

# Characterizing Clauses

by Georgia Madge Woodhead

*1907*

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

Master Theses

Latin

Woodhead, G. Madge 1907

"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 "eis ostendam potissimum qui duxerunt" the determining clauses, essential with indefinite antecedents, must be omitted. II "sicut portae exent qui res Romanas scribunt Md. IX 25" These are generalizing clauses, and may be turned into a conditional sentence still retaining the original meaning. Sometimes such clauses are found in the subjunctive. 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. and B. 52/16 with a sentence like this "cuius - veniant Md. L XVIII 5-4. For further discussion of this see the general criticism of the grammars and the treatment of the origin.

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

Volitive characterizing clauses.

Mago locum monstrabit quem insidiatu Divy 21, 54, 3. The "quem insidiatu" is

Hand B.

579. 2.

virtually a command.

Obligation or propriety characterizing clauses like *Livianae fabulae morisatis dignae quae iterum legantur* C. Brut. 18.71.

These are also found following words like *aptus, idoneus* when used in the predicate.

Optative characterizing clauses

*Hoc erat in votis: modo agri --*

*hortus -- et paulum silvae super*

*his foret* Horace Satires 6. 1

Potential Characterizing clauses

*nihil erat quo famem tolerarent*

B. G. 128. 3

*unum angustum et difficile*

*vix qua singuli carri ducerentur* B. G. 16. 1

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 classification and arrangement. I have divided them in four great classes and these include all essential clauses save the determining clause, and the generalizing.

If the subjunctive is used in clauses which give the result of qualities expressed by *is, talis, tam* or *adeo* + 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. 39. 122

2 tam desertam quo -- non fama pervaserit M.D. <sup>44</sup> XL

3 innocentia est affectio talis animi quae noceat  
nemini C. 7. W. 3. 8

4. Genus est bellii eiusmodi quod -- debeat M.D. II 6

5 Ego is sum qui nihil unquam meo potius  
quam meorum civium causa fecerim <sup>C. 7am 5, 20</sup>

6 non longius hostes aberant quam quo telum  
adici posset. B. G. 2. 21

7. si quem habetis qui --- superare non posse M.D. <sup>XIII 66</sup>

8. nemo est tam senex qui non putet C. de Sen <sup>132</sup>

9. nemo est tam fortis quin rei novitate perturbetur  
B. G. VI 39.

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 tempestates quae continerent B. G. IV 34. 4

2 in ea tempora natus es quibus -- expediat <sup>fac. Ann. 16</sup>

3 classis ea, cui consul --- praepositus esset

M. D. XII 33

4 et turres toto opere circumdedit quae pedes

LXXX inter se distarent B. G. 7. 72 - 4

5 si aliquis eum deducit ubi sit futurus

C. de Sen XIX

II The subjunctive is used in clauses equivalent  
to a complex adj and joined to an adjective  
or substantive by a coordinating conjunction  
audax et coetus possit quae ferre  
Juvenal 6, 3-99

III The subjunctive is used in clauses following expressions of existence and non existence restricting the subject or in equivalent expressions, the objects.

a. with positive expressions, *si multi sunt, aliae sunt, quaedam sunt, sunt qui, habui qui reliqui sunt, si quis est qui etc.*

1. *fuit antea tempus cum Germanos Galli virtute superarent B. G. 6.24.1.*
  2. *aliae causae sunt quae plane efficiant C. Off. 15.*
  3. *quaedam sunt etiam, quae putentur C. de natura deorum 1.37.103*
  4. *multi fuerunt -- removerint 7. C. Off. 1.20.69*
  5. *sunt qui -- dicant Cat 2.6.12*
  6. *consecrati dies pauci -- per quas liceret C. Sest. 34.94.*
  7. *supersunt qui de philosophia scripserunt Quintilian 10.1.123*
  8. *Innumerabilia sunt ex quibus effici cogique possit nihil esse quod sensum habeat quin ad intereat C. Nat. Deo 3.13.34.*
  9. *Haec habui, de senectute quae dicerem, Cic Sen 23.85*
  10. *Legi enim audivique munnulos quorum propemodum absolute concluderetur oratio C. Or. 51.171.*
  11. *reliqui sunt qui mortui sunt*
  12. *nunc si quis est qui hoc dicat aut sic cogitet Thomio (Trol 12).*
- Note, In affirmative expressions of this

kind the indicative is often found, quite frequently after subjects which may be partially definite in the speaker's mind (See onique).

