

C

PASCAL



Dep	Mod	Ran	Sect	Shelf	Tray	Item
P	2	04	10	20	04	009

PASCAL

378.188B
B81



University of Colorado at Boulder



U18303 9969710

C

378.788B

1381

PASCAL



Dep	Mod	Ran	Sect	Shelf	Tray	Item
P	2	04	10	20	04	009

THESIS
CONDITIONAL
SENTENCES
IN THE
LATER
LYRIC
POETS

BROWN

PASCAL

378-710
22531
378.788B
B81



The subject of this paper suggested itself to me in the course of my work on the Latin lyric poets. It is a subject which has not been treated in any of the books on Latin syntax which I have consulted. It is a subject which is of great importance to the student of Latin, and one which is not properly treated in any of the books on Latin syntax which I have consulted. It is a subject which is of great importance to the student of Latin, and one which is not properly treated in any of the books on Latin syntax which I have consulted.

It is a subject which is of great importance to the student of Latin, and one which is not properly treated in any of the books on Latin syntax which I have consulted. It is a subject which is of great importance to the student of Latin, and one which is not properly treated in any of the books on Latin syntax which I have consulted.

CONDITIONAL SENTENCES IN THE LATIN LYRIC POETS.

In a number of cases I cannot hope that all forms have been included or that all are correctly classified, but I trust the errors are few and not serious.

The tabulation is made under the following heads:

1. The subjunctive in both clauses of the conditional sentence.

1. Indicative in both clauses of the conditional sentence.
2. Subjunctive in both clauses of the conditional sentence.
3. Imperative in both clauses of the conditional sentence.

Jessie P. Brown
University of Colorado
Boulder
Colorado

The subject of this paper suggested itself to me by the freedom and divergence seen in the uses of conditional forms in the lyric poets. That there should be the greatest range and diversity might naturally be expected, but one is not prepared for the richness and variety which a careful tabulation reveals. Propertius, as one might expect, is found to revel in unusual turns of conditional expression, but the other three are not less widely heterodox.

Of necessity, from the scope of the paper, it is largely a tabulation, but the tabulation conveys its own results. I have refrained from comment on particular cases where it was possible to do so, preferring to let the classification speak for itself. A consideration of many of even the best annotated editions of these authors compels me to state that most of the difficulties raised about conditional sentences are due to desire to reduce them to a rigid system. In almost no case has there been found any difficulty that does not disappear on assigning to the form in question a perfectly normal force as to mood and tense. This I have noted particularly in connection with the so-called mixed sentences!

In a number of cases I cannot hope that all forms have been included or that all are correctly classified, but I trust the omissions and errors are not serious.

The tabulation is made under the following heads.

Note. The subheadings follow the different tenses.

- A. Indicative in both apodosis and protasis.
- B. Subjunctive in both apodosis and protasis.
- C. Imperative in apodosis and indicative in protasis.

D. Mixed conditions where the subjunctive is explained on some other basis than the conditional force.

- I. Jussive.
- II. Hortatory.
- III. Optative.
- IV. Rhetorical Question.
- V. Protasis a Temporal Clause.
- VI. Obligation.
- VII. Nedum.

E. Mixed sentences where both clauses have purely conditional force.

F. Cases where protasis is expressed without si.

- I. a. Imperative or jussive force in protasis, resumed by sic;
b. resumed without sic.
- II. Clauses of Proviso.
- III. Quin si non.
- IV. Apodosis represented by Quid.

G. Conditional relatives.

H. Indirect Narration.

J. Virtual Indirect Narration.

K. So-called suppressed Apodosis.

Notes:
C = Catullus (Müller)
H = Horace (Scherer) (Shorey)
Y = Tibullus (Müller)
P = Propertius (Paley)

The only example of this use is found as follows:

Sive hospes, pariativo tua regina sub aula

Des tibi non humilis prodita Roma venit. P.V. 4, 85-86.

and even in this example the venit has the force of a future tense, the present being used to express the imminence of the result.

A. I. Present indicative in both apodosis and protasis.

This, the most ordinary form of the conditional sentence, naturally occurs most often, no fewer than eighty-two (82) times.

Ridetque si mortalis ultra

Pas trepidat.

H. III, 29, 31-32.

The other examples are to be found in the following places:

C. 14, 8; C. 16, 7-10; C. 23, 13; C. 35, 11-12; C. 39, 4-5; C. 42, 45;
C. 42, 13-15; C. 51, 1-2; C. 55, 1; C. 55, 21-22; C. 62, 39;
C. 68 B, 107; C. 76, 1-5; C. 90, 3-4; C. 96, 1-5; C. 98, 1-2;
C. 107, 1-2; H. I, 1, 31-34; H. I, 3, 15-16; H. I, 6, 19-20; H. I, 15,
24-25; H. I, 22, 1-9; H. II, 14, 5-7; H. II, 17, 5-6; H. II, 17, 17-22;
H. III, 6, 29-32; H. III, 15, 7-8; H. III, 18, 5-8; H. III, 24, 33-40;
H. III, 29, 31-32; H. III, 29, 53-54; H. IV, 2, 9-20; H. IV, 3, 24;
H. IV, 9, 5-8; Y. I, 1, 11-12; Y. I, 2, 17-18; Y. I, 8, 61; Y. II, 3, 74;
Y. III, 1, 5-6; Y. III, 1, 25-26; Y. III, 4, 73-74; Y. IV, 1, 43-44;
Y. IV, 1, 15-16; Y. IV, 2, 9-12; Y. IV, 5, 5-6; P. I, 2, 26; P. I, 9, 26;
P. II, 1, 11-12; P. II, 1, 47; P. II, 1, 49-50; P. II, 6, 25; P. II, 8, 40;
P. II, 9, 35-36; P. III, 4, 9-10; P. III, 6, 12; P. III, 9, 30;
P. III, 12, 19-20; P. III, 13, 45-46; P. III, 16, 32; P. III, 17, 24;
P. III, 20, 34; P. III, 22, 31-32; P. III, 24, 43-44; P. III, 26, 5-2;
P. IV, 8, 13-16; P. IV, 8, 23-26; P. IV, 11, 12; P. IV, 107, 21;
P. IV, 22, 5-17; P. IV, 24, 19; P. V, 3, 1-2; P. V, 3, 30;
P. V, 6, 34; P. V, 6, 5-2; P. V, 7, 71-72.

