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"Characterizing clauses."
In such a treatment of characterizing clauses it is quite necessary to exclude by definition certain relative clauses such as the non-essential relative clauses, those which may be omitted without impairing the thought of the sentence and do not by asserting a fact point out the person or thing meant. Also such clauses as this: *est pedes quid-quid ducesunt* "the determining clauses, essential with indefinite antecedents, must be omitted.* I *sunt pedes centuriarum qui res Romanas scribunt M. S. IX 26* These are generalizing clauses and may be turned into a conditional sentence still retaining the original meaning. Sometimes such clauses are found in the proasynthetic. This may be accounted for by analogy. It was so strong a habit to use the subjunctive in such sentences after indefinite or negative antecedents that it was often used in generalizing sentences by analogy.  

The following types of essential clauses require as characterizing clauses but find no occasion to treat them in the discussions. The subjunctive is special in each case.

Volitive characterizing clauses.

Mago locum monstrabit quem inque meteatis Div. 21. 54. 3. The "quem" "in meteatis" is
virtually a command.
Obligation or propriety characterizing clauses like Livianae fidece motisiæ dignae
quad iterum legantur C. Bruc. 18. 1.
These are also found following words like
aptus, idoneus when used in the predi-
cate.
Optative characterizing clauses
Hoc erat in volitio: modo agr--
thostus -- et paulum silvae super
his fores Torae Satires 6.
Potential Characterizing clauses
mibi erat quæ famem tolerarent
13. 4. 12 8. 3
immem singuum et difficile
vix quæ singuli carri ducerentur
Each of these is to be translated by
use of the auxiliary could.
The remaining clauses are very great in
number and among these are found
those giving most difficulty in classi-
fication and arrangement. I have divided
them in four great classes and these in-
clude all essential clauses save the

determining clause of the generalizing.
I The substantive is used in clauses
which give the result of qualities express
by i.e. talis, tam or ades + an adj and
comparatives with quam.
Note: talis-qualis, tantus-quantus
are not included since they do not express
result.
I nulla acies humani ingenii tanta quae penetrare 
in caelum possit C. Ac. 2. 37, 122

² tam decessit quo -- non fames pervaserit N. P. XV
³ innocentia est adfectis talis animi quae nescat
     neminem C. 7, 12, 8
⁴ feriae est bellii eorum inscius -- debebat M. P. II
⁵ ego is sum qui nihil sibi quam potius
     quam meorum civeum causa securum
⁶ non longius hostes abierant quam quis telum
     radici posset B. G. 2, 21

XII 66

SI quem habetis qui --- superare non posse M.P.
⁸ nemo est tam senex qui non putet C. de Sen.
⁹ nemo est tam fortis quin rei novitate perturb.

73, 81, Ⅱ 37.

a. Such clauses with the introductory word omitted.
In these cases no definite rule can be made.
as to the consecutive feeling, the author using
the subjunctive if he wishes to express that
force.

1 sunt tempus et quae continentur B. G. Ⅱ 34, 4
2 in ea tempora natu vectigal quibus - expediat
3 classis est, cui consul ... praepositus esset
   M. L. XII 33

4 et terrae tota opere circumdedit quae pedes
   XXX inter se distarent B. G. Ⅶ, 12 - 4
5 si aligus cum deducit subi sit futures
   C. de Sen. XIX

The subjunctive is used in clauses equivalent
to a complex adj. and joined to an adjective
or substantive by a coordinating conjunction
audax et coetue possit quae ferre
       Auson. 6, 3 - 99
The subjunctive is used in clauses following expressions of existence and non-existence, restricting the subject or its equivalent expressions, the objects.

