

Relative Clauses in Terence

by Maelynette Aldrich

1913

Submitted to the Department of Latin of the
University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

RELATIVE CLAUSES IN TERENCE.

Presented to the Department of Latin
of the University of Kansas in Partial ful-
fillment of the Requirements for the Degree
of Master of Arts by

Maelynette Aldrich-

June 1913.

Contents

1. Statement of the clauses to be treated.
2. Material we have on the subject.

Grammars.

Roby.

Lane.

Gildersleeve.

Allen and Greenough.

Bennett.

Hale.

Other works than grammars.

Holtze.

Bennett (Latin Language
) Syntax of Early Latin.

Hale (Cum Constructions.

3. Figures and examples collected from Terence.
4. How far they bear out theories already advanced and conclusions.
5. Treatment and examples of a few special types of clauses.

In Latin we have a large mass of relative clauses which may be roughly divided into those that are Indicative and those that are Subjunctive. The Indicative clauses themselves fall into various groups. There is the large group of those which qualify a definite antecedent pointing out the particular person or thing meant. Then there are parenthetical clauses and some which though they describe are not closely linked with the sentence. Another group includes those whose antecedents are general and which may be easily changed into a conditional form. A few of this group may be Subjunctive if the form of condition they represent would be so. With these groups of clauses this paper will not deal. There are however a few types of Indicative clauses which appear in early Latin which are superseded later by clauses in the Subjunctive mode and others too of the same types as Subjunctive clauses and in which the two moods seem to be used more or less interchangeably. These Indicative clauses will be treated.

Of the Subjunctive relative clauses there are a few well marked types that do not need discussion namely those with the volitive idea as purpose clauses and those whose Subjunctive is due to Indirect Discourse

or Attraction. Excluding these clauses we have left a mass that for the present may be grouped under the names commonly given. These are the Characterizing clauses, the causal relative clauses and relative result clauses. Besides these there are clauses of the three types "non habeo quod dem," "nil est quod (cur) det", and "quod sciam", It is the use and origin of these clauses as seen in Terence that I will endeavor to present. Chiefly I will have to do with the characterizing and the relative causal clauses but examples of the others will be included.

In taking up a discussion of these clauses it is well to see what grammarians and syntacticians have said of them. First I will take up the treatment of the grammars leaving the other syntactical works till the last.

Roby is the first grammarian I shall consider. In his discussion of purpose clauses he says "These sentences are distinguished by the use of ne not non for a negative. These sentences might almost be classified as far as meaning goes under the head of consequence. Indeed the consecutive Subjunctive has arisen from the final Subjunctive.

Three typical instances of the relative type are "mitto qui dicat", "nihil est quod scribam", and "dignus est qui vincat". Under the general heading Causation with a separate heading consecutive *Subjunctive* he has "Sentences expressing a consequence greatly resemble those expressing a purpose. Consecutive sentences as final ones are introduced by qui, ut, quin but the negative is non not ne. The Subjunctive in no way implies the non-existence of the action but simply that the principal and subordinate clauses are related as cause (real or possible) and effect. Typical examples are "is sum qui illud faciam", "non is sum ut me periculum deterreat", "nemo est qui non cernat", and "ita laudo eum ut non pertimescat."

Of such expressions as "sunt qui" he says. "The Indicative is universal (except in early writers and poets) unless an adjective of number or definition is added as "multi".

Mr. Roby considers the Consecutive clauses final in origin. In his discussion he gives the point of the negative. This might be offered as an argument against this origin. We have no negative relative purpose clauses. If we had the negative would probably be ne. In the consecutive

clauses non is used. A growth and change may have taken place but it is hardly probable. One difficulty underlying this theory of origin is that steps of development cannot be traced clearly while in other theories they can.

His statement in regard to sumt qui and multi qui clauses does not seem to hold for the few examples of Terence.

Lane in his Latin Grammar makes no statements as to the origin of any of these clauses. He merely states their uses. He groups the relative characterizing and result clauses and gives the following topics.

1. These sentences are equivalent to Subjunctive sentences introduced by ut "so as to" "so that". The main sentence may have is, eius modi or rarely talis.

a. The Subjunctive with qui is used with dignus, indignus or idoneus usually with a form of sum. b.

Relative Subjunctive sentences may be joined by et or sed with a substantive or adjective or participle.

2. Relative sentences after assertions or questions of existence or non-existence usually take the Subjunctive. Such expressions are est qui, sunt qui, nemo est qui. (non) habeo quod etc. The Indicative is found in affirmative sentences in early Latin and poetry.

Under the relative causal sentences he says they are equivalent to Subjunctive sentences with cum. With qui tamen the Indicative is usual, and often where the causal relation might be expected the simple declaratory Indicative is used as "sed summe ego stultus qui rem curo publicam". The

causal relation he says is often introduced by quippe and less frequently by ut or ut pote. The Subjunctive he says is used in parenthetical sentences of restriction as "quod sciam".

These divisions of the clauses he makes are well confirmed by the examples collected. Question arises though as to whether qui is equivalent to ut. In Terence the ut clauses outnumber the qui clauses and qui and ut clearly cannot be used interchangeably.

Some question exists as to the place of the dignus clauses. Most authorities, we shall see, assign them to a volitive origin. Of Terence examples 9 occur with a form of sum and three with other verbs.

In the statement in regard to causal clauses, he said they are equivalent to the Subjunctive cum clauses. The causal ones are doubtless meant. An examination of any examples will show that this is not true. They are never used interchangeably. In his statement in regard to the use of the Indicative it is easy to infer that when the Indicative is used

the causal meaning is lost, which is far from true.

Gildersleeve recognizes sentences of tendency. He does not believe that the Subjunctive can express a fact, so the Latin consecutive clause to him does not properly express an actual fact or result but only a tendency that will lead to a result. Thus to him "as the use of the Subjunctive spreads there is a drift to the expressions of character by tendency (Subj) rather than by fact (Ind.) so that the relative of character takes more and more the Subjunctive and cum follows the lead of ut and the pronouns. "In section 631 he takes up the relative sentences of tendency. Potential relative sentences he says are put in the Subjunctive of Tendency when qui- ut is. The notion is that of character and adaptation and there are four varieties.

1. With a definite antecedent when the character is emphasized - after idoneus aptus, dignus, indignus, is, talis, tam, tantus, unus, solus. Ut is often found also.
2. With an indefinite antecedent after negatives of all kinds ^{and in combinations as multi, quidam, with} est, sunt, existet etc. The Indicative he says may be used in the statements of definite facts, the Subjunctive of general characteristics after multi qui.

3. After comparatives with quam. 4. Parallel with an adjective. Next he takes up quin in sentences of character after a negative clause where we might expect qui non.

In the relative causal clause he says if qui= cum is "as he" the Subjunctive is used. Quippe, utpote, ut are often used with the relative.

