

THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO  
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA

**PARATAXIS**

IN

**EARLY LATIN**

BY

**AXEL REYNOLD WALLIN, A.M.**



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
LIBRARY

NEW YORK  
1910

BRARY  
UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA  
SAN DIEGO

# PARATAXIS

IN

EARLY LATIN

BY

AXEL REYNOLD WALLIN, A. M.



UPSALA COLLEGE,  
KENILWORTH, N. J.

NEW YORK  
1910



## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Preface . . . . .	5
Introduction . . . . .	9
Chapter I. Final Substantive Clauses . . . . .	15
" II. Consecutive Substantive Clauses . . . . .	20
" III. Indirect Question . . . . .	24
" IV. Indirect Discourse . . . . .	26
" V. Final Adverbial Clauses . . . . .	32
" VI. Consecutive Adverbial Clauses . . . . .	35
" VII. Causal Adverbial Clauses . . . . .	37
" VIII. Temporal Adverbial Clauses . . . . .	40
" IX. Conditional Adverbial Clauses . . . . .	41
" X. Concessive Adverbial Clauses . . . . .	45
" XI. Relative and Comparative Clauses . . . . .	47
" XII. Conclusion . . . . .	50



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

## PREFACE.

The theory that hypotaxis has developed from parataxis, was first set forth by F. W. Thiersch in his Greek Grammar (Edinburg, 1831). This theory was again discussed by Hermann in 1850.<sup>1)</sup> During the second half of the century the subject was studied by a large number of syntactists. Holtze, in his *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum*, (Leipzig, 1861—62), gave a new impetus to the study by his large collection of paratactic sentences from early Latin writers. This study was continued by Kühner in his *Ausführliche Grammatik*, (Hanover, Hahn, 1877—79), and by Draeger in his *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache*, (Leipzig, 2d ed., 1881).

More careful collections of paratactic material were made in the eighties by Weissenhorn,<sup>2)</sup> Weninger,<sup>3)</sup> and Becker,<sup>4)</sup> and, a little later, by Lindskog.<sup>5)</sup> These scholars, however, did not exhaust the subject. They either confined themselves to the classification of paratactic sentences in Plautus or Terence, or, when the field from which they drew their illustrations was wider, treated only a limited portion of the subject. The work of Becker was the most ambitious of them all. The aim was to embrace within one compass all sentences in the ancient Roman dramatic writers, which could be classed as paratactic. This work was, however, never completed. Only the first part, treating one class of substantive clauses, appeared. The discussion of Claes Lindskog, which appeared in 1896, covers practically the same field, though it differs in arrangement, and in giving more attention to origins.

Numerous discussions, in addition to the above, are found in current periodicals and grammatical works both on the general subject of parataxis and on particular phases of the same. No work has, however, appeared, so far as the present writer is aware, which covers the whole field of parataxis. Neither do the following pages aim to exhaust the subject. The main object will be to present to view the whole field of parataxis as it is illustrated by the various

---

1) Hermann, C. Fr., *De protasi paratactica*, (Göttingen, 1850).

2) Weissenhorn, J. B., *Parataxis Plautina*, (Burghausen, 1884).

3) Weninger, A., *De Parataxis in Terenti fabulis vestigiis*, (Erlangen, 1888).

4) Becker, Ed., *Beiordnende und unterordnende Satzverbindung bei den altrömischen Bühnendichtern*, (Metz, 1888).

5) Lindskog, Claes, *Quaestiones de parataxi et hypotaxi apud priscos Latinos*, (Lund, 1896).

kinds of paratactic sentences found in early Roman writers down to the time of Lucilius, or about 100 B. C.

The present writer naturally owes much to his predecessors both for suggestions which have helped him in the determination of paratactic sentences and for methods of arrangement and discussion. The sentences used for illustration are, however, mainly from his own collection. The text is, on the whole, that given in the following editions, but changes in punctuation have been made where this has seemed necessary.

- Ribbeck, O., *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, 2 vols., (Leipzig, 1897—98).  
 Keil, H., *M. Porci Catonis De Agri Cultura*, (Leipzig, 1895).  
 Goetz, G., and Schoell, F., *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae*, (Leipzig, 1902—06).  
 Fleckeisen, A., *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*, (Leipzig, 1901).  
 Marx, F., *C. Lucili Carminum Reliquiae*, (Leipzig, 1904).  
*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. I.

The following are the more important works and articles that have been used for reference. They are arranged chronologically.