The indicative is especially found after *quidam, unus, multi, alii* etc

1. *Sunt autem multi* -- qui eripiunt alios -- *Off. 1.1.43*
2. *unum etiam est, quod me maxime*  
*perturbat cui loco --- videor posse. Cluen. 135*
3. *Sunt quaedam quae* -- non possum dicere <sup>Phil. 2.19.47</sup>
4. *Tum autem sunt alii qui te roturium*  
*vocant. Plant. Trin 101.*

b. after negative expressions,

1. *neminem vidi qui numero sciret*  
*Ribb. Scaen 1s 14 Dittmar 110*
2. *servus est nemo* -- qui non audaciam  
*civium perhorrescat C. Cat 48.*
3. *reperitus est nemo, qui non mori*  
*diceret satius esse Verr. II 88*
4. *nullus Ephesi quin sciat Pl. Bacc 336*
5. *nec defuere qui eodem modo oppeterent*  
*Sac. Ann. 4.50. 4.*

c. after questions implying a negative answer.

1. *Quid est, quod tibi mea ars efficere*  
*hoc possit amplius? Andria Ter. 30*
2. *Quis navigavit* -- *committeret? M. L. XI 31*
3. *Quis homost qui dicat me dixisse istuc*  
*Plant Bacc 807.*
4. *Quid est quod possit M. L. XI 29*
5. *Quid genus belli esse potest in quo* -- *exercuorid*  
*M. L. X 28.*

IV. Clauses completing restrictive words or expressions like unus meaning the only one, solus pauci meaning <sup>only</sup> a few, primus etc.

1. Att. Ain tandem? unane est solum dissentio?  
M. Quae quidem ad rem pertineat una quippe quom antiqui omne quod secundam naturam esset quo vivaremur in vita bonum esse decreverint L. 20. 54.
2. Una est enim amicitia in rebus humanis de civis utilitate omnes uno ore consentient. Lael. 23. 82
3. Unus adhuc fuit post conditam Romam conditam cui res publica totam se traderet temporibus et malis coacta domesticis L. Sulla Verres III 81.
4. unus fuit affinis sociis necessariis Sex. Naevius qui cum ipse ultro deberet quasi eximio praemio sceleris exposito cupidissime contenderet Quinct. 74.
5. Quoniam hic locus est unus quem tibi cum Caesare communem esse dicas Vatin. 15
6. Fratrem erat unus, qui suo squalore vestros oculos inflecteret; qui suo flectu desiderium mei memoriamque renovaret Quir. 8.
7. Sapientia enim est una quae

by. accounted for  
by (quasi).



maestitiam pellat ex animis, quae nos  
ex hoc rescare metu non serviat C. F. I 13 4 3

8. Hic locus igitur est unus quo perfugiant  
hic portus haec arx haec ara sociorum  
Verr. I 126

9. Nam haec est propria natura animi  
atque vis quae si est una ex omnibus  
quae se ipsa (semper) movent neque  
mota certe est et aeterna J. I 54.

10. Homo unus omnium qui nodum  
huius erroris exsolvere posset in potestate  
sua est, Niphus Livy 40-55

11. Unus inventus est, qui id auderet  
quod omnium fugisset ut reformid-  
asset audacia Cic 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  
Cat. III 22

13. Ex his unus mihi testis est producendus  
qui pecuniam datam dicat. 2. Rosc. #2

14. Rapiunt eum ad supplicium  
de patrii quos iste unus unus  
inventus est qui et e complexu  
parentum abreptos filios ad necem  
duceret et parentes pretium pro  
sepultura liberum posceret  
Verr. 1-7.

