The subject of this paper suggested
the diversity seen in the use of conditional
sentences in the Latin 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 forms of conditional expressions,
but the other three are not less widely heterodox.

Necessity, from the scope of the paper, it is largely
exclusion, but the tabulation conveys its own results. I have
attempted from comment on particular cases where it was possible to state
preferring to let the classification speak for itself. A considerable
number of or authors compel me to state that most of the
comments relate about conditional sentences are due to desire to reduce them to a rigid system. In
almost no case have I found that does not show
appear in assigning to the form in question a perfectly normal form to
read and teune. 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 con-
clusions and errors are not serious.

The tabulation is made under the following heads:

Title. The subheadings follow the different topics,
A. Indicative in both aequitiae and praetalia.
B. Subjunctive in both aequitiae and praetalia.
C. Imperative in aequitiae and subjunctive in praetalia.
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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.

\[
\begin{align*}
L &= \text{Caius Iulius} \quad \text{(Caesar)} \\
H &= \text{Horace} \quad \text{Odysseus (Thucyd)} \\
Y &= \text{Tibullus} \quad \text{(Müller)} \\
P &= \text{Persius} \quad \text{(Bacchyl)}
\end{align*}
\]

A. H. 3. Mixed cases where protasis, future indicative in protasis, future indicative in protasis. The only example of this use is found as follows:

\[\text{Sui hospit, carinam tuum congregat e nuga.} \]

\[\text{Ubi tibi non humilia prodita Home venit.} \quad \text{P.V.4,65-66.}\]

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

Fas trepidat.

H. III, 29, 31-32.

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

The only example of this use is found as follows:

Sive hospes, pariamve tua regina sub aula

Dos tibi non humili 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 maminerunt, meminit Fides

the perfect in the apodosis has really the force of the present.

The other places where this use may be found are:

- Much more[o moon is the use, in twenty (20) different places, of a perfect protasis along with a present apodosis.
- The other places where this use may be found are:
  - H. I. 1, 6-9,
  - H. II, 9, 19-20,
  - H. III, 9, 19-20,
  - H. IV, 9, 19-20,
  - Y. I, 9, 19-20,
  - Y. II, 9, 19-20,
  - Y. III, 9, 19-20,
  - Y. IV, 9, 19-20,
  - P. I, 9, 19-20,
  - P. II, 9, 19-20,
  - P. III, 9, 19-20,
  - P. IV, 9, 19-20,
  - P. V, 9, 19-20,
  - P. VI, 9, 19-20,
  - P. VII, 9, 19-20,
  - P. VIII, 9, 19-20,
  - P. IX, 9, 19-20.

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:

- * Nec deprecor iam, si nefaria scripta*
  - Sesti recepso C. 44, 18.
  - Nec sitim pellit, nisi causa morbi
  - Fugerit venis H. II, 2, 14-15.

Also:

- P. I, 9, 19-20
- P. II, 9, 19-20
- P. III, 9, 19-20
- P. IV, 9, 19-20
- P. V, 9, 19-20
- P. VI, 9, 19-20
- P. VII, 9, 19-20
- P. VIII, 9, 19-20
- P. IX, 9, 19-20
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.

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.

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

a. Sive iactatam reli garat udo
   Litore navim,
   Liberum et Musas Veneremque et illi
   Semper haerentem puerum canebat  H. I, 32, 7-10.

b. Quid mihi, si fueras miseros laesus amoris,
   Foedera per divos, clam violanda, dabas? T. I, 9, 1-2.

c. Quae si forte aliquid vultu mihi dura negarat,
   Frigida de tota fronte cadeat aqua. P. III, 13, 11-13

d. Hic placatus erat, seu quis libaverat uvam,
   Seu dederat sanetiae spicis aerta 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 veti comos 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 (35) places in which we find it.

e.g. Quare, si sapiet, viam vorabit

C. 35, 7.

See also:

C, 60, 73-75; H. III, 9, 1-12; H. III, 9, 14-16;

A. III, 21, 21-24; H. IV, 2, 45-46; Y, II, 4, 5-2; Y. I, 4, 27;

Y, II, 4, 43; Y, II, 6, 3-4; Y, IV, 1, 24-27; P, I, 6, 34-36;

P, II, 11, 2 5-26; P, II, 3, 4 3-49; P, III, 7, 5-66;

P, III, 5, 10; P, III, 14, 24; P, III, 17, 9-10; P, IV, 20, 42;

P, III, 23, 25; P, III, 26, 11-62; P, IV, 7, 64;

P, II, 21, 3 3-24; P, IV, 3 2; P, IV, 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.
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 periculo,


And,

Compenset unda, scilicet omnibus,

Quicumque terrae munere vesce mixer,

Enaviganda, sive reges


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

Nam, si luxerit, ad librario rum

Curram scrinia, Caesios, Aquinos,

Suffremum, 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.

E.g. Si figit adamantinos

Summis verticibus dira Necessitas

Clavos, non animum metu,


See also: C, 3, 10, 11, 12; C, 35, 10; C, 68, A, 31, 32.

A. IV. Future indic. in protasis, perfect 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 situation or state of the protasis must be over and done with, before the future action or state can begin.
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.

A. IV. 2. 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.

A. IV. 2. 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.

A. IV. 2. 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.

A. IV. 2. 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.
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 sepulcrum,

Proxima subposito contingens Umbria campo
Me genuit, terris fertilis uberibus.

and in the following:

Sin aliquam vultusque meas 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 abscedit
Prudens Oceano dissociabili
Terras, si tamen impiae

Non tangenda rates transiliunt vada.

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, iuris iurum Romulus augur

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

(b) Ter si resurgat murus aeneus
    Auctore Phoebo, ter pereat meis
    Excisus Argivis, ter uxor

and also:

(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,

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

The examples of the form

  Quem si quis videat vetus ut non fregerit actas,
  Terna minus Pyliae miretur saecula famae.

  T. IV, 1, 111-112

occur as follows:
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 sequarentur 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 Orphee
Auditam moderere arboribus fidem,
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 protas.

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 Iliae
Mavortisque puer, si taciturnitas
Obstaret meritis invida Romuli? H. IV, 8, 22-23.

But in P. IV, 7, 45-45 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 refers 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 aorist 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.

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.
(a) Non custos si fingar ille Cretum, 
Non si Pegaseo ferar volatu, 
-------
Defessus tamen omnibus medullis
-------

(b) Quod tu si manibus teras fricesque, 
Non umquam digitum inquinare possis. C. 25, 22-25.

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

(d) Nostri si parvola cura 
Sit tibi, quanta libet, si sit modo, non mihi regna 
Lydia, non magni potior sit fama Gyliippi, 
Posse Meleteas nec mallem 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 umquam, 
Dente si nigro fieres vel uno 
Turpior ungui, 
Credere.

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.

Cui si longaevae miruisset 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 umero 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 dix age tibia*

*Regina longum Callicipe melos,*

*Seu voce nunc mavis acuta,*


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

C. 36, 17; C. 7, 6, 17-19; C. 4, 2, 1-4; C. 10, 3, 3; H. I, 7, 17-20; H. II, 14, 5-16; H. III, 8, 1-6; H. III, 21, 2-7; H III, 17, 61-63; H. II, 14, 21-22; Y. II, 4, 11; Y. III, 4, 20; Y. IV, 4, 77; Y. IV, 2, 2; Y. IV, 3, 1-2; Y. IV, 5, 9-10; P. III, 9, 32; P. III, 8, 1-3; P. IV, 7, 7; P. III, 13, 4; P. III, 20, 41; P. IV, 6, 7; P. IV, 4, 9-6; P. III, 8, 2-2; P. IV, 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.


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 meo suceat via proxima busto,*

*Esseda caelatis siste Britanna iugis, P. II, 1, 75-76.

See also: C. 11, 2-16; Y. IV, 6, 21-22; P. III, 20, 8-11; P. III, 4, 39-40; P. II, 11, 79.
C. I. 3. Pres. imperat. in apodosis, fut. perf. indic. in protasis.

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

Servare mentem,

(b) Seu maestus omni tempore vixeris,

Senare parare.

(c) Seu tamen adversum mutavit iamualectum,

Sederit et nostro canta noverca toro,

Coniugium, pueri, laudate et forte paternum;

P. V, 11, 85-87.

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.


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

Lusinus tecum, quod et mune in annum

Vivat et plures, age dic Latinum,

Barbite, carmen,

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. II. 2. Future imperative in apodosis, pres. indic. in protasis.

E.g. (a) Verum, ut quid esse, ut maxima est.

P. V, 11, 93-95.

In sentences of this type the command is made to depend upon the complete fulfillment of some action in the past.

Cf. C, 26, 17-19; H. III, 14, 17-20; P. I, 3, 53-54; P. II, 17, 2-7; P. III, 9, 14; P. III, 24, 61-62; P. IV, 6, 34-36.
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 quares 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, 29-34.

(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 apo-
dosis "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 iussieris 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 Eea, Doryxenium, iuvat aurea ripa,

Seu quae palmiferae mittunt venalia Thebae,

(b) Prodeas, nova nupta, si

Ian videtur, et audias

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

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

Of the type:

Si quaeret urbium

Subscribi statuis, indomitam audeat

Refrenare licentiam,

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: \[y, \begin{array}{c} \text{III} \\ \text{IV} \end{array}, 4, 11-12; \ y, \begin{array}{c} \text{IV} \\ \text{V} \end{array}, 7, 5-6; \ p, \begin{array}{c} \text{II} \\ \text{V} \end{array}, 4, 47; \ p, \begin{array}{c} \text{II} \\ \text{IV} \end{array}, 4, 12, 9; \ p, \begin{array}{c} \text{IV} \\ \text{II} \end{array}, 11, 71-72; \ p, \begin{array}{c} \text{V} \\ \text{II} \end{array}, 11, 63-66.\]


**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, oculat ille


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

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

Si per obliquum similis sagittae


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

Ignoscas:

T. I, 2, 11-12.

Compare: \[c, \begin{array}{c} \text{II} \\ \text{V} \end{array}, 4, 5-7; \ y, \begin{array}{c} \text{II} \\ \text{IV} \end{array}, 4, 10-11; \ y, \begin{array}{c} \text{IV} \\ \text{II} \end{array}, 4, 62; \ y, \begin{array}{c} \text{II} \\ \text{IV} \end{array}, 11, 79-81.\]

D. II. Hortatory.

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

**e.g.**

Lesbia mo dispeream nisi amat.

Verum dispeream nisi amat.

**D. VI.**

summi materiem mali,

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

Compare C. 42, 16-17.
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, 41, 3-7; C, 92, 44; P, III, 12, 8-10.
   P, III, 15, 15-16.

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

   Quod si forte aliqua nobis mutabere culpa,

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

   Atque utinam, si forte pios eduximus annos,
   Ille vir in medio fiat amore lapis! P. II, 9, 47-48.

D. IV. Rhetorical question in the apodosis.

   Miseremur, 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 curreat 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,

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".
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.

\[ \text{e.g. (a)} \] Non est meum, si mugiat Africis Malus procellis, H. III, 29, 57-58.

\[ \text{(b)} \] At si pro dulci reeditu quaeque voventur, Audiat avera non menia aure deus, Nec me regna iuvant nec Lydium aurifer annis

C. XVII, 23 (\(\text{q} \)) ex ante (\(\text{p} \)); C. 101, 13, 4, 11-12, \(\text{H} \) \(\text{III} \), 2, 1-4, \(\text{H} \) \(\text{III} \), 2, 7-6-5-7, \(\text{H} \) \(\text{III} \), 3, 17-20, \(\text{V} \) \(\text{III} \), 3, 11-12, \(\text{V} \) \(\text{III} \), 1, 3-7, \(\text{IV} \) \(\text{I} \), 1, 117-124, \(\text{P} \) \(\text{I} \), 18, 3-4, \(\text{P} \) \(\text{I} \), 5-6, \(\text{P} \) \(\text{III} \), 2, 2, 11, 11, 17, 4, 1-4, 6,

\(\text{P} \) \(\text{III} \), 7, 31-36.

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 Saxosanum 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.

\[ \text{Si frustra inlabátur orbis,} \]
\[ \text{Impavidum ferient ruinae.} \]

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

Sed pretium si grande feras, custodia victast.

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) \[ \text{Me truncus inlapsus cerebro} \]
\[ \text{Sustulerat, nisi Faunus ictum} \]
\[ \text{Dextra levasset,} \]

(b) \[ \text{Inclusam Danaen turris aenea} \]
\[ \text{Robustaetque fores et vigilum canum} \]
\[ \text{Tristes excubiae munierant satis} \]
\[ \text{Nocturnis ab adulteris,} \]
\[ \text{Si non Acrisium virginis abditae} \]
\[ \text{Custodem pavidum Iuppiter et Venus} \]
\[ \text{Risissent:} \]

Conditional sentences of this type are usually explained on the assumption that something is omitted; e.g. in (a) 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.

Si chartae sileant quod bene feceris.

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

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

Si quid vidisti, semper vidisse negato;

P. III, 9, 3.
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.

Displiance aliiis: sic ego tutus ero.
   T. IV, 13, 6.

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

Sed iuveni quaeae 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.


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

Sic venias hodierne: 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
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. Adnue: sic tibi sint intonsi, Phoebe, capilli, Sic tua perpetuo sit tibi casta soror.

T. II, 5, 121-122.

Compare also:

C. 17, 6-8: H, 27. 23-27: Y, III, 6, 29-30

To be connected with this type is the following:

Vera cano: sic usque sacras innoeia 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 nidius plenis confius rusticus agris

Ingeret ardentil grandia ligna foco.

T. II, 1, 19-22.


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

Illic formasae veniant chorus heroinae,

Quarum nulla tua fuerit mihi, Cynthia, forma

Gratio: P. I, 19, 13-16.
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.

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

Displiceas aliiis: sic ego tutus ero.

T. IV, 13, 6.

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

Sed iuveni quaeso mutua vinola 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 incolumem precor.


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
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, properea: nec te iam, Phoebe, pigebit Formosae medicas adpliqueisse 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

Quodcunque retrost efficiet, etc.

H. III, 29, 44-46.

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

Incorrumpa 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 subjunctive in the apodosis is due to a passive force, while in T. I, 4, 18-22 and T. V, 4, 33-34 it is due to the optative force.
1. Pres. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.
Non labor hie laedit, reseret modo Delia postes
Et vocet ad digiti me taciturna somm.

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 precem.

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: \( Y. I, 2, 3, 2 \).

5. Pres. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.
Quare concedo sit dives, dum omnia desint.

C. II, 5.

6. Fut. indic. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.
Dummodo purpureo spumant mihi dolia musto,

Salturn laudenum, dum domo ipse egeat.

C. II, 6.

Compare: \( Y. I, 2, 3, 5, 6 \).

7. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, pres. subjunct. in protasis.
Saltum laudernus, dum domo ipse egeat.

C. II, 6.

Compare: \( Y. I, 2, 3, 5, 6 \).

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.

Possim ego, quin oculos appetat illa meos,

laudare nec ullam

Festus, iii, 12-14, p. 66, 6.

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".

Compare: P. III, 9, 17-30.

F. IV. Apodosis is represented by quid.

1. Present indicative in protasis.

Quid si prisca reedit Venus

Diductosque iugo cogit aeneo?

Si flava exoutitur Chloe

Reiectaeque patet ianua Lydiae?

N. 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.
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 mam.
   T. I, 6, 77-78.

IV. Present indic. in apodosis

IV. Future indic. in apodosis, present indic. in protasis.
   Destrietus ensis cui super impla
   Cervice pendet, non Siculae dapess
   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.

VI. Pres. subjunct. in apodosis, fut. perf. indic. in protasis.
   Qui versus, Coae dederit nec manera 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.

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 restitutas esset
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 conditionibus
Foedis et exemplo trahentis
Perniciem veniens in sevum,
Si non periret immiserabilis
Captiva impubes. H. III, 5, 13-16.

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.

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.

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

II. Imperfect subjunctive in protasis.

Dimovit

Quam si clientum longa negotia


Compare: C. 3 6, 7-8; H. III, 16, 25-30.