for so uniting them.
The Hale and Buck grammar seems to merit special mention. They clearly exclude from their treatment of the characterizing clauses, the determining, generalizing, causal, and restrictive clauses. The latter, which are analogous with the characterizing clauses, they place with them under the "subjective / actuality" or the historical treatment of their grammar demands. They include the subjective / actuality in characterizing clauses as well as the clauses translated by the various forces of the subjunctive. Their opinions are all of little consequence, such as optional characterizing clause 2 clause joined to an adjective by a coordinating conjunction, the latter which they probably intentionally omitted because no such example is found in secondary Latin. Here we see that Hale is fundamentally right in his treatment of these clauses.

The most serious objection to this grammar is its system. Generally, it does not permit the grouping of constructions which naturally belong together. The clauses are grouped according to their origins and not in accordance with their usage.
with which the pupil of the secondary school is primarily interested and the book was intended for use in secondary schools. We shall under each use of the substantive a characterizing clause and so where are all these characterizing clauses grouped for this could not be done without doing violence to the system of the grammar. 

It is also unfortunate in that he has used in many instances a different terminology from the other grammarians. Where he has found a name better suited to the construction, well and good. But such has not always been the case. For instance he had changed the term "characterizing clause" to "descriptive clause". But these clauses do not all either characterize or describe nor can we say that they more often describe than characterize. Since there seems to be no advantage in his name and at least one great disadvantage in that it adds to the confusion already so prevalent covering these clauses.

He is also apt to be misunderstood for his grammar contains so few explanations. It does not go into detail as much as one might wish.
may here be said that Hede intends to include these explanations in an appendix, which has as yet not come out.
The subjunctive in characteristic clauses of activity has its origin in two different sources. I shall take up the most satisfactory of these first. Unsatisfactory, because no theory about the origin of the subjunctive in the type of characteristic clauses, which are equivalent to result clause, however plausible, can be verified by the Latin, for the subjunctive had been firmly established in these clauses even in the earliest writers, as it is impossible to prove that it started in a certain type of sentence and then spread into the others. The fact is, that whenever the ensuiting idea is clear the subjunctive is invariably used whether the antecedent is negative or affirmative.

A possible theory for the origin of the subjunctive in characteristic clauses which are equivalent to the result clause I recall is as follows: It seems likely that the subjunctive was first used in these clauses after negative antecedent. In the first place the Romance must have had the two expressions, the indicative and the subjunctive, that is, they said: *Ne mo dev in quem qui te inzet, ne mae in* as good rulers would aid you, and *Ne mo dev in quem qui te inzet, ne mae in* as good ruler is aiding you.
Gradually the Romans began to feel that in stating the first, the second was also stated, for if they could not help you, the natural inference would be that they were not helping you. But the indicative clause, which states that no one is helping you, gives you no idea if whether they would help you or not. So they began to use the subjunctive clause to state both facts, and finally, the indicative after negative antecedents entirely disappeared in clauses of this type. But even after the subjunctive came to be firmly fixed in these clauses after negative antecedents, the two words of the affirmative antecedent still remained: "qui te invenit, multā eorum absistit." And if the negation was added, the entire clause would read: "qui te invenit, multā eorum absistit, qui te invenit, multā eorum absistit, qui te invenit, multā eorum absistit." The statement that many would aid you, does not warrant the inference that they are aiding you. But when they came always to say "numer et tuum from, qui te invenit, naturally when they changed the nouns to elogia in some affirmative, that felt..."
that the same construction should follow. Thus finally by analogy with
the negative clause, the subjunctive became
the invariable word even after affirmative
antecedents where the substantive idea
was clear. It, of course, required ages
for this to be accomplished, and as
I said was never before for the
subjunctive as established in both
affirmative and negative sentences in
the earliest Latin. But this theory
is supported by the fact that this is
just what did take place in the case
of the characteristic clauses which
follow expressions of existence and non-
existence. In these clauses the subjunctive
always follows the negative antecedent,
even in the earliest Latin while the
indictive is found more often that
the subjunctive after affirmative antecedent,
in this type of clauses in Early Latin
and less often in later Latin, and in
Cicero the subjunctive is more common
after affirmative antecedent in this type
of clauses than the indicative which
seemed to indicate that in time the
subjunctive would have entirely replaced
the indicative even after affirmative
antecedents. This change in the case
of the clauses after expressions of
existence or non-existence made
probably more rapid than in the case of the successive clauses. Although they both went through the same process, it was hastened in the clauses following suppression of existence and non-existence, because the subjunctive having become established in successive clauses, it made its advance more easily by analogy with these clauses into the clauses after suppression of existence and non-existence after both negative and affirmative antecedents. For example, when the Romans had become accustomed to say "Multi Iam hani sunt qui te inuent," it was a very short step to omit the two lines and say "Multe sunt qui te inuent."
The subjunctive of necessity, starting in these two types of clause spread over a large field, and in the development of the two types their territory often overlapped and hence there are examples which it is probable are influenced by both. The subjunctive thus growing, from clause following negation antecedent to those after qualifying and thus by analogy into other clauses, did fair to cover the entire field and to extend out the indicative in all subjunctive clauses, but it was checked on the one side by the clause following directly self-defining antecedent, or at the so-called non-essential clause. On another side it was checked at the determining and qualifying clauses. But into these latter the subjunctive did occasionally find its way. We see the subjunctive in a generalizing clause in example 6. Such examples are not really characterizing and cannot be included in a definition frame, for they merely give us some idea of how the subjunctive might have spread had it not been checked by some outside force such as the establishment of the language and the influence of grammarians. We see the subjunctive in a determining clause in example 7, but it is cited under
here than in the case of the generalizing clause.

