On Latin Conditional Sentences *of* Unreality in Indirect Discourse Proper.

By OTIS BURGESS SEARS, A. B.

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty *of* the University *of* Virginia, April 22, 1902, as a Part *of* the Requirements for the Degree *of* Doctor *of* Philosophy.

ON UNREAL CONDITIONAL SENTENCES IN INDIRECT DISCOURSE.

I. APODOSIS OF UNREAL PAST.

1. Act. Subj. Apod. denying Aorist with Prot. denying Aorist.
      a. On Dicit.
    b. On Dixit.
2. Act. Subj. Apod. denying Aorist with Prot. denying Imperfect.
3. Act. Subj. Apod. denying Aor. with Prot. denying Pres., holding good in Past, also.
4. Past Sentences with Subj. in Prot. and Indic. in Apod.
    a. Act. and Pass. Indic. Apod. of Aor. Tense.
        (1) Prot. denying Aorist.
            (a) W. possum.
            (b) Subst. Pred.
            (c) Adj. Pred.
            (d) Prope in Pred.
            (e) Pass. Periphr.
            (f) Indic. of Vividness.
            (g) Indic. of Interruption.
        (2) Prot. denying Imperfect.
            (a) W. possum.
            (b) Pass. Periphr.
            (c) Debeo.
    b. Indic. Apod. of Imperfect Tense.
        (1) Prot. denying Aorist.
            (a) Indic. of Interruption.
        (2) Prot. denying Imperfect.
            (a) Indic. of Vividness.
5. Pass. Subj. Apod. denying Aorist with Prot. denying Aorist.
            (a) Circumlocution with potuisse, etc.
6. Fuisse Omitted.

4

II. Apodosis of Unreal Present.

1. Act. Subj. Apod. denying Pres. with Prot. denying Pres.
   a. On Dicit.
   b. On Dixit.
2. Act. Subj. Apod. denying Present with Prot. denying
   Aorist.
3. Objections to Theory Answered.
4. Fuisse Omitted.
5. Indic. Apod. in O. R. in Verbs of Ability, etc.
6. Posse Representing futurum fuisse, etc.

III. Constructions Possible to Unreal Pres. or Unreal Past.

1. Rhetorical Questions.
2. Personal Verbs.

On Latin Conditional Sentences *of* Unreality in Indirect Discourse Proper.

This dissertation will deal with Latin Conditional sentences of Unreality in Indirect Discourse Proper, i. e., those whose Apodosis in O. O. is expressed by the Infinitive. Those in Indirect Questions and Dependent Statements with dubito, etc., though coming under Indirect Discourse in its widest application, are for the sake of narrower specialization excluded from treatment.

The classes of Conditional sentences must be noticed briefly. These are four, and the character of the Conditional sentence is always indicated by the Protasis.

In the first class, the Apodosis follows the Protasis without implication as to fulfillment, just as the Conclusion follows the Premises in Logic. Here the conception is simple, and there is no inference as to reality or unreality, as to possibility or impossibility. What the Protasis holds forth may be complemented by fulfillment, or it may not ; but if the Protasis is realized in act, being, or state, a certain necessary consequence attends it. This class is called Logical.

In the second class, there is implication as to fulfillment. There is the conception of possibility. *Should*, implying possibility, is used in translating the Protasis. Fulfillment is held before the mind as an idea, and, accordingly, this class is called Ideal.

In the third class, the Protasis carries with it the idea of repetition, or iteration. The action, being, or state of the Apodosis is fulfilled "as often as," "whenever," or, better, "if ever," the conditions of the Protasis are favorable. This is classed accordingly as Iterative.

In the fourth class, it is inferred that the time has passed when fulfillment might have taken place. The unrealized fulfillment may belong to the sphere of the past and imply the denial of an Imperfect or an Aorist, or it may belong to the

sphere of the present and imply the denial of a Present. In either case, the class is called Unreal.

Indirect Discourse is substantially reported discourse. If it depends on dicit, it is manifest that it is reported. If it depends on putat it is reported, nevertheless, for a quoted thought is no less a report than is a quoted saying. Whether the speaker or writer says puto, putas, or putat, he is reporting thoughts ; his own, those of the person addressed, or those of the person spoken of.

Direct Discourse, on the other hand, is exactly reported or original discourse.

The Unreal Conditional sentence is found under three forms of construction when it comes into connection with a verb of saying or thinking.

In the first place, the exactly reported Unreal Conditional sentence may be loosely connected, by Parataxis, with the verb of saying or thinking. Num, censes, faceret, filium nisi sciret eadem haec velle ? Ter., Andr., III. 3. Probably Terence did not feel that the conditional sentence was the object of censes, but it is likely that he felt censes to be parenthetical.

In the second place, an Unreal Conditional sentence reported exactly may be construed as the object of a verb of saying, and this construction occurs often, the poets, in particular, using it to avoid the –urum fuisse construction (hereafter to be discussed), which was often too cumbersome for their metre. At ille : Facerem mehercule, nisi esse scirem carnis te cupidum meae. Phaedrus, I. 24, 7. If Phaedrus had used the Indirect instead of the Direct form, he would have crippled the verse as begun.

In the third place, an Unreal Conditional sentence may be reported substantially (Oratio Obliqua), instead of exactly, and with this class the body of this dissertation is to deal.

Unreal Conditional sentences in Indirect Discourse may be divided into those whose Apodoses deny the Past and those whose Apodoses deny the Present.

Unreal Conditional Sentences in Oratio Obliqua with Apodoses Denying the Past.

These may be divided according to the state of the verb into (a) Active and Passive; according to the mood of the verb in Oratio Recta into (b) those with Subjunctive Apodoses and those with Indicative Apodoses; and according to the action denied in Oratio Recta into (c) those whose Apodoses deny the Aorist and those whose Apodoses deny the Imperfect Indicative.

Adopting the last as the principal ground of classification, we shall first discuss Active Subjunctive Apodoses denying the Aorist. This class may be subdivided into (a) Active Subjunctive Apodoses denying the Aorist with Protases denying the Aorist and (b) Active Subjunctive Apodoses denying the Aorist with Protases denying the Imperfect Indicative.

Active Subjunctive Apodoses Denying the Aorist with Protases Denying the Aorist, in Oratio Recta, Passed into Oratio Obliqua.

When such a sentence passes into Oratio Obliqua, the Pluperfect Subjunctive of the Protasis is retained, while the Pluperfect Subjunctive of the Apodosis passes into the form –urum fuisse, an Infinitive of the Active Periphrastic.

If the verb lacked the –urus form, it is presumed that, rather than the theoretical futurum fuisse ut with Imp. Sub., there was used a tense of posse with the Infinitive (with a slight difference of meaning).

But let us consider why the Active Periphrastic conjugation is used, employing for illustration the following sentence: Eius modi igitur credo res Panætium persecuturum fuisse, nisi aliqui casus aut occupatio consilium eius peremisset. Cic., Off., III. 7.

