

not regarded in its connections with other facts, whether as their cause or their consequence, nor as dependent on any man's veracity or knowledge. It makes no difference whether a clause be the principal clause in a sentence or a minor clause; its verb so long as it expresses a fact of this character will stand in the indicative mood. For this reason the phrase "subordinate clause" as a reason why a verb is found in the subjunctive mood is most misleading and incorrect. The verb of a "subordinate" clause (in the natural sense of the word, *i.e.*, a "minor" clause,) may be in the indicative, for such a clause may be quite independent of the main clause, though of minor importance.

For example, "They administered the State." *Rempublicam administrabant* here is an independent fact standing by itself and expressed by the indicative. This is clear enough. Now alter to "Those who administered the State were dishonest."

(*li*) *qui rempublicam administrabant improbi erant*.

The clause in which the verb "*administrabant*" stands is a minor or subordinate clause; but the verb is still in the indicative mood, because the fact of "administration" is regarded as independent of the other fact of dishonesty; and independent also of any particular person's opinions or assertions.

The test, therefore, for the use of the subjunctive mood is not the "subordination" of the clause but the dependence of the fact which it expresses. The trouble has arisen from the different meanings attached to the word "subordinate."

Once more, keeping almost the same words but altering their significance, we may say, "The other, who was a politician, was dishonest," meaning now that the fact of administration was not independent of the other fact of dishonesty, but was the cause (or result) of it: he was dishonest because he was in politics (or, he was dishonest and therefore he engaged in politics).

The subordinate clause, "who was a politician," is now dependent on the other clause, "was dishonest," and the mood will be the subjunctive.

Ille—qui rempublicam administraret, improbus erat.

No doubt, be it marked, is thrown on the fact of administration; the administration is a fact as before; but it is no longer regarded as an independent fact, rather as bound up with the further fact of dishonesty. If it were convenient to always insert inverted commas wherever the sense implies them, and to alter the order accordingly, we might print

Ille erat "improbus qui rempublicam administraret."

He "being a politician was dishonest."

So in Virgil, *Æneid* VI., 590-591—
*Demens qui nimbos et non imitabile fulmen,
Ære et cornipedum pulsū simularet equorum.*

"Fool to mimic the storm-cloud and the portentous thunderbolt with the tramp of horn-hoofed horses on a bridge of brass."

The mimicry here was a fact, but not a fact regarded as standing alone, rather as giving the reason for the epithet "*demens*," "fool to mimic," etc.

So in the familiar but difficult "*sunt qui putent*," "*erant qui putarent*," the subjunctives express facts conceived as consequences of causes tacitly implied—persons are (or were) found to think; there are (or were) persons of such character that they think (or thought); in short, the words are equivalent to "*quidam tales (or ii) sunt ut putent*," "*qui=ii (or tales) ut*," some persons have that temperament and habit of mind that they (necessarily) think, etc. Where there is no such notion of cause and consequence, where the verb following the "*qui*" expresses a fact regarded as independent of any implied cause, there is no need for the subjunctive.

Thus in Virgil, *Georgic* IV., 165.

Sunt quibus ad portas cecidit custodia sorti.

The last word, "*sorti*," shows that the selection of some bees as gate-keepers is arbitrary; the poet does not say that "some bees are so endowed by nature that they are especially serviceable as gate-keepers," but simply that "there are some bees appointed to keep guard;" the appointment is a fact independent of their qualities.