1. aliæ sunt quædam sunt, sunt qui, habui qui reliqui sunt; quæ est qui etc.
2. aliæ causae sunt quæae plane efficiant (C. Off. 67)
3. quædam sunt etsi quæ poterunt

C. de natura deorum 1, 37, 103
4. multi fuerunt -- removerint

5. sunt qui -- dicant Cat 2, 6, 12
6. consecuti die sparsi -- per quas liceret

C. Fact. 34, 94.
7. super sunt qui de philosophia perper

A. Timon 10, 1, 123
8. Innumeribilia sunt ex quibus efficax cogitque posse nihil esse quod seminem habeat quin ad interess Cat. Nat. b.c. 3, 13, 34.
9. Hæc habui, de senectute quæ diceam

A. Sen. 23, 85
10. Legi enim audirem unam multæ quorum propemodum absolute conclutcretur oratio C. Or. 51, 171.
11. reliquæ sunt qui mortui sunt
12. nilque si quid est qui hoc dicat et sic cogites Thomæ (Tol. 12).
kind. The indicative is often found, quite frequently after subjects which may be partially definite in the speaker's mind (see above).

The indicative is especially found after quidam, senex, multi, alii, etc.

1. Sunt autem multi -- qui invenit aliis. -- Off. 1.44.
2. omnem etiam est quod me maxime perturbat cui loco -- video posse. Cic. 1.35.
3. Sunt quaedam quae -- non possum dicere. Phil. 2.1.7.

b. After negative expressions.

1. Neminem vidi qui numerum secert
   Tib. Scaen. 1.4. 4. Hittmar. 110
2. servus est nemo -- qui non audaciam
   Cevrin perhorrescat. C. Cat. 48.
3. repertus est nemo, qui non moni
decret satis esse. Verr. II. 58.
5. nec defueri quia eodem modo oppetent
   Tac. Ann. 4. 50. 4.

c. After questions implying a negative answer.

1. Quid est, quod tibi mea aere efficere
   hoe posset amplius? And. 1. 30.
3. Quid homin qui dicit me dicisse dicer
4. Quidest quoq propit M. L. 1. 29
5. Quid genus bellae esse potest in quo exercit.
   M. L. 3. 28.
IV. Causes completing restrictive words or expressions like unus meaning the only one, solus praecipie meaning a few, primus etc.

1. Att. Ann. tandem unus est estum dissentio?
M. Duas quaedam ad rem pertinent una
qui resquem antiqui omne quod
secundam naturam esset quo
survarerem in vita bonum esse
decereverent L 20. 2-4.

2. Una est enim amicitia in rebus
humanis de cius usu utilitate omnes
uno ore consentiunt. Sael 23. 82

3. Unus adhuc fuit post conditam
Romanorum conditam cui res publia
iatam se tradeter temporibus et
malis coacta domesticis. L. Sulla
Verres III 81.

4. Unus fuit affinis socii necessarique
Scri. Naevo quis cum spes ulter
deberet quasi eximis praemio
occidit exposito cupidissime
contenderet. Quinum 74.

5. Leoniam hic locus est unus
quem tibi cum Cacaro comm.
minem esse dicea Vatinii 15.

6. Trabè erat unus, qui suo nelre
vestros solvus reflexerat; qui
suo fletu deciderium mei memor
causque renovaret Luiii 8.

7. Sapientia enim est una quae
maestitiam pellat ex animis, quae nos
et ex resecare metu non serviat C. F. I. 13 43
8. hic locus agitur est unus qui per fugiant
hic portus haece arx haece ara sociorum
Verr. I. 12 6
9. Nam haece est propria natura animi
atque vis quae si est una et omnibus
quae se ipsa (semp) movet neque
nota certe est et aeterna I. I. 54
10. Homo unus omnium qui modum
huius erorious extollere possit in potestate
fua est, JULIUS LIVY 40–55–
11. Unus inventus est, qui id averteret
quod omnium fugisset ut reforma
asset audacia. AEC Phil. II. 64
12. Ut homines Galli ex civitate male
pacata quae gens una restat
quae bellum populo Romano facere
et posse et non nolle videatur
CXLIII 22
13. Ex his unus mihi testis est productus
qui pecuniam datam dixit. 2. ROSE. 72
14. Napiunt eum ad supplicium
de patri quod iste unus unus
inventus est qui et e complexu
parentium abreptos filios ad necem
duceret et parentes pretium pro
repertura liberum posceret
Verr. I. 7.
15. Ex quibus ut de antiquissimis
loquar, Colophonis Xenophonis
unus qui deos esse diceret divinationem
funditus postulit 3. 3-5.

16. Ille ergo unus aequalis inventus
qui cum auctor regni esse esse
que quem collegam habeas
dominem habeare velles. Phil II 86.