15. Ex quibus ut de antiquis semine  
loquar, Colophonis Xenophones

unus qui deos esse diceret divinationem  
funditus sustulit h I 3-5.

16. Tu ergo unus scelerati inventus  
qui cum auctor regni esses eum  
que quem collegam habebas  
dominium habere velles. Phil II 86.

17. Atque ita in his rebus unus est  
solus inventus qui ab hac  
tam impensa voluntate bonorum  
palam dissideret Sest 130.

18. Hanc ob amentiam in discordiis  
nostris de quibus ipsis his prodig-  
is recentibus a deo immortalibus  
admonemur arreptus est unus  
ex patriciis cui tribuno pl. fieri  
non liceret Har. Resp. 44.

19. Hic qui in collegio sacerdotum esset  
primus post Romanam iudicio publico  
est condemnatus Cic Brut. 33. 127.

Muscopied.  
Les Indes.

20. Sed pauca quae meum animum  
repente moverunt prae de L.  
Murenae fortuna conqueras  
Murena 55.

21. Nunc enim sunt pauci illi quidem  
sed tamen plures qui ita  
loquantur Phil II 16.

22. Invenit Archatagus paucos qui  
vellent accipere Verr IV 53

23. Sed quoniam significatio vestra  
satis declarat quid hac de re sentia-  
tis ad litteras veniam, quae sunt

a consulibus et a praetore missae  
si pauca ante quae ad ipsos litteras  
pertineant dixerit Phil. XIV 6.

24. Neque pauci neque leues sunt qui  
se daco soles vidisse dicant Rep. I 15

25. Consecuti dies pauci omnino  
Januario mense per quos senatum  
habere liceret Sest 74.

26. Solus hic homost, qui sciat divinitus  
Persius V 2.2.

27. Solus es Caesar in cuius victoria nemo  
cecederit C. Dei 12.34.

28. Excludit eum solum cui prope dicam  
soli potestatem factam oportebat Verr. 142

29. Sacrilego poena est neque ei soli  
qui sacrum abstulerit sed etiam  
ei qui sacro commendatum Leg II 42.

30. visis non omnibus adiungebat  
fidem sed iis solum quae prope  
quandam haberent declarationem  
Ac 1.41.

31. beatam vitam eam solam (appellat)  
quae cum virtute degatur 7 II 60

32. Non faciam iudices; omnia  
vetera praetermittam duo sola  
recentia sine cuiusquam in-  
fama ponam ex quibus con-  
iecturam facere de omnibus  
possitis Verr V 34

33. solus est hic qui nunquam  
rationes ad aerarium referat  
Verr. a. pr. 98.

34 quoniam ex tota provincia  
soli sunt qui te salvum velint  
Verr. II Bk IV 150

Unde is adverbial  
but really relative).

35 Itaque hoc adhuc oppidum Verres  
invenit prope solum in orbe Ferrarum  
unde nihil eiusmodi rerum de  
publico per vim nihil occulte --  
nihil pretio posset auferre Verr. II 88

36. Quod si -- voluptas autem est sola  
quae nos vocet ad se et alliciat  
de Fin I 54

37. Quamvis audax ut alia obliviscas,  
hinc omnes intellegere potuerunt  
quod ex tota societate hoc est ex  
tot sicariis solus tu inventus  
es qui cum accusatoribus sederes,  
atque os tuum non modo ostenderes  
sed etiam offeres. Sex Rosc 87

38 solus enim tu inventus es  
cui non satis fuerit corrigere  
testamenta vivorum nisi etiam  
rescindere mortuorum Verr. II Bk IV

39 Causa est haec inventa sola in  
qua omnes sentirent unum  
atque idem Cat. IV 14.

a. Where some such word is implied  
Morini et Menapii superarent  
qui in armis essent B. G. III 28. 2.  
In this example solus must  
be implied. The Morini and  
Menapii were the only ones

who remained in arms.