Potential clauses are always Subjunctive, the other clauses here are not, yet all are included by the use of the word potential in the first statement. In his first variety he says the antecedent is definite. With tam, tantus, is, it may be but is not necessarily so. "Quo est tam demens qui arbitretur". With solus and unus the antecedent is indefinite. He says the Indicative may be used in statements of definite facts and not general characteristics after affirmative sentences. I believe a careful glance at examples will disprove this. The use of the moods is more a matter of development than of meaning in nearly all clauses where either mood may appear. This is proven by examples. Again in the causal clauses the statements do not hold. There too the Subjunctive is a

growing force and no rule as he makes can be supported.

In the Allen- Greenough grammar Mr. Morris presents theories for the origin of these different clauses. He states that the relative clause of characteristic is a development peculiar to Latin. The relative Indicative clause merely states something as a fact which is true of the antecedent. The Subjunctive clause defines the antecedent as a person or thing of such a character that the statement made is true of him and of all others of the same class. The example in illustration is not well chosen. It is taken in its indicative form from the Manilian law, 36. Both examples are conditional sentences and the Subjunctive manufactured by Morris is a form which probably cannot be found in Latin literature. This construction he says has its origin in the potential use of the Subjunctive. This potential idea "who would restrain" passes over easily into that of general quality. The characterizing force is most easily felt when the antecedent is indefinite or general.

This usage in Latin is extended to cases which differ but slightly from statements of fact. In this same place is given the origin of the Subjunctive in result clauses. He says it comes from the use in the characteristic clause. As the characteristic often appears in the form of a supposed result the construction readily passes over into pure result with no idea of characteristic. The Allen-Greenough definition for the characterizing clause is "A relative clause with the Subjunctive is often used to indicate a characteristic of the antecedent especially where the antecedent is otherwise underfined. Its uses are stated in 6 subtopics. 1, After expressions of existence or non-existence including questions which imply a negative. They state the Subjunctive is regular after *nemo est qui* and is the prevailing mood after *sunt qui* although the Indicative occurs. With *multi sunt qui* the mood depends on the shade of meaning to be expressed. 2. used after *unus* and *solus*, 3. *quam ut, quam qui* after comparatives. 4. restrictions or *proviso - quod sciam*. 5. cause or concession may be expressed by a relative clause of characteristic. In this use the relative "*cum is*" and is often preceded by *ut, utpote* or *quippe*. 6. after *dignus, indignus, idoneus*. The result clauses are next treated, as they

are a development of the Characteristic clauses; no sharp line can be drawn between them.

The treatment of the whole matter here tends to be confusing and is inadequate. The best part is that furnished by Mr. Morris. He omits to speak of the fact that the development he gives of the characterizing clauses seems to have taken place after negative antecedents which is important. Examples tend to prove also that the result clauses are even earlier than the characteristic clauses or at least that they grew up side by side. The definition is worse than nothing. The antecedent of a characterizing clause may be defined. "There are red headed men who swear". The causal clauses are placed under the same heading. Nothing is said of their antecedents and one would suppose they are undefined too. The quod sciam clauses also come under this rule and they have no antecedents at all.

Mr. Bennett in the older edition of his Latin grammar gave this definition of a characterizing clause.

"A relative clause used to express an essential quality or characteristic of an antecedent not otherwise defined is called a clause of characteristic and stands in the Subjunctive". This definition is that of the Allen - Greenough grammar save for the word essential which is not needed to be sure. Very few qualities are essential.

"There are red headed men who have green eyes."

In his later edition the definition reads, "A relative clause used to express a quality or characteristic of a general or indefinite antecedent is called a clause of characteristic and usually stands in the Subjunctive. As in the Allen-Greenough grammar he has divisions under his rule and includes the causal clauses and those of "quod sciam" type. The second definition includes two types of clauses that are not characteristic, namely the conditional relative clauses whose antecedent is general and some of the Indicative clauses which point out and defines their antecedent. Not all characterizing clauses are included and we get no real definition

or explanation of those which are.

Professor Hale of Chicago in his Latin Grammar introduces entirely new classifications of clauses. He distinguishes descriptive and determinative relative clauses. The determinative clauses are those which point out or determine an antecedent idea of any kind. These include a few Subjunctive clauses and the majority of the Indicative relative clauses excepting those which he classes as loosely attached free descriptive or parenthetical, terms which practically define themselves. His descriptive clauses on the other hand those which are usually Subjunctive and usually called characterizing clauses he divides under various headings according largely to their origin. He has volitive descriptive clauses, Anticipatory descriptive clauses, Potential relative clauses after expressions of existence or non-existence, descriptive clauses of Ideal Certainty

and descriptive clauses of Actuality. These last he says follow incomplete descriptive words or negative or indefinite expressions, or questions implying a negative. Under the heading Derivatives of the Descriptive clause of fact he discusses the restrictive relative clause and the causal or adversative relative clauses. These Subjunctive causal clauses he contrasts with Indicative causal clauses which merely suggest the idea of cause or opposition. These latter he calls Tacit causal and the Subjunctive ones explicit causal. Result clauses he places under Ideal Certainty and Actuality. Clauses of the type non habeo quod dem are given under the Potential. The nulla causa est cur ones under Obligation and Propriety and the quod sciam clauses under Actuality. The dignus qui clauses he places under Obligation and Propriety also. These Categories for the most part will be better understood later in the paper. Mr. Hale does not explain his arrangement here. In his Cum- Constructions the clauses we are concerned with are explained.

This work and that of Mr. Lane are the only two that have given us any very clear ideas as to the use of these clauses. We will now take up other works on the subject where we should expect fuller treatment especially in regard to the origin of these clauses.

Holtze's *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum ad Terentium* published in 1862 is the earliest syntax of the early Latin that we have. There are no complete lists of examples as one might expect, nor even figures. There is little or no discussion. The treatment so far as he goes is clear. There are few and large categories. The relative Subjunctive clauses he divided into four groups, purpose, consecutive, causal and concessive. He states too that the limits of these groups often overlap and it is difficult to place many examples. In the result clauses by way of explanation of the Subjunctive ^{he refers to a work on the "Cause of the Subjunctive"} in Result Clauses by Weissenborn in the Year Annals 1848 Vol. 53. This work of Holtze's is of little use to us and we shall pass on to the

more recent works of Mr. Bennett.

The first work of Mr. Bennet to be treated here is his Appendix to his grammar. The treatment there is practically identical with that in his later book "The Latin Language" so that I will not give space to a discussion of it save to state that the last chapter was written by Mr. Elmer a student of Prof. Hale. Mr. Bennet himself apparently did not accept Mr. Elmer's theories. In the "Latin Language" then the origin of the characterizing clause is given as a development from the Subjunctive of Contingent Futurity. In origin it was probably confined to such words as *possim*, *velim*, *nolim*, *malim*, *audeam*, *credam*, *putem* following negative expressions. These passed readily into clauses of fact. Difficulty he says often exists in distinguishing clauses of characteristic from relative clauses of purpose. This results from the fact that a relative clause of purpose may denote a characteristic of an antecedent in the general sense of the word characteristic. The characteristic

clause denotes an act contemporary with or anterior to that of the main clause while purpose denotes an act relatively future to the main clause. Some he says are ambiguous as Phor. 433.