The Subjunctive is the mood of the ideal, the conceptional, the possible, the inexistent. It here indicates what Panætius had been about to do, had been likely to do, *would have done*, if something had not rendered the fulfillment of his purpose impossible. Now, the Active Periphrastic conjugation in O. R. indicates what is going to be, what is likely to be, and,

consequently, when the time for fulfillment has passed, what *would have been*. We see, therefore, that between the Subjunctive of such an Apodosis and the Active Periphrastic conjugation there exists so close a relation that the Infinitive of the latter may well be called for when the former comes under the influence of a verb of Saying or Thinking.

The form is the same whether the sentence in question depends on dicit or dixit. *A.* Examples will first be given in which the Governing Verb of Saying or Thinking is in the Present tense (including First and Second Future). In this case, we have the Unreal Past Conditional dependently stated from the Present (Time of the Speaker). Qui, si vicisset, acerbiorem se in me futurum fuisse confiteatur. Pseudocic., I. 15, 11. Dicit me, si multa dixissem, sublevaturum fuisse eum. Cic., Verr., Sec., I. 9. Apud Catonem scriptum esse video, nisi pueris et lacrimis usus esset, poenas cum daturum fuisse. Cic., Or., I. 53. Eloqui timeo, invicti corporis spolia inertissimas manus fuisse infecturas, nisi te interceptum misericors in nos fortuna servasset. Curt., IX. 24. Quid auditurum putas fuisse Ulixem, si in illa simulatione perseveravisset? Cic., Off., III. 26. Perspicuum est omnibus, nisi tanta acerbitas inuriae fuisset, numquam illos in eum locum progressuros fuisse. Cic., Verr., Sec., I. 32. Si quis hoc forte dicet, Catonem decensurum ad accusandum non fuisse, nisi prius de causa iudicasset. Cic., Mur., 28. Clodium negant eo die Romam, nisi de Cyro audisset, fuisse rediturum. Cic., Mil., 18. Si contendisset, impetraturum non fuisse. Cic., Am., 11. Qui hoc non intelligat, si M. Antonius a Brundisio cum iis copiis Romam venire potuisset, nullum genus eum crudelitatis praeteriturum fuisse? Cic., Phil., III. 2. Quae, nisi collega afuisset, credo iis futura fuisse communia. Cic., Phil., I. 2. Sic iudico, nisi unus adolescens illius furentis impetus crudelissimosque conatus cohibuisset, rem publicam funditus interituram fuisse. Cic., Phil., III. 2. Quis est qui hoc non intelligat, nisi Caesar exercitum paravisset, non sine exitio nostro futurum Antonii reditum fuisse? Cic., Phil., IV. 2. Statuas, me haec eadem sensurum fuisse, si mihi integra omnia ac libera fuissent.

Cic., Ad Fam., I. 9, 21. Ita existimes velim me antelaturum fuisse, si ad me misisses, voluntatem tuam commodo meo. Cic., Ad Fam., V. 20, 1. Hoc vero certum habeto, nisi ille veteranos celeriter conscripsisset legionesque duae de exercitu Antonii ad eius se auctoritatem contulissent atque is oppositus esset terror Antonio, nihil Antonium sceleris, nihil crudelitatis praeteriturum fuisse. Cic., Ad Fam., X. 28. 3. Brundisium te ad me venturum fuisse, nisi subito in Hispaniam missus esses. Cic., Ad Fam., XV. 21, 2. Scribis, ni ita vobis placuisset, illos hoc idem per populum assecuturos fuisse. Cic., Ad Att., III. 24, 1. Quod dicent defensores futurum fuisse, nisi id factum esset. Cic., Inv., II. 24. Ut ipsi se quoque idem facturos fuisse arbitrentur, si sibi illa res atque ea faciendi causa per idem tempus accidisset. Cic., Inv., II. 26. Demonstrabit scriptorem ipsum factum hoc probaturum et idem ipsum, si ei talis res accidisset, facturum fuisse. Cic., Inv., II. 47. Qua credo usuros veteres illos fuisse, si iam nota atque usurpata res esset. Cic., Or., 51. An censemus, si Fabio laudi datum esset quod pingeret, non multos etiam apud nos futuros Polyclitos et Parrhasios fuisse? Cic., Tusc., I. 2. Dicamus non fuisse periturum, si omini paruisset. Cic., Div., II. 40. Puto enim, etiam si Icadius tum in spelunca non fuisset, saxum tamen illud casurum fuisse. Cic., Fat., 3. Quis dixerit rerum naturam melius acturam fuisse nobiscum, si ventos flare vetuisset. Sen., N. Q., V. 18. Hoc nuntia, melius me morituram fuisse, si non in funere meo nupsissem. Liv., XXX. 15. Stipendium scitote socios vestros fuisse pensuros si a me foret cessatum. Livy, XXXVIII. 47. Quem constet imperaturum fuisse, etiamsi non adoptasses. Plin., Min., Pan., 7.

B. When the Unreal Past Conditional sentence depends on a Past tense of a verb of Saying or Thinking, the Protasis is unchanged. The Apodosis is expressed by —urum fuisse. Such a Conditional sentence cannot be coincident with the time of the Governing verb, for, however far back the time of that may be, the Pluperfect Subjunctive of Protasis and Apodosis, since it denies an Aorist, must belong to an Antecedent period.

The following sentences illustrate this principle. Hoc initio est
usus: Quodsi in rebus iudicandis populi Romani existimationi
satis facere voluissent, non tanto opere homines fuisse tribu-
niciam potestatem desideraturos. Cic., Verr., Prim., 15.
Affirmavit, nunquam Xenocratem illa dicturum fuisse, nisi ea
dici expedire sibi indicasset. Val. Max., IV. 1. Docebat,
si hoc tum fuisset edictum, fortasse Ligurem hereditatem
aditurum non fuisse. Cic., Verr., Sec., I. 48. Dixit
maiores poenas Graecis Persas daturos fuisse, si ipsum in solio
Xerxis conspicere coacti essent. Curt., V. 23. Dixit si
cessasset, alium fuisse regnum occupaturum. Curt., VII. 24.
Nec quicquam aliud adiecit, quam forsitan eum, si diutius
locutus foret, exprobraturum sibi fuisse vitam a semetipso
datam. Curt., VIII. 5. Nemini erat eis temporibus dubium,
si adfuisset, illam Athenienses calamitatem accepturos non
fuisse. Nep., Con., 1. Fuit apertum, si ille non fuisset,
Agesilaum Asiam Tauro tenus regi fuisse erepturum. Nep.,
Con., 2. Apparuerit, nisi ille fuisset, Spartam futuram non
fuisse. Nep., Ages., 6. Certum habere maiores, si divinas-
sent non invitiorem in se plebem, quamlibet dimicationem
subituros fuisse potius, quam eas leges sibi imponi paterentur.
Liv., IV. 2. [Dixit] Quid illum facturum fuisse si adversa
pugna evenisset. Liv., VIII. 31. Oratio habita est, duces
sicut belli, ita insatiabilis supplicii futuros fuisse, ni respec-
tus equitum sexcentorum praepedisset animos. Liv., IX.
14. Ut appareret, si diutius vixisset, Poenos arma Italiae
inlaturos fuisse. Liv., XXI. 2. Eadem, si intrassent
Syracusas, facturos fuisse. Livy, XXIV. 32. Secuta Ner-
onis oratio, quamvis sontem et defensioni merito diffisum
victurum tamen fuisse, si clementiam iudicis expectasset. Tac.,
Ann., XV. 35. Se molestum non futurum fuisse Caelio, nisi
iterum eadem de re suo familiari absoluto nomen hic detulisset.
Cic., Cael., 23. Veniam te daturum fuisse dicebas, si tantum
auxilia Pompeio, vel si etiam filium misisset. Cic., Deiot., 3.
Quod si esset factum, caedem magnam futuram fuisse. Cic.,
Ad Att., X. 4, 8. Marcellus, si iam auditi ab senatu Siculi
essent, aliam forsitan futuram fuisse sententiam suam dicere.
Livy, XXVI. 29. Si se atque Hannonem audissent Cartha-