In the case of the restrictive clauses which are considered as essential in this paper, the subjunctive became quite common and it is not easy to see just why it did not become the prevailing word. In these types it became established, namely the qui modo, see example 7, quod recipit, see example 8, and quae quidem si provercum, see example 9. The subjunctive gained its foothold in the qui modo type by analogy with the modo formae clauses. It got into the other two on account of the fact that the Romans used the subjunctive so habitually after negative antecedents. And these clauses by their very nature follow negatives. The subjunctive did not get into the clauses of the type like "quod sit me attinet, quod patri quod in te juit, fac eum claves would follow affirmative rather than negative antecedents.

In sum up, the subjunctive from actuality in characterizing clauses developed along two different lines. The subjunctive in the result type seems to be older of the two for this subjunctive, even in the earliest Latin, is invariably found in every clause where the consistent feeling is clear. This fact hastened the establishment
If the subjunctive in the other type. The subjunctive in both the clause is a development. The subjunctive.

Ideal Certainty and get us to the clauses of reality—first after negative antecedents, then by analogy, passed into the affirmative clauses. The spread of the subjunctive was checked by the non-essential clauses, knowledge clauses, and restrictive, but covered the rest of the dependent relative clauses.
Having shown wherein the grammars fail to satisfy in their treatment of the characterizing clauses, and having suggested a probable origin for the substantive in these clauses, it now remains to suggest a definition for treatment which will include all the characterizing clauses and exclude those not belonging to this type. The following definition is based on the list of examples found in this paper, and attempts to include only those clauses I actually used.

Ideal Certainty.
Clauses of characteristic comprise all of the essential relative clauses which are not determining, generalizing or restrictive, and are of the following types:

I. Clauses stating the results of qualities expressed by such incomplete descriptive words as long of shade with an adjective, longer, comparative with queue, calice, etc. or ille meaning such in one single mode.

See examples 16-32.

II. Taliisque, qualiisque and taurique, queaque do not express result and hence are not included. For example: iura taurique in sacra, quasi in omnibus religiosis imperatoribus, quoque ant vivimus aut vivimus, non vivamus, non vivamus. Nou. 9. 27.

As si quis est taliisque, qualeque esse omen pretendent. Cat. 2-3.

It is sometimes found the subjunctive in clauses of this type when no such incomplete descriptive word is present, but in all such cases the subjunctive is optional being used only where some such word is clearly implied.

See examples 32-36.
It should restrict the application of expressions of existence or non-existence or their equivalents, when no such incomplete descriptive words are listed in I are present.

Such expressions are: est (estatis, esturum est), qui, sunt (sunturum, non sunt, sonum sunt, qui, nemo est qui, quae est qui, nihil est, quid est quod nihil habes quod, deos (hustum) habes qui, si quae est qui, quid est proest quod, remicium, vidi qui, remicium cognovi qui, multi sunt qui, quidam sunt qui, nonnulli sunt qui, alius sunt qui, jam est qui, alius, dixit qui, reliqui sunt qui. Nullum est qui.