In sentences such as "fortunate iuvenis qui praeconem invenerat" there is an apparent violation of the principle that a characterizing clause refers to an antecedent not otherwise defined. Here he says we may explain the relative as referring to an indefinite antecedent to be supplied. The original force would have been "O fortunate man (one) who has found. The use of the second person is a species of attraction.

His theory for the origin of the result clauses is practically the same as for the characterizing clauses. They come from the Subjunctive of contingent futurity in its second phase where there is a condition implied. This Subjunctive developed from the idea "would hate" to "hates" probably through velit, nolit, etc. Relative result clauses he says are simply a development of characteristic.

The first theory presented is almost the same as that given by Allen-Greenough save that he includes after negative expressions. This fact was not mentioned in his Appendix. I am not prepared to say as to the truth of the origin and change taking place in such words as *velim, nolim*, but it seems probable.

The difficulty he speaks of in always distinguishing the characteristic and the purpose clauses lies chiefly in the *habeo quod den* clauses which I have taken as a separate type and will treat of near the end of the paper.

The way Mr. Bennett explains the causal relative sentences in order to make them characterizing is certainly not satisfactory. Is it not better to accept the sentence as causal not characterizing and so leave it clear for the sentence to have a definite antecedent. Usually with an antecedent given we do not feel the need of supplying one. The person of the verb he calls attraction but such use of attraction we do not find elsewhere and until we do it seems unsafe

to assume it here especially as another explanation is possible for the subjunctive than to make the clause characterizing, i.e. the consecutive nature of the clause or the result idea.

Mr. Bennett does not tell us how the real certainty originally got into the characteristic clauses nor whether any development took place after the would idea had passed into that of actuality.

Leaving Mr. Bennet's "Latin Language" we come to his work on the "Syntax of Early Latin". This was intended to replace Holtze. To a certain extent it does but for the most part it is merely a reproduction of his work. For a work of this kind to be really useful to the syntactical student the writer ought to give the complete lists of examples. Mr. Bennett felt this as he shows in his preface but yet he hesitated to give complete lists. Very frequently he gives figures but aside from proportions little is gained from these without the examples themselves. Mr. Holtze's categories would be sufficient with full lists of examples though of course more divisions would make the work better.

The discussion of descriptive clauses begins on page 288. At the very beginning here_x Mr. Bennett made a peculiar mistake. He says, "Descriptive clauses are opposed to determinative clauses which simply add another fact or item with regard to a person or thing." Then he says Prof. Hale defines the determinative clause as one telling what person or thing is meant while the descriptive clause is defined as designating what kind of a person or thing is meant". What did Mr. Bennett mean by that first definition? Did he think it was the same as Mr. Hale's?

Next he states that theoretically any type of independent subjunctive may appear in a descriptive clause but as a matter of fact the usage is confined mainly to developments of the should would potential. Here follow his classifications of the various kinds. He gives figures not complete lists of examples. 1. Potential descriptive clauses (55), idea of contingent futurity not actuality - *dicam quod libenter audias* Fhor. 488. 2. Descriptive clauses of fact (34), a development from the previous type especially through verbs as *malim, velim*, etc. For the

developed form he gives these categories. 1. nullus qui, nemo qui, nihil quod, non nullus qui, non quicquam qui, nonquicquam quod, (complete examples) According to his statements here these would be Indicative clauses. He should have said nullus est qui etc. 2. quis est qui. 3. unus or solus qui. 4. si est qui. 5. is qui, ille qui, id quod, and Subjunctive in Determinative clauses, an extension of this use. 6. pauci qui, 7. alius qui, 8. multi qui, 9. aliquis qui, 10. clauses following an indefinite antecedent denoting a person or thing. 11. relative causal clauses. He had already treated of the Indicative causal qui clauses under his use of the Indicative. He states in both places that the antecedent of the relative is more commonly in the first or second persons. In this place he says the causal idea develops purely as a result of the context. The reason or cause is regularly not the motive or impelling cause of the action but the ground for the assertion made by the speaker. His examples for these Subjunctive clauses claim to be complete. He gives 25 for the first person, 33 the

second and 3 the third. Adversative clauses he says are less frequent and gives eleven examples. As topic 12 he states that *sunt qui* in early Latin is regularly followed by the Indicative. He says nothing as to its frequency of occurrence.

In regard to the divisions Mr. Bennett makes might he not just as well have shown that examples under group 1 could also be divided among these 12 types. The explanation he offers for placing the causal clauses under the descriptive heading has already been discussed.

Briefly I will give his treatment of a few other clauses. Result clauses he makes closely related to the predicative descriptive clauses. He says they are probably a development of the potential subjunctive. A transition occurred from the would idea to actuality, probably in the words *malit* etc. of 106 result clauses introduced by *ut* he says 30 have these verbs and many are of the original type. Of 29 relative result clauses 11 point to the original type. The *quod sciam* clauses he treats under

Restrictive clauses. He merely says that many descriptive clauses develop secondarily a restrictive notion.

Under his treatment of purpose clauses he speaks of those that are adverbial and those that are adjectival. Under the latter which he says are also descriptive he places the *habeo quod det* clauses. He refers to Mr. Hale's potential and Mr. Frank's purpose treatment of these clauses and says he cannot go as far as Mr. Frank who accepts them as purpose with an idea of can potential. To him they are simply purpose until it is proven that "*det*" and "*haec fiant*" can mean "he can give" and "these can be done" respectively.

After these clauses he treats the *dignus qui* ones which he believes to be purpose. He fails to see the justification Prof. Hale had in putting them under a category of obligation and propriety or in fact for having such a group at all.

Under substantive clauses developed from the volitive he treats the clauses *quid est quod*, and *nihil est quod*. He quotes from Durham p. 77 f. that

these expressions are a development of relative purpose clauses. In accord with this theory "quid est quod metuas" meant originally "what is there for you to fear" and from this came "what reason is there to fear" or "why do you fear." Quod became an interrogative conjunction and this led to such clauses as quid est quod abeas? where there could have been no idea of purpose.

This work has given a rather full treatment of the clauses in question but owing to its nature no clearer account of their origins than the others. We have left the one work of Mr. Hale§ before presenting our examples.

Prof. Hale in his Cum- Constructions in order to give the development of the cum clauses treats of the qui clauses. He divides his relative clauses into essential and non-essential ones. If the antecedent of the clause is unfinished or not intelligible in itself and only made complete or intelligible by the help of the clause, the clause is essential. If the omission of the relative clause still leaves the antecedent complete and the sentence intelligible

and does not entirely spoil its original meaning the clause is non-essential. Under the essential clauses fall the determinative Indicative clauses, the generalizing clauses and nearly all Subjunctive clauses. The clauses we are discussing are all essential save most of the Indicative causal clauses. The history of the Subjunctive relative clauses, the characterizing and the causal Mr. Hale gives as follows: The original consecutive *qui* clause was simply a grammatically independent Subjunctive of ideal certainty like the sentence "he is a man who would not listen to such proposals" which might equally well have stood in the independent form "he would not listen to such proposals", a Subjunctive of ideal certainty.