17. Atque ita in his rebus unus est
solum inventus qui ab hac
fam impensa voluntate honorem
palam desideret Sect 130.

18. Hanc ob amentam in discordi
nostro de quibus ipsius hic prodig-
ris recutibus a die immortalibus
adminemur arpectus est unus
ex patribus cui tribunopla. feeri
non licet Res. Resp. 44.

19. Ibi qui in collegis sacerdotum esse
primus post Romanam indicis publica
est condemnatio Cic Brut. 53. 127.

20. Sed paucia quae meum annum
repente moverint prae di
Murenae fortuna conqueras
Murena 65.

21. Nec enim sunt paucii illi quidem
sed tamen flere qui ita
loguantur Phil II 16.

22. Invenit Archatagus paucos qui
vellet accipere Vers II 59.

23. Sed quoniam significatio vestra
satis declarat quid hae de re sentis.
tis ad litteras veniam, quae sunt
a consubus et a propraetare missae si paucia ante quae ad ipsos litteras pertineant dixerit Phil. 1476.


25. Consecuti dies pauci omnino Januario mense per quos renatum habere liceret Sext. 74.

26. Solus hic homoest, qui sciat divinitus Persius 7, 2, 2.

27. Solus est Caesar in cujus victoria mense cecederit C. Rei 12, 34.


29. Sacriego poena est neque ei soli qui sacrum ab stabebit sed etiam li qui sacro commendatum Leg. 42.

30. Vide non omnibus adunget fidelem sed unam solam quae prope quando habebant declarationem Ac 1, 41.

31. Beatam vitam eam solam appellat quae cum virtute degatur 7, 7, 60.

32. Non faciam indices; omnia vetera praetermittam duas sola recentia sine cunoquam in famia ponam ex quibus concetturam facere do omnibus positis Vers. 7, 34.

33. Solus est hic qui nunquam rationes ad derarium referat Vers. a p. 95.
34 quorum ex tota provincia
Soli sunt qui te salutum velit
Verr. II 136
Inde is adverbial
but really relative
35-Itaque hoc adhibi oppidum Verres
inventit prope columnae ubi terrarum
unde nihil minusmodi remiem de
publicis per vim nihil occulte
nihil habuisse posset auferre Verr. II 85
36. Modo si voluisset autem est solo
quae nos vobis ad se et aliis ad
hie 7 ini II 54
37. Quamvis audax et alia obliviscat,
hinc omnem intellegere poterunt
quod est tota societate hoc est et
tot scribris solus tu inventus
et qui cum accusatoribus eedere,
atque os trium non modo ostendens
sed etiam offerens. Sex Rexc 87
38. solus enim tu inventus es
et qui non satis fecit corrigere
testamenta vivorum mihi etiam
respicerere mortuorum Verr. II 134
39. Nunc est hae inventa solus,
equin omnes sentiret remum
atque idem Cest. 14

a. Utere some such word is implied
Morini et Menapie superarunt
qui in armo essent Verr. II 28. 2.
In this example solus must
be implied. The Morini and
Menapie were the only ones
who remained in arms.

This list is complete as far as the Cicero lexicon is concerned and we find among them several types. Some are predicate as numbers 1 - 10 in which the verb is some form of sum or some equivalent word such as invenire etc. These have as introductions to the clauses almost any case of the relative, oftenest the nominative but often the genitive or accusative. Then there are some characterizing clauses which are attributive that is modifying any word in the sentence. As in numbers 10, 12-16 the clause modifies directly some word in the sentence. These clauses are to be further worked up, making a detailed study of some work of Cicero. An interesting question has been raised as to whether these expressions is est solus qui etc. are not, if not colloquial at least used to make the expression of an idea much clearer and is seldom or is primary used in works of a more elevated character. This is suggested by the fact that most of the is est solus qui type of the Reden und in the Schriften. The interesting point in the study of these clauses is the distinction between the use of the
Indicative and that of the subjunctive word
in relative clauses with solus. This distinct
ion seems to be based on the meaning
of the word as it is used. In the
relative clauses with solus unus etc the
indicative mood is not used where
a restrictive meaning is given i.e.
meaning "the only one of a thing who etc.
and in such a sentence the subjunctive
is used."
The examples following these same words solus, sumus, and the like, where the indicative is used are interesting and from these a distinction may be drawn as to the use of the two moods. I now give the indicative clauses with paucē.