A. I. 2. Present indicative in apodosis, future indicative in protasis.

The only example of this use is found as follows:

Sive hospes, pariamve tua regina sub aula

Dos tibi non humilis prodita Roma venit. P. V, 4, 55-56.

and even in this example the venit has the force of a future tense, the present being used to express the imminence of the result.

A. I. 3. Present indicative in apodosis, perfect indicative in protasis.

Much more common is the use, in twenty (20) different places, of a perfect protasis along with a present apodosis.

e.g. Si ad rei ventum est

Subsellium, cum orator excitat fletum,

Renidet ille.

C. 39, 2-4.

In C. 30, 13 Si tu oblitus est, at dii meminere, meminit Fides the perfect in the apodosis has really the force of the present.

The other places where this use may be found are:

H. I, 1-6-9; H. I, 9, 25-28; H. I, 13, 9-12; H. I, 23, 5-9;
H. III, 14, 21-25; Y. I, 9, 19-20; Y. II, 4, 5-; Y. IV, 2, 9-11; (2)
Y. IV, 2, 11; P. I, 10, 23-24; P. I, 12, 17-18; P. II, 1, 5-8;
P. II, 1, 15-17; P. II, 6, 11; P. III, 22, 34-35; P. IV, 2, 15;
P. IV, 11, 47-49; P. IV, 3, 5-9-60; P. V, 7, 41-42;
P. V, 11, 29-30.

It might be noted that in these examples the perfect has the force of either the true perfect, or the regular aoristic force, or even sometimes, as in the following example, the gnomic force of the aorist.

Divitiis captus si quis violavit amorem,

Aspera quest illi difficilisque Venus. Y.

A. I. 4. Pres. indic. in apodosis, fut. perf. indic. in protasis.

e. g. (1) Nec deprecor iam, si nefaria scripta

Sesti recepso

C. 44, 18.

(2) Nec sitim pellit, nisi causa morbi

Fugerit venis

H. II, 2, 14-15.

Also: P. I, 6, 44; P. III, 4, 15-16; P. III, 9, 31-32;
P. III, 22, 11-12; P. V, 7, 103-105; P. V, 7, 71; P. V, 6, 13

5

This use in the protasis indicates that the action is fully completed, or state fully brought about, before the time of the main verb. It is rather curious that more examples of this are found than of the use of the simple future in the protasis, with the present indicative in apodosis. There are eight (8) examples of the future perfect, and only one (1) of the simple future.

A. II. 1. Imperfect indicative in both clauses.

Of the imperfect indicative in both clauses, one of the so-called normal types given by the grammarians, we have not a single example; and, indeed, there are only five (5) examples of its use in the apodosis, along with other tenses in the hypothetical clause. This curious fact raises the question whether the appearance in prose literature of the pure type is as frequent compared with its appearance beside some other tenses.

A. II. 2. Imperf. indic. in apodosis, pluperf. indic. in protasis.

a. Sive iactatam religarat udo

Litore navim,

Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi

Semper haerentem puerum canebat H. I, 32, 7-10.

b. Quid mihi, si fueras miseros laesurus amores,

Foedera per divos, clam violanda, dabas? T. I, 9, 1-2.

c. Quae si forte aliquid vultu mihi dura negarat,

Frigida de tota fronte cadegat aqua. P. III, 13, 11-13

d. Hic placatus erat, seu quis libaverat uvam,

Seu dederat sanctae spicea sorta comae: T. I, 10, 21-22.

That the apodosis has clearly the feeling of the imperfect tense is shown by the context, the next line running:

Atque aliquis voti compos liba ipse ferebat

In these cases, (a), (c), and (d) have the force of indefinite frequency so often found in the pluperfect tense. In (b) the periphrastic form is noteworthy. "If you had been about to bruise." It is quite possible that in this also several occasions are referred to.

A. III. 1. Future indic. in apodosis, future indic. in protasis.

This is a normal type of the future condition, and naturally we might expect it to occur as often as it does, in the twenty-five (25) places in which we find it.

e.g. Quare, si sapiet, viam vorabit C. 35, 7.

See also: C. 66, 73-75; H. III, 9, 11-12; H. III, 9, 15-16;
A. III, 21, 21-24; H. IV, 2, 45-46; Y. I, 4, 5-2; Y. I, 4, 27;
Y. II, 4, 43; Y. II, 6, 3-4; Y. IV, 1, 25-27; P. I, 6, 35-36;
P. I, 11, 25-26; P. II, 3, 43-44; P. II, 1, 65-66;
P. III, 15, 10; P. III, 14, 24; P. III, 17, 9-10; P. III, 20, 42;
P. III, 22, 25; P. III, 26, 41-42; P. IV, 7, 64;
P. IV, 21, 33-34; P. V, 32; P. V, 3, 3-6

A. III. 2. Simple future in the apodosis, fut. perf. in the protasis.

Exactly as common as the simple future in both clauses are the cases of the future perfect in the protasis, expressing an action or state which is to be completed some time in the future before the action or state expressed by the main verb.

e.g. Cenabis bene, mi Fabulle, apud me

Si tecum attuleris bonam atque magnam

Cenam,

C. 13, 1 & 3.

The remaining instances are in the following passages:

C. 13, 14-17; H. I, 12, 53-57; H. III, 23, 7-7; 4. IV, 4, 21-22; P. I, 1, 37-38; P. I, 5, 25-26; P. I, 7, 15-22; P. I, 11, 19-20; P. I, 15, 27-28; P. II, 5, 10; P. III, 3, 21; P. III, 6, 5-6; P. III, 19, 15-; P. III, 20, 25-26; P. III, 22, 4-6; P. IV, 6, 41-42; P. IV, 16, 7-8; P. IV, 17, 13-15; P. IV, 23, 21; P. V, 5, 31.

In this class there come up instances where the apodosis is not formally expressed as the future indicative, but where the future notion is perfectly clear.

e.g. Audax, ah nimium nostro dolitura periclo,

Si quid forte tibi durius inciderit! P. I, 15, 27-28.

And,

Compescit unda, scilicet omnibus,

Quicumque terrae munere vescimur,

Enaviganda, sive reges

Sive inopes erimus coloni. H. II, 14, 9-13.

In C. 14, 17-20 the "si luxerit" is equivalent to "cum luxerit."

Nam, si luxerit, ad librariorum

Curram scriinia, Caesios, Aquinos,

Suffenum, omnia colligam venena,

Ac de te his suppliciis remunerabor.