Through a confusion which seems to have taken place first in consecutive clauses after negative antecedents, the line between this assertion of ideal certainty and the assertion that implies a fact as "There is no one who can" was obscured and the Subjunctive became universal in consecutive clauses. In *qui* clauses after negative antecedents this change had taken place before Plautus, but after indefinite

antecedents it was not complete till Cicero's time. Three other stages of development Mr. Hale gives are - first, the developing clause originally consecutive becomes qualitative and characterizes the antecedent by directly stating the existence or non-existence in it of a quality. Next the developing qualitative clause exhibits the condition of the antecedent by stating some experience of it proceeding not from the nature of the antecedent but from an external source. Lastly the classifying clause placing the antecedent in a class on the ground of some act or circumstance which may be wholly external.

The causal use of the Subjunctive *qui* clause is probably a development from a consecutive use in which the Subjunctive clause expresses the result of the character attributed to an antecedent and at the same time appears to justify the attribution of that character i.e. it is both consecutive and causal as in sentences "are they dumb who speak not". The frequent recurrence of such combinations would lead to an association of the causal idea with the mood itself and the Subjunctive would extend to all causal clauses.

Originally the qui clause alone, he says, was sufficiently consecutive and no tam qui was needed but as the language grew and the fullness of its expression, the clauses where the true consecutive force is intended to be expressed, would be cast in the familiar form tam qui, and the pure consecutive qui clause probably older than the tam qui would have nothing but its causal function left.

Mr. Hale says that in Plautus time the introductory phrases were talis qui, talis ut and is ut. The Subjunctive is always used in qui clauses expressing the result of an adjective modified by tam and in phrases after negatives as "nullus est qui", but in expressions as "si quis est qui" it is not yet fixed.

This treatment of Mr. Hale is the one that the count of examples in this paper will, on the whole, be found to support, yet there are a few points to criticize. Like Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hale does not give complete examples and but rarely any figures. There is one point also in which his statements seem confusing. In his five steps through which he takes the

characterizing clause we would infer that the Subjunctive developed because of the consecutive force. If the consecutive force in itself preferred the Subjunctive why is it that we find the Indicative so often with the est qui type, but never with the nullus est qui? Mr. Hale has really confused it seems two forces that were at work in these clauses, namely the Subjunctive as required after negative sentences and by the consecutive idea. Examples show that the negative force was the stronger. The confusion on this point is more clearly marked in the body of the work than in the summary.

Discussion.

Having reated of the chief works that deal with our subject we come to the examples of these clauses collected from one reading of the six plays of Terence. Dziatzko's text was used.

Before taking up the discussion it is well to say a few words in regard to the name characterizing applied to these clauses. It is too broad a name, under it might come all Indicative clauses which qualify an

antecedent, and the clauses treated here do not as a rule characterize the antecedent any more than they do. Again the name does not define the clauses as for instance the name determinative does. Prof. Hale has used no one name for the clauses, some few are descriptive and others are consecutive descriptive clauses of actuality. It would be well if some name could be found which would include all types and define them but until such a name is found it is perhaps well to do about as Mr. Hale has done. No one definition of such clauses as these can be given without being more or less a mere statement of the groups of clauses and their workings. Again the only way in which we can collect these clauses for a discussion is by the process of elimination. That has been done here. The determinative and free descriptive or parenthetical relative Indicative clauses that readily fall into Mr. Hale's groups, are not included nor the generalizing clauses. If any of these are Subjunctive and yet can be explained as Attraction or Indirect Discourse they are not included. Of Subjunctive clauses those of volitive or optative nature are omitted. It is the

clauses then left that we are to consider and endeavor to classify.

The writers whom we have reviewed have already presented the problems of the use and origin of these clauses and raised questions in regard to them. These questions which we have to answer by examples are -

Through what Subjunctive clauses did the Subjunctive come to be used in the so called Characterizing clause? Is it true that the Subjunctive appears always after negatives and in varying proportions after various positive expressions? What of the clauses that follow incomplete descriptive words, such as *tam*, *tantus*; are they equivalent to the *ut* clauses and are they a clearly marked type? Are they frequent enough for us to base on them the origin of the Subjunctive in such sentences as, "*insanus es qui*"? Are these sentences, "*insanus es qui*" etc. always Subjunctive in Terence, or at least often enough so, to assign to them the origin of the Subjunctive in causal clauses? What is the proportion of Subjunctives and Indicatives in these relative causal clauses? These are all questions we must have before us in treating of these clauses.

The so called characterizing clauses fall really into the two groups those consecutive, after an intensifying word, and those after expressions of existence or non-existence.

Our first group includes those clauses which have a strong consecutive force. Tam, tantus, ita, adeo, is, eius modi appear in the main clause. These clauses are result as well as characterizing and are to be compared with the ut result clauses. Three relative clauses occur and all appear after an intensified adjective or noun, and where an antecedent is convenient. In this same construction where qui might have appeared ut occurs 11 times, quin 3,.

This table will show the use and particles.

	tam,	tantus,	ita,	adeo,	quan- tum,	is,	eius huius "	Modi
qui after an adj. and noun	1	1					1	
ut after adj.			1	4				
ut after subst.		2				1		
ut after noun and adj. ut after adv.	1	2	1	4	1	4	1	
			1			2		
ut after verb			4	6				
quin after adj. and noun	2				1			
quin after adv.	1		2					

Besides these result clauses there are 2 ut clauses following quam and an adverb, and 17 others with various expressions. Several of this last group of ut clauses have a characterizing force as No 1. and 2. The examples of the clauses follow:
Qui clauses.

1. Quemquamme animo tam comi esse aut leni putas
qui se vidente amicam patiatur suam -? H.T.912.

2. Nulla mihi res posthac potest iam intervenire
tanta quae mi aegritudinem adferat. H.T.680.

3. Quam scitumst, eius modi parare in animo cupiditates quas quom res advorsae sient paulo mederi possis! Ph. 322/ ~~Ut~~ after adjective.

1. Ita sum inritatus, animum ut nequeam ad cogitandum insituere. Ph.240. 2. Adeon me esse pervicacem censes quoi~~mater~~ siem ut eo essem animo?

Hec. 547. 3. Sed Syrum quidem egone si vivo adeo exornatum dabo, adeo depexum ut dum vivat neminerit semper mei. H.T.951.

4. Adeon te esse incogitantem atque inpudentem ut phaleratis ducas dictis (me) et meam ductes gratus! Ph. 499.

5. Adeon me ignovom putas, adeon porro ingratum aut inhumanum aut ferum ut neque me consuetudo neque amor neque pudor commoveat neque commoneat ut servem fidem? And.277-280.

Ut~~x~~ After a Substantive.

1. Tantumne ab re tuast oti tibi aliena ut cures ea quae nil ab te attinent? H.T. 76.

2. Hocine de improvise mihi mali obici tantum ut neque quid de me faciam nec quid agam certum siet. Ad. 610.

3. In id redactus sum loci ut quid agam cum illo
nesciam prorsum - Ph. 980.

Ut χ after a noun and adjective.