This list is complete as far 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 invenio 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 solus or is primus used in works of a more elevated character. This is suggested by the fact that more of the is est solus qui type appear in the Reden than 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 <sup>words</sup> in relative clauses with <sup>principis and kindred</sup> solus. This distinction 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 kind who etc." and in such a sentence the subjunctive is used.

The examples following these same words *solus unus* 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 *pauci*.

1. *Exponit suas copias omnis . . . . non pauca etiam pocula ex auro quae -- gemenis erant distincta. Verres IV 62*
2. *Quaeso vobis ut haec pauca quae restant ita audiatis Sex Rosc. 129.*
3. *praeter paucos qui propter societatem furtorum tuorum nihil omnino dederunt Verres III 42*
4. *Sed pauca quae meum animum repente moverunt ferius de L. Murenae fortuna conquerar Murena 55*
5. *Sunt impii cives . . . . admodum pauci quorum opprimendorum di immortales incredibilem rei publicae potestatem et fortunam dederunt. Phil III 36*
6. *Pauca quae ad huius causa reiuncta sunt respondebo. Cluent 149*
7. *Lycurgus γέροντας Laedaemone appellavit nimis is quidem paucos XXVIII quos peries summam concilii voluit esse.*  
*Har. Rep. II 50*
8. *pauci ordinis senatorii qui se cum his coniuras erant nocte fuga*

salutem petierunt B. G. III 97.

9. #. oppidum munitum faucibus  
diebus quibus eo ventum erat, expugnatum  
cognoberant B. G. III 23.

10. #. pauci qui ex fuga evaserant  
reliquerunt B. G. III 19-4.

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.

1. unum erat quod mihi vitiosum  
videbatur quod tanta ex frequentia  
inveniri nemo potuit Agr. L. II 13.

2. An cum patres conscripti illo senatus  
consulto quod in monumento mari  
factum est quo mea solus omnibus  
est gentibus commendata uni Cn. Plancio  
gratias egerint: cui senatus pro me  
gratias agendas putavit. ei ego a me  
referendam gratiam non putem Planc 78.

3. \* Trater erat unus - - - qui - - -  
flecteret, qui - - - renovaret: qui statuerat  
Quirites se vos me tibi ad Quir 8.

4. \* Est enim unum maximum totius  
Sardiniae frumentarium crimen  
de quo trearius omnis Sardos interro-  
gavit quod genus uno testimonio  
fordere et consensu omnium est  
confirmatum Scaur 2.

5. \* De epistulas complures attulerat  
in his unam domo, quae totum  
mutaret hominem Veru II 64.

6. Unum etiam est quod me maxime  
perturbat, cui loco respondere vix  
videor posse. Cluen 135

7. Unum hic sumo quod mihi apertum  
(See next page)

scium scelus resque manifesta dat. S. Rosc 97

9. servulum unum quem iste pre-  
benderat abducit Quin 27

10. Omnibus sententiis praeter unam  
quam suam staremus esse dicebat  
Scamander prima actione condemnatus  
est. Cluen 55

11. Recte igitur unus invictus es, a quo  
ipsius victoriae condicio usque deducta  
est. Marcellus 12.

12. Quorum uni sunt Athenienses quae  
gens Ionum habebatur, Aeolis alteri Hores  
tertii nominabantur Flacc. 64.

13. Tibi uni pateris qui ita a puero  
vixeras Phil II 86

14. Unus legatus P. Ladius qui erat  
reliquis non ita multum secum fuit. Verr II 49

15. Itaque ille unus dies quo die me  
populus Romanus a parta in Capitolium  
atque unde domum sua celebritate  
laetitiaque comitatum honestavit. Homo 76.