In one case the "si" is omitted, thereby giving a touch of vividness to the line.

Attigeris, labentur opes

T. I, 6, 53.

A. III. 3. Future indic. in apodosis, present indic. in protasis.

This is the converse of A. I. 3. and is much more common, being found in twenty-one (21) places. The protasis in nearly every case expresses a present situation, on the continuance of the truth of which the statement made in the protasis depends. Horace seems to have been particularly fond of this form. The frequency of its occurrence is worthy of notice.

A. IV. e.g. Si figit adamantinos

Summis verticibus dira Necessitas

Clavos, non animum metu,

Non mortis laqueis expedies caput. H. III, 24, 5-8.

See also: C. 13, 2; C. 13, 10; C. 68 A. 31-32;

H. I, 1, 35-36; H. I, 16, 3-4; H. II, 6, 9-11;

H. II, 10, 17; H. III, 1, 41-47; H. III, 5, 31-32;

H. III, 17, 9-12; H. III, 24, 5-8; H. IV, 1, 11-12;

H. IV, 12, 14-16; Y. I, 8, 77-78; Y. III, 1, 19;

Y. IV, 1, 205-210; P. I, 5, 9-10; P. I, 6, 31-34;

P. I, 18, 19; P. III, 1, 17-18; P. IV, 6, 31-32.

A. III. 4. Future indic. in apodosis, perf. indic. in protasis.

This rather rare combination of tenses seems to have been used by the lyric poets when they wished to express that the action or state of the protasis must be over and done with, before the future action or state can begin.

e.g.(a) Si quicquam tacito commissum est fido ab amico

Mecum esse invenies illorum iure sacratum

C. 102, 1-3.

(b) Ut melius quidquid erit pati,

Seu pleures hiemes seu tribuit Iuppiter ultimam.

H. I, 11, 3-4.

(c) Sive (vidi sc.) illam Cois fulgentem incedere coccis,

Hoc totum e Coa veste volumen erit.

P. II, 1, 5-6.

(d) Sic hodie veniet, si qua negavit heri.

P. III, 5, 20.

A. IV. 1. Perfect indic. in apodosis, perfect indic. in protasis.

As in the case of the imperfect indicative in both clauses, the small number of times—only three (3)—in which we find the perfect used in both clauses makes us wonder if this type is so common as we have often been led to suppose.

e.g.(a) Immunis aram si tetigit manus,

Non sumptuosa blandior hostia

Mollivit aversos Penates

H. III, 23, 17-19.

(b) At si forte eadem est ulmo coniuncta marito,

Multi illam agricolae, multi accolluere iuveni:

C. 62, 54-55.

In these cases the perfect has clearly the gnomic force, in the following example the perfect has the feeling of the true perfect.

Nec si quid olim lusit Anacreon

Delevit aetas;

H. IV, 9, 9-10.

y. with (a)+(b) C. 62, 54-55; H. IV, 9, 9-10

A. IV. 2. Perfect indic. in apodosis, present indic. in protasis.

The present indicative in the protasis expresses, as a rule, a present situation, while the perfect has either the aoristic or the true perfect force.

In the following the regular aorist force is seen in the perfect tense:

O funde noster seu Sabine seu Tiburs

Sed seu Sabine sive verius Tiburs,

Fui libenter in tua suburbana

Villa malamque pectore expuli tussim, C. 44, 1 & 5-7.

In C. 56, 7-8

hunc ego, si placet Dionae,

Pro telo rigida mea cecidi.

the perfect has the pure aorist feeling. It is worthy of notice that the present has a peculiar force. The protasis does not express a pure condition, but is merely parenthetical.

A pure aorist also is the perfect in P. I, 22, 3-10.

Si Perusina tibi patriae sunt nota sepulchra,

Proxima subposito contingens Umbria campo

Me genuit, terris fertilis uberibus.

and in the following:

Sin aliquam vultusque meus saetaeque leonis

Terrent, et Libyco sole perusta coma,

Idem ego Sidonia feci servilia palla

Officia, et Lydo pensa diurno colo; P. V, 9, 45-48.

The true perfect force is felt in P. III, 26, 83-84.

Nec minor his animis, aut si minor, ore canorus

Anseris indocto carmine cessit olor.

and also in H. I, 3, 21-24.

Nequiquam deus abscidit

Prudens Oceano dissociabili

Terras, si tamen impiae

Non tangenda rates transiliunt vada.

~~cf. C. 44, 1-3; C. 5-6, 7-8; P. I, 22, 3-10; P. III, 26, 83-84; P. IV, 3, 1-3~~

IV. 3. Perfect indic. in apodosis, future indic. in protasis.

In this isolated use the truth of a happening in the past is made to depend upon the fulfilling of some act in the future.

Quam nisi defendes, murorum Romulus augur

Ire Palatinas non bene vidit aves. P. V, 6, 43-44.

(3) The purely future use of the perfect indicative appears in twelve (12) cases, though in one of these the present subjunctive in the apodosis must be explained on some other basis.

Nec, velit insidiis alius ab insidiis velles,

Dum placeam, unum totum fore coactum. P. I, 4, 48

where the subjunctive "necesse" has clearly a passive force.

The examples of the form

Quem si quis videt, velle ut non spernit notat,

Torna minus Pyliis arceat addula fovea.

P. IV, 3, 33-34

occur as follows:

B. I. 1. Present subjunct. in apodosis, present subjunct. in protasis.

The present subjunctive in both clauses has two forces:

(1) Where both clauses refer to some action or state of the present time, which is unfulfilled.

(2) Where both clauses distinctly refer to future time.

Of (1) there are ten (10) examples.

e.g. (a) Si quis me sinat usque basiare

Usque ad milia basiem trecenta.

(b) Ter si resurgat murus aeneus

Auctore Phoebo, ter pereat meis

Excisus Argivis, ter uxor

Capta virum puerosque ploret. H. III, 3, 65-68.

and also: C, 6, 13-14; C. 48, 4-5; H. I, 13, 12-15; H. I, 24, 13-15; H. II, 2, 9-13; H. III, 3, 65-68; Y. IV, 1, 197-199; P. III, 18, 23; P. IV, 15, 22.

(2) The purely future use of the present subjunctive appears in twelve (12) cases, though in one of these the present subjunctive in the apodosis must be explained on some other basis.

Nec, velit insidiis altas si claudere valles,

Dum placeas, umeri retia ferre negent. T. I, 4, 49-50.

Where the subjunctive "negent" has clearly a jussive force.