1. **Expónit quae copias omnis** ... now paucē eliam pocula ex auro quae [gemineis erant distinctae.** Verres** III 62.**
2. **Quaeque vobis it haec, paucē quae restant ita audiantis Sex.** Rec. 129.
3. **praeter paucos qui propter societatem** furorum suorum nihil omnino dederunt **Verres** III 42.
5. **Sunt impii cives** ... admodum paucē quorum opprimerorum di immortalēs incredibīlemque publicae protestātem et fortūnām dederunt. Phi. IV 36.
6. **Paucē quae ad hunc causā collectā** sunt respondēbo. Cluent 147.
7. **Lycurque ἔθηκεν ηκατομμυρίαν.** appellavit numis in quidem paucōs **XXVIII** quos pēnes summam consēlii voluit esse.


8. **Paucē ordinis senatus qui nec alīus placuit evanisse nocte fugā**
9 10. Oppidum munitione satis
diebus quibus eo ventum erat, ex fugatione
10.11. Aequi qui ex fuga evaserant

As opposed to these indicative clauses we find five subjunctives. There are seven indicatives taken from Cicero. The subjunctive examples are found on pages 8 and 9, examples 21 - 25.
The following are the unus indicative clauses in the Reden as found by the Cicero lexicon.


2. An cum patres conscripti elli senatus consulto quod in monumento mari factum est quod mea solus omnibus est gentiles commendata uni Cn. Planio gratias egerint: cui senatus pro me gratias agendas putavit et ego eam referenda gratiam non poterim Plaut 78.

3. Frater erat unus qui flecteret qui removeret qui staberet Veturii et vos me tibi addiscer 5.

4. Est enim unus maximun totius Sardinarum frumentarium aumen de quo treatus omnis Santos interrogavit quod genus uno testimonio foderet et consensu omnium est confirmatum Scarr 2.

5. De epistulis complures attulerat in his unum domo quae totum mutaret hominem Verre L. 64.

6. Ursum etiam est quod me maxime perturbat cui toco respondere vi videor posse Cluen 135

1. Ursum hic unus quod mihi aperitum

(See next page)
sicum rcelus resque manifesta dat. 8. Rosc. 99
9. servulum unum quemque pretenderat abducit Jun. 27
10. Omnibus sententiat praeter unam quam suam stassemus esse dicbat
$amander prima actione condemnatus est. Cluen 5-3-
11. Recte igitur unus invictus es, a quo
ipsius victoriae condicio visque deducta est. Marcellus 12.
12. Quorum uni sunt Athenienses quae
gens domum habebat, Aeslis alteri hodie
fert eminabantur. 7 acc. 64.
13. Iibi uni pateris qui ita a puerro vixeras Phil. 86
14. Unius legatus P. Ladius qui erat
religius non ita multum fecundit. Verr. 49
15. Itaque elle unus dies quo die me
populum Romanum a parta in Capitolium
atque unde domum sua celebrata
caerimia comitatum honestauit. Dom. 76.
16. Non numquam etiam libertas Sem-
Chides adhibebatur, mulieres autem
nuptae nofles praeter unam minis
scorbi filiam quam icto propter
amorem ab Rhodio tibicine abduxerat.
Verr. I 81
17. Dico solo recentia sine cuiusquam
infamia ponam - unum illud quod
ita fuit illustre notumque omnis
Verr. I 34.
18. Hac et que eadem nos erat quo fructus
amoris surpissimi flamma classis
populi Romani praedonum incendia
conflagrabat. "Verr. V 92".
Examples of uses with the Indicative in the "Schriften".

1. Sed omnium una regula est quamibi cuius esse notissimun
   O. III 20-81

2. Est enim unus, quis quo devinta est hominum societas et quod lex
   constituit una Lael. I 15. 42.

3. Motu unus eiusdemque naturae quae (sidere) velociamm movabantur

4. Restat unus um genus reperhens-

5. Princeps Thales unius est: enim
   cui sex religiosa concessisse primas
   ferunt ex aqua dixit constare
   omnia Ac. 37-118.