16. Non numquam etiam libertus Timar-  
chides adhibebatur, mulieres autem  
nuptae nobiles praeter unam mimi  
Isidori filiam quam iste propter  
amorem ab Rhodio tibicine abduxerat.  
Verr V 81

17. duo solo recentia sine cuiusquam  
infamia ponam -- unum illud quod  
ita fuit industrie notumque omnibus  
Verr V 34.

18. Una atque eadem nox erat qua fractor  
amoris turpissimae flamma classis  
populi Romani praedonum incendio  
conflagravit Verr. V 92.

Examples of unus with the Indicative  
in the "Schriften".

1. Sed omnium una regula est  
quam tibi cupio esse notissimum  
O. III 20-81

2. Est enim unum vis quo devincta  
est hominum societas et quod lex  
constituit una Lael. I 15. 42.

3. Motu unius eiusdemque naturae  
quae (sidera) velocissime movebantur

4. Restat unum genus reprehens-  
orum quibus Academiae ratio non  
probatur Agr III 3. 7.

5. Princeps Thales unum e septem  
cui sex reliquos concessisse primas  
ferunt ex aqua dixit constare  
omnia Ac. 37-118.

6. Utrum igitur inquit percurri  
omnem Epicuri disciplinam placeat  
an de una voluptate quaeri  
de qua omne certamen est Fin 1. 28

7. Atque si emolumentus non  
suapte vi virtus ex petitur una  
erit virtus quae malitia rectissime  
dicetur Lael I 8. 44

8. Vos ex his tam dissimilibus rebus  
non modo nomen unum (nam id  
(see next page)

facilius pateret) sed etiam rem  
unam ex duabus facere conamini  
quod fieri nullo modo potest. Fin II 7-20.

11. Novem tibi orbis vel potius globis  
conexa sunt omnia quorum unus  
ut caelistic extumus qui reliquos  
omnes complectitur R. VI - 17.

12 Ita fit ut duo genera propter se  
ex petendorum reperiantur unum  
quod est in iis in quibus completur  
illud extremam. Fin II 23. 68.

13. Si una virtus unum istud  
quod honestum appellas rectum  
laudabile decorum Fin III 4-14.

## Examples of solus with indicative

1. Neque enim illae sunt solae virtutes imperatoris quae vulgo existimantur De Impi 29.
2. Solum igitur quod se ipsum movet quia nunquam ne moveri quidem desunt 7 1. 53.
3. iis solis consulunt quos bona ratione donavit De nat. deo. III 70
4. Utrum id solum videtur esse actum quod est tamen actam VII 67.
5. Etenim recuperatores non ea sola vis est quae corpus nostrum vitamque perverit sed etiam multo maior ea quae periculo mortis iniecto formidine animum perturbatum loco saepe et certo de statu demovet  
Caecin 42
6. Permanet illi soli atque omnia rei publicae causa perferunt qui sunt Sest 101.
7. Inveni duos solos libellos a L. Canuleia missos sociis ex portu Syracusis in quibus erat scripta  
Verr. II 182.
8. Ut enim consuetudo loquitur id solum dicitur honestum quod est populari fama gloriosum  
Fin II 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 includes 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. Lane whose treatment of the characterizing subjunctive is most satisfactory in that it includes most of the clauses cited above makes no attempt at a general statement but gives what we agree are two types, first, those after *I am* is etc which are equivalent to *it result* clauses, second those clauses after expressions of existence

Benn. 283.1

and nonexistence. It is however impossible to tell whether those 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 bars to the determining and generalizing clauses and fails to include the type "sunt qui putent" or the subjunctive of actuality. In his statement he uses the word 'essential' to describe these clauses but this word is meaningless 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 qui dicant" necessarily meant "there



are people who would say. "In other words they recognise 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 sort who does something" and in his next statement says that it follows expressions like *sunt qui* etc, flatly contradicting his former statement.