- Jolly, J., *Ueber die Einfachste Form der Hypotaxis*, *Curtius Studien*. VI., (1873), pp. 215—246.  
 Wölfflin, E., *Bemerkungen über das Vulgärlatein*, *Philologus*, XXXIV., (1875), pp. 137—165.  
 Schnoor, H., *Quaestiones Plautinae*, (Kiel, 1875).  
 Kühner, R., *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache*, (Hanover, Hahn, 1877—79), esp. vol. II., pp. 213 ff.  
 Jordan, H., *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Lateinischen Sprache*, (Berlin, 1879).  
 Draeger, P., *Historische Syntax der lat. Sprache*, (Leipzig, 2d ed., 1881), vol. II., pp. 213 ff.  
 Rebling, O., *Versuch einer Charakteristik der römischen Umgangssprache*, (Kiel, 1882).  
 Abel, Carl, *Linguistic Essays*, (London, 1882), pp. 160 ff.  
 Gildersleeve, B. L., A. J. P., vol. IV., (1883), pp. 419—420.  
 Probst, Arthur, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Grammatik*, (Leipzig, 1883).  
 Weissenhorn, J. B., *Parataxis Plautina*, (Burghausen, 1884).  
 Ballas, E., *Grammatica Plautina*, (Berlin, 1884).  
 Techmer, F., *Sprachentwicklung, Spracherlernung, Sprachbildung*, *Internat. Zeitschrift f. algem. Sprachw.*, vol. II., pp. 141—192, (Leipzig, 1885).



- Ostendorf, A., *Zum Gebrauch von ut bei Plautus*, Vierzehnter Jahresbericht, Progr. Nu. 264, (Neumünster, 1885).
- Brugman, O., *Ueber den Gebr. d. conditionalen NI in d. ält. Lat.*, (Leipzig, 1887).
- Becker, Ed., *Beiordnende und unterordnende Satzverbindung bei den altröm. Bühnendicht.*, (Metz, 1888).
- Roby, H. J., *Latin Grammar*, vol. II., 5th ed., (London, 1888).
- Kern, Franz, *Die deutsche Satzlehre*, Berlin, 1888).
- Tylor, E. B., *Anthropology*, (London, 1888), and *Primitive Culture*, (New York, 1889).
- Weninger, A., *De Parataxis in Terenti fabulis vestigiis*, (Erlangen, 1888).
- Morris, E. P., *On the Sentence Question in Plautus and Terence*, A. J. P., X., (1889), p. 397.
- Onions, J. H., *Classical Review*, III., (1889), p. 249.
- Morris, E. P., A. J. P., XI., (1890), pp. 16—145.
- Strong, H. A., *Introduction to the study of the History of Language*, (London, 1891).
- Müller, Max. F., *The Science of Language*, (New York, 1891).
- Hentze, K., *Die Parataxis bei Homer*, (Göttingen, 1888—91).
- Miles, E. H., *Comparative Syntax of Latin and Greek*, (Cambridge, 1893).
- Gildersleeve, B. L., and Lodge, G., *Latin Grammars*, (New York, 1894 and 1898).
- Ries, J., *Was ist Syntax?* (Marburg, 1894), pp. 150 ff.
- Elmer, H. C., A. J. P., XV., (1894), p. 2.
- Lindsay, W. M., *The Latin Language*, (Oxford, 1894), pp. 598 ff.
- Lindskog, Claes, *De enuntiativis apud Plautum conditionalibus*, (Lund, 1895).
- Ueber die sogenant. Attractio inversa im Lateinischen*, Eranos, I., (1896), p. 48.
- Beiträge zur Geschichte der Satzstellung im Latein*, (Lund, 1896).
- Zur Erklärung der Acc. mit inf. Constr. im Lat.*, Eranos, I., (1896), p. 121.
- Quaestiones de parataxi et hypotaxi apud priscos Latinos*, (Lund, 1896).
- Morris, E. P., *The Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus*. A. J. P., XVIII., (1897), pp. 133 ff.
- Ashmore, S. G., Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., XXVIII., (1897), p. viii.
- Paul, H., *Principien der Sprachgeschichte*, 3 aufl., (Halle, 1898).
- Bennett, C. E., *Critique of some Recent Subjunctive Theories*, Cornell Studies in Cl. Phil. IX., (1898), espec. pp. 66 ff.

- Lane, G. M., and Morgan, M. H., *Latin Grammar*, (New York, 1898 and 1903).
- Schmalz, J. H., *Lateinische Syntax*, (München, 1900), pp. 341 ff.
- Sweet, H., *History of Language*, (London, 1900).
- Riemann, O., *La Syntaxe Latine*, 4th ed., (Paris, 1900).
- Wundt, W., *Die Sprache*, (Leipzig, 1900), vol. II., pp. 326 ff.
- Sjögren, H., *De particulis copulativis apud Plautum et Terentium*, (Uppsala, 1900).
- Durham, C. L., *Subjunctive Substantive Clauses in Plautus*, Corn. Stud., XIII., (1901).
- Morris, E. P., *Principles and Methods in Latin Syntax*, (New York, 1901), espec. pp. 113 ff.
- Müller, F. Max., *Last Essays*, (London and New York, 1901), vol. XVII., pp. 63 ff., et al.
- Delbrück, B., *Grundfragen der Sprachforschung, mit Rücksicht auf Wundts Sprachpsychologie erörtert*, (Strassburg, 1901).
- Nutting, H. C., *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.*, XXXIII., (1901), p. cv.
- Gildersleeve, B. L., *Problems in Greek Syntax*, A. J. P., XXIII., (1902), p. 253.
- Sidgewick, A., *Relative Parataxis*, *Cl. Rev.* XVII., (1903), p. 402.
- Nutting, H. C., *Modes of Conditional Thought*, A. J. P., XXIV., (1903), pp. 25 ff.
- Hale, W. G., and Buck, C. D., *A Latin Grammar*, (Boston, 1903).
- Allen, J. H., and Greenough, J. B., *New Latin Grammar*, (Boston, 1904).
- Gaffiot, Felix, *Le subjonctif de subordination en Latin*, (Paris, 1906).
- Bennett, C. E., *The Latin Language*, (Boston, 1907).
- Lindsay, W. M., *Syntax of Plautus*, (Oxford, 1907), espec. pp. 52 ff.