The examples of the form

Quem si quis videat vetus ut non fregerit aetas,

Terna minus Pyliae miretur saecula famae.

T. IV, 1, 111-112

occur as follows:

(a) C. 75, 3-4; C. 98, 3; H. III, 16, 37; H. III, 27, 4

(b) Y. I, 6, 71-73; Y. IV, 1, 45; Y. IV, 1, 100-101; Y. IV,

P. II, 9, 49-50; P. V, 5, 47-48 from the poet.

B. I. 2. Present subjunct. in apodosis, imperf. subjunct. in protasis.

This form of the conditional sentence is the converse of B. II. 2., and in this case also there is no strict differentiation of the tenses.

e.g.(a) Quid faciam, nisi et ipse fores in amore puellae?
T. I, 9, 39.

(b) Quod si certa meos sequerentur funera casus,
Talis mors pretio vel sit emenda mihi.
P. IV, 16, 21-22.

In this latter example, "sit emenda" cannot be distinguished from esset emenda. This raises the question whether the lyric poets did not use the present subjunctive in one of the common forces of the imperfect. It is impossible to distinguish between the force of this sentence and some of the sentences in B. I. 1.

e.g. Quod si Threicio blandius Orpheo
Auditam moderere arboribus fidem,

(b) Non vanae redeat sanguis imagini, H. I, 24, 13-15.
where the feeling is manifestly that of present time, contrary to fact.

B. I. 3. Present subjunct. in apodosis, perfect subjunct. in protasis.

Of this there is only one example, and here the tense in the protasis has the feeling of the true perfect, while the subjunctive in the apodosis is due to the optative force.

B. II. 1. Imperf. subjunct. in apodosis, imperf. subjunct. in protasis.

This form of the conditional sentence may have reference:

(a) To a situation in the past.

(b) To an unfulfilled action or state in the present, which is sometimes a situation continued to the present from the past.

of (a) there is only one example.

Quid foret Iliac

Mavortisque puer, si taciturnitas

Obstaret meritis invida Romuli? H. IV, 8, 22-23.

But in P. IV, 7, 43-45 there is a mixture of the two meanings,

Quod si contentus patrio bove verteret agros,

Verbaque duxisset pondus habere mea,

Viveret ante suos dulcis conviva Penates,

where the protasis refers to the duration of an act in the past, and the ~~present~~ apodosis to a present unfulfilled state.

The use of the imperfect and pluperfect in conjunction raises the query whether in the conditional sentences referring to past time, as in the indicative, the imperfect does not indicate a situation and the pluperfect an aoristic feeling. In this case, at least, the statement would hold true

(b) There are fourteen (14) cases of sentences formed like the following, where both clauses refer to unfulfilled present time.

Si nostri oblita taceret,

Sana esset:

C. 83, 3-4.

C. 14, 1-3; C. 21, 9; C. 39, 10-15; C. 104, 3;
H. II, 5, 21-22; H. III, 10, 1-4; P. II, 7, 15-16;
P. III, 6, 41-42; P. III, 11, 19-20; P. III, 15, 5-
P. III, 17, 35-36; P. IV, 8, 35-36; P. IV, 14, 33-34.

B. II. 2. Imperf. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

In the five (5) cases where this form occurs, the present of the protasis has the force of a present unfulfilled condition, in other words, the tenses are used without differentiation.

e.g. (a) Non custos si fingar ille Cretum,
Non si Pegaseo ferar volatu,

Defessus tamen omnibus medullis

Essem te mihi, amice, quareitando. C. 55, 23-32.

(b) Quod tu si manibus teras fricesque,
Non unquam digitum inquinare possis. C. 23, 22-23.

(c) Nei sint inlepidae atque inelegantes,
Velles dicere, nec tacere posses. C. 6, 2-3.

(d) Nostri si parvula cura
Sit tibi, quanta libet, si sit modo, non mihi regna
Lydia, non magni potior sit fama Gylippi,

Posse Meleteas nec malle vincere chartas. T. IV, 1, 197-200.

(e) Et faceret, si non aera repulsa sonent. T. I, 8, 22.

B. II. 3. Imperf. subjunct. in apodosis, pluperf. subjunct. in protasis.

This combination of tenses, wherein the apodosis refers to an unfulfilled action or state in the present and the protasis to an unfulfilled action or state in the past, is a little more common, as it is found in eight (8) different places.

e.g. Ulla si iuris tibi peierati
Poena, Barine, nocuisset unquam,
Dente si nigro fieres vel uno
Turpior ungui,
Crederem.

In this case, we have in the protasis both an example of the

pluperfect used with the aoristic force and the imperfect expressing a past situation, or perhaps "fieres" here may be a past situation continued to the present.

$\frac{1}{2}$ H. IV, 6, 17-22 ; P. I, 17, 19-21 ; P. II, 1, 17-21 ;
 P. III, 18, 13-14 ; P. III, 26, 11-12 ; P. IV, 7, 44-45 ;
 P. V, 9, 43-46 .

B. III. 1. Pluperf. subjunct in apodosis, pluperf. subjunct. in protasis.

It is most remarkable that there occurs only one case of this form of the conditional sentence. As in the case of the imperfect and perfect indicative, the query rises, whether the so-called normal type is as common as it has commonly been represented to be.

Cui si longaevae minuisset fata senectae
 Gallicus Iliacis miles in aggeribus,
 Non ille Antilochi vidisset corpus humari,
 P. III, 4, 47-49.

B. III. 2. Pluperf. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. subjuncti in protasis.

In this case the present subjunctive has the force of an unfulfilled condition, with the same temporal feeling as is seen in the present indicative, expressing a general truth.

e.g. carmina ni sint,

Ex unero Pelopis non nituisset ebur. T. I, 4, 63-64.

C. I. 1. Pres. imperative in apodosis, pres. indic. in protasis.

As might be expected we run across many sentences of this type.

Descende caelo et dic age tibia
Regina longum Calliope melos,
Seu voce nunc mavis acuta,
Seu fidibus citharaque Phoebi. H. III, 4, 1-4.