6. Utrum igitur inquit percurr
   omnem Epicurum disciplinam placeb
   an de una voluptate quater
   de qua omne certamen est Fi 1.28

7. Atque si emolumentum non
   acuapte ui virtus ex potuit una
   ert virtus quae malaia recteim
   dicitur Lael. I 8. 44

8. Vox ex hie tam demum eius rebus
   non modo nomen unum (nam id
(see next page)
facilium patere sed etiam rem inam ex duabus facere comenmini quod fieri nullo modo potest. Fin. III 7-20.
12. Eta fit ut duo genera propter se et potissimum repercintur unum quod est in iis in quibus completae illud extremam. Fin. IV 23. 68.
13. Si una virtus unum sit ut quod honestum appellas rectam laudabile decorum Fin. III 4-14.
Examples of solus with indicative
1. Neque enim illae sunt solae
   virtutes imperatoris quae vulgo
   existimantur. De Imp. 29.
2. Solum igitur quod se ipsum
   movit quia nunquam ne mover
   quidem desunt. 7 53.
3. iis solis consulunt quos bona
   ratione donavit. De nat. deo. 17 70.
4. Utrum id solum videtur esse actum
   quod est vanum actum ut 6 67.
5. Etenim recuperatores non ea sola;
   vestis est quae corpus nostrum vitam
   perversi sed etiam multo maior
   de quae periculo mortis inecto.
   Porphyrius annum perversum
   loco eripe et certe de statu demort.
   Caecin 42.
6. Permanet illi soli atque omnia
   rei publicae causa perseverent qui
   sunt. Sest. 101.
7. Inveni duo solos libellos a L.
   Camileia misos sociis et postie
   Syracusie in quibus evas scripta
   Verr. II 18 2.
8. Ut enim consuectudo cognitor
   id solum dicitur honestum quod
   est populosi fama gloriosum
   finit. 48.
All of these clauses must be treated and classified in a work on characterizing clauses but in looking for a complete statement of such clauses, a statement which includes every clause named above and excludes all generalizing, determining, and restrictive clauses as well as causal and adverbial clauses one is impressed by the widely diverging treatments made by different grammarians as well as the vague and totally unsatisfactory statements. I am sure that I am safe in saying that no grammar either included the correct clauses or makes a statement covering all possible cases. Most grammarians do not define either generalizing or determining clauses hence when they try to make a definition of characterizing clauses they do not exclude determining or generalizing clauses. One whose treatment of the characterizing subjunctive is most satisfactory is that it includes most of the clauses cited above makes no attempt at a general statement but gives what I agree are two types, just, those after 'am it etc which are equivalent to it result clauses, second these clauses after expressions of existence
and non-existence. It is however impossible
to tell whether these clauses under the
second type are considered characterizing
or not. We see here the absolute need
of some general statement before the
mention of specific types. Bennett has
tried to make some such preliminary
statement but made several grave errors
in it. He lets down the bar to the determ-

ining and generalizing clauses and
fails to include the type "punt qui
guent" or the subjunctive of actuality
in his statement he uses the
word "essential" to describe these
clauses but this word is meaningless
less and valueless when not defined
Practically the same results have
attended all those who have tried
to make a general statement, probably
the failure is due to the fact that
they are including several distinct
and separate kinds of clauses and
one statement cannot be made
for all of these.

Gildersleeve and Harkness tell us
indirectly, in their treatment of
characterizing clauses, that the
Roman had no way of saying "There
are people who say" but that their
expression of this idea, sunt quia
cidant, necessarily meant there
are people who would say: "In other words they recognize only the subjunctive of ideal certainty, ignoring or denying the subjunctive of actuality. Some characterizing clauses must of necessity be translated by what Gildersleeve calls the subjunctive of tendency but it is just as necessary to translate some of these clauses as though they were indicative. Bennett states that the subjunctive of characteristic denotes only "the man of the post who does something" and in his next statement say that it follows expressions like "punt qui etc., flatly contradicting his former statement.