ginienses et tempore uti voluissent, daturos fuisse pacis con-
diciones. Livy, XXX. 42. Urbis quoque suae similem
deformitatem futuram fuisse, nisi Romani subvenissent. Livy,
XXXI. 30. Nisi avertisset vana spes, mox bello Gracciam
arsuram fuisse. Livy, XXXIII. 44. Si ad portas exercitus
Romanus fuisset, non sine effectu futurum eum motum fuisse.
Livy, XXXIV. 26. Si primo in conspectu dimicassent, pug-
naturos fuisse apparebat. Livy, XLII. 57. Si quid imper-
atum foret, adiuturum regem fuisse. Livy, XLV. 13.
Melius quidem Nominatum fuisse facturum, si causam Vicetin-
orum eodem animo quo susceperat pertulisset. Plin., Min.,
Ep., V. 13. From these examples it is evident that the cir-
cumlocutory expression —urum fuisse is employed, whether
the Governing verb is dicit or dixit, to represent the O. O.
Apodosis of the Unreal Aorist Conditional sentence.

Active Subjunctive Apodoses Denying the Aorist, with Protases Denying the Imperfect Indicative, in Oratio Recta, Passed into Oratio Obliqua.

In an Unreal Conditional sentence with Pluperfect Subjunc-
tive denying the Aorist, in Apodosis, there may be a Protasis
with Imperfect Subjunctive denying an Imperfect Indicative.

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish this from the Unreal
Present, whose form is the same, and a close examination of
the context is often required.

The following sentences illustrate this construction. Here,
as shown in the foregoing class by separate classification, the
form is the same whether the sentence depends on dicit or dixit.
Dixisse dicitur, Si quintum pareret mater eius, asinum fuisse
parituram. Cic., Or., II. 66. O. R. Si quintum pareret,
asinum peperisset. Quintum non pariebat; asinum non pep-
erit. Illud, Scaevola, negasti te fuisse laturum, nisi in meo
regno esses. Cic., Or., I. 16. We know from previous occur-
rence that the O. R. of this sentence is, Illud, nisi in tuo regno
essem, non tulissem. In tuo regno eram; illud tuli. Nobis
cognitum est, illum non tam anxie iniuriam laturum fuisse, si
adempta provincia alii quam Mario traderetur. Sall., Jug., 83.
O. R. Non tam anxie tulisset, si provincia alii traderetur.

Tam anxie tulit ; provincia non alii tradebatur. Respondit :
si quid ipsi a Caesare opus esset, sese ad eum venturum
fuisse. Caes., B. G., I. 34. O. R. Si quid mihi a Caesare
opus esset, ego ad eum venissem. Nullum opus erat mihi
a Caesare ; ego ad eum non veni. Si doceo eos damnum fac-
turos fuisse si tua iniquitas, si tui ex cohorte recuper-
atores non intercederent. Cic., Verr., Sec., III. 46. Dixit
se, si censor tum esset, cum ego aberam, meo loco sen-
atorem recitaturum fuisse. Cic., De Domo Sua, 32. The
accompanying temporal modifier, tum, cum ego aberam
proves conclusively that esset represents the denial of the Im-
perfect Indicative, and not of the Present, as might otherwise
have been suspected. Ita dixit, aliam sententiam se dicturum
fuisse eamque se ac re publica dignam, nisi propinquitate
impediretur. Cic., Phil., VIII. 1. Si eo loco esset, negavit,
se facturum fuisse. Cic., Ad Fam., IV. 4, 4. Respondeo
me te exspectaturum fuisse, nisi in provincia relictas rationes
pro relatis haberem. Cic., Ad Fam., V. 20, 2. Quo magis
probetur cum fuisse excepturum, si quid excipiendum putaret.
Cic., Inv., II. 45. Nuntiatum est nobis nisi de via fessus
esset, continuo ad nos venturum fuisse. Cic., Academ. Post.,
I. 1. An Cn. Pompeium censes tribus suis consulatibus,
tribus triumphis, maximarum rerum gloria laetaturum fuisse
si sciret se in solitudine Aegyptiorum trucidatum iri? Cic.,
Div., II. 9. Id se negavit facturum fuisse, nisi expediret
his dominum habere. Sen., Ira, III. 22. Perseveraturum
fuisse nisi obsequeretur principis voluntati. Pliny, Min.,
VIII. 6. Mansuros fuisse enim ad Aliam nisi hoc consilii
foret. Livy, V. 39. Adiciebat se quoque laturum fuisse
ad populum ni sciret mancupia nobilium tribunos plebis
legem inpedituros. Livy, X. 37. Nunquam, si sibi con-
scius esset, oblaturum se multitudini mentionemve eius caedis
nullo lacessente facturum fuisse. Livy, XXXIII. 28. Si
hoc tibi dem, quod credi non potest, nisi ego huic adessem,
hos adfuturos non fuisse. Cic., Sulla, 7. Demonstrabit illum
scriptorem, si scripta sua stultis hominibus et barbaris iudici-
bus committeret, omnia summa diligentia perscripturum
fuisse. Cic., Inv., II. 47. Dicet eam rem et sententiam

quamvis prudentem et iustum hominem, si integrum daretur, scripturum fuisse. Cic., Or. Part., 38. Facturum se fuisse dixit ut duorum patriciorum nomina reciperet, si alium quam se consulem fieri videret. Livy, X. 15. Se, nisi confideret eum consensu populi Romani consulem declaratum iri, dictatorem fuisse extemplo dicturum. Livy, X. 21. Si quam opem in sese crederent, eodem studio fuisse oblaturos. Livy, XXII. 32. Epicydes, si qua ad se mandata haberent, responsum ait se daturos fuisse. Livy, XXIV. 33. Quod si exemplum haberet bis eundem aerarium relinquendi, C. Claudium nominatim se inter aerarios fuisse relicturum. Livy, XXIX. 37. Quinctius verum id futurum fuisse dicere, si aestas et tempus rerum gerendarum esset. Livy, XXXII. 36. An me nisi te audire vellem, censes haec dicturum fuisse? Cic., Fin., I. 8. Volebam ; dixi. Romanus responsurum se fuisse iis dixit, nisi ita infensos omnes in eos videret. Livy, XXXIV. 24. Si ab aliis sibi praemiorum optio deferretur, consilio amplissimi ordinis usurum fuisse. Livy, XXXVII. 52. Docebat, si victores Histri, quibus armis cepissent castra, iisdem capta retinere in animo haberent, primum exutum castris hostem ad mare persecuturos fuisse ; deinde stationes certe pro vallo habituros. Livy, XLI. 3. Quae si vera foret, alium super alium recentes ex fuga venturos fuisse. Livy, XLIV. 44.

Active Subjunctive Apodoses Denying the Aorist, with Protases Denying the Present Indicative (Holding Good in Past, Also), in Oratio Recta, Passed into Oratio Obliqua.

There are certain occurrences of the Pluperfect Subjunctive in Apodosis coupled with the Imperfect Subjunctive in Protasis wherein the Imperfect Subjunctive denies an action, being, or state of Present time, but applying also to the Past. Here, as shown in the first class, the form is the same whether the dependence is on dicit or dixit. In O. O. the Imperfect Subjunctive in Protasis is retained, and the Pluperfect Subjunctive becomes —urum fuisse. Dubitabitur, utrum sit probabilius, Sex. Naevium statim, si quid deberetur, petiturum fuisse, an ne appellaturum quidem biennio ? Cic.,

14

Quinct., 12. Cicero is arguing that nothing is due at the present time, and nothing was due in the Past. The original conception of the Protasis is denial of the Present Indicative involving denial of the Past, also. Video, si haec contra ac dico essent omnia, tamen illum haec venditurum non fuisse. Cic., Verr., Sec., IV. 6. Here the Protasis evidently applies to present time, as well as past. A me petivit, ut Laodiceam protinus irem ; nisi ego successor essem, quem tu cuperes videre, te antea, quam tibi successum esset, decessurum fuisse. Cic., Ad Fam., III. 6, 2. Si posset, in omnes saeviturum fuisse. Livy, VIII. 31. Non potest ; non saeviit. It is not, and was not, possible. Si antiquus animus plebei Romanae esset, audaciter se laturum fuisse de abrogando Q. Fabi imperio. Livy, XXII. 25.

It is possible that the Protasis in one or two of these cases denies merely an Imperfect Indicative. It is very difficult in some cases to determine the exact original conception.

Unreal Conditional Sentences of Past Time That in Oratio Recta Would Have Subjunctive in Protasis and Indicative in Apodosis.

Often in Conditional sentences of Direct Discourse, Unreal Protases have their Apodoses in the Indicative mood. It will be observed, however, that in most of these cases there is indirectness, or obliquity, a meaning of such a character that there is no small degree of resemblance to the Subjunctive, inhering in the expression, as in possum with its Infinitive. Deleri potuit exercitus, si quis aggredi ausus esset. The army could have been destroyed, if any one had dared to attack it. Here we are not told that the army *was* destroyed. This would be purely an Indicative conception. But the exact force is, that it was *possible* for the army to be destroyed. Hence, because potuit with its Infinitive already contains within its signification the indirectness that characterizes the Subjunctive mood, it is manifestly superfluous, if we attend strictly to the indirectness inherent in the expression by nature, to add the extrinsic indirectness characterizing the Subjunctive. We should have, if close attention were given to its significance, indirectness on indirectness, the extrinsic on the intrinsic. If it is objected that again and again such verbs under these circum-

stances take the Subjunctive, it may be answered that
in these cases either grammatical construction is per-
mitted to override the strict interpretation of inherent mean-
ing, or a Subjunctive conception clings to the auxiliary sense
of the verb. Either the indirectness of possum with its
Infinitive, for example, is ignored, and the truth that it (with
its Infinitive) is partly Subjunctive in soul, though Indicative
in body as to posse, is not permitted to modify the syntactical
construction, or the sense of ability itself is looked at as a
Subjunctive conception. The Passive Periphrastic conjugation
in the Apodosis of the Unreal Conditional sentence often has
the Indicative mood. This conjugation does not indicate
occurrence, etc., but what has to occur, etc. It is character-
ized, then, by obliquity, or indirectness even in the Indicative
mood. To avoid the repetition of obliquity, these verbs are
often retained in the Indicative. Sometimes, however, in
other cases the Indicative is retained with a Protasis of Unreal
Condition, not because any degree of obliquity inheres in
the verb, but because the Indicative, the mood of fact, indicates
greater rhetorical vividness than the Subjunctive. The
Apodosis is regarded by a lively play of the imagination as an
actual occurrence. For example, in Si oppidum deletum esset,
oppidani perierunt, for the sake of vividness the perishing is
treated as a fact, but denied by Protasis.

Again, in a case of interrupted action, we may have the
Indicative in the Apodosis of an Unreal Conditional sentence.
Id deponere eum in animo habuisse, quidam auctores sunt, ni
scelus intestinum liberandæ patriæ consilia agitanti intervenis-
set. Livy, I. 48. "He had it in mind (and would have done
so) unless," etc. In the O. O. the Protasis is unchanged,
while the Apodosis, whether Imperfect, Aorist, or Pluperfect,
whether dependent on dicit or on dixit, becomes Perfect form
of Infinitive, Active or Passive according as the O. R. is
Active or Passive.

Active and Passive Indicative Apodoses of the Aorist Tense in O. R., with Unreal Protases, Passed into O. O.

Active and Passive are not classified separately in Indicative

Apodoses, since on passing into O. O. they do not present the difference pertaining to the Subjunctive in the same construction.

A. *With Protases Denying the Aorist.*

(a) With Possum in Apodosis.

Tulisse ad caelum manus dicitur cum hac voce: Se totius orbis dominum esse potuisse, Si tales sibi milites contigissent. Eutrop., II. 11. Platonem existimo, si genus forense dicendi tractare uoluisset, gravissime et copiosissime potuisse dicere. Cic., Off., I. 1. Memor, tantam multitudinem armatorum iuvenum, si honeste mori voluissent, turpiter capi non potuisse. Val. Max., II. 7. Deleri potuisse, ni Suetonius Paulinus receptui cecinisset. Tac., Hist., II. 26. Exstat iocus, bene agi potuisse cum rebus humanis, si Domitius pater talem habuisset uxorem. Suet., Nero, 28. Existimant, si acrius insequi voluissent, bellum eo die potuisse finire. Caes, B. C., III. 51. Eas te non potuisse consequi, nisi meis puer olim fidelissimis atque amantissimis consiliis paruisses. Cic., Ad Fam., II. 1, 2. Provideri potuisse, si hoc aut illud fecisset, aut ni sic fecisset, praecaveri. Cic., Inv., II. 32. Obsistere fato fatetur se non potuisse, nisi ad has commenticias declinationes confugisset. Cic., Fat., 20. Puto multos potuisse ad sapientiam pervenire, nisi putassent se pervenisse, nisi quaedam in se dissimulassent, quaedam opertis oculis transiluissent. Sen., Tranq., 1. Subvenire eis ab legato potuisse ni tristia edicta exhorruisset. Livy, VIII. 35. Si ducis consilia favor subsecutus militum foret, debellari eo die cum Samnitibus potuisse. Livy, VIII. 36. Nisi saepe bellum parantes pacem petissent Samnites, transigi potuisse. Livy, IX. 45. Hostem debellarique, ni cessatum foret, potuisse. Livy, XXII. 41. Si caede abstinuissent, pervenire ad tabernaculum regium potuisse. Livy, XXIV. 40. Quonam modo, nisi defunctos suo bello, sine certamine adducere exercitum potuisse? Livy, XXV. 35. Si non Hieronymus ad Hannibalem defecisset, quid ultra facere hostiliter Marcellum potuisse? Livy, XXVI. 30. Se potuisse iudicio populi Romani in amplissimum locum pervenire, si sua studia ad honores petendos conferre voluissent. Cic., Pro Cluentio,

56. Si confestim victores Stratoniceam petissent, recipi eam urbem sine certamine potuisse. Livy, XXXIII. 18. Potuisse se extra id periculum esse, si decedere fide, si coniurare cum ceteris voluissent. Livy, XXXIV. 11. Si quis antea ignorasset, ex legatorum sermone potuisse apparere. Livy, XXXV. 49.

(b) With Substantive Predicate in Apodosis.

Si spatium ad dicendum nostro commodo vacuosque dies habuissemus, tamen oratione longa nihil opus fuisse. Cic., Verr., Prim., 18.

(c) With Adjective Predicate in Apodosis.

Sibi proclive fuisse Samum capere, nisi a Timotheo et Iphicrate desertus esset. Nep., Timoth., 3. Si alicuius iniuriae sibi conscius fuisset, non fuisse difficile cavere. Caes., B. G., I. 14.

(d) With Prope in Apodosis.

Here the unreality of the Apodosis is implied, rather than expressed. In Achaico concilio, nisi discussa res per paucos Romanum imperium intentantes esset, eo rem prope adductam, ut aditus in Achaiam daretur. Livy, XLII. 12.

(e) With Pass. Periphrastic in Apodosis.

Si ea fuisset cura, quae simularetur tum mittendos legatos fuisse. Livy, XLV. 3. Non recipiundum fuisse, nisi amissum foret. Livy, XXVII. 25. Si sine excidio Lacedaemoniis fieri potuisset, pacis mentionem admittendam auribus non fuisse. Livy, XXXIV. 49. Etiamsi senatus Carthaginiensium non censuisset, eundum Hasdrubali fuisse. Livy, XXVII. 20.

(f) With Indicative of Rhetorical Vividness.

Vettio pugionem defuisse, nisi ei consul dedisset. Cic., Ad Att., II. 24, 2. Sibi vitam filiae sua cariorem fuisse si libere ac pudice vivere licitum fuisset. Livy, III. 50. Ita fuisse si ad iudices alios itum foret. Livy, III. 72. Si vita longior contigisset, magni regis in eo indolem fuisse. Livy, XXXV. 15.

(g) With Indicative of Interrupted Action.

Destinatum promere apud patres principemque arguere, ni elusus a Seiano per vana promissa foret. Tac., Ann., III.

16. Se prima in iuventa studium philosophiae acrius hausisse, nisi prudentia matris coercuisset. Tac. Agr., 4. Strictly, however, in such sentences the unreality of the Apodosis is merely implied. "He drank, and would have continued to do so, unless," etc.

In several of the foregoing examples, the O. R. may be Imperfect. In one or two cases, it may be Pluperfect. It is impossible sometimes to decide definitely.

B. *With Protases Denying the Imperfect.*

(a) Apodoses with Possum.

Si sana mens esset, Graeciae supplicium Persas dare potuisse. Nep., Ages., 5. Si pax cum populo Romano maneret, hospitiumque privatim regi cum Scipionibus esset, neque liberalius neque benignius haberi colique adolescentem, quam cultus est, potuisse. Livy, XXXVII. 34. Quid, si gratuita pax esset, plus adimi ei potuisse? Livy, XXXVIII. 59. Si Claudio circa Lychnidum satis validus exercitus foret, potuisse ancipiti bello distineri regem. Livy, XLIV. 20. Potuisse se desinere ni animus inquies pasceretur opere. Pliny Mai., Praefat. H. N., I. 16.

(b) With Debeo in Apodosis.

Si status imperii aut salus Galliarum in discrimine verteretur, debuisse Caesarem in acie stare. Tac., Hist., IV. 85. Non, si Graccho daret, expertem consilii debuisse matrem esse. Livy, XXXVIII. 57.

(c) With Passive Periphrastic in Apodosis.

Dictatorem quippe dicendum eum fuisse, si privatus esset. Livy, VI. 6. Si simultas ignota hominibus esset, tamen non fuisse ferendum. Livy, XXXIX 4. Nec cuiquam ante pereundum fuisse, si Silius rerum poteretur. Tac., Ann., XI. 36.

Indicative Apodoses of the Imperfect Tense in O. R., Passed into O. O.

Such Apodoses may be divided according to the time of the Protasis into two classes.

A. *With Protases Denying the Aorist.*

(a) Indicative of Interrupted Action.

Agitasse Gaium Caesarem de intranda Britannia satis constat,

ni ingentes adversus Germaniam conatus frustra fuissent. Tac., Agr., 13. Here the unreality of the Apodosis is implied in what would have been.

B. *With Protasis Denying the Imperfect.*

(a) With Indicative of Vividness.

Nemo mihi persuadebit multos praestantes viros tanta esse conatos, nisi animo cernerent posteritatem ad se pertinere. Cic., Senec., 23.

Passive Subjunctive Apodoses Denying the Aorist, with Protases Denying the Aorist, in Oratio Recta, Passed into Oratio Obliqua.

Under the above circumstances, the Pluperfect Subjunctive of Protasis is retained, and the Passive Pluperfect Subjunctive of Apodosis passes into the form futurum fuisse ut with the Imperfect Subjunctive. Quorum si aetas potuisset esse longinquior, futurum fuisse, ut omnibus perfectis artibus omni doctrina hominum vita erudiretur. Cic., Tusc., III. 28. Nisi eo ipso tempore nuntii de Caesaris victoria essent allati existimabant plerique futurum fuisse ut amitterentur. Caes., B. C., III. 101. Both these sentences depend on Past verbs, but a verb of Present tense would require the same construction.

Potuisse Possibly Representing Futurum Fuisse, etc.

On account of the rarity of the foregoing construction, we are led to believe that possibly the Romans sometimes employed an approximate circumlocution with potuisse and Present Passive Infinitive instead. Litterae Romam allatae, se exercitumque suum gravi morbo affectari, nec sisti potuisse, ni eadem vis mali aut gravior etiam in hostes ingruisset. Livy, XXIX. 10. Senatus dixit: Si quem similem eius priore anno inter morbum bellumque irati dii tribunum dedissent, non potuisse sisti. Livy, III. 9.

Fuisse Omitted from Unreal Conditional Sentences of Past Time in O. O.

Often there is an omission of Fuisse from the Apodosis of the Unreal Conditional sentence of Past time in O. O., when it

may be supplied readily from the context. This omission occurs principally in later writers, such as Tacitus and Curtius. Livy, XXIV. 5, 12, is adduced as an occurrence of this construction (in earlier Latin). Fuisse is indeed omitted, but a universally recognized lacuna, which may include fuisse, follows ausuros. Livy, XXIII. 2, 5 (Sibi defectionis ab Romanis consilium placiturum nullo modo nisi necessarium fuisset), is adduced here, but this sentence is Logical, the Apodosis being First Future, and the Protasis, Second Future. Esse, not fuisse, is omitted, as very frequently occurs in the Future Infinitive. Aristander, si extrinsecus cruor fluxisset, Macedonibus id triste futurum, ait. Curt., IV. 9. Rex pronuntiavit nunquam talia ausuros, qui ipsum ex India sospitem aut optassent reverti, aut credidissent reversurum. Curt., X.1. Iuravit Tiberius petiturum se vitam quamvis nocenti, nisi voluntariam mortem properavisset. Tac., Ann., II. 31. Quod si solus arbiter rerum, si iure et nomine regio fuisset, promptius adsecuturum gloriam militiae. Tac., Ann., II. 73. Neque enim cessurum nisi damnandi officio. Tac., Ann., III. 22. Credebant non mansurum Tiberio imperium, si iis quoque legionibus cupido novandi fuisset. Tac., Ann., IV. 18. Fuisse may be omitted from the Personal construction when it is clearly implied. Credebatur si rerum potitus foret, libertatem redditurus. Tac., Ann., I. 33.

Unreal Conditional Sentences in Oratio Obliqua Apodoses Denying the Present.

In Direct Discourse the Unreal Present is expressed by the Imperfect Subjunctive both in Protasis and in Apodosis. Inasmuch as the Subjunctive is the mood of contingency, it is manifestly proper that the contingency characterizing the Unreal Conditional sentence should be expressed by that mood.

But why should the Imperfect tense be employed to indicate Unreal Present time ? We have seen that, in order to express an Unreal Aoristic conception, the Pluperfect Subjunctive is employed. We have seen that under those circumstances unreality is indicated by relegating the conception to the past and binding it up there. It is expressed by adopting the mood of contingency and a tense of the irrevocable past. To express the exact force of the Unreal Aoristic conception, the supposition is thrown backward one degree beyond the Aorist, and this throwing backward coincides with the Pluperfect tense.

Now, the same law holds good in the Unreal Present. Although there is a clear reference to present time, and the denial of an act, being, or state, in present time, yet the past must be employed to show unreality, to indicate that the time when fulfillment of the supposition might have taken place is past and gone.

The Imperfect tense is employed because it is one degree back of the Present and exactly corresponds with the backward shift of one degree from the Present for the purpose of denoting present unreality. This seemingly anomalous condition is seen, therefore, to rest on clear and reasonable laws.

In O. O., the Imperfect Subjunctive of the Protasis is retained, while the Imperfect Subjunctive of the Apodosis passes into –urum fuisse if the form can be made, i. e., if the Supine system is not lacking. Otherwise, it is believed that a tense of posse with a slight difference in meaning was used to represent the theoretical futurum fuisse ut with Imp. Subj.

As the O. O. Apodosis of Unreal Present Conditionals is not agreed on by grammarians, many contending that –urum esse is

the regular form, it will be necessary to treat this part of the theme at some length.

It is objected that –urum fuisse would be an anomalous form because the Present is denied. It has been seen, however, that the Unreal Present is indicated by binding up the conception in the past. Now, while the denial belongs to present time logically, it is expressed grammatically by utilizing the Past. Accordingly, when it became necessary to employ a Periphrastic Infinitive to represent this conception, what were the Romans to do? The –urum fuisse construction, because of the apparent discord between fuisse and the Present denied, clashed apparently with logic ; the –urum esse construction, because of the discord between esse and the backward shift, ·clashed clearly with grammar. Let us illustrate this point. Si hic esset, laeta esset. If she were here, she would be glad. The following is denied: Hic est ; laeta est. From the standpoint of logic, it might be expected that since est is denied, such denial would be expressed by the Periphrastic with esse. Yet, in order to express Unreal being, it became necessary to convert est into the Subjunctive and throw it backward one degree to esset. The problem was solved by adopting the fuisse form, corresponding with the backward shift to esset.

Active Subjunctive Apodoses Denying the Present with Protases Denying the Present, in O. R., Passed into O. O.

A. First will be discussed those depending on verbs of Saying and Thinking of Present tense.

Concessum est si voluptas esset bonum, fuisse desideraturam. Cic., Fin., I. 11. O. R. Si voluptas esset bonum, (manus) desideraret. Bonum non est; non desiderat. The O. R., with Imperfect Subjunctive in both Protasis and Apodosis, occurs in the preceding context, and no further proof that this is a case of the Unreal Present with –urum fuisse in Apodosis is necessary.

Utrum censes Imperiosum illum, si nostra verba audiret; tuamne de se orationem libentius auditurum fuisse an meam ? Cic., Fin., II. 19.

The context shows clearly that this is an example of the

Unreal Present. There is no reference whatever to an Aoristic period of time. Cum ego dicerem accompanying does not indicate Unreal Past. This clause is of Conditional force and nearly equal to Si ego dicerem. It belongs, therefore, to Present time.

Si id explanare velles apertiusque diceres nihil eum fecisse nisi voluptatis causa, quomodo eum laturum fuisse existimas? Cic., Fin., II. 19. This sentence, following closely the preceding, belongs to the same tense-scheme, i. e., denial of the Present.

Hoc magis intellegendum est haec ipsa nimia in quibusdam futura non fuisse, nisi quaedam essent modica natura. Cic., Fin., V. 11.

· This is the language of philosophy. It partakes somewhat of the nature of a general truth. To such extent, it belongs to the sphere of the Present, inasmuch as general truths are regularly expressed in the Present tense. There is no past time to which this is referable.

Qui fatentur se virtutis causa, nisi ea voluptatem crearet, ne manum quidem versuros fuisse. Cic., Fin., V. 31. No particular circumstances are referred to here. The speakers are dealing rather with a generality. This being the case, we have here a denial of the Present.

Quid censes, si ratio esset in beluis? non suo quasque generi plurimum tributuras fuisse? Cic., Nat. Deorum, I. 27. The context shows that Cicero had in mind not what would have been, but what would be. He is dealing undoubtedly with a general truth, and such truths are expressed in the Present tense. If stated conditionally and supposed not to exist, the Unreal Condition belongs to Present time, and must be expressed by the Imperfect Subjunctive.

Musas Plautino sermone locuturas fuisse, si Latine loqui vellent. Quint. X. 1, 100. "They would speak." They are regarded as still in existence.

An tu censes ullam anum tam deliram futuram fuisse, ut somniis crederet, nisi ista casu non numquam forte temere concurrerent? Cic., Div., II. 68. This, also, is of general nature. To argue that the Apodosis denies the Past would be

to militate against its naturalness, and to introduce a degree
of time that probably did not enter into Cicero's mind.

Nullam a se neque belli externi neque discordiarum domes-
ticarum calamitatem abfuturam fuisse, si hoc imperio non
teneretur. Cic., Ad Frat., I. 1, 11. The context shows
clearly that the author is referring to present circumstances,
and there is no reason for referring this supposition to the
Past.

Quid putamus passurum fuisse, si viveret? Pliny Minor,
Ep., IV., 22. There is a conversation at table. Mauricus
asks this question. The answer, as is indicated in the follow-
ing sentence, is "Nobiscum cenaret." He would be dining
with us? This is undoubtedly Unreal Present.

B. There are here presented some sentences of originally
Present Unreality depending on verbs of Past tense, coinci-
dent with the tense of the Governing Verb. Alloquebatur si
qui dissimiles eorum essent se illa fuisse dicturum. Curt., IV.
52. O. R. Si qui dissimiles eorum essent, illa dicerem. Non
dissimiles sunt; illa non dico. Here the speaker is evidently
not referring to a previous speech, and it cannot be proved
that he is referring to a previous part of this speech. The
circumstances all favor the supposition that this is originally
Present unreality.

Illi, si ab alio occiderentur, tristes morituros fuisse, respond-
ent. (Hist. Pres. with Past context.) Curt., VII. 39.
Those who endorse the –urum esse theory, if denying that this
is Unreal Present in O. R., would be compelled to construe
morituros fuisse as a denial of the Aorist. "We did not die
sad!" The sentence quoted is not the language of ghosts,
but of men. It is the originally Unreal Present, then, not
the Aorist.

Eo deinde dicente, libenter id se fuisse facturum, nisi
senatus voluntate impediretur. Val. Max., III. 2. If it is
objected that this in O. R. is Unreal Past, it is suggested that
this is in answer to the question, Quid cessas in me
cruentam securim destringere? The answer would be, Cesso
quod impedior, not impediebar. The hindrance is looked at
as still effective, as acting at present, though the will of the
Senate had been expressed some time previously.

Et illud ostendi, si ipse unus cum illo uno contenderet, me ei satisfacturum fuisse. Cic., Ad Att., I. 1, 4. This cannot be referred to any previous contention. General trend of context indicates Unreal Present in the Direct Discourse.

Si essent in re publica magistratus, nullum futurum fuisse Romae nisi publicum concilium. Livy, II. 28. The context shows that Livy is treating of Rome as it is, not as it was.

Ni ita esset, patrio iure in filium animadversurum fuisse. Livy, I. 26. Preceding this we have : Maxime Publio Horatio patre proclamante se filiam iure caesam iudicare. Ni ita esset is nearly equivalent to ni iudicarem filiam iure caesam. But iudicarem would deny the iudico represented by iudicare, and it is, accordingly, an Unreal Present in O. R. If any one affirms that ni ita esset refers to caesam, etc., instead of iudicare, it may be maintained that such a supposition would demand the Pluperfect Subjunctive in Protasis. As to the Apodosis, the case is still pending, and nothing can reasonably militate against its denying the Present.

Se rectius viduam et illum caelibem futurum fuisse. Livy, I. 46. The most natural denial here is that of the Present in O. R. If the speaker had the Past in mind, it is not evident.

Initium a Prisco factum : recitat non dicturum fuisse, ni caritas rei publicae vinceret. Livy, II. 2. We have these words immediately preceding : Invitum se dicere hominis causa. The speaker said, Invitus dico, not dixi. "I am speaking unwillingly." The sentence in question is a continuation of the same thought. "I should not be speaking unless," etc.

There have been grouped separately Unreal Present Conditionals depending on dicit and those originally Present depending on dixit. By appeal to the context and in other ways, it has been shown in some cases very probably, in others, absolutely certainly, I think, that these were originally Unreal Present. It remains to call attention to the principle that whether such sentences, depend on dicit or dixit, the form is exactly the same. If the dependence is on dicit, the time of the Conditional sentence is Present (time of the speaker). If on dixit, it is of the same time with the Governing verb of Saying. It

is not antecedent, as some might affirm. It is referable to the time of the reporter and coincident with it. Accordingly, the –urum fuisse construction dependent on *dixit* may represent an originally Unreal Present, as has been shown in Ni ita esset, patrio iure in filium animadversurum fuisse ; or, dependent on *dicit* it may represent Unreal Present, as has been shown in Quid censes, si ratio esset in beluis? non suo quasque generi plurimum tributuras fuisse ? In determining an –urum fuisse construction, we may go to the context or to the meaning of the sentence itself, as well as to the time of the Governing verb, if we would distinguish between Unreal Present and Unreal Past.

Active Subjunctive Apodoses Denying the Present with Protases Denying the Aorist in Oratio Recta, Passed into Oratio Obliqua.

An Unreal Conditional sentence may have the Pluperfect Subjunctive in Protasis and the Imperfect Subjunctive (denying the Present) in Apodosis. In O. O. the Pluperfect Subjunctive is retained, and the Imperfect Subjunctive passes into –urum fuisse, whether the dependence is on dicit or dixit. Oblitus, nisi hic Atharrias, senex iuniores pugnam detrectantes revocasset, adhuc nos circa Halicarnassum haesuros fuisse. Curt., VIII. 4. Adhuc ("still" or "up to and embracing the present") indicates the Unreal Present in O. R.

Si sibi eum quo digna esset dii dedissent virum, domi se prope diem visuram regnum fuisse. Livy, I. 46. Prope diem seems to call for the Unreal Present in O. R. Evidently, conditions still holding good are under discussion.

Objections to the Foregoing Theory.

It now remains to answer certain objections to the –urum fuisse theory. As to fore (Tac., Ann., XIV. 8), the text is so doubtful, various emendations having been suggested, that the –urum esse theory cannot be established from it. An objection is based on Caes., B. G., V. 29. Titurius clamitabat Eburones, si ille adesset, tanta contemptione nostri ad castra non venturos esse. In reply to this objection, it may be urged that esse may be an interpolation. We have

seen that fuisse is sometimes omitted from the Apodosis of the Unreal Past in O. O. We shall see hereafter that it is sometimes omitted from a similar Unreal Present. Though such omissions belong rather to a period later than Caesar's, he may have written merely venturos, omitting fuisse because it is implied in the context, or he may possibly, though not probably, have intended that it should be supplied from the preceding Periphrastic Infinitive, fuisse capturos. If Caesar had intended to write the Future Infinitive, he would probably, though not undoubtedly, have omitted the esse. Caesar generally, but not always, makes this omission.

Again, Caesar may have written sese, and copyists may have misread it and changed it to esse. If we take this position, we must place a period after venturos, and make sese the subject of the Infinitive spectare. Unless we do this, we are required to supply sese for spectare. Or, barely possibly, Caesar may have deviated from regular usage for the purpose of precluding ambiguity. He has just used fuisse capturos, representing denial of an Aorist. If Caesar had written venturos fuisse immediately after the foregoing Infinitive, it might have been taken as the representative of the denial of an Aorist, while adesset might have been taken as the representative of the denial of the Imperfect Indicative.

Again, Caesar, though a great stylist, may have omitted fuisse and written esse by blunder or oversight. The greatest stylists of modern literature occasionally err in syntax; did the Romans never? Are we to regard as an "exception" every deviation from regular usage in Greek and Latin classics?

However, if we concede that Caesar wrote esse designedly, we do not admit that this lone occurrence in all Latin prose, as far as observed, establishes the rule in the face of the numerous indubitable examples quoted in support of the –urum fuisse theory from Valerius Maximus, Younger Pliny, Curtius, Quintilian, Livy, and Cicero. Shall only one example from only one writer, even though that be Julius Caesar, be allowed to weigh more than the numerous examples quoted in the foregoing pages, from the deliberate works of five writers?

The preponderance of evidence is overwhelmingly against such a supposition.

Again, it may be urged that Cic., Flacc., 32 (Si aliena censendo Decianus sua facere posset, eum maxima habiturum esse), indicates the use of –urum esse for the Apodosis of the Unreal Present in O. O. But a careful consideration of the context, coupled with an investigation of Ciceronian usage, will show that this is a case of the First Future in both Protasis and Apodosis. Cicero often, instead of using the Unreal Conditional form in cases where he would deny that reality exists, prefers the First Future, which has a force somewhat similar to that of the Imperfect Subjunctive of Conditional sentences, since binding up a supposition in the Future is somewhat akin to binding it up in the Past, and a somewhat similar result is secured. Cic., Fin., I. 6, Nam si omnes atomi declinabunt, nullae umquam cohaerescent, is an illustration of this usage.

It may be objected that Cic., Fin., I. 6, 19, Si omnia deorsum e regione ferrentur, numquam fore, ut atomus altera alteram posset attingere, illustrates the –urum esse theory, but an examination will show that this, also, is First Future.

Finally, an eminent grammarian says : "In like manner, the infinitive future with esse is used in the apodosis of hypothetical sentences instead of the imperfect subjunctive; e. g., Cic., in Verr. I. 47, libertus, nisi iurasset, scelus se facturum (esse) arbitrabatur."

But facturum does not represent an original Imperfect Subjunctive, nor is this an Unreal Conditional sentence, at all. It is a Logical Conditional sentence. The verb of the Protasis in O. R. would be Second Future, while that of the Apodosis would be First Future. The thought of the libertus was : Nisi iuravero, scelus faciam. The context shows clearly that he was looking forward and not backward.

Fuisse Omitted from Apodosis of Unreal Present.

Fuisse may be omitted from the Apodosis of the Unreal Present when it can be readily supplied from the context. Hoc ne statuam quidem dicturam pater aiebat, si loqui posset.

Cic., Fin., I. 11. Cum Parmenion dixisset, se, si Alexander esset, usurum conditione. Val. Max., VI. 4. Nec recusaturum Tiridaten accipiendo diademati in urbem venire, nisi sacerdotii religione attineretur. Tac., Ann., XV. 24. Si ambo consules cum suis exercitibus ad Nolam essent, tamen non pares Hannibali futuros. Livy, XXIII. 43. Here, it will be noticed, one omission occurs in Cicero, and one in Livy. In these writers this is exceptional.

Present Unreal Apodosis in Certain Verbs Denoting Abilty, Will, Necessity, etc. (Indicative Apodosis).

Certain verbs, such as volo, nolo, malo, possum, etc., and the Periphrastic Passive, in the Apodosis of the Unreal Conditional sentence of Present time, may be either Imperfect Indicative or Imperfect Subjunctive. Malle, si mutare fortunam posset, apud Samnites quam Romanos victoriam esse. Livy, VIII. 31. The O. R. is probably Mallem, si mutare fortunam possem. Quae si paria essent, Punicam Romanae societatem atque amicitiam praeoptandam esse. Livy, XXIII. 43. The O. R. is probably Si paria essent, Punica Romanae societas atque amicitia praeoptanda esset (erat?).

We have here, then, a clear confirmation of the rule that such Apodoses are expressed by the Present form of the Infinitive. The Protasis is unchanged.

Posse Representing Futurum Fuisse in Passive Apodosis.

Sometimes posse with Present Passive Infinitive may possibly represent the Periphrastic form futurum fuisse with ut and the Imperfect Subjunctive. This theory gains a degree of plausibility from the fact that in the Unreal Present, the regular form for the Passive (same as in Unreal Past, probably) does not occur as far as observed.

The following examples illustrate this theory: Cuius si filius hostili in solo adultus in regnum venisset, posse extimesci. Tac., Ann., XI. 16. At mehercule ego arbitrabar posse id populo nostro probari si te ad ius respondendum dedisses. Cic., Leg., I. 4, 12.

Constructions Possible either in Unreal Present or in Unreal Past.

We must consider certain constructions that from their nature may belong either to the Unreal Present or to the Unreal Past. As a matter of fact, they may be found in only one of these categories, but nothing will prevent them from belonging by nature to both. Omitted fuisse, requiring special discussion, is treated elsewhere.

Rhetorical Questions of the Unreal Conditional Character in O. O.

In the Rhetorical Question of the Unreal Conditional nature in O. O., the same laws hold good that pertain to the Stating sentence. Quem pium et bonae mentis, auditis quae ad eum delata erant, non protinus ad regem fuisse cursurum? Curt., IV. 30. Quid passurum fuisse filium suum si exercitum amisisset, si fusus fugatus castris exutus fuisset? Livy, VIII. 33.

Unreal Conditional Sentences Depending on Personal Verbs.

Here the Nominative instead of the Accusative is used as to the subject, and the Participle differs accordingly from the construction with Impersonal Verbs.

Videbatur aeque diuturnus futurus labor ac Veis fuisset, ni fortuna imperatori Romano maturam victoriam dedisset. A nominative, implied in personal ending of videbatur, is used instead of eum which would have been the subject of the Infinitive, and the Participle is, accordingly, in the Nominative. Videmur quieturi fuisse, nisi essemus lacessiti. Cic., Or., II. 56.

Ut Capitolium nullam sine fastigio dignitatem habiturum fuisse videatur. Cic., Or., III. 46. Nec mihi aliter potuisse videor hominum perditorum de me consilia frangere, nisi cum praesidiis iis, quae semper habui, nunc etiam potentium benevolentiam coniunxissem. Cic., Ad Fam., I. 9, 21. Otacilium,

nisi interpellatus ordo comitiorum esset, collegam absentem
daturus fuisse videbatur populus. Livy, XXVI. 23. Ut,
nisi receptui cecinisset, permixti fugientibus irrupturi fuisse
in urbem viderentur. Livy, XXVI. 44.