The other twenty-six (26) examples occur as follows:

C. 36, 17 ; C. 76, 17-19 ; C. 82, 1-4 ; C. 103, 3 ; H. I, 7, 17-20 ;
H. I, 14, 15-16 ; H. II, 3, 1-8 ; H. III, 2, 2-7 ; H. III, 27, 61-63 ;
H. IV, 12, 21-22 ; Y. II, 4, 15 ; Y. II, 4, 20 ;
Y. III, 4, 77 ; Y. IV, 2, 2 ; Y. IV, 3, 1-2 ; Y. IV, 5, 9-10 ;
Y. IV, 5, 11-12 ; P. I, 9, 33 ; P. III, 3, 18 ; P. 7, 7 ;
P. III, 13, 42 ; P. III, 20, 41 ; P. IV, 6, 7 ; P. V, 4, 5-6-58 ;
P. V, 5, 21-22 ; P. V, 8, 73-74 .

The very frequent occurrence of the imperative in one form and another would perhaps suggest that the imperative lends itself to forcible and vivid expression. Thus we might expect to find it more in the poets than in prose literature.

C. I. 2. Pres. imperative in apodosis, future indic. in protasis.

e.g. (a) Vel si caeruleas puppi volet ire per undas,
Ipse levem remo per freta pelle ratem. T. I, 4, 45-46.

(b) Vivite felices, memores et vivite nostri,
Sive erimus, T. III, 5, 31-32.

(c) Si te forte nec ducet via proxima busto,
Esseda caelatis siste Britannia iugis, P. II, 1, 75-76.

See also: C. 11-2-16 ; Y. I, 6, 21-22 ; P. I, 20, 8-11 ;
P. III, 4, 39-40 ; P. V, 11, 79 .

18
C. I. 3. Pres. imperat. in apodosis, fut. perf. indic. in protasis.

e.g. (a) Aequam memento rebus in arduis

Servare mentem,

Seu maestus omni tempore vixeris, H. II, 3, 1-5.

(b) Seu tamen adversum mutarit ianua lectum,

Sederit et nostro tanta noverca toro,

Coniugium, pueri, laudate et ferte paternum;

P. V, 11, 85-87.

(c) Seu memor ille mea contentus manserit umbra,

Et tanti cineres duxerit esse meos,

Discite venturam iam nunc sentire senectam,

P. V, 11, 91-93.

In these examples, C. I. 2. and C. I. 3., the present imperative is used in conjunction with the future and future perfect indicative. These cases offer an interesting illustration of the fact that the present imperative, strictly speaking, has a future force.

C. I. 4. Pres. imperative in apodosis, perf. indic. in protasis.

e.g. (a) Si quid vacui sub umbra

Iusinus tecum, quod et nunc in annum

Vivat et plures, age dic Latinum,

Barbite, carmen,

H. I, 32, 1-4.

(b) Quod si fatales iam nunc explevimus annos,

Fae lapis inscriptis stet super ossa notis:

T. I, 3, 53-54.

In sentences of this type the command is made to depend upon

the complete fulfillment of some action in the past.

cf. C. 76, 17-19; H. III, 14, 17-20; Y. I, 3, 53-54; P. I, 17, 27;
P. III, 9, 4; P. III, 24, 61-62; P. IV, 6, 35-36

19
C. II. 1. Future imperative in apodosis, pres. indic. in protasis.

Coming to the future imperative in the apodosis, we find a variety of constructions in the protasis. With present indicative in the protasis this form is the converse of C. I. 2.

e.g. (a) si forte meo tramite quaeris evem;

Et me Pana tibi comitem de rupe vocato,

P. IV, 13, 44-45.

(b) capa tura libens votisque faveto,

Si modo, cum de me cogitat, ille calet.

T. IV, 5, 9-10.

It is worthy of note that in the apodosis the present and future imperative are used with exactly the same force.

C. II. 2. Future imperative in apodosis, future indic. in protasis.

e.g. (a) Verum, si quid ages, statim iubeto; C. 32, 9.

(b) Si per invisum mora ianitorem

Fiet, abito.

H. III, 14, 23-24.

(c) Et me Pana tibi comitem de rupe vocato,

Sive petes calamo praemia, sive cane.

P. IV, 13, 45-46.

C. II. 3. Future imperative in apodosis, perf. indic. in protasis.

e.g. Si quid vidisti, semper vidisse negato; P. III, 9, 3.

The protasis here has a generalizing force, and in the apodosis "negato" has no future feeling at all.

C. II. 4. Fut. imperat. in apodosis, fut. perf. indic. in protasis.

e.g. (a) Quod tibi si sancti concesserit incola Itoni,

Tum vero facito

C. 64, 228-231.

(b) Et si iusseris illud, adiuvato,

C. 32, 4.

Compare with this B. III. 2.

D. Mixed sentences where the subjunctive is to be explained on some other basis than the conditional force.

D. I. Jussive. (Note. The sentences of this type might logically be connected with the preceding imperatives, but for the sake of the formal classification, they are put under a separate head.

1. Present subjunct. in apodosis, pres. indic. in protasis.

In these sentences the subjunctive has the regular jussive force.

e.g. (a) Si te Eoa, Doryxenium, iuvat aurea ripa,

Seu quae palmiferae mittunt venalia Thebae,

Sperne fidem, provolve deos, mendacia vincant,
P. V, 5, 21-27.

In the apodosis the imperative and subjunctive are both used, the only difference being that the latter is a less peremptory command.

(b) Prodeas, nova nupta, si

Iam videtur, et audias

Nostra verba.

C. 61, 92-94.

C. 76, 16; H. I, 2, 30-36; H. I, 2, 41-45; Y. II, 3, 5-10;
Y. III, 6, 25-26; Y. III, 3, 35-37; Y. III, 4, 13-16; Y. III, 6,
11-12; P. I, 6, 12; P. II, 3, 41-42; P. III, 11, 16; P. III, 20, 50;
P. IV, 16, 24; P. IV, 12, 15; P. V, 6, 1-2; P. V, 7, 53-54; P. VI, 11,
19-20; P. VI, 11, 27-28.

D. I. 2. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, future indic. in protasis.

Of the type:

Si quaeret urbium

Subscribi statuis, indomitam audeat

Refrenare licentiam,

H. III, 24, 27-28.

A very interesting example of the present subjunctive in prohibitions comes up in T. I, 4, 15-16.

Sed ne te capiant, primo si forte negabit,

Taedia;

Compare also:

Y. III, 4, 11-12; Y. IV, 7, 5-6; P. II, 4, 17;
P. III, 14, 12; P. III, 16, 9; P. IV, 11, 71-72; P. V, 1, 65-66;
P. V, 4, 45-46;

D. I. 3. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, fut. perf. indic. in protasis.

e.g. (a) Sed tamen hic pulcher vendat cum gente Catullum,

Si tria notorum savia reppererit. C. 79, 3-4.