1. Hocine(est) credibile aut memorabile tanta
vecordia innata quoiquam ut siet ut malis gaude-
ant atque ex incommodis alterius sua ut comparent
commoda? And.627.

2. Hic me magnifice ecfero qui vim tantam in me
et potestatem habeam tantae astutiae vera dicendo
ut eos ambos fallam; ut quom narret senex - non
credat H.T.710.

3. Trae sunt inter Glycerium et gnatum-- Si.

Ita magnae ut sperem posse auelli. And.553.

4. Non adeo inhumano ingenio sum chaerea, neque ita
inperita ut quid amor valeat nesciam.

5. Adeo ingenio esse duro te atque inexorabili ut
neque miseracordia neque precibus moleliri queas.Ph. 497.

6. Adeo impotenti esse animo ut praeter civi^um morem
atque ~~le~~^{le}gem et sui voluntatem patris tamen hanc habere
studeat ---! And.881.

7. Adeo pervicaci esse animo ut puerum praeoptares

perire ex quo firmiorem inter nos fore amicitiam posthac scires. Hec.532.

8. Quantam fenestram ad nequitiam patefeceris tibi autem porro ut non sit suaue vivere ! H.T.482.

9. Ego in eum incidi infelix locum ut neque mihi eius sit amittendi nec retinendi copia. Ph. 176.

10. In eum iam res rediit locum ut sit necessus. H.T.360.

11. Hoc mihi dolet, nos sero rescisse et rem pae-
ne in eum locum redisse ut si omnes cuperent tibi
nil possent auxiliarier. Ad. 273.

12. Nam ea aetate iam sum ut non siet peccato mi
ignosci aequom. Hec. 737.

13. Fortunatissime Antipho quoi quod amas domist,
neque cum huius modi unquam usus venit ut conflict-
ares malo. Ph. 505.

Ut after an adverb.

1. Numquam tam dices commode ut tergum meum tuam
in fidem commitam. Hec. 109.

2. Postquam videt paratas nec moram ullam quin ducat
dari ibi demum ita aegre tulit ut ipsam Bacchidem si
adesset credo ibi eius commiseresceret. Hec. 128.

3. Eo rediges me ut quid egerium egomet nesciam.

Eum 690.

4. Quod si eo meae fortunae redeunt -- abs te ut
distrahar, nullast mihi vita expetenda. Ph. 201.

Ut after a verb.

1. Utinam quidem ita se defetigarit velim ut
triduum hoc perpetuum prorsum e lecto nequeat sur-
gere. Ad. 520.

2. Itan parasti te ut spes nulla relicua in te sit
tibi? Eum. 240.

3. Ita conturbasti mihi rationes ommis ut eam non
possim suis tradere. Eum. 869.

4. Di vostram fidem ita comparatam esse hominum
naturam omnium aliena ut melius videant et diu
dicent quam sua ! H. T. 503.

5. Adeon rem redisse ut---patrem ut extimescam Ph.
154.

6. Audivi cepisse odium tui ---- sed non credidi
adeo ut etiam totam hanc odisset domum. Hec. 221.

7. Adeon rem redisse ut periculum etiam a fame
mihi sit, Syre ! H.T. 980.

8. Adeon homines inmatarier ex amore ut non cog-
noscas eundem esse! Eum.226.

9 Etsi ego me meis omnibus scio esse adprime obsequentem sed non adeo ut mea facilitas corrumpat illorum animos. Hec.248.

10. Antiquamque adeo tuam venustatem obtines ut voluptati obitus, sermo, adventus tuos semper sit. Hec.859.

Quin after an adjective and noun, adjective, or adverb.

1. Nullast tam facilis res quin difficilis siet quam invitus facias. H.T.805.

2. Nil tam difficilest quin quaerendo investigari possiet. H.T.675.

3. Verum ego numquam adeo astutus fui quin quidquid possem malle auferre potius in praesentia. Ad.221.

4. Numquam tam mane egredior neque tam vesperi domum revortor quin te in fundo conspicer fodere aut arare r H.T.68.

5. Numquam ita magnifice quicquam dicam id virtus quin superet tua. Ad. 257.

6. Numquam ratione ad vitam fuit quin res aetas usus semper aliquid adportet novi. Ad.856.

The two ut clauses with quam and any

adverb are-

1. Vel hic pamphilus iurabat quotiens Bacchidi quam sancte, ut quivis facile posset credere. Hec.61.
2. Tum illa ut consuetum facile amorem cerneret, reiecit se in eum flens quam familiariter- And.135.

The 17 other result clauses without these particles in the main clause are. Hec, 131,374, 861, 4, Eun. 386, 833, 841, H.T.98, 307, 342, 395, 945, Ph.108, 547, Ad.234, and And.516, 524.

These figures and clauses tend to show that the ut result clause was very firmly established but the relative result clause was not. I believe figures from Plautus do not bear this out so forcibly there. Three relative clauses opposed to 11 ut clauses after an intensified adjective and noun is a small proportion and scarcely sufficient to allow us to base on these relative clauses the reason for the Subjunctive in such clauses as "insanus es qui dicas" in which the origin of the Subjunctive in causal clauses seems to lie. The three relative clauses of this group we see are also characterizing.

We come now to a larger group of clauses after expressions of non-existence and existence. These I have divided into various categories.

(1.) Those after negative expressions as. a. nihil est quod (7) malim (2).

1. Nam mihi nunc nil rerum omniumst quod malim quam me hoc falso suspicariet - H.T. 268.

2. Nil est quod malim quam illam totam familiam dari mi obviam Ad.311.

3. Nihil est quod verear. Ph.738.

4. Nil adhuc est quod vereare H.T.175.

5. Nihil est aeque quod faciam lubens. Ph.565.

6. Nam quod de argento sperem aut posse postulem me fallere nil est. H.T.671.

7. Profecto in hac re nil malist quod sit discidio dignum. Hec.782.

b. nemo est qui 4. malim 1.

1. Davom video. Nemost quem malim omnium. And. 963.

2. Nemost hominum qui vivat minus (formidulosus)? Eun. 757.

3. Nemost quem ego nunciam magis cuperem videre quam te. Eun. 561.

4. Nemost meorum amicorum hodie apud quem expromere omni mea occulta -audeam. H.T. 575.

c. Nullus est qui. 1.

1. Nullumst iam dictum, quod non sit dictum prius, Eun.41.

(2.) Those after quisquam est qui.5.

a. Negative.

1. Nec, qui eam respiciat quisquam est. Ad.932.

2. Neque extra unam aniculam quisquam aderat qui adiutaret
funus. Ph. 99.

3. Nec quemquam ego esse hominem arbitror quoi magis
bonae felicitates omnes advorsae sient. Eun.325.

b. Affirmative.

1. An quisquam index est qui possit noscere tua iusta. Ph.279.

2. Si quisquamst qui placere se studeat bonis in his poeta
hic nomen profitetur su om. Eun. 1.

(3) Those after unus or solus.4.a.unus.

1. Nunc una mihi res etiam restat quae est conficiunda,
otium ut habeam. Ph.831.

b. solus.