Bennett, Allen and Greenough and Noey class relative clauses of cause and opposition (adversative) with characterizing clauses. These clauses have no connection at all with the subjunctive of characteristic being without characterizing feeling and having definite antecedents. They cannot be characterizing for they are non-essential.

After the preliminary statement Bennett continues his discussion by saying that characterizing clauses are opposed to those clauses which are used merely to state or assume a
fact about an antecedent already defined and which take the Indicative. This assuming a fact about an antecedent already defined is impossible of accomplishment for I am sure that no one could form a sentence illustrating this. So in this statement he does not make a satisfying distinction as to the use of the Indicative and Subjunctive. His second error is in a failure to subordinate paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5. These should not be coordinate with his general statement given at the beginning for he at most mean paragraphs 2, 3, 4, and 5 to illustrate and elaborate his first statement. Paragraph 2 giving a list of types of expressions after which we find characteristic clauses is good with the exception of 'est qui' which could be followed only by a generalizing or determining clause. 'Est est qui' however is frequently found followed by a characterizing clause. The statement made in paragraph 4 is not complete for characterizing clauses are not introduced by 'quem = quem non cave after general negatives. One could come to this conclusion after studying examples
given for in each case they are negative. Ty makes a serious mistake in placing the type following comparatives with quam, under the list of expressions of existence for from the very nature of the example given "non longius hostes abertant quam quos telimum digi posset "there is a strong sense of feeling present. Then from a study of many such examples we find the result idea always prominent. It unites the 

result clauses and the relative result clauses which would not be so wrong if he were consistent in doing this, but he places part under the head of result and part under characterizing clauses. Under this head he makes no provision for the types

1. Etenim talis est ver, ut nulla res
   ille, non -- conficere posset M. 2. XX 59. These are clauses with tam + an adj.
2. sunt tempestates quae continent
   13. 9. 34 13. 4 line 4. In such clauses an introductory word like talis etc. is implied
3. Moreni et Menapae superarent
   qui in arma essent 13. 9. III 28 2. Where some such introductory word as voces is implied.
4. Also the unus and solus clauses
of this type. *Homo unus omnium qui nodum ex solvere possit in potestate tua est Ycles.* Livy 40, 55.
In these unus and solus are directly modified by the clause.

5. He makes no mention of the fact that in affirmative expressions of existence and non-existence the indicative is often found.

As a general criticism of Bennett's grammar I think he should give references for his examples. For in careful work a point can never be proved by an example not found in good Latin. Made examples may be necessary and helpful at times but in authoritative grammar references should be given.

In the appendix to Bennett's grammar W. C. Elmer gives a short treatment of the characterizing clauses differing but little from Yale's treatment. The error is in including causal and adversative clauses.