Bennett, Allen and Greenough and Koby 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 continued his discussion by saying that characterizing clauses are opposed to those <sup>relative</sup> 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 ~~of~~ must 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 'is qui' which could be followed only by a generalizing, or determining clause. 'Is est que' 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 quin = qui non save after general negatives. One could come to this conclusion after studying examples.

given for in each case they are negative. He 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 aberant quam quo telum adigi posset" there is a strong result feeling present. Then from a study of many such examples we find the result idea always prominent. He unites the ut 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 these types

1. Etenim talis est vir, ut nulla res tanta sit et tam difficilis quam ille non --- conficere possit M.D. XX 59

These are clauses with tam + an adj.

2. sunt tempestates quae continerent B. G. 34. B. I. line 4. In such clauses an introductory word like talis etc. is implied

3. Morini et Menapii superarunt qui in arma essent B. G. III 28. 2. Where some such introductory word as solus is implied.

4. Also the unus and solus clauses

of this type. "Nemo unus omnium  
sui modum exsolvere posset in  
Potestate tua est Xyclus. Livy 40-55.

In these ~~unus~~ 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 Hale's treatment. His 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 char-  
acteristic 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 putent" there are people who think Cic. Tuscl. Disp 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 undistinguishable from statements of fact. The statement is made that the subjunctive of result comes from its use in the clauses of characteristic. This is more usually considered to be twin developments.

In paragraph 535 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 *solum*. Division c includes *quam* ut which never introduces a characterizing clause but always a clause of real result.

The arrangement of characterizing clauses in Lane's 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 II and III are sentences of characteristic. He omits the type of clauses following *tam* + and adj. and comparatives with *quam*. All others he included and in a general way his treatment is quite satisfactory. Two very good points in his treatment are: 1. that he includes with his expressions of existence and non existence equivalent expressions such as *nihil habeo*, *neminem vidi* and similar expressions. II that he recognizes the fact that although the subjunctive is regular after affirmative expressions of existence and non existence often the indicative is found.

Harkness 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 and form. This is not true and they cannot be included in the same statement. The great and fundamental mistake in Harkness 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 would or the ideal certainty.

Roby's 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 subj so called spread into 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 subj) 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 *sunt qui putent* "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 eusmodi* 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 <sup>book</sup> ~~work~~ 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 recognise 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.

IV These clauses completing restrictive words and expressions like *unus* meaning the only one *solus 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 *quam* 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 ideal certainty and actuality. This treatment can be sharply criticised from one standpoint alone. To a student in the high school or really any beginner 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 his

change of terminology. If all schools and text books used the same terminology (that is doing away with the name 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 "quod sciām" clauses. Hale and Buck place them with characterizing clauses, Harkness, Gildersleeve, Allen and Greenough and Bennett treat them similarly while Lane and Roby give them a distinct treatment as a separate type. It seems that this expression became set and is entirely restrictive

In tracing the origin of the clauses known as characteristic we must recognise 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 thro' 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* <sup>tam bonus</sup> *terret* and *Sunt tam boni qui* <sup>te</sup> *terret* would consider it

but a natural step to the same use of the subjunctive in a sentence like *Nemo est qui terret*. 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 subj. ceased to spread here before it invaded the whole province of the indicative after such expressions. The primal 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 then 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 actuality. 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 emenerim et legerim*

*Cic Brut 17. 65*

*Eorum quos viderim longe princeps*  
*Topponius Secundus Quint 10. 1. 98.*  
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 <sup>enimmodi</sup> is, talis, tam or adeo + an ady and comparatives with quam.

Note talis - qualis tantus quantus are excluded for they do not express result.

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

III Those clauses following expressions of existence and non-existence

List of expressions pauci sunt qui aliae sunt qui, quaedam sunt qui, multi sunt qui, ~~habes~~ habes qui, supersunt qui, deliqui sunt qui, repertus est nemo. servus nemo est qui nullus est qui neminem vidi etc.

Note Often in affirmative expressions of this kind the *vid* is found when antecedent

is partially definite in the mind of the speaker.

It shows clauses completing restrictive words and expressions like unus meaning the only one solus pauci and primum.

University of Kansas Libraries



3 3838 100532038