1. Desine ! Solus es quem diligant di. And. 973.

2. Tu sola exorere quae perturbes haec tua impudentia. Hec.213.

3. Dum istis fuisti colus, dum nulla alia delectatio quae pro-
pior esset te indulgebant, tibi dabant; nunc-H.T. 989.

(4) After si quis est qui - 3.

1. Nunc si quis est qui hoc dicat aut sic cogitet. Ph.12.

2. Tum si quis est qui dictum in se inclementius existumavit
esse sic existumet. Eun.4.

3. Intus transigetur si quid est quod restet. And.981.

(5) After quid est quod. 10. malim 1, velim 1, vis 1.

1. Quid est quod mihi malim quam quod huic intellego evenire. Hec.794.
 2. Quin uno verb dic, quid est quod me velis? And 45.
 3. Quid hoc quod rogo ut illa nubat nostro? nisi quid est quod magis vis. H.T.936.
 4. Quid istuc est quod te audio nescio quid concer- tasse cum ero? Ad.210.
 5. Ere licetne scire exte quid sit quod feci boni? aut quid istuc est quod nos agitis? Hec.873.
 6. Quid est quod amplius simuletur? H.T.901.
 7. Quid est quod tibi mea ars efficere hoc possit amplius? And.31.
 8. Num quid est aliud mali damnive quod non dixeris relicuom? Eun.995.
 9. Num quid nam hic quod nolis vides? Eun.272.
 10. Num quid est quod opera mea vobis opus sit? Ph.563.
- (6) After aliquis qui.3.
1. Audisti ex aliquo fortasse qui vidisse eum diceret exeuntem aut intro euntem ad eam. Hec. 550.
 2. Hunc videre saepe optabamus diem quom ex te esset aliquis qui te appellaret patrem. Hec.652.
 3. Chaerea aliquid inveni modo quod ames; in ea re utilitatem ego faciam ut cognoscas meam ! Eun. 309

(7) est qui. 2.

1. Est genus hominum qui esse primos se omnium rerum volunt, nec sunt. Eun.248.

2. Etiam argentumst ultro obiectum ut sit qui vivat Ph. 770.

(8) Multi sunt qui .3.

1. Concurrunt multae opinionem res quae mi animo exaugeant. H.T. 232.

2. Multa concurrent simul qui coniecturam hanc nunc facio. And.512.

3. Multa in homine signa insunt ex quibus coniectura facile fit. Ad. 822.

(9) Pauci sunt. 1.

1. Paucae quae circum illam essent, manent noviciae puellae. Eun.581.

(10) Clauses introduced by quin. 10.

1. Nil est quin male narrando possit depravarier Ph. 697.

2. Nam illi nil vitist relictum quin sit idem itidem tibi . H.T.1021.

3. Nam vostrarum nullast quin gnatum velit ducere uxorem. Hec. 241.

4. Nullamne ego rem umquam in vita mea volui quin tu in ea re mi fueris aduorsatrix. H.T.1007.

5. Nam numquam unum intermittet diem quin semper veniat. Ad.294.

6. Nam nemo illorum quisquam,--ad te venit quin ita paret sese--- Hec.69.

7. Quid relicuist quin habeat quae quidem in homine dicuntur bona? H.T.193.

8. Numquam etiam fui usquam quin me omnes amarent plurimum. Eun.1092.

9. Quam ioco rem voluisti a me tandem quin perfecteris? Eun.180.

10. Neque honestum mihi neque utile ipsi virginist quin integram itidem reddam ut accepi a suis. Hec.150.

(11) After verbs as evenit. 5.

1. Censen t^o posse reperire ullam mulierem quae careat culpa? Hec.663.

2. Quam saepe forte temere eveniunt quae non audeas optare? Ph.758.

3. Inventast quae dotem petat. Ph.647.

4. Ad nos deductus hodiest adolescentulus quem tu videre vero velles. Eun.687.

5. Numquam edepol quicquam iam diu quod magis vellem

evenire mi evenit quam quod modo senex intro ad nos
venit errans. Eun. 1002.

In these clauses we see that the Subjunctive^a
invariably follows the negative expressions but occurs
after the others in varying proportions. After quis-
quam est qui there are no Indicatives, after si quis
est qui 2 out of 3, after quid est quod 1 out of 10.
after unus est qui 1 out of 2. After est qui there
is one Indicative, after multi sunt qui 2. This proves
that the negatives required the Subjunctive and that it
doubtless started after them. The words velim, malim do
not occur often enough to prove that the change in feel-
ing from the would idea to actuality took place in them
first. One case of the Indicative vis occurs.

Prof. Hale has shown that the Subjunctive of
ideal certainty is the Subjunctive that appears in these
clauses but there seems to have been another force at
work, namely the anticipatory Subjunctive. This is
shown by the fact that wherever the future idea appears
we have the Subjunctive. Often too the anticipatory
force and that of ideal certainty both seem to be present.

The following clauses fail to fall within either of the two groups given and yet are characterizing. We notice too that they are all more or less anticipatory in feeling. They are probably an outgrowth of one or both of the two groups given above.

1. At nunc dicam quod lubenter audias -Ph.488.
2. Quaere, obsecro ne quid plus minusve faxit quod nos post pigeat. Ph.544.
3. Gnate mi ego pol tibi dabo illam lepidam quam tu facile ames- H.T.1060.
4. Videndumst ne minus propter iram hinc impetrem quam possiem aut ne quid faciam plus quod post me minus fecisse satius sit. Hec.729.
5. Vin primum hodie facere quod ego gaudeam--et quod tuo viro oculi doleant. Ph.1052.
6. Dum expecto quam mox veniat qui adimat hanc mihi consuetudinem Ph. 161.

So far the clauses have fitted Mr. Hale's treatment exceedingly well and we will see that the types we still have to give do also. After an elimination of all clauses that fit his groups we had left the 6 clauses just given and the 4 we are to give below.

These are insufficiently radical in their difference to allow any change in his classification and we can with assurance state that his treatment is proved for Terence.

The 4 clauses I mentioned as exceptions are -

1. Scitumst periculum ex aliis facere tibi quod ex usu siet. H.T.210.
2. Ceterum de redducenda id facias quod in rem sit tuam. Hec.391.
3. Rogas? Quia ne alteram quidem illam potero ducere; nam quo redibo ore ad eam quam contempserim? Ph.917.
4. Conrasi omnia, Ancillas, servos nisi eos qui opere rustico faciundo facile sumptum exercirent suom, omnis produxi ac vendidi H.T. 143.

The first two really seem interrogative. The quod seems to stand for a quid. The other two are clauses following is. These can be explained by the growing force of is. We saw that it was used in the result clauses with the force of "such" and it has something of that force here. After is acquired this force a clause following it always took the Subjunctive.

This led to a more definite line of feeling of essential opposition between determinative and characterizing clauses and for that is important.

We come now to the relative causal clauses. Prof. Hale has placed the origin of the Subjunctive that occurs in them in the group of clauses *insanus is qui* " which he says are nearly always Subjunctive. The Subjunctive in them he thinks is due to the idea of result present and the consecutive force. We have seen that the *qui* clauses of result or those with a strong consecutive force are very rare in Terence. They are not quite so much so in Plautus. This theory will doubtless have to hold till something better is suggested. Of the type "*insanus is qui*" these cases occur.