Allen and Greenough in the introductory statement just before their treatment of characterizing clauses make this statement: "A relative clause in the indicative merely states something as a fact which is true of an antecedent: a characteristic clause (in the subjunctive)
defines the antecedent as a person or thing of such a character that the statement made is true of him or it and of all others belonging to the same class. This is not true for we find the subjunctive of characteristic in clauses "sunt qui pertinent" there are people who think. Cic. loc. 23, p. 118. This states a fact about the antecedent and does not denote in any way persons of the sort who think. It is merely a statement of fact and must be translated as the indicative. The statement made by Allen and Greenough will not hold true. They however go on to say that the characterizing subjunctive is developed, originating in ideal certainty until it comes to be indistinguishable from statements of fact. The statement is made that the subjunctive of result comes from its use in the clauses of characteristic. They is more usually considered to be tragic developments. In paragraph 335 a statement is made which is so absolutely vague and indefinite that no criticism can be made. The division a and note 1 are very good and should be included in every grammar. Division b is not complete needing some qualifying statement or some way of knowing when the indicative...
and when the subjunctive follows cum
and solv. Division C includes quam
ut which never introduces a char
acterizing clause but always a clause
of real result.
The arrangement of characterizing
clauses in Lanes grammar is at
fault giving two or three divisions
the first having the statement “Relative
sentences of characteristic or result
are equivalent to subjunctive clauses
introduced by ut. This is true but
in continuing to his next Statements
he makes no logical connection but
leaves the reader to guess as to whether
I and III are sentences of characteristic.
He omits the type of clauses following
tamen and ad, and comparatives with
quam. All others he includes and in
a general way his treatment is quite
satisfactory. Two very good points in
his treatment are: that he includes
with his expressions of existence and
non existence equivalent expressions
such as nihil habeo, nemenem vidi
and similar expressions. II that he recog
nises the fact that although the subjunctive is regular after affirmative ex
pressions of existence and non existence
often the indicative is found.
Narkhess attempts to define charact
erizing clauses by referring to their antecedents. He says: "Characterizing clauses are to characterize indefinite or general antecedents especially general negatives. He does not define in any manner determining and generalizing clauses hence in a definition of this kind does not exclude them. In a note he says that the indicative is used whenever the fact is to be made more prominent. When examples of these indicative characterizing clauses so called we find that hardly ever is the thought especially emphatic. The indicative is never found in such expressions save in affirmative statements. In division 2 under 591 he puts in one class those examples of sentences which are relative result and those after statements of existence and non-existence. They are treated as being of the same nature and being alike in form. This is not true and they cannot be included in the same statement. The great and fundamental mistake in Sackness's grammar is his failure to recognize two kinds of characterizing force running through all of the clauses: the ideal certainty and regular indicative force. Instead he translates all examples by word or the ideal certainty. Robins grammar is an old one and is used and highly regarded in the schools.
of England. It is very good in many points but in the matter of characterizing clauses still clings to the notion prevalent at one time that wherever the causal idea appeared the subjunctive was the necessary mood. Hence from this argument they considered the characterizing subjunctive simply a relative and descendant far removed of the causal subjunctive. Roby gives this explanation of characterizing clauses in his grammar. People holding this belief fail to remember that that the causal idea alone does not always require the subjunctive. The quod clauses which express cause purely stand in the indicative and hence we can in no way say that the causal idea requires the subjunctive. It would seem reasonable that if the causal subjunctive called spread out and affected permanently the characterizing clauses it would first have conquered its own field, namely the quod clauses. Hence Roby's very foundation premise is wrong. He says that the consecutive subjunctive (characterizing subjunctive) is used to express an action viewed as characteristic of persons or things
or as the natural result of other actions or qualities. This excluded the type quod qui potest in which gives no characteristic of the antecedent and no such intention of giving a characteristic is present. It may include determining and generalizing clauses. His next statement is that the characterizing subjunctive is used with relative adjectives so that he, such that he, etc. in negative sentences after qui non or if principal sentence is negative or quasi negative. His great error here is in classing clauses after statements of existence and non-existence under this heading. They can in no sense be said to have result feeling. He also states that the characterizing subjunctive is frequent after demonstratives is talis eumodi etc. This is true only when they are in the predicate. As a general criticism I would say that he should give translations for his examples as his book is for school use. As a general thing his treatment is quite good when we consider that it is an old grammar and has not been revised for many years. Gildersleeve does not recognize the subjunctive of actuality translating all characterizing clauses by the subjunctive of tendency. He along with Harkness is wrong in
is partially definite in the mind of the speaker.
If those clauses completing restrictive words and expressions like unus meaning the only one solve pauci and primum.
under this heading he expresses himself in such a way that his meaning cannot be grasped. In statement three he says that these clauses in quum with an object clause, and is immediately inconsistent in giving an illustration which is not an object clause.

In an examination of Hale and Buck's grammar one is at first at loss to grasp the arrangement of the book. The different kinds of subjunctives are given as separate divisions and under each of these are grouped the sentences in which that certain use of the subjunctive is found. So when looking for characterizing clauses we find some grouped under subjunctive of natural likelihood, some under the subjunctive of obligation, potential idea, certainty and actuality. This treatment can be sharply criticised from one standpoint alone. To a student in the high school or really any beginning this arrangement would be very confusing. Even for higher work it cannot be readily grasped. the clauses are so scattered that a student could not get a clear idea of what is included among the characterizing clauses. A second and less important criticism is on the
change of terminology. If all schools and textbooks used the same terminology that is doing away with the phrase characterizing and labelling them relative clauses of actuality etc., it might be profitable but nothing is gained by this change. As a general comment the treatment is very good giving a detailed and correct list and account of the characterizing subjunctives.