See examples 27-65

Note. The indicative, which was the original word and never completely driven out after sunt qui and est qui, and it is quite frequent after such affirmative antecedents as multi, quidam, numnulli, facit, reliqui, alius, and even, and it seems to need in these cases where the writer has definite persons in mind. For example: ex. example 70.

Sunt autem qui spatium non numeram complexione saperere supercedere. Aeg. Inv. 140-724 est qui nec spernit. Ves. 3rd 1-1-17

Sunt autem multi — qui eripiant alius quod alius largiabant. Cis. C. 14-43
Sunt quaedam, quae hincet in possum dicere. Cís. Phil. 2:19-47
Erant numeši togiāe creditores Gracorum quiāe ad exigendās pecunias incipissimi eruisset. Legāti plurimum prodūit gratia.
Reliqui eis fuerunt, e quiāne partium plāne tēcum sentiēsant. Est 16
Tum autem sunt alii, qui te voluerim orant. Plant. Lii. 101
Numm etiam est, quod me maximē perturbat, cui loco respondere vir
III. Clauses joined to an adjective, participle, or descriptive noun by a coordinating conjunction. See examples 66-69.
II. Clause completing such restrictive words as unusus (exceedingly the only one), solus, primus, primo (meaning only a few) and superlative adjectives.

See Examples 70-108.

Note: Care must be taken not to include non-essential clauses following these words for such clauses would not complete the restrictive word. Essential clauses which complete some other word in the sentence must also be included. For example:

*Omnibus sententiae praeceps unusus, quem quem actum aequum esse diximus, quemque quem praecipue aequum esse accepisset.*

2. Sometimes the subjunctive is used when such a restrictive word is not present but clearly implied. See Example 109.
The preceding treatment of the characterizing classes is much too
quick and detailed for practical purposes in secondary schools. It is intended
merely to state the facts about the construction and not to be in any
sense teachable.

The following treatment attempts to
include all the information about
characterizing classes necessary to
the pupil in secondary school and
to so state these facts that they will
be useful for teaching purposes.
Characterizing clauses comprise all of the essential relative clauses which are not generalizing, determining, or restrictive, and are of the following types:

I. Clauses equivalent to "as clause" (result).

In these clauses some such incomplete descriptive words as an or illa meaning such, talis, haec, verba, tantum + adj., or a comparative + genus are usually present, as in: in suis quibus flavescebat super contubernium, I saw me that had always defined such applause, Phil 1:17-19. Some times such incomplete descriptive words are only implied, as: decolae sunt constantes exemplars dies temperantes quae natae in cœlis eunctuent; there followed a succession of storms to keep our mind in check, B.C. 4:34-44.

II. Clauses restricting the application of expressive, restrictions and non-existent.

In clauses. This type no such incomplete descriptive words as are mentioned are present, as at sunt qui dicant, but there are me who say, Cat. 2:6-12.

Such expressions are: est qui, sunt qui, nemo est qui, quae est qui, si qui est qui, nihil habes, quod etc. Indefinite subjects are sometimes used with these verbs, as multi, quidam, nominem, aliqui, faciei et al.

The indicative, which was the original word in these clauses is still sometimes found
after affirmative antecedent. ex. sent gave
ris ene amicis. There are some
whom I know are my friends.