(b) Si quis et imprudens aspexerit, occulat ille

Perque deos omnes se meminisse neget: T. I, 2, 37-38.

D. I. 4. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, perfect indic. in protasis.

e.g. (a) Rumpat et serpens iter institutum,

Si per obliquum similis sagittae

Terruit mannos: H. III, 27, 5-7.

(b) Et mala si qua tibi dixit dementia nostra,

Ignoscas: T. I, 2, 11-12.

Compare: C. 15, 3-5; Y. IV, 4, 14-15; Y. III, 4, 62;

Y. IV, 1, 79-81;

D. II. Hortatory.

1. Present subjunct. in apodosis, present indic. in protasis.

e.g. ~~Lesbia ne dispaream nisi amat.~~

~~verum dispaream nisi amo.~~

e.g. Summi materiem mali,

Mittamus, scelerum si bene paenitet. H. III, 24, 49-50.

Compare C. 42, 16-17.

22-
D. III. Optative.

1. Present subjunct. in apodosis, present indic. in protasis.
e.g.(a) Si quis haec audis, utinam inter errem

Nuda leones!

H. III, 27, 51-52.

The protasis is not an actual condition, but rather parenthetical in meaning.

- (b) Acer Amor, fractas utinam tua tela sagittas,
Si licet, extinctas aspiciamque faces.

The protasis has the same force as (a).

Compare: C. 457, 3-7; C. 92, 44; P. III, 12, 9-10;
P. III, 15-15'.

- D. III. 2. Present subjunct. in apodosis, future indic. in protasis.

Quod si forte aliqua nobis mutabere culpa,

Vestibulum iaceam mortuus ante tuum. P. III, 5, 31-32.

- D. III. 3. Present subjunct. in apodosis, perfect indic. in protasis.

Atque utinam, si forte pios eduximus annos,

Ille vir in medio fiat amore lapsus! P. II, 9, 47-48.

- D. IV. Rhetorical question in the apodosis.

Miramur, nobis et Baccho et Apolline dextro,

Turba puellarum si mea verba colit? P. IV, 2, 7-8.

- D. V. Ideal Certainty.

Pres. subjunctive in apodosis, perf. indic. in protasis.

Non ego, si merui, dubitem procumbere templis

T. I, 2, 83.

- D. VI. Perf. indicative in apodosis, imperf. subjunct. in protasis.

Note. The protasis in both of these cases is really a temporal clause.

e.g.(a) Nec violenta suo consumpsit more Charybdis,
Vel si sublimis fluctu consurgeret imo,
Vel si interrupto nudaret gurgite pontum.
T. IV, 1, 73-75.

(b) Cimmerion etiam obscuras accessit ad arces,
Quis numquam candente dies adparuit ortu,
Seu supra terras Phoebus seu currebat infra:
T. IV, 1, 64-66.

D. VII. Perf. indic. in apodosis, pluperf. subjunct. in protasis.
Si piguit portas ultra procedere, at illuc
Iussisses, lectum lentius ire meum.
P. V, 7, 29-30.

D. VIII. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, perf. subjunct. in protasis.
Nedum, si levibus fuerit collata figuris,
Inferior duro iudice turpis eat. P. I, 4, 9-10.

The explanation of the subjunctive in the apodosis most probably lies in the "nedum", as Propertius has been using the vivid future indicative in the preceding lines. "Fuerit" in the protasis might easily be the future perfect indicative, or it may be attracted to the mood of the "eat".

D. IX. Perf. indic. in apodosis, perf. subjunct. in protasis.
Invenit opus verbaque non sibi parva
Excessive tantum exilis et levitas.
P. II, 1, 19-20.

This exceedingly rare combination may be accounted for in the protasis taken its form from the habit of view of the subject of exordium. The verb appeared in the text with special emphasis and the tense and mood was changed for greater vividness in present subjunctive.

24
E. Mixed sentences where the sentences have purely the conditional force.

Note. In all these cases the subjunctive and indicative have their ordinary forces of mood and tense, and practically no difficulty occurs in the explanation of any of them, if this is borne in mind. Accordingly, I have not appended explanations in many cases where they would otherwise have been required.

E. I. 1. Pres, indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

e.g.(a) Non est meum, si rugiat Africis

Malus procellis,

H. III, 29, 57-58.

(b) At si pro dulci reditu quaecumque voventur,

Audiat aversa non meus aure deus,

Nec me regna iuvant nec Lydius aurifer amnis

T. III, 3, 27-29.

C. XVII, 23 (If, as is possible, poet in v. 24 = present).

C. 106, 13; H. I, 4, 11-12; H. II, 2, 1-4; H. III, 24, 75-6-57;

H. IV, 3, 19-20; Y. III, 3, 11-12; Y. IV, 1, 3-7; H. IV, 1, 172-174;

P. I, 18, 3-4; P. II, 5, 16; P. III, 22, 11; P. IV, 45-46;

P. III, 7, 32-36

E. I. 2. Pres. indic. in apodosis, perf. subjunct. in protasis.

Si fuerint castae, redeunt in colla parentum,

P. V, 8, 13.

E. II. 1. Imperf. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Exornabat opus verbis seu blanda pererrat

Saxosamve terat sedula culpa viam.

P. V, 5, 19-20.

This exceedingly rare combination may be accounted for thus: The protasis takes its form from the point of view of the subject of exornabat, "The witch dressed up her work with specious words", and the tense and mood are changed for greater vividness into the present subjunctive.

E. III. Future indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

The frequency with which these two tenses occur together is really noteworthy.

note the indic. Si ~~fr~~^qetus inlabatur orbis, to make the situation

realistic Impavidum ferient ruinae. H. III, 3, 7-8.

> for other examples see next page (at bottom)

E. IV. Perf. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Sed pretium si grande feras, custodia victast.

T. II, 4, 33.

The present subjunctive has the regular future force, while the perfect indicative expresses extreme vividness: "The grim

guardian has already conquered."