The grammars vary somewhat as to their treatment of "good wičmi clauses". Hale and Buck place them with characterizing clauses; Harkness, "Fildersleven", Allen and Greenough and Bennett treat them similarly while Lane and Roby give them a distinct treatment as a separate type. It seems that there is precision because set and is entirely restrictive.
In tracing the origin of the clauses known as characteristic we must recognize two separate and distinct beginnings. In the result clauses the use of the subjunctive was fixed in early Latin prose and the making of a theory to account for its origin is a very difficult task. There has been offered a theory that it was first used in negatives with a clause where there might be some confusion in the mind of the reader were the subjunctive not used. This probably grew up as did the use in clauses after expressions of existence and non-existence when the clauses were negative and spread gradually third analogy to the affirmative clauses but nothing definite can be said as to this because it is impossible to trace its development and usage as in case of existence and non-existence clauses. In Plautus and Terence we find the usage fixed and this use is very natural after sentences in which the consecutive feeling is very prominent. Then this use of the subjunctive had great influence over the beginning as well as the
spread of the subjunctive in clauses after expressions of existence and non-existence. For we can see how easy it would be for one who was accustomed to say: Nemo est qui tecum and Sunt ianboni qui te would consider it but a natural step to the same use of the subjunctive in a sentence like Nemo est qui tecum. Both the affirmative and negative result clauses being fixed expressions influenced the sister constructions of existence and non-existence. In the statements or expressions of existence and non-existence we find a mode of expression yet in developmental stages. In early Latin we find affirmative expressions of this kind, scarcely ever in the subjunctive while after negative expressions are frequent. An occasional affirmative with the subjunctive is found. In subsequent Latin we find the subjunctive always appearing after negative expressions, and most frequently after affirmative expressions while occasionally an indicative is found after an affirmative expression. This shows us that the use of the subjunctive
first became used after negatives and then gradually spread to the affirmative clauses usually after more indefinite subjects. The rule ceased to spread here before it invaded the whole province of the indicative after such expressions. The primary use of the subjunctive after negatives came as a result of confusion more likely to occur after these clauses as well as the consecutive feeling present. As a sort of summary we may then say that the subjunctive in exist and non exist clauses came after negatives because of a more likely confusion there and so spread to some of the affirmative clauses. The subjunctive in result clauses is hard to account for, for we cannot see its developmental stages. It probably came from some such confusion likely in negative clauses their invading the whole province of the indicative. Throughout both of these constructions we must bear in mind that we find both the subjunctive of ideal certainty and actuality present. We cannot say that either the result clauses or expressions of existence and non
existence are wholly ideal certainties or actualities. Both forces of the subjunctive are found in each type.

In clauses like eorum quos viderim.

Refertae sunt orationes amplius centum quinquaginta quas quidem adhuc lenuerim ad legem

Cic. Brut. 17. 65

Eorum quos viderim longe primo

Pop. jovius Secundus Brut. 10. 1. 95.

These have been classed by some grammarians as characterizing, but I think that a study of these shows that their origin is altogether after negative clauses and that they are set expressions of restrictive ideas. Hence should scarcely be classed with characterizing clauses.
The foregoing discussion is altogether too detailed for use in the school room and I have endeavored in the following to give a treatment of characterizing clauses which will be pedagogically practical.

Characterizing clauses include all essential clauses which (1) can not be conditional (2) are not determining or (3) restrictive.

There are of four general types:

I. Those equivalent to a result clause with ut, clauses following is, talis tam or ades a, are adp and comparatives with quam.

   Note: talis, quali, tantus quantus are excluded for they do not express result.

II. Those clauses equivalent to a complex adj joined to an adp by a coordinating conj.

III. Those clauses following expressions of existence and non-existence.

   List of expressions: jam est qui, aliae sunt qui, quaedam sunt qui, multe sunt qui, haec habeas qui, sequentur qui, 
   delegi sunt qui, repetio est nemo, nemo nemo est qui, nullus est qui, nemo nemo vidit, etc.

   Note: After in affirmative expressions of this kind the end is found when antecedent
is partially definite in the mind of
the speaker.

These clauses completing restrictive
words and expressions like unus meaning
the only one solus parce and primum.