III. Classified completing such restrictive
words as nouns (meaning the only one)
axles, junct (meaning only 1 foot), primes,
and superlative adjectives.
The grammarians all fail to give satisfactory information about the relative clauses which follow verbs, such as, primus and the like. Most of them give me the impression that such clauses are always subjective, for they simply state that characterizing clauses follow these words. At least state that these words may be followed by characterizing clauses, but they do not say when nor do they give me any idea of the frequency of the construction. For this reason I shall give here the complete statistics for these clauses for Cicero's Orations and Philosophical Works. The subjunctive relative clauses following these words have been given; see examples 70-104. The indicative relative clauses following them are as follows:
1. Tertiuni petitur, qui ita fuero mutaserit. O. P. II 86.
2. Amicitiae secretae privatae manus, quam nume habeas eum diebat, clamaveris prima actione condamnatione est. Alumn. 5 3.
5. Tum est, ut omnis utulitatis impetratur, in his
6. frater eum num quae... flectur, qui
7. Est nume nume maximum totius
8. Iunius in omnem etinculat, qui
9. Pariter itinerar nume invictus et, a quo
10. Una atque eadem non est quae praeda
11. Etenim illud, quod ita hostis
12. Itaque illae nume dies, quae die me populus
13 Nihilis nunc veritatis genere, quod
magnum sideris orbis intellectus, 27. 2. 5-88
14 Nunc legisce P. Linium, quae erat reliqui
num in multis terminis factum 22. 4. 6.
15 Nummum etiam est, quod esse maxime
justus, qui locus respiciente me videor
esse. Clem. 12. 5.
16 ... piacerem nunquam deus iubere filiam,
quam sit justa suam suam et Nubri
liberum adduxerat. 22. 5. 51.
17 nummum est quod nullius vitium
videbatur, quod tanto ex frequentia
inveniri necesse pluit. 22. 5. 13.
18 Recta nummum genere reprehensionum, quibus
Academice ratio in probationes. 22. 5. 2-3.
19 nummum est easiit, ut illum,
quae reliquum
omnem comptatisse. 22. 5. 17.
20 sed omnium max regra est quae tibi
cupid esse utinam. 22. 5. 20-81.
21 Buncie verbis tres magis percepsit, numm
quod esse inipe pugnab. 22. 5. 47.
22 Ita fit ut hcs genere propter se
repudiendum referantr, nummum quod
sit in his. 22. 5. 23-68.
23 Est nummum innum inveni et autem est
omnium soriter et quod ille est constitutum
aut. 22. 5. 44.
24 locum virtutem, numm ildum, quod
atem et nonnum effellas, nuncum libeticum deorum.
22. 5. 44.

Utrum igitur ingenium pereundi omneum Epicuri disciplinam pastum sibi esse sumpta quaeris, de quo une certamen est? 22. E 8-20

... una est virtus quae malitia restitutione dicitur. L 7-15-49.
1 At enim concutit solum, id solum dicitur lumentum, quod est populari fumum gloriemum. T. II. 40

2 Nescia cuius ille sunt sole riuattus imperatoriae quae vulgo主义思想・

De inj. 27.

3 Solum igitur, quod si ipsum movit, quae a numquam descriuer a se, numquam el

noveri quidem desint. T. 53.

4 in sole smaeluit, pura bona ratione

amanit. De Nat. Del. III. 76

5 At enim id solum ni detur esse actum, quod
tet lauen actum. D. II. 67

6 Denui, reperatorem, non sae sola ut

quae ad corpus nostrum vitamque perennit.

Carr. 42.

7 Permaneat illi soli atque omnis sej

publicae causa perferrunt, qui sunt--

Deut. 101

8 Inveni dual solis libello a P. Canuleio

munere asciss uspotro Syracusae in quibus

stat scripta. D. II. 182.
2. Inecco orbis ut haec faceris quae restant ita audistis. --- Hx. Rom. 129.
4. Id paneae quae mecum animum repente moverunt, prima de u. Serenae fortune summonar. Herculan. 5-3.
5. Paneae, quae ad hunc causae reiuncta sunt responseto. Claud. 149.
The results arrived at from these clauses from Cicero's rhetorical and philosophical works are as follows: after enneus we have 28 subjunctive and 19 indicative relative clauses. After solvi we have 11 subjunctive and 8 indicative clauses, while after faeci there are 6 subjunctive and 7 indicative clauses. Thus, it will be seen from the examples included only three clauses which follow enneus enneus and faeci and not those in which the same set are in the clause itself. The statistic for enneus are not given for it is so seldom followed by a relative clause as the Romans usually said 'Caesar first came to Rome' rather than 'Caesar was the first, who came.'

Hence we see that the subjunctive is by no means the prevailing mode after enneus, solvi, faeci, and the like although in the case of the first two it is the more common. We also learn that that no statement that characterizing clauses may follow enneus, solvi, and the like in perfectly true as far as it goes in the only question left is, when do characterizing clauses follow these words?

An examination of these clauses found Cicero seemed to give us
the answer. In all the subjunctive relative clauses follow these words the words
which, whom, whose, or whose, as the case may be, all have a semi-restrictive sense; the
which means the "only me" sense, a very few, etc. In addition to this when the
indicative clause follows the restrictive sense is never present. Thus for Cicero
at least it is safe to say that characterizing
clauses follow these words when these
words have the semi-restrictive
meaning.