E. V. I. Pluperf. indic. in apodosis, pluperf. subjunct. in protasis.

(a) Me truncus inlapsus cerebro

(b) Sustulerat, nisi Faunus ictum

Dextra levasset,

H. II, 17, 27-29.

(b) Inclusam Danaen turris aenea

Robustaeque fores et vigilum canum

E. VI. 2. Tristes excubiae munierant satis indic. in protasis.

Nocturnis ab adulteris,

Si non Acrisium virginis abditae

Custodem pavidum Iuppiter et Venus

Risissent:

H. III, 16, 1-7.

Conditional sentences of this type are usually explained on the assumption that something is omitted; e.g. in (b) The doors, etc., had fortified Danae, and would have fortified her sufficiently had not, etc. But this certainly cannot apply to the former of the two examples, where the indicative is manifestly intended

to put the picture strongly before the reader as an actually realized fact. In the latter, however, the "satis" does introduce a new element, which suggests the ordinary explanation; but even here the indicative is manifestly intended to make the situation realistic.

E. V. 2. Fut. perf. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

neque

Si chartae sileant quod bene feceris

Mercedem tuleris.

H. IV, 8, 20-22.

E. VI. 1. Pres, imperative in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

(a) Parcite luminibus, seu vir seu femina fiat

Obvia:

T. I, 2, 33-34.

(b) Quin etiam sedes iubeat si vendere avitas,

Ite sub imperium sub titulumque, Lares.

T. II, 4, 53-54.

And also Y. III, 5, 31-32.

E. VI. 2. Future imperative in apodosis, perf. indic. in protasis.

Si quid vidisti, semper vidisse negato;

P. III, 9, 3.

E. III Compare - H. II, 17, 14-15; Y. III, 6, 5-9 + 61; Y. IV, 1, 46-47; Y. I, 6, 3; Y. IV, 1, 207-210; Y. IV, 1, 201-203; P. II, 1, 5-17 + 5-6; P. III, 1, 5-6; P. III, 14, 29-30; P. III, 14, 5-7-5-8; P. III, 22, 3-6; P. V, 2, 37

F. Under this head will come cases where the protasis is expressed without "si".



I. Imperative or jussive in protasis.

A. Sic resuming the protasis.

In all sentences of this type a jussive or optative expression is used in the protasis, followed by the apodosis in the future indicative or present subjunctive. The "sic" in the apodosis resumes the condition.

F. I. A. 1.a. Put. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Displaceas aliis: sic ego tutus ero.

T. IV, 13, 6.

b. Put. indic. in apodosis, pres. imperative in protasis.

Sed iuveni quaeso mutua vincla para

Sic bene compones: T. IV, 6, 8-9.

F. I. A. 2. a. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Sic te diva potens Cypri,

Ventorumque regat pater

Reddas incolumen precor. H. I, 3, 1-7.

Both "reddas" and "regat" have the optative force.

Sic venias hodie: tibi dem turis honores,
T. I, 7, 53.

This is usually taken to be practically equivalent to *si venies, tibi dem*, and is taken closely parallel to the example from Horace; but in reality it stands by itself, and strictly taken could not be so construed. The only explanation that I could offer is either that Tibullus thought of the "sic" really

28

in connection with the "tibi dem" in spite of its position, or that the "tibi dem" etc. is an explanation of the "sic". In the latter case the meaning would be, 'Come on these terms; namely, that I should give.'

F. I. A. 2. b. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

e.g. Admue: sic tibi sint intonsi, Phoebe, capilli,

Sic tua perpetuo sit tibi casta soror.

T. II, 5, 121-122.

Compare also: C. 17, 5-8; H. I, 28, 23-27; Y. II, 6, 29-30
Y. III, 6, 1-2.

To be connected with this type is the following:

Vera cano: sic usque sacras innoxia laurus

Vescar, et aeternum sit mihi virginitas.

T. II, 5, 63-64.

Here the "sic" really gives a protasis taken from "vera cano," and "vescar" is optative.

F. I. B. Imperative or jussive in protasis, not resumed by "sic".

1. Fut. indicat. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Neu seges eludat messem fallacibus herbis,

Neu timeat celeres tardior agna lupos.

Tunc nitidus plenis confisus rusticus agris

Ingeret ardenti grandia ligna foco,

T. II, 1, 19-22.

Compare: H. I, 27, 10-13; P. V, 7, 37-38.

2. Fut. perf. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Illic formosae veniant chorus heroinae,

Quarum nulla tua fuerit mihi, Cynthia, forma

Gratior:

P. I, 19, 13-16.

F. Under this head will come cases where the protasis is expressed without "si".



I. Imperative or jussive in protasis.

A. Sic resuming the protasis.

In all sentences of this type a jussive or optative expression is used in the protasis, followed by the apodosis in the future indicative or present subjunctive. The "sic" in the apodosis resumes the condition.

F. I. A. 1.a. Fut. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Displiceas aliis: sic ego tutus ero.

T. IV, 13, 6.

b. Fut. indic. in apodosis, pres. imperative in protasis.

Sed iuveni quaeso mutua vincla para

Sic bene compones: T. IV, 6, 8-9.

F. I. A. 2. a. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Sic te diva potens Cypri,

Ventorumque regat pater

Reddas incolumen precor. H. I, 3, 1-7.

Both "reddas" and "regat" have the optative force.

Sic venias hodie: tibi dem turis honores,
T. I, 7, 53.

223 31-16 My 00-3
This is usually taken to be practically equivalent to
Si venies, tibi dem, and is taken closely parallel to the example
from Horace; but in reality it stands by itself, and strictly
taken could not be so construed. The only explanation that I
could offer is either that Tibullus thought of the "sic" really

There seems to be no doubt that the feeling is, 'Supposing these to come, none of them will turn out to be' etc.

3. Pres. indic. in apodosis, pres. imperative in protasis.

Tu modo semper ama: salva puella tibi 'st.
T. IV, 4, 16.

4. Fut. indic. in apodosis, pres. imperative in protasis.

Crede mihi, propera: nec te iam, Phoebe, pigebit
Formosae medicas adplicuisse manus.
T. IV, 4, 3-4.

Compare:

5. Fut. indicative in apodosis, fut. imperative in protasis.

Nube polum pater occupato
Vel sole puro; non tamen inritum
Quodcumque retrost efficiet, etc.
H. III, 29, 44-46.

6. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. imperative in protasis.

Incorrupta mei conserva foedera lecti.
Hac ego te sola lege redisse velim,
P. V, 3, 69-70.

7. Perf. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. imperative in protasis.

En agedum, dominae mentem convertite nostrae,
Et facite illa meo palleat ore magis.
Tunc ego crediderim vobis, et sidera etc.
P. I, 1, 21-23.