1. Fortunatu's *qui isto animo sies*. Ad.852.
2. Satin sanus's *qui me id rogites?* And. 749.
3. Sed ego stultior meis dictis *qui parere hanc postulem*. Hec.564.
4. ^s *fatuc sapere est qui ubi quomque opus sit animum possit flectere*. Hec.608.
5. Iniquos es *qui me tacere de re tanta postules*. H.T.1011.

Of those exclamatory in form we have 6 only 1 is Subjunctive.

1. O Fortunatum istum eunuchum qui quidem in hanc

detur domum. Eum.365.

2. O fortunissime Antipho quoi quod amas domist!

Ph. 504.

3. O scelestum Parmenonem, qui istum huc adduxit!

Eum.944.

4. Festivom caput, qui ignominias sibi post putavit esse prae meo commodo. Ad.262.

5. Heu me miserum qui tuom animum ex animo spectavi meo ! And. 646.

6. Me miseram quae nunc quam ob rem accuser nescio. Hec.205.

One clause occurs with video.

1. Tu mihi---videre fortunatus-- quoi de integro est potestas -- consulendi quod velis. Ph. 174.

A clause of this type occurs with quom, which I will give. Bonus es quom haec existumas. Ad.897. 35

Indicative causal and adversative clauses appear and

24 Subjunctive ones aside from those above. Of the

Subjunctive ones 12 can clearly be explained as

attraction or indirect discourse. The other 11 are.

1. Et quidem , ere, nos iam dudum hic te absentem

incursamus qui abieris. Ph.471.

2. Ego autem, quae essem anus deserta, egnas, ignota, ut potui, nuptum viginem locavi huic adolescenti. Ph. 751.

3. Ego illam (Tristitiam) hercle vero omitto qui quidem te habeam fratrem.

4. Mihi qui id dedissem consilium egit gratias. Ad. 368.

5. Nam in me plane di potestatem suam omnem ostendere quoi tam subito tot congruerint commoda. Eum. 1033.

6. Non potui quo quemquam plus amem aut plus ligam eo feci; sed ita erat res faciendum fuit. Eun.96.

7. Miseret tui me qui hunc tantum hominem facias inimicum tibi. Eun.802.

8. Egon qui ab orco mortuom me reducem in lucem feceris sinam sine munere a me abire? Hec.852.

9. Facis adeo indigne iniuriam illi qui non abstineas manum. H.T.565.

10. O mi Syre, audisti obsecro? quid ni ? qui usque una adfuerim. H.T. 684.

11. Hic me magnifice exfero, qui vim tantam in me et potestatem habeam tantae astutiae vera dicendo ut eos ambos fallam. H.T.710.

Two other sentences occur in which both Indicative and Subjunctive are present.

1. Quid commemorem primum aut laudem maxime? illumne qui mihi dedit consilium ut facerem aut me qui id ausus sim incipere, an fortunam conlaudem quae gubernatrix fuit. Eun.1045.

2. Ut. illum di deaque senium perdant qui me hodie remoratus est; meque adeo qui restiterim; tum autem qui illum flocci fecerim. Eun.302.

One sentence has ut qui.

Ita tum discedo ab illo ut qui se filiam neget daturum. And.148.

The relative clauses with dignus, indignus, etc. are very probably volitive in origin and force as Mr. Bennett has shown in his Syntax of Early Latin. Those that occur in Terence are-

1. Sane pol illa temulentast mulier et temeraria nec satis digna quoi committas primo partu mulierem. And. 230.
2. Dignam me putas quam inludas. H.T.741.
3. Adfines qui illum decrerunt dignum suos quoi liberos committerent. Hec.212.
4. Sed quando sese esse indignam deputat matri meae quae concedat eiusque mores toleret sua modestia, neque alio pacto componi potest. Hec.478.
5. (Est) adeo digna res (est) ubi tu nervos intendas tuos. Eun.312.
6. Nam si ego digna hac contumelia sum maxume, at tu indignus qui faceres tamen. Eun.866.
7. Nil est Thaide hac, frater, tua dignius guod ametur Eun.1052.
- 8 (Dicat) Et Magis esse illum idoneum qui ipsi sit familiarior. Phor.721.
9. Nequeo mearum rerum initium ullum invenire idoneum

unde exordiar narrare quae accidunt. Hec.362.

10. Adeon videmur vobis esse idonei in quibus sic
inludatis? And.758.

11. Itane tandem idoneus tibi videor esse quem
tam aperte fallere incipias dolis? And.493.

There are a few types of clauses that in the introduction to this paper I said I would treat of. These are the clauses "nihil habeo quod det", "nulla causa est cur" and "quod sciam". So far I have only spoken slightly of them in connection with the grammars but now I will present what is said of the first 2 types by Mr. Tenny Frank and of the last by Mr. Hale. The first type "nihil habeo quod det". Mr. Frank has discussed in an article in the Classical Philology Magazine Vol.2. No.2 April 1907 under the heading "The Semantics of Modal Constructions." In this article Mr. Frank refutes the idea that these clauses are potential by showing that there is no independent Latin potential. The potential idea he says does not come from the verb or its mood but from the question of helplessness or introductory particles. Vix and facile always carry the potential idea with them. He proves that this feeling can be expressed as easily with the Indicative as the subjunctive. The verb standing alone he says is never interpreted as potential. By a comparison with Greek

and Sanskrit he shows that in these languages there is no independent potential but this force always lies in the context or particles. The mood is that of an ideal condition.

Secondly Mr. Frank shows that these clauses are not characterizing. Those may be Indicative the habeo quod clauses never can be. The character they express as a consequence of the nature of the antecedent is not expressed as an existing fact but rather as possible. The quod of these clauses is usually objective. In characterizing clauses it is never so save when the action of the verb is not purely momentary or physical in the present time.

Lastly Mr. Frank thinks these clauses have their origin in purpose clauses. Purpose expressions fall into expressions of character and capacity. An imperative in the main clause gives a strong tone of intention, but as the intention in the main verb shades off, and it changes into a tense and voice that make it a mere expression of the existence or non-existence of an effective agent, the relative clause shifts from the

tone of a purpose into that of a potential expression. Whether Mr. Frank has really proved that there is no Latin Potential I will not discuss here but will present the Terence examples, letting his theory stand as proved.

1. Non multum habet quod det fortasse? Phor.145.
2. Si concordabis cum illa, habebis quae tuam senectutem oblectet. Phor. 433.
3. Nullum invenire prologum posset novos quem diceret nisi haberet cui male diceret. Phor.15.
4. Habet haec ei quod, dum vivat usque ad aurem obganniat. Phor. 1030.
5. Domi habuit unde disceret. Ad.413.
6. Facturum credo ut habeas quicum cantites. Ad.750.
7. Miseram me, neminem habeo, nec quem ad obstetricem mittam nec qui arcessat Aeschinim. Ad. 292.
8. Ni metuam patrem, habeo pro illa re illum quod moneam probe. And. 918.
9. (Amicae) quoi quod respondeam nil habeo. H.T.224.
10. Mane habeo aliud, si istuc metuis, ambo quod fateamini sine periculo esse. H.T.338.
11. Num quid habeo quod contemnas? Eun.475.
12. Nam hercle nemo posset, sat scio, qui haberet

qui pararet alum, humc perpeti. Eun.488.