## INTRODUCTION.

Unfortunately there exists as yet no universally accepted definition of parataxis. It is, therefore, necessary at the outset to gain a clear understanding of what sentences are to be included under this term. The kind of sentence-structure to which it should be applied will, perhaps, best be seen after a few general remarks on the development of language have been made.

The human mind is the ultimate source of all language. Without thought no language is possible. Human thought finds its means of expression in words which are the instruments by which one man communicates his thoughts to another.<sup>1)</sup> These instruments are signs, either visible or audible, and were invented to represent the thought elements that were to be communicated.

In primitive man these thought elements were very simple. Language must, consequently, have been very simple, for a creation of the human mind always exhibits the limitations of the latter. Language, however, reacted on the mind. The power of the brain and its capacity for thought were increased, so soon as language came into use. Order was gradually brought into the chaos of the mind, and man became able to correlate and classify. And thus spoken language, which at first consisted of isolated vocal utterances, gradually evolved the simple sentence.

But this simple sentence was not long used alone, for nothing hindered primitive man from forming a number of related concepts and from expressing them by an equal number of successive simple sentences or propositions.<sup>2)</sup> Two or more of these simple sentences would, therefore, be joined to express thoughts that were related. All sentences thus joined may be called compound irrespective of the nature of this relation.

Of these compound sentences two distinct groups must be recognized. In the one group, which may be termed coordinate, the simple sentences were merely placed side by side without the thought in the several propositions being thereby modified. The relation between propositions in coordinate sentences is, accordingly, not that of inter-

---

1) Cf. Müller. F. Max., *On Thought and Language*, Last Essays, Vol. XVII., pp. 85 ff.

2) The term *propositions* will at times be used, in this dissertation, synonymously with *simple sentences*. The term *clause* is used to denote a proposition which is dependent or subordinate to a principal proposition.

dependence, but, on the other hand, of a character similar to the relation of successive thoughts. The multitudinous kinds of connections, which we can conceive as existing between successive thoughts; can therefore also be conceived as existing between these propositions. The relation may be that of coexistence, succession, contrast, contradiction, etc.<sup>1)</sup> Thus in Most. 3, *Venit imber, lavit parietes, perpluunt*, the relation is manifestly that of succession.<sup>2)</sup>

The compound sentences of the second group may be called complex. The propositions are here, so to speak, woven together. Their relation is that of parts to a whole. The complex sentence contained a principal proposition and one or more dependent propositions or clauses which may be termed subordinate.

The relation between the simple sentences placed in juxtaposition was then, according to the belief of the present writer, either coordinate or complex. Some writers on Parataxis<sup>3)</sup> have, however, doubted that these relations existed from the beginning, and have held that the simple sentences remained independent in thought as well as arrangement. Others<sup>4)</sup> grant that the coordinate relation existed, but insist that the complex relation is a later development. The absurdity of the first mentioned theory, that continuous statements in connected discourse can be absolutely independent, has been clearly shown by later syntactists, especially by Ries<sup>5)</sup> and Morris.<sup>6)</sup> In fact, all contiguous statements are related in some way.<sup>7)</sup> This relation which was, in the first place, indicated by the sequence of the simple sentences, could, undoubtedly, also be quite clearly indicated in spoken language by gestures and by what has been termed "musical means", namely, pauses, accentuation, rhythm, and pitch.<sup>8)</sup>

It is, of course, probable that primitive man did not at once analyze these coordinate and complex sentences which he had formed. But if *he* did not feel that one sentence was coordinate and another complex, we have nevertheless no right to say that these relations did not exist. On the contrary, it is the belief of the present writer, that we must concede the existence of the complex relation from the beginning. This theory does not invalidate the commonly accepted belief that complex sentences were a result of successive utterances of simple sentences containing independent indicatives, subjunctives,

1) Cf. James, W., *Psychology*. (New York, 1904), p. 253 f.

2) For other examples see p. 39, note 2.

3) See Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*, §265; Kern, *Die deutsche Satzlehre*; Reis, *Was ist Syntax?* Anmerk. 30, et al.