F. II. Clauses of Proviso.

Note. I have included under this head the clauses of proviso that are so logically part of a condition as to demand treatment under conditional sentences.

In all these examples the conjunctive in the apodosis is due to a jussive force, while in P. I, 1, 21-23 and P. V, 3, 69-70 it is due to the optative force.

F. II. 1. Pres. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Non labor hic laedit, reseret modo Delia postes

Et vocet ad digiti me taciturna sonum.

T. I, 2, 31-32.

Compare: P. I, 7.4.

2. Pres. indic in apodosis, pres. imperative in protasis.

mens est mutabilis illis:

Tu modo cum multa brachia tende prece.

T. III, 4, 63.

3. Future indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Fortuna domus, modo sit tibi fidus amicus.

P. IV, 20, 9.

4. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. indic. in protasis.

O valeant fruges, ne sint modo rure puellae:

T. II, 3, 67.

Compare: Y. I, 6, 63-64 ; Y. II, 5, 105-106.

5. Pres. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Quare concedo sit dives, dum omnia desint.

C. 114, 5.

6. Fut. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Dummodo purpureo spument mihi dolia musto,

Quod superest vitae, per te et tua cornua vivam,

P. IV, 17, 17-19.

cf. Y. I, 2, 32.

7. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Saltum laudemus, dum domo ipse eget.

C. 114, 6.

Compare: Y. I, 2, 73-74 ; Y. I, 1, 5-6.

In all these examples the subjunctive in the apodosis is due to a jussive force, while in T. I, 1, 57-58 and P. V, 4, 33-34 it is due to the optative force.

F. III. Quin-si non.

Present subjunct. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

laudare nec ullam

Possim ego, quin oculos appetat illa meos,

T. I, 6, 69-70.

Of this there can be no other explanation than that the "quin" is equivalent to si non. Its use is perhaps rendered easier by the negative idea in the preceding clause, and the late appearance of the "illa".

F. IV. Apodosis is represented by quid.

1. Present indicative in protasis.

Quid si prisca redit Venus

Diductosque iugo cogit aeneo?

Si flava excutitur Chloe

Relectaeque patet ianua Lydiae?

H. III, 9, 17-20.

2. Protasis in present subjunctive.

Quid si iam canis aetas mea candeat annis,

Et faciat scissas languida ruga genas?

P. III, 9, 5-6.

3. Protasis in imperfect subjunctive.

Quid si non esset facilis tibi copia?

P. I, 9, 15.

Compare: P. II, 9, 29-30.

There the subjunctive has the jussive force.

G. Conditional Relatives.

- I. Pres. indic. in apodosis, pres. indic. in protasis.

Errat, qui finem vesani quaerit amoris:

P. III, 6, 29.

Compare: P. III, 14, 13-14; P. III, 17, 34; P. III, 18, 28.

- II. Pres. indic. in apodosis, future indic. in protasis.

felix, quicumque dolore

Alterius disces posse cavere tuum.

T. III, 6, 43-44.

- III. Present indic. in apodosis, perfect indic. in protasis.

At, quae fida fuit nulli, post victa senecta

Ducit inops tremula stamina torta manu

T. I, 6, 77-78.

- ~~IV. Present indic. in apodosis~~

- IV. Future indic. in apodosis, present indic. in protasis.

Destructus ensis cui super impia

Cervice pendet, non Siculae dapes

Dulcem elaborabunt saporem,

H. III, 1, 17-19.

- V. Fut. indic. in apodosis, fut. perf. indic. in protasis.

Nam fuerit quicumque loquax, is sanguine natam,

Is Venerem e rabido sentiet esse mari.

T. I, 2, 39-40.

- VI. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, fut. perf. indic. in protasis.

Qui versus, Coae dederit nec munera vestis,

Istius tibi sit surda sine aere lyra.

P. V, 5, 57-58.

Where the subjunctive has the jussive force.

VII. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

Quae tuis careat sacris

Non queat dare praesides

terra finibus: C. 61, 71-73.

cf. P.I, 19, 19-20

H. Conditional clauses in indirect discourse.

I. Pres. infinitive in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.

A good instance of this use is found in T. IV, 1, 91-97.

II. Pres. infinitive in apodosis, imperf. indic. in protasis.

Tunc mihi iurabas nullius divitis auri

Pondere, non gemmis, vendere velle fidem,

Non tibi si pretium Campania terra daretur,
T. I, 9, 31-33.

Compare: ~~#####~~ C. 4, 1-5 & 18-20; C. 74, 1-2.

III. Pres. infinitive in apodosis, pluperf. subjunct. in protasis.

Quod scibant Parcae non longo tempore abesse,

Si miles muros isset ad Iliacos.

C. 68 B, 45-46.

IV. Fut. infinitive in apodosis, pluperf. subjunct. in protasis.

Vovit, si sibi restitutus essem

Desissemque truces vibrare iambos,

Electissima pessimi poetae

Scripta tardipedi deo daturam C. 36, 4-8.

V. Perfect infinit. in apodosis, pluperf. subjunct. in protasis.

Et inde tot per inpotentia freta

Erum tulisse, ---

--- sive utrumque Iuppiter

Simul secundus incidisset in pedem; C. 4, 18-21.

VI. Imperf. subjunct. in apodosis, pluperf. subjunct. in protasis.

Hoc tu iurabas, si quid mentita fuisses,

Ut tibi suppositis exciderent manibus.

P. I, 15, 35-36.

J. Virtual Indirect Discourse.

I. Imperfect subjunctive.

e.g. Hoc caverat mens provida Reguli

Dissentientis condicionibus

Foedis et exemplo trahentis

Perniciem veniens in aevum,

Si non periret immiserabilis

Captiva impubes.

H. III, 5, 13-18.

II. Pluperfect subjunctive.

Te, boves olim nisi reddidisses

Per dolum amotas, puerum minaci

Voce dum terret, viduus pharetra

Risit Apollo.

H. I, 10, 9-12.

Compare: T. I, 5, 19-20.

K. So-called suppressed apodosis in comparison with quasi, quam, aliter quam, etc.

I. Present subjunctive in protasis.

Tantundem omnia sentiens quam si nulla sit usquam.
C. 17, 20.

Compare: H. III, 39, 42; T. IV, 11, 3-4.

II. Imperfect subjunctive in protasis.

Dimovit -----

Quam si clientum longa negotia

Diludicata lite relinqueret. H. III, 5, 51-54.

Compare: C. 34, 7-8; H. III, 16, 25-30.