13. Spero me habere qui hunc meo excruciem modo,
Eun.920.

14. Principio et habet quod det et det nemo largius. Eun. 1078.

1. Est ubi vos ulciscar probe. Ph. 989.

2. Nullum invenire prologum posset novos quem
diceret nisi - Ph.15.

3. Neque quod daretur quicquam, id curarant patres.
Ph. 84.

4. Nam si esset unde id fieret faceremus. Ad.106.

5. Et dis gratia, est unde haec fiant et adhuc non
molesta sunt. Ad.122.

6. Tum quod dem ei, "recte" est. H.T.228.

7. Aliquid reperiret, fingeret fallacias unde esset
adulescenti amicae quod daret. H.T.534.

8. Defunctus sum, nil est quod dicat mihi. Eun.15.

9. Quod des paulumst et necessest multum accipere-
Eun. 1075.

10. Quos perconter video, saluete. And.800.

11. Facite, fingite, invenite, efficite qui detur
tibi. And.334.

12. Repperi qui det neque lacrumet. Ph. 522.

13. Vis amare, vis potiri, vis quod des illi
effici. H.T.322.

14. Repperisti tibi quod placeat an non? H.T.596.

The following sentence is distinct, habeo=scio.

1. Teneo quod erret et quid agam habeo. And.498.

The clauses of the type "nil est quod dem" in which quod is adverbially used, Mr. Frank discusses in another article in the Classical Philology Magazine Vol.3. No.1. He shows that this idiom of obligation and propriety is not supported by similar ones in cognate languages. They have idioms similar in function but not at all in form. Mr. Frank rejects the idea of there being a force of the Subjunctive in Latin expressing obligation. He explains the origin of each type of the idiom separately and shows that the idea of obligation comes from the form of expressions; the Subjunctive is hypothetical. I will merely present the Terence examples here without discussion.

1. Nam nil est illic quod moremur diutius. H.T.834.
2. Tam hoc aliud est quod Gaudeamus. Eun.1041.
3. Nunc ego eam,- multae sunt causae quam ob rem cupio abducere. Eun.145.
4. Nil propter hanc rem, sed est quod suscenset tibi, And.448.
5. Nam iam adulescenti nihil est quod suscenseam Ph.361.

6. Sed demiror quid sit quam ob rem tanto opere omnis nos celare colueris. Hec. 530.
7. Nam ei causa alia quae fuit quam ob rem abs te abiret. Hec.695-6.
8. Credo edepol te non nil mirari Bacchis, quid sit quapropter te huc foras puerum evocare iussi. Hec.731-2
9. Est magnam ecastor gratiam de istac re quod tibi habeam. Hec.741.
10. Atqui nihil fecit, patre, quod suscenseas. Ph. 263.
11. Ego in hac re nil reperio quam ob rem lauder tanto opere. Ad.592.
12. Invenerit aliquam causam quam ob rem eiciat oppido. And. 382.
13. Nam iam diu aliquam causam quaerebat senex quam ob rem insigne aliquid faceret eis: nunc reperit. Eun.1001.
14. Nam est quod me transire ad forum iam oportet. Hec. 273.
15. Quam causam dicam patri quam ob rem non redducam? Hec.453.

16. Nil satis firmi video quam ob rem accipere hunc mi expediat metum H.T.337.

17. Inventast causa qua te expellerent. H.T.989. quin.

1. Si est--non causam dico quin quod meritus sit ferat. Ph.272.

2. Quid causa est quin hinc in pistrinum recta proficiscar via? And.600.

3. Ego rus abiturum ---me esse -- decrevi -- ne me a praesentia obstet neu causa ulla restet quin tua Philumena ad te redeat. Hec.588.

To show the development of the expression quid est quod I will give the following examples.

1. Mane quid est quod tam a nobis graviter crepuerunt fores? H.T. 613.

2. Si rogem iam quid est quod peccem aut quam ob rem hoc facias nescias. H.T.1008.

3. Quid quod te oro? Ad.253.

4. Me miseram quid namst quod sic video timidum ---- Getam? Ad.305.

5. Quid est quod trepidas? Eun.978.

6. Chaerea quid est quod sic gestis? Eun.558.

7. Quid est quod laetus ea? Eun.559.

Mr. Hale treats of the "quod sciam" clauses by themselves in a short article in the "Transactions of the American Philological Association Vol. XXII. 1891." He gives the two explanations for them first that the mood is due to the analogy of restrictive clauses with qui quidem. He says if he may trust his collection the restrictive clause does not occur in early Latin while quod sciam occurs frequently. Therefore the older construction cannot owe its origin to the later. Second, the mood is more generally explained as potential. Such an explanation is forced and the determinative Indicative clause might be expected if the sentence is so interpreted, "as regards that which I perhaps know" and "so far as that which I know is concerned." Accordingly Mr. Hale infers that the mood here is due to some process of association. By a collection of examples he has found that 11 are after negative antecedents, 2 after tantum and 2 after positive

antecedents. These figures include both Plautus and Terence. From these figures then it is easy to believe that the mood came in from its use after negative antecedents. Such clauses as "quod ad me attinet he says do not occur naturally after negative antecedents. The qui quidem construction he treats as of consecutive origin.

The following I have classed as restrictive clauses.

1. Non equidem istas (pepuli) quod sciam. Ad. 641.
2. Nam numquam ante hunc diem meis oculis eam, quod nossem, videram, Hec. 863.
3. Utinam quidem quod cum salute eius fiat, ita se defetigarit velim ut--e lecto nequeat surgere. Ad. 519.
4. Quaeso hercle ut liceat pace quod fiat tua dare huic quae volumus convenire et conloqui. Eun. 466.
5. Et quod dicendum hic siet tu quoque perparce nimium; non laudo. And. 454.

The sentence "At quem virum! quem ego viderim in vita optimum. Ph. 367" is hard to interpret as to the real meaning of its Subjunctive.

Clauses such as "Is mihi suadet nuptias quantum queam ut maturem. And.577". occur rather commonly. While these are not true Subjunctive restrictive clauses (their Subjunctive is attraction) they may have had some influence.

This paper has served its purpose in giving a brief discussion of a few types of clauses and following this up with examples from the one author Terence. These examples we have seen have strongly supported Mr. Hale's theory. However several points are left without an entirely satisfactory explanation; for instance- how the Subjunctive came to be used in the "insanus eat qui" clauses when relative result clauses that would seem to have influenced it are so rare. Again we can never feel just satisfied in regard to the passage from a feeling of ideal certainty to that of actuality. How the Roman felt in regard to this we never can tell. Perhaps someday though a solution may be found for the first question if not for this last.