4) E. g. Bennett, *Corn. Stud.*, vol. IX., pp. 66 ff., and *Lat. Language*, p. 223; and Durham, *Corn. Stud.*, vol. XIII.

5) Ries, *Was ist Syntax?* pp. 31 ff. et al.

6) Morris, *Lat. Synt.*, pp. 36 ff., and pp. 115 ff.

7) See Strong, *Introd. to the Study of Lang.*, pp. 121 ff.

8) Cf. Ries, l. c., p. 32.



or imperatives. The purpose for which these simple sentences came to be used in sequence, must have been to give expression not only to coordinate thoughts, but also to thoughts that were mutually dependent. It is inconceivable, for instance, that a speaker would say, *eum moneo: abeat*, "I advise him: let him go away"; without meaning that the thought expressed by *abeat* constitutes his advice. It is, of course, true that in a great number of the paratactic sentences found in the following pages, the complex relation is not so easily seen as in the sentence just quoted. But this is due to the fact that many of these sentences have been taken from the fragmentary remains of the dramatic poets, where the lack of connection of thought often makes it impossible to determine the nature of the relation; or,—in the case of examples from Plautus and Terence as well—, to the fact that we have no means of discovering with what gestures and voice-modulation speech was accompanied. Even if we did know this, we would still be in doubt, if we did not know just what was the conventional gesture and modulation of voice which would indicate to the listener whether the subordinate thought was to be taken as a condition, concession, cause, etc. <sup>1)</sup>

From what already has been said it is evident that there is a difference between the inherent psychological relation of two or more contiguous propositions and the linguistic expression of the same. The relation may be merely indicated by gestures, quality of voice, attendant circumstances, or even by a word, i. e. an adverb or a pronoun,<sup>2)</sup> or it may be clearly expressed by the form of the language itself. The former was, undoubtedly, the earlier method of indicating the relation of sentences, and was a method still in use when language was first committed to writing. In the early Latin writers we still find numerous examples of both coordinate and complex sentences in which the relation between the simple sentences is not at all indicated by the written language. Side by side with these, however, are found other coordinate and complex sentences in which the coordinate or complex relation is more or less clearly expressed by the form of the language.

In the present dissertation it is not the intention of the writer to deal with all the classes of sentence-structure described above. Coordinate sentences are entirely aside from this discussion. Of complex sentences we shall deal with only those in which the complex relation is either not at all or only slightly indicated by the language. These sentences are by the present writer included under the term parataxis, while the term hypotaxis is applied to complex sentences in which

---

1) Cf. pp. 40 ff., 37 ff., and pp. 45 f.

2) Cf. pp. 50 f.

the relation of the propositions to each other is expressed by a subordinate conjunction or a relative pronoun. The following classification will show the position which parataxis holds relative\* to other compound sentences.

### 1. COORDINATE SENTENCES.

- a. The coordinate relation is not indicated by the language, e. g., Most. 49, *Tu fortunatus, ego miser: patiunda sunt.* (Asyndetic Coordination).
- b. The coordinate relation is indicated by the language, e. g., Asin. 543, *Intro abi: nam te quidem edepol nil est impudentius.* (Syndetic Coordination).

### 2. COMPLEX SENTENCES.

- a. The complex relation is  $\alpha$ ) either not at all,  $\beta$ ) or only slightly indicated by the language, i. e. by an adverb or a demonstrative pronoun,<sup>1)</sup> e. g.,  $\alpha$ ) Phorm. 265, *unum cognoris, omnis noris*;  $\beta$ ) Andr. 937, *vix sum apud me: ita animus commotust metu.* (Parataxis).
- b. The complex relation is indicated by  $\alpha$ ) subordinate conjunctions or  $\beta$ ) relative pronouns, e. g.,  $\alpha$ ) Asin. 654, *Has ego si vis tibi dabo*;  $\beta$ ) Asin. 877, *Nil ecastor est quod facere mavelim.* (Hypotaxis).

There is no psychological difference between the two classes of coordinate sentences described above. The difference between them is grammatical. At first one simple statement was merely added to another, and the coordinate relation was sufficiently indicated by the juxtaposition. As the language developed, however, it became desirable to emphasize this relation, and the sense of unity found expression in coordinate conjunctions. As in the case of the coordinate sentences, so also do the complex sentences, above mentioned, exhibit the same psychological relation. These sentences differ only in the way the complex relation is indicated.

It is the writer's intention, as was stated above, to discuss the kinds of sentence structure which fall under the first class of complex sentences. By parataxis, therefore, is here understood that juxtaposition of two simple sentences, of which one is subordinate in thought to the other, though this subordination is either not at all or only slightly indicated by the written language. There is, of course, nothing in the etymological meaning of the term, parataxis, which would hinder us from applying it also to asyndetic sentences. The term has, however, by almost universal consent of the foremost

---

1) See chap. XII., pp. 50 f.

writers on parataxis<sup>1)</sup> been limited to the class of sentences just described, and it is desirable that it should be so fixed. Two terms are needed, one for the juxtaposition of simple coordinate sentences, (Asyndeton), and one for the juxtaposition of simple sentences of which one is subordinate, (Parataxis).

It has already been intimated that the complex relation in paratactic sentences is not indicated in any one definite way. From the most primitive form of parataxis there is, on the other hand, a steady progression toward clearness in the expression of relations. It is with this in view that Morris<sup>2)</sup> defines parataxis: "It covers all that lies between coordination and the suggestion of relation by musical means as the upper limit, and the expression of relation by subordinating words as the lower limit." Near the upper limit are included a large number of sentences which partake of the nature of asyndeton. That is, it is often impossible to determine whether the thought is complex or coordinated.<sup>3)</sup> Similarly it is also often difficult to determine whether sentences are to be classed as paratactic or hypotactic. This is especially true in cases where the original meaning of the subordinate conjunctions is still seen.<sup>4)</sup>

Kühner distinguished two kinds of parataxis, the natural and the rhetorical. He says,<sup>5)</sup> "Wir müssen in dem Gebrauche der Parataxis zwei Arten wohl unterscheiden: die natürliche und die künstliche oder rhetorische. Die natürliche geht aus einer Bequemlichkeit oder Nachlässigkeit in Denken hervor. Und das ist die wahre Parataxe. Die künstliche oder rhetorische Parataxe hingegen wird absichtlich angewendet um der Rede grösseres Gewicht zu geben." But there is no need of postulating a category of rhetorical paratactic sentences. Most of the paratactic sentences found in later writers, though at times, no doubt, used for rhetorical purposes, are only reminiscences of the early paratactic structure of language.<sup>6)</sup> Many expressions of this kind became by frequent use mere idioms,<sup>7)</sup> and thus could not have been employed to lend weight to the language.<sup>8)</sup>

It is evident that a discussion of paratactic clauses may be based either on the form of the sentence, i. e. the relative clearness with which subordination is suggested by musical means, a pronoun, an

1) Weissenhorn, Becker, Lindskog, Morris, Sjögren and others.

2) Morris, *Lat. Synt.*, p. 147.

3) Cf. ch. VII., p. 39, note 2. and ch. XII., pp. 51 f.

4) Cf. pp. 46 f. and pp. 54 f.

5) *Ausführ. Gram.* p. 757.

6) For illustrations of paratactic sentences in later writers cf. Kühner's *Grammar*, pp. 757 ff., and Lane's *Grammar*, pp. 285 ff.

7) Cf. Lindskog, *Quaest.*, p. 37.

8) Cf. Draeger, *Hist. Synt.* II, p. 206, §366; and Becker, *Beiordn. u. Unterordn. Satzverb.*, p. 2.

adverb, etc., or on the nature of the subordination, i. e. causal, conditional, temporal, etc. Both of these methods have their advantages and disadvantages. A formal classification is valuable, as it reveals the steps in the development of the complex sentence, but the almost endless divisions and subdivisions that it necessitates, is not in favor of clearness. A functional classification sets forth the varied relations which the subordinate clause holds to the principal. It is the more tangible, though it is often difficult to determine the nature of the subordination.<sup>1)</sup> Most writers in treating the subject have disregarded the form of the sentence, and have classified the paratactic sentences on a purely functional basis. The advantage gained in clearness because of the natural tendency of the mind to seek to establish the character of the relation between the subordinate and the principal clause, makes it desirable to employ a functional classification. But the form need not therefore be neglected. The aim will be to include both in the following pages. The function will constitute the basis of division into chapters. In the discussion in each chapter the development of each form of sentence will be touched upon. The discussion will finally be summed up in the last chapter where the formal difference will be more clearly pointed out.

---

1) Cf. Morris, *Lat. Synt.*, pp. 31 ff., and p. 114.



## PART I.

### SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES.

In the early language two simple sentences, one of which served the function of subject or object of the verb in the principal proposition, were often arranged paratactically. The subordinate clause contained the main statement, i. e. a wish, a question or an assertion. The examples that have been collected, may be arranged as follows, Final, Consecutive, Indirect Question, and Indirect Discourse.

### CHAPTER I.

#### FINAL SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES.

Clauses of this kind are introduced by specific words, viz., *volo, malo, nolo, quaeso, caveo, obsecro, sino, licet, amabo, rogo, oro, cedo, oportet, iubeo, curo, metuo*, etc. First will be given a few of the many examples collected, after which a discussion of the most important principles of parataxis which they illustrate will follow.

