

F. Mugler, *Concerning the Usage of the Conditional Sentence in Latin* 119

Dumnorix, des Treverers Indutiomarus, schließlich des Pompeius) werden beide gleichsam gleichgestellt, der Mord aus politischer Notwendigkeit durch den unauffälligen Ausdruck sanktioniert.

Der Gebrauch emphatischerer Ausdrücke ist ebenfalls tendenziös: er soll wie bei *concidere* und *caedes facere* den Kampfelan der Truppe Caesars, bei *necare* die Grausamkeit der barbarischen Gegner hervorheben. Bezeichnenderweise ist Caesar nur in zu Unrecht erhobenen Verdächtigungen seiner Gegner der Träger solcher Handlungen.

Diese Beobachtungen haben ihr Analogon im Wortfeld „Sterben“. Dafür ist durchgängig die schonende Ausdrucksweise kennzeichnend. Caesar bevorzugt geradezu die militärischen Termini *technici*: *cadere*, *amittere*, *desiderari*; wo er einmal einen energischeren Ausdruck wählt, wie *concidere*, soll damit wiederum der Kampfgeist der eigenen Truppe gewürdigt werden. *Interire* und *perire* sind bewußt unanschaulich.

Caesars Stil ist damit einmal durch eine bewußte Distanz von den Tötungsvorgängen gekennzeichnet. Die anscheinend indifferente Wortwahl bei gerechtfertigten und ungerechtfertigten Tötungsvorgängen dient der politischen Rechtfertigung, emphatische Wortwahl hingegen der eigenen Glorifizierung oder der Anklage des Gegners.

Man kann also auch an dem Wortfeld „Töten“ und „Sterben“ Caesars Stilprinzip ablesen: scheinbare Sachlichkeit als Kunst der Insinuation. „La déformation de la vérité historique.“

Concerning the Usage and Evolution of the Conditional Sentence in Latin

By FRANCE MUGLER, University of Michigan

In the Modern Romance dialects there exists a multiplicity of combinations of tenses and moods which can be used in a so-called conditional sentence. Such variety reflects a number of nuances in time and meaning within the sentence on one hand and the variety of usages in different geographical locations of the Romania on the other. The main purpose of this paper is to investigate the situation in Latin in order to try to determine whether this diversity was directly inherited from Latin or constitutes a Romance innovation.

After a definition and description of the typical conditional sentence to be studied in the present paper, I shall briefly cite some examples as evidence of the multiplicity of forms used in Romance to which I alluded above. The next part will be a brief sketch of the historical background of the Latin conditional sentence in Indo-European. In the next section I shall attempt to determine criteria for a classification of the various forms existing in Latin and lastly, describe the evolution of usage of these forms from what I shall call, for the sake of simplicity, Pre-Classical (III to I century B.C.), to Classical (50 B.C. to 50 A.D.), then Post-Classical (I to VI(?) century A.D.) Latin, using those terms exclusively with reference to a rough chronology.

1. *Definitions—Limits of this paper*

A conditional sentence is one which contains a main clause and a subordinate clause which expresses 'a hypothesis or condition under which the statement (question, command, or wish) of the main clause holds true' (Woodcock 1959: 147). The subordinate clause is typically (though not always) introduced by a conjunction with the meaning 'if' and is called the protasis, while the main clause is called the apodosis.

The conditional sentence can refer to a fact which is stated or considered by the speaker as real, possible, or contrary-to-fact; taking place in the present, future, or past time; referring to a particular or general situation. The apodosis, as mentioned above, can have the shape of a statement, command, wish, or question, whereas the protasis is almost always a subordinate clause.

I shall consider in this paper only conditional sentences of the type protasis-apodosis, which is the most common, although not the only type possible (see section 3), and in which the protasis is introduced by the subordinating conjunction *si* (combinations with *si* which had a similar function in Latin were: *nisi*, *si non*, *ni*, *si modo*, *etsi*, *tam etsi*, etc.). This means that I shall not treat 'concessive' ('even if') or 'comparative' ('as if') conditional sentences, for instance, both for the sake of simplicity and brevity, and because they seem to be derived from the basic type described above.

2. *Romance*

Italian seems to exhibit a particularly wide range of possibilities. The following chart shows what tense/mood combinations can be

Concerning the Usage and Evolution of the Conditional Sentence in Latin 121

found, in one geographical location or another, and with various possible nuances in meaning which will not be discussed here, to express a present time contrary-to-fact conditional statement (to which I shall limit myself, as an example, in this section):

Chart I

<i>protasis/apodosis</i>		
<i>tense & mood/tense & mood</i>		<i>on the model:</i>
1. imp. subj.	/ imp. subj.	se potessi, facessi
2. imp. subj.	/ pres. cond. indic.	se potessi, faría (-ei)
3. pres. cond.	/ pres. cond.	se poría, faría
	(subtype: morphological variant)	se porei, farei
4. imp. indic.	/ imp. indic.	se potevo, facevo
5. imp. indic.	/ pres. cond.	se potevo, farei

(see Table I for examples)

In Spanish, besides the Standard most common imperfect subjunctive/present conditional ('si pudiera, haría'), it is possible to find imperfect subjunctive/imperfect subjunctive, imperfect subjunctive/imperfect indicative, imperfect indicative/imperfect indicative. In French, although the most common and Standard form is imperfect indicative/conditional present, it is also possible to have an imperfect subjunctive in either or both clauses ('si j'eusse . . .'), or an imperfect indicative or present conditional in both clauses. In Rumanian also, the imperfect indicative can often be found instead of a present conditional.

3. *Origins of the Latin conditional sentence*

Historical evidence seems to indicate that the form of the original conditional sentence in early Indo-European and Pre-Classical Latin was quite different from what it is in Classical Latin or Modern Romance. It was not a sentence consisting of a main clause and a subordinate clause introduced by a conjunction, but rather a paratactic sentence made up of two independent clauses not linked by subordination or coordination and expressing two desiderative statements in the form: 'May you believe me! That would be better!', which developed into a hypotactic sentence such as: 'It would be better if you believed me!'.

The mood used in this type of paratactic sentence in early Indo-European was generally the optative, in Latin the subjunctive.

This type can be found in Latin at all periods, if not very frequently: *veniat nunc, experiatur: tecto recipiet nemo*. Cic. Verr. 2, 10, 26.

The Latin subjunctive is the result of the syncretism of two Indo-European moods: the subjunctive and the optative. In Indo-European the subjunctive was used to express the speaker's desire for the realization of the action or state described by the verb ('volitive'), or simply his expectation of its realization ('likelihood'). The optative was used when that action or state was a possibility or when the speaker expressed a wish concerning it ('desiderative'¹). The third mood, the indicative, expressed the neutrality of the action²).

On the morphological level, the Indo-European subjunctive is reflected in the Latin *ē/ā* of the subjunctive, as in *laudem, moneam*. The optative is seen in the Pre-Classical forms of the verb 'to be': *siem, sies, siet, sient*, analogized by Classical Latin times on the model of *sīmus* and *sītis*. It is also recognizable in the forms of the Latin perfect subjunctive (ex: *dīxerīs*).

The subjunctive of conditional sentences in Latin is therefore a reflex of both the Indo-European optative and the subjunctive.

Typically the subordinate clause of the conditional sentence was introduced in Latin by the conjunction *si* (see above) from Proto-Indo-European **sei* to which could be added the demonstrative particle *-ce*, and which seems to have had the original adverbial meaning 'thus' in paratactic sentences using the optative, then became a subordinating element linking the two clauses into a hypotaxis.

4. *The Situation in Latin*

The evidence available in Latin texts documents the existence of a wide variety of combinations of tense and mood in conditional sentences. The protasis could be either in the indicative or the

¹) Not to be confused with the Indo-European morphological desiderative.

²) The distinction between the Indo-European subjunctive and optative survived only in Indo-Iranian and in Classical Greek. It is the Indo-European optative which gives Germanic its subjunctive and Slavic its imperative.

'En realidad no es cosa fácil discernir, muchas veces, entre los deseos y las voliciones. No obstante, las lenguas que conservan en forma autónoma los subjuntivos y optativos utilizan, generalmente, el último de estos modos en las oraciones de carácter histórico!' (Bassols de Climent 1948: 471). Personally, I suspect that 'wish' was similar to a prayer or an invocation to the gods when referring to an action over which the speaker had no power, and was thus very different from a volitive.

Concerning the Usage and Evolution of the Conditional Sentence in Latin 123

subjunctive. In the indicative the tense could be present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect, future, or future perfect. In the subjunctive, it could be present, imperfect, perfect, or pluperfect (since there was no future or future perfect in the subjunctive). The apodosis could be in either mood and any tense in combination with any type of protasis. The multiplicity of verb forms used in the apodosis is explained by the variety of shapes which the apodosis could take: a question, command, statement, or wish in the form of an exclamation. If the apodosis was a statement, usually the same tense/mood was used as in the protasis, provided the time reference of the two clauses was the same (see Table II for examples).

I shall therefore be more concerned here with explaining the usage of tense/mood in the protasis, which sets the conditions for the fulfillment of the apodosis, and which assumes the shape of a subordinate clause.

The number of combinations possible calls for an explanation of the evident differences in meaning which the various tense/moods must have conveyed and demands a classification thereof. The great number of tense shiftings and morphological replacements in the verb system in the history of Latin from Pre- to Post-Classical times renders the description rather difficult, and, although excluding the chronological factor in our description is an analytical artefact, it is one which is needed as a first step to make any kind of classification possible. I shall therefore not describe in this section the evolution in usage of tense/moods, but concentrate on other explanatory criteria.

It seems that two criteria are crucial in determining the form of the verb used in the protasis: the time reference, and what I shall call the 'reality' of the action or state expressed by the verb. Roughly, the time reference determines what tense is going to be used, the 'reality' factor the mood.

However, against the schematic simplicity of this division, I must point out that all combinations of these two sets of elements are NOT possible, as some combinations seem to be intrinsically contradictory within the language. Let me explain: the time reference, in most cases, is reduced to the 'basic' present, future, and past. The type of action is rather more difficult to schematize and the terminology varies almost from one author to the next. It can be of three kinds: what have often been called 'real', 'potential', and 'contrary-to-fact'. For the first case, Latin used the indicative; for the other two, the subjunctive.

The indicative was used when 'la condition est supposée remplie' (Ernout 1953: 375). Woodcock (1959: 147) explains its use in the following way: 'the protasis may suppose or concede a fact, without any implication of denial that the fact is true, as "if he said this (which is uncertain), he made a mistake": *si hoc dixit, erravit*; or "if anyone did wrong, he used to be punished": *si quis peccaverat, poenas dabat*. The following statement by Blatt (1952: 312) summarizes the two previous views: 'on ne se prononce pas sur le fait de savoir si l'action a lieu ou non . . . les subordonnées conditionnelles à l'indicatif s'emploient aussi de façon affirmative, c'est-à-dire que le fait exprimé par la conditionnelle a réellement eu lieu: Cic. Fam. 16, 14, 2 *si me diligis. excita ex somno tuas litteras humanitatemque.*'

The tense used depended on the time reference and was the same as would be used in any independent clause (see above).

As for the subjunctive, why was it used to express both the potential and contrary-to-fact? Because, according to Ernout (1953: 377) Pre-Classical Latin 'n'avait pas d'expression distincte du potentiel' or, in different but complementary terms: 'Indo-European has no separate means of expression for unreality.' (Palmer: 1954: 315). The distinction between potential and contrary-to-fact was introduced later (Classical Latin) but was expressed then by means other than mood (since, morphologically speaking, there was no other mood available). It seems therefore that it might be useful for the sake of classification to consider potential and contrary-to-fact as constituting one pole of a formal dichotomy whose other member would be the 'real'. Actually it would be more accurate to call the 'real' 'non-contrary-to-fact' since it can be, as we have seen above, either 'real' or simply unmarked for the feature 'reality' from the speaker's point of view.

Contrary-to-fact and potential could be said to be in complementary distribution, their choice depending on the time reference involved. The future (because it is future and therefore open) can only be potential, it cannot be properly called contrary-to-fact in the sense that there is always a possibility that the condition might be fulfilled at some undetermined time. Conversely, the past (because of its closed nature) can only be contrary-to-fact, it can 'no longer be potential', so to speak. *If I have money tomorrow . . .* implies that I still might have some, whereas *if I had had money yesterday . . .* implies that I did not have any.

Concerning the Usage and Evolution of the Conditional Sentence in Latin 125

In Pre-Classical Latin, a past-time contrary-to-fact was expressed in the protasis by an imperfect subjunctive of the type *si possem* (. . . *facerem*) while a future potential was expressed by a present subjunctive of the type *si possim* (. . . *faciam*), which could however also express a present contrary-to-fact, for the above-mentioned reasons: lack of a separate morphological future subjunctive, and absence of distinction between the potential and contrary-to-fact at that time. The present subjunctive was therefore ambiguous in this type of construction, just as *if I had money* can be ambiguous since it can mean 'if I had money now (but I don't)' or 'if I had money tomorrow (and I might)' . . . *I would give it to you*.

Therefore, in Latin as in English in this case, 'it is left to the context to make clear whether future possibility is contemplated, or whether the thought is confined wholly to the present' (Woodcock 1959: 153). Here are a few examples:

Future time: *mea sit culpa, si id Alcumenae . . . expetat*. Plaut. Amph. 871.

Present time: *si nunc habeas quod des, alia verba praehibeas*. Plaut. Asin. 188.

Often the sentence can be interpreted either way:

Present or futur?: *si sciat, suscenseat*. Plaut. Asin. 458.

It must be noted that the perfect subjunctive could be used instead of the present when the action was 'thought of as completed in its entirety' (Woodcock 1959: 153) i.e. with the usual completed aspectual meaning of the perfect: *possis, si conspexeris, cognoscere?* Plaut. Asin. 878.

To express a contrary-to-fact the indicative was used instead of the subjunctive in a few cases: when the main verb was a modal (already marked semantically as potential/contrary-to-fact) as in: *possum persequi permulta oblectamenta rerum rusticarum; sed ea ipsa quae dixi sentio fuisse longiora*. Cic. C.M. 55; or with a negative protasis to indicate that 'si telle chose ne s'était pas produite, tel résultat allait se trouver acquis' (Ernout 1953: 380) or, in other terms, 'parce que le tour négatif équivaut à l'affirmation d'une réalité' (Ernout 1953: 382) as in: *quingentos simul, ni hebes machaera foret, uno ictu occideras*. Plaut. Mi. 52f.

So far we have dealt with statements referring to a particular event. Generalizing statements are peculiar in that, when the subject of the verb in the protasis is the 'ideal' generalizing second person singular ('you' in the sense of 'one'), the subjunctive (usually

a present) is used, but for all other persons the verb of the protasis is in the indicative: *standum est in lecto, si quid de summo petas*. Plaut. Men. 103, but *si non est, nolis esse neque desideres; si est, abstinere quin attingas non queas*. Plaut. Bacch. 914. According to Woodcock (1959: 152) 'the importance of this idiom lies in the fact that it establishes a use of the subjunctive whereby it expresses facts, and not actions merely conceived. The mood here indicates, not that the actions expressed are hypothetical, but that the speaker is practicing induction upon them and arguing from the particular to the general'.

5. *Evolution in usage*

The following chart is an attempt to represent in a schematic fashion the major changes occurring in the usage of tenses and moods in the typical conditional sentence in Latin from Pre-Classical to Classical, then to Post-Classical times.

Chart II

	<i>Pre-Classical</i>	<i>Classical</i>	<i>Post-Classical</i>
Potential: future	pres. subj./pres subj. <i>si possim, faciam</i>	→ same	→ same
Contrary- to-fact: present	pres. subj./pres. subj. <i>si possim, faciam</i>	<i>si possem, facerem</i>	<i>si potuissem, fecissem</i>
Contrary- to-fact: past	imp. subj./imp. subj. <i>si possem, facerem</i>	pluperf. subj./ pluperf. subj. <i>si potuissem, fecissem</i>	new analytic pluperf. subj./pluperf. subj. or pres. cond. <i>si habuissem potutum, habuissem factum (facere habebam)</i>

(Adapted from Tekavčić 1972)

The above chart has the advantages and disadvantages of any schematic representation. It is a correct generalization, to a great extent, and brings some organization to a situation in dire need of one. On the other hand it is an abstraction which must exclude or overlook variants and nuances. It does, however, point to two

Concerning the Usage and Evolution of the Conditional Sentence in Latin 127

probable causes for confusion in the sense that the same tense is used to convey different meanings, or that two tenses are used to express the same concept. If we look at one synchronic slice, that called Pre-Classical Latin, we observe that the present subjunctive was used both for the future potential and for the present contrary-to-fact. On the other hand, if we look at the chart from left to right, we notice that, diachronically, there is a great deal of shifting of forms, of tenses.

The present subjunctive continued throughout to express a future potential, but no longer expressed a present contrary-to-fact in Classical Latin. It was replaced in that function by the imperfect subjunctive which previously had expressed past contrary-to-fact. The 'case vide' thus created for past contrary-to-fact was filled by the pluperfect subjunctive.

In Post-Classical Latin however, the imperfect subjunctive was lost and replaced by the forms of the Classical Latin pluperfect subjunctive. The new imperfect subjunctive then was used for present contrary-to-fact. Past contrary-to-fact came to be expressed by a new analytic pluperfect subjunctive. At the same time that this replacement was taking place, a new tense was developing which tended to be used in the apodosis of the past contrary-to-fact conditional sentence: the 'conditional' or 'future in the past' tense on the model *facere habebam*, shaped on the new analytic future of the form *facere habeo*, which had risen due to the disappearance, for phonological reasons, of the Classical Latin future.

Schematically then, a form for the present contrary-to-fact disappears (for that function) and is replaced by the form used until then for past contrary-to-fact, the latter being replaced in turn by another form. The process is repeated in exactly the same fashion at a later chronological point.

It must be kept in mind, as I previously noted, that this chart is an abstraction and that Pre-Classical, Classical, and Post-Classical Latin are by no means to be considered discrete units. This diachronic change, like any process of linguistic change, implies that there were periods of overlap during which two forms coexisted for the same function. The innovation had to be introduced, then had to spread, and finally cause the older form to disappear (?) or disappear itself, or maybe rather, to become specialized, stylistically, geographically, or otherwise. In other words, during some time *si possem*, *facerem* could express ambiguously either a present or a past contrary-to-fact. Similarly for *si potuissem*, *fecissem* at a

later period. The existence of these periods of overlap is confirmed by the following evidence:

Present subjunctive

In Plautus the present subjunctive is mostly used for contrary-to-fact (present) whereas other writers of the same period use it less often for that function.

Ex. of potential: *si in aedem ad cenam veneris . . . adposita cena sit . . . si quid tibi placeat quod illi congestum siet. edisne an inenatus . . . accubes?* Plaut. Trim. 468.

Ex. of contrary-to-fact: *liber si sim, me periculo vivam; nunc vivo tuo.* Plaut. Cas. 293.

Even in Classical Latin, although it was usually preferred to express the potential, the present subjunctive can still be found in a present contrary-to-fact function as in Cicero: *me dies, vox, latera deficient, si hoc nunc vociferari velim*³). Verr. II, 2, 21, 52.

The existence of proverbs and other set phrases ('expressions figées') contributed to the survival of this usage: *si decem habeas iunguas . . .* (in Bassols de Climent 1948: 476).

Imperfect subjunctive

Although in Classical Latin the imperfect subjunctive is normally used for a present contrary-to-fact, its Pre-Classical function of past contrary-to-fact can also be found in Classical times, as in Cicero, S. Rosc. 103: *si diceret, non crederetur.*

Later on it was the forms of the Classical Latin pluperfect which were used for present or past contrary-to-fact:

Ex. of present: *ipsa denique hiscere si animantia muta potuissent . . .* Arn. Nat. I, 33.

Ex. of past: *quam voluptatem mente conceperas, si Sigismerem . . . videsses!* Sid. Ep. 4, 20.

An example of the replacement in the apodosis of the Classical pluperfect subjunctive by the new conditional is: *sanare te habebat Deus per indulgentiam, si fatereris.* Ps. Aug., Serm. 253, 4.

Besides the shifting of tenses and morphological replacements, there were some changes in the use of mood. The indicative tended to be used for the subjunctive more and more in Post-Classical Latin, especially to express a potential (closer to 'reality' on the

³) 'Es evidente que este período nos evoca más bien una idea de irrealidad que de potencialidad, pues desde el punto de vista psicológico es seguro que Cicerón no pensaba pasarse el día gritando' (Bassols de Climent 1948: 475).

Concerning the Usage and Evolution of the Conditional Sentence in Latin 129

continuum), but not exclusively for that function. The two moods, in Palmer's view (1954: 716) 'came to be interchangeable': *si iubebas, accederemus ad primum*. Fredeg. 2, 62.

As for the generalizing sentences, 'by the Silver Age the indicative and the subjunctive seem to be employed indiscriminately' (Woodcock 1959: 152). An example where the subjunctive is used is: *si quis collegam appellasset, ab eo ad quem venerat ita discēdebat ut paeniteret non prioris decreto stetisse*. Livy 3, 36, 8.

The multiplicity of forms in Latin to express a conditional statement was therefore not random, but depended on a few criteria such as the time reference involved, the reality factor of the action involved, and whether the statement was of a general or particular character. It seems then that the diversity found in Romance is not an innovation, but is inherited from Latin. More importantly, the evidence shows that the Romance forms are reflexes not of one homogeneous period in Latin but from different stages of the language. If the use of the conditional tense or of the Classical Latin pluperfect as an imperfect seem to be inherited from Post-Classical Latin, the use of the indicative to 'replace' the subjunctive had always existed from Pre-Classical Latin on and expressed a concept different from that conveyed by the subjunctive. Although neither the present nor the imperfect (Classical) subjunctive seem to have survived in Romance, the fact that an imperfect subjunctive (morphologically, the pluperfect of Classical Latin) can be used for either a present or a past contrary-to-fact in different Romance dialects to this day also points to the fact that Romance forms must have been inherited from different periods of Latin.

Table I

The following are examples of the different types of present contrary-to-fact conditional sentences in Italian. The numbers of the examples correspond to the numbers of the types used in section 2 in Chart I. The source is Rohlfs 1966.

1. *ji perlesse, se le truvesse*. (Abbr.)⁴
2. *mbivarría, si nci fussi acqua*. (Calab.)
3. *se avessimo, ti daremmo*. (Tusc.)
bevarío se saría acqua. (Fiume)
4. *ci tinía fame, mangiava*. (Salento)
5. *si denía abba, deo dia buffare*. (Log. Sard.)

⁴) In parenthesis is the geographical origin of the example cited. Note that the existence of a given type is by no means limited to the geographical origin of the example but can often be found in several areas.

Table II

As a sample of the variety of combinations possible in conditional sentences, the following are examples of forms attested in Pre-Classical Latin. They are ordered according to the mood, then the tense in the protasis. The tense/mood in the apodosis is mentioned in parenthesis after the example and before the source. I. stands for indicative, S. for subjunctive. The source is Bennett 1966 (all examples are from Plautus).

Indicative

Pres.

- Si istaec vera sunt, non metuo. (Pres. I.) Amph. 1105.
Sed si domist, volebam. (Imp. I.) Asin. 452.
Si voltis, faciam. (Fut. I.) Amph. 54.
Provenisti futile, si neque adest neque subvenit. (Perf. I.) Stich. 398.
Hoc te monitum, nisi forte non vis, volueram. (Pluperf. I.) Capt. 309.
Si verum est, periveris. (Fut. Perf. I.) M.G. 298.
Si censes, arripiamus. (Imper.) Ad. 601.

Imp.

- Ea si erant, magnas habebas omnibus dis gratias. (Imp. I.) Asin. 143.

Fut.

- Satin est, si plura audiet? (Pres. I.) Bacch. 911.
Si quid te volam, ubi eris? (Fut. I.) Asin. 109.
Si incipies, actumst. (Perf. I.) Eun. 51.
Hau sine poena feceris, si rebitet. (Fut. Perf. I.) Capt. 695.
Dicito, si quis petet. (Imper.) Aul. 94.
Hoc si efficiam, quid tibi mittam? (Indep. S.) M.G. 936.

Perf.

- Si deliqui, nulla causa est. (Pres. I.) Amph. 853.
Uno modo persuadebit, si illam adempsit Orcus. (Fut. I.) Epid. 362.
Quid deliqui, si tecum fui? (Perf. I.) Amph. 817.
Si quem aspexit, caeca siet. (Indep. S.) Asin. 770.
Si verum dixi, signum date. (Imper.) Cas. 3.

Pluperf.

- Quid tibi erat negoti, nisi iusseram? (Imp. I.) Aul. 427.

Fut. Perf.

- Non potest auferre, si quis venerit. (Pres. I.) Asin. 154.
Si faxis, te in caveam dabo. (Fut. I.) Capt. 124.
Perii, si me aspexerit. (Perf. I.) Amph. 320.
Aufugero, si usus venerit. (Fut. Perf. I.) Bacch. 363.
Si iceris me posthac, credas mihi velim. (Indep. S.) Turp. 26.
Verbum si faxis, cave. (Imper.) And. 752.

Concerning the Usage and Evolution of the Conditional Sentence in Latin 131

Subjunctive

Pres.

- Si neget, amittat. (Pres. S.) Cas. 573.
Scis bene esse, si sit unde. (Pres. I.) Capt. 850.
Si roges, numquam dabit. (Fut. I.) Aul. 311.
Si aequom facias, odiosus ne sies! (Juss. S.) Men. 502.
Si velis, commoda amico! (Imper.) Asin. 445.
Illa si sciat, ego faxim. (Perf. S.) Amph. 510.
Si sint vera, quid mirum fecit? (Perf. I.) Pseud. 433.
Compellarem, ni metuam. (Imp. S.) Aul. 523.

Perf.

- Sit carior, si circumduxerit. (Pres. S.) Bacch. 311.
Tua istuc refert, si curaveris. (Pres. I.) Amph. 741.
Si factus siet, comminiscuntur. (Fut. I.) Hec. 330.
Si quid te fugerit, ego perierim. (Perf. S.) H.T. 316.
Si tussire ocepisset, ne sic tussiat. (Juss. S.) Asin. 794.

Imp.

- Si equos esses, esses indomabilis. (Imp. S.) Cas. 811.
Si adesset, recepisset. (Pluperf. S.) Asin. 396.
Absque te esset, ego illum haberem. (Juss. S.) Bacch. 412.
Paene in foveam decidi, ni adesses. (Perf. I.) Pers. 594.
Non erat copia, nisi occiperes? (Imp. I.) Bacch. 563.
Magis par fuerat, nisi nollem. (Pluperf. I.) Stich. 512.

Pluperf.

- Si voluisset, mitteret. (Imp. S.) Curc. 700.
Si quiessem, nil evenisset. (Pluperf. S.) And. 604.
Vocem te, nisi dixisset. (Pres. S.) Stich. 510.
Si tacuisset, eram dicturus. (Imp. I.) Cist. 152.
Si voluisses, oportuit. (Perf. I.) H.T. 164.
Potuerat, si quiesset. (Pluperf. I.) And. 691.
Non nova istaec condiciost, si voluissem. (Pres. I.) And. Alter Ex. 5.

References

- Bassols de Climent, Mariano. 1948. *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua latina*.
Barcelona: Escuela de filología.
Bennett, Charles E. 1966, repr. of 1910–1914 Boston 1st. ed. Hildesheim:
Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung. Vol. I.
Blatt, Franz. 1952. *Précis de syntaxe latine*. Lyon: Edition IAC.
Bourciez, Edouard. 1967. *Eléments de linguistique romane*. Paris: Klincksieck.
Elcock, W. D. 1960. *The Romance languages*. London: Faber and Faber.
Ernout, Alfred and François Thomas. 1953. *Syntaxe latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
Grassi, Cesare. 1966. *Problemi di sintassi latina*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

- Haadsma, R. A. and J. Nuchelmans. 1966. *Précis de latin vulgaire*. Groningen: J. B. Wolters.
- Herman, József. 1975. *Le Latin vulgaire*. Paris: P. U. F. *Que sais-je?* No. 1247.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1964, repr. of 1912 3rd. ed. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. University: University of Alabama Press.
- and J. Vendryes. 1948. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. Paris: Champion.
- Nutting, Herbert C. 1905. *Concessive si-clauses in Plautus*. University of California Publications; *Classical Philology*. Vol. I.
- Palmer, L. R. 1954. *The Latin language*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Ronconi, Alessandro. 1959. *Il Verbo latino: problemi di sintassi*. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli.
- Scherer, Anton. 1975. *Handbuch der lateinischen Syntax*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Tekavčić, Pavao. 1972. *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana*. Vol. II: *Morfosintassi*. Bologna: Società editrice Il Mulino.
- Väänänen, Veikko. 1967. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Wheelock, Frederick M. 1963. *Latin: An Introductory course based on ancient authors*. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc.
- Woodcock, Eric Charles. 1959. *A New Latin syntax*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.