#### *volo.*

Naev. Coroll. II, 37 R. *diu vivat: volo.*

Capt. 858. *vin te faciam fortunatum?*

Capt. 360. *vin vocem huc ad te?*

Most. 1074. *nunc ego ille huc veniat velim.*

Rud. 662. *Nimis velim: improbissimo homini malas edentaverint.*

Rud. 877. *Verum sit: velim.*

Andr. 418. *Hodie uxorem ducas: — — — volo.*

Heaut. 162. *Apud me sis: volo.*

Heaut. 1066. *Syro ignoscas: volo.*

#### *nolo.*

Most. 1176. *nolo ores.*

Pers. 245. *nolo ames.*

Andr. 819. *me nolo in tempore hoc videat senex.*

Heaut. 701. *quin nolo mentiare.*

#### *malo.*

Pseud. 209. *taceas: malo.*

Adelph. 782. *an tibi iam mavis cerebrum dispergam hic?*

*caveo.*

- Cato, R. R. V. 6. *terram cariosam cave ne ares.*  
 Accius, Epig. I. 304 R. *cave vestem attigas.*  
 Capt. 431. *cave tu mi iratus fuas.*  
 Most. 1025. *tu cave quadraginta accepisse hinc te neges.*  
 Adelp. 458. *cave dixeris.*  
 Andr. 403. *cave te esse tristem sentiat.*  
 Heaut. 187. *cave faxis.*  
 Heaut. 302. *et cave ne falsam gratiam studeas inire.*  
 Cato, R. R. I. 4. *caveto alienam disciplinam temere contemnas.*  
 Cato, R. R. XXVIII. 1. *Caveto, cum ventus siet aut imber, effodias aut feras.*  
 Cato, R. R. XX. 2. *caveto ne laxi sient.*  
 Ib. XXXII. 2. *caveto ne vitem — — — praestringas.*  
 Ib. XL. 2. *caveto: ne librum convellas.<sup>1)</sup>*

*Obsecro.*

- Heaut. 432. *duc me ad eum, obsecro.*  
 Most. 460. *fuge obsecro atque abscede.*  
 Most. 618. *obsecro hercle, tu iube obicere argentum ob os impurae beluae.*  
 Amph. 923 seq. *per dexteram tuam te, Alcumena, oro opsecro, da mihi hanc veniam, ignosce, irata ne sies.*  
 Most. 1156 seq. *nunc te obsecro, stultitiae adolescentiaeque eius ignoscas.*  
 Adelp. 309. *Propius obsecro accedamus.*

*Quaeso.*

- Most. 652. *Absolve hunc quaeso.*  
 Ib. 835. *Quaeso huc ad me specta.*  
 Ib. 1177. *noxiam unam quaeso fac causa mea.*  
 Rud. 1298. *Di quaeso subvenite.*  
 Pacuv. Ilion. I. 200 R. *neu reliquias quaeso mias sireis.<sup>2)</sup>*  
 Heaut. 537. *Eho quaeso laudas.*  
 Andr. 305. *Quaeso — — — id velis quod possit.*

*amabo.*

- Most. 166. *contempla, amabo.*  
 Ib. 298. *cedo amabo decem.*  
 Ib. 324. *duce me amabo.*  
 Poen. 380. *amabo, mea voluptas, sine te exorarier.*  
 Rud. 249. *Quo amabo ibimus?*

1) *Caveto* with *ne* is more frequent than without *ne* in Cato. Cf. R. R. XLV. 2; XLVIII. 2; LIII.; CLXI. 2; CLXI. 4; etc.

2) Fleckeisen reads: *neu tu reliquias sic meas stieris.*

*Rogo.*

C. I. L. I. 1027. *rogo te viator: monumento huic nil male feceris.*<sup>1)</sup>  
 Most. 680. *roga circumducat.*

*Oro.*

C. I. L. I. 1175. *semol te orant se [v]oti crebro condemnes.*<sup>2)</sup>  
 Capt. 1021. *sed tu dic, oro.*

*Sino.*

Caecilius, Hymnis, II. 72. R. *sine suam senectutem ducat usque ad  
 senium sorbilo.*

Most. 11. *sine modo adveniat.*

Ib. 1180. *sine te exorem.*

Bacch. 24. *sine te amem.*

Cato, R. R. LXXXII. *sinito macerescant.*

Ib. CXVI. *sinito arescat.*

Ib. CIX. *sinito conbibant noctem et diem.*

Ib. CXII. 2. *sinito bene coquantur.*

*Cedo.*

Rud. 1380. *cedo quicum habeam iudicem.*<sup>3)</sup>

Most. 478. *quid istuc est, sceleste, aut quis id fecit, cedo.*

*iubeo.*

Most. 930. *curriculo iube in urbem veniat.*

*curo.*

Cato, R. R. CXLIII. *vilicae quae sunt officia curato faciat.*

*licet and licebit.*

Titinius, Fullon. II. 27. *nec noctu nec diu licet fullonibus quiescant.*

Capt. 303. *facto nunc laedat licet:*

Phorm. 347. *ludas licet.*

Rud. 139. *salvos sis licet.*

Cato, R. R. CLVIII. 2. *licebit bibas.*

Ib. LXXXIII. 1. *licebit faciat.*

*oportet.*

Cato, R. R. XIV. 1. *faber haec faciat oportet.*

*metuo.*

Titinius, Setina, II. 107. *metuo — — — ne nimis stulte fecerim.*

Asin. 743. *ne uxor resciscat metuit.*

1) Cf. C. I. L. XIV. 2535. *per deos superos inferosque te rogo: ne ossuaria velis violare.*

2) Cf. Hor. Sat. II. 6, 35. *orabat— — — adesses*; Ib. 37; also wall inscription of Pompeii, C. I. L. IV. 61. *M·MARIVM·AED·FACI·ORO·VOS, i. e. M. Marium aedilem faciatis: oro vos*; cf. C. I. L. IV. 171 et al.

3) Colloquial for, *cedo habeam aliquem quieum ad iudicem eam.*

The preceding lists of final clauses belong to the class often called complementary, that is, the subordinate clause is the complement of specific verbs.

The verbs of *will, volo, malo, nolo*, are regularly construed with the subjunctive without *ut*. The most probable origin of this construction is the following. The desire or wish was at first expressed by the subjunctive alone. Thus, *Syro ignoscas* was equivalent to, "may you pardon Syrus." *Volo* was a later addition, employed to emphasize the wish that was already expressed by the subjunctive. This emphasis was again strengthened by the use of *velim*<sup>1)</sup> as in Most. 1074. The adverbial particle *uti, ut* (later *utinam*) often preceded the subjunctive of wish,<sup>2)</sup> and finally developed into a subordinate conjunction.<sup>3)</sup> In later times when *ut* had become thoroughly established as a conjunction, it was often omitted for ease in expression, cf. the English sentence, "I wish (that) he would come." This sort of parataxis Kühner calls rhetorical.<sup>4)</sup>

The imperatives *cave* and *caveto* are frequently found before a subjunctive either with or without *ne*. The two constructions evidently developed side by side. The first was formed as was the construction with *volo*. The prohibition was first expressed by *ne* (=non) with the subjunctive, viz., *ne falsam gratiam studeas inire*. *Cave* was then added, giving additional weight to the prohibition. The other construction in which *cave* is used without *ne* is not a development of the former, i. e. *cave respexis*, (Most. 523) is not at first equivalent to *ne respexis* as has been held by some writers on parataxis.<sup>5)</sup> The explanation given by Lindskog<sup>6)</sup> seems more probable. The clause represented by *faxis* in *cave faxis*, (Heaut. 187), was originally conditional, (=if you do this: beware). Cf. Andr. 752 seq. *verbum si mihi unum praeter quam te rogo faxis: cave*.<sup>7)</sup> Later, however, this origin was forgotten and *cave* became equivalent to *ne* or *cave ne*.

1) Cf. Morris, *Lat. Synt.* p. 135, note; and Weninger, *Parat.* p. 55.

2) Cf. Poen. 912. *valcas beneque ut tibi sit*.

3) In hypotaxis *volo*, etc., are followed both by *ut* and the subj. and acc. w. inf. e. g. Non. quoting Sext. Turp. s. v. *fungi, sed volo ut — — — fuhgatur*; Most. 632. *velim ut petas*; Lucil., Sat. XXVI., 593 M. *Persium haec legere nolo*; Andr. 898. *vis me uxorem ducere? Ut* is not found after *volo* (*nolo, malo*) in Terence, cf. Weninger, *Parat.* pp. 55—56.

4) Cf. *Introd.* pp. 13.

5) See Weninger, *de parat. vestig.* p. 57, and Schmalz *Lat. Synt.* p. 171.

6) *Quaest.* p. 19, note 1.

7) Lindskog. *Quaest.* p. 19, note 1. "Hoc modo esse ortum coniunctivum cum verbo *cave* coniunctum concludere possumus et ex ea re, quod coniunctivus ad solam imperativi formam (*cave*) legitur (at cetera verba — ut *facio, sino* — non solum post imperativi formam hunc coniunctivum nudum habent, sed etiam post alias verbi formas) et ex eo, quod in generibus usitatissimis dicendi (imprimis ad verbum *facio: cave faxis*) semper fere perfecti, non praesentis coniunctivum legi." Cf. *De enunt. ap. Pl. et Ter. Concl.* pp. 28 ff.

The acc. w. inf. was occasionally used after *cave*, e. g. *Vaticinium* in Livy 5, 16, *aquam Albanam cave lacu teneri, cave in mare manare*.

At least three<sup>1)</sup> different meanings of the verb *obsecro* may be distinguished, viz., a) I beseech, (*duc me ad eum: obsecro*); b) tell me, I beg, (Most. 1083. *Eho, an negavit sibi datum argentum: obsecro?*); c) I assure you, (Merc. 789, *nesceis negoti quid sit uxor: obsecro*). Only when used in the first quoted meaning does a complementary final clause follow. In origin it is similar to the above. The final clause was at first a command or an exhortation expressed by the imperative or the subjunctive either without or with *ut*. The extant examples of *ut* with the subj. must, however, be classed as hypotactic, e. g. Most. 1036. *nunc te obsecro, ut me bene iuves operamque des*; Amph. 388; Asin. 38; Poen. 392; etc. The paratactic origin is, however, evident if we resolve the sentence just quoted: "May you kindly aid me and lend me your assistance; I beseech you."<sup>2)</sup> When *obsecro* is followed by *ne* and the subjunctive, the sentence may perhaps in some cases still be considered paratactic, e. g. Heaut. 1048. *mi vir, te obsecro: ne facias*,<sup>3)</sup> *ne* being equivalent to *non*.

*Quaeso*, like *obsecro*, is of very frequent occurrence<sup>4)</sup> and is used in a similar way. It is most frequently found with the imperative, which its addition renders less harsh.<sup>5)</sup> Rud. 1298. *Di quaeso subvenite*, would be no prayer, if *quaeso* were omitted. The paratactic structure with the subjunctive and the indicative is not so frequent, but the hypotactic sentence with *ut* and *ne* is often found.<sup>6)</sup> This verb is also often used parenthetically, e. g. *Caecilius, Plocium* II. 158. *sed tua morosane uxor, quaeso, est*.

The paratactic construction with *amabo* is probably conditional in origin like *cave* with the subjunctive treated above. Thus the origin of the sentence, *contempla: amabo* may be understood by translating it, "if you look, I shall love you." This expression first

1) *Obsecro* is also often used parenthetically, see Lindskog, *Quaest.* pp. 8 ff.

2) For a discussion of this whole subject see Ostendorf, A. *Zum Gebrauch von ut bei Plautus*, *Vierzehnter Jahresbericht*, (Neumünster, 1888), Progr. Nu. 264.

3) Cf. Capt. 319; Most. 1097; Phorm. 944; et al.

4) *Obsecro* occurs 216 times and *quaeso* 146 times in Plautus and Terence, Lindskog, *Quaest.* pp. 7 and 13.

5) Cf. Weissenhorn, *Parat. Plaut.* p. 8: "Huius imperativi vis debilitatur et ad precatationis speciem revocatur verbis orandi solute appositis."

6) With *ut*, Novius, *Androm.* II. 4, R. *quaeso ut in pectus tuum demittas*; Cato, R. R. CXLI. 2, *sic dicito, Mars pater, te precor quaesoque uti sics volens propitius mihi domo familiarumque nostrae*; Capt. 1025; *Adelph.* 275; etc.

With *ne*, Bacch. 1013 seq., *quaeso, pater, ne me — — — deseras*; Curc. 400, *quaeso ne me incomitias*; Asin. 450, etc.



restricted in meaning and used only by women,<sup>1)</sup> in time acquired a meaning similar to *quaeso*,<sup>2)</sup> and was used by all without any restrictions. The original of the hypotactic construction with *ut*<sup>3)</sup> may be understood from, *sed scin quid te amabo: ut facias*, "but do you know what I ask you? may you do that," and *quin* (*qui + ne*)<sup>4)</sup> *amabo accubas*, "I ask you: why don't you take your place?"

The verbs *oro* and *rogo* are used in the same way as *quaeso*. In later Latin they are construed with *ut* and the subjunctive or with the acc. w. inf.

The paratactic sentences, in which the subjunctive is joined to the imperatives, *sine*, (*sinito*), *cedo*, *iube*, *curato*, are alike in origin. The subjunctive at first expressed the wish independently of the imperative. Later the imperative was added for the sake of emphasis or to distinguish the subjunctive used as a wish from other uses. Thus *sine: adveniat* originally meant, "may he come: let him." When this use had been established, other forms of the verbs were employed. Occasionally the indicative<sup>5)</sup> instead of the subjunctive is found in the subordinate clause. These verbs are also followed by *ut* and the subjunctive and occasionally by the infinitive.<sup>6)</sup>

In addition to the verbs *licet*<sup>7)</sup> *oportet*, and *metuo*, of which examples are given, other verbs are also found introducing complementary final clauses. Such are *opto*, *placet*, *precor*, *peto*, *hortor*, *postulo*, etc.

## CHAPTER II.

### CONSECUTIVE SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES.

Verbs denoting bringing to pass and happening, i. e. *facio*, *fi*, *sum*, etc., are often joined to an indicative or a subjunctive. Of

1) Blase, *Archiv für lat. Lex.* IX. (1896) p. 491. "Es (i. e. *amabo*) ist ein Schmeichelwort vorzugsweise der Frauen, freier und unfreier, nur an wenigen Stellen lässt Plautus es, um eine komische Wirkung zu erzielen, von Männern an Frauen richten, ein einziges Mal aus demselben Grunde von einer männlichen Person an eine andere." Cf. Lindskog, *Quaest.* p. 20.

2) Weissenhorn, *Parat. Plaut.* p. 9, "Eundem fere sensum, quem verbum *quaeso*, accipit formula, *amabo*, quam Brixius explicat 'amanter rogabo'."

3) *Amabo w. ut*: Cist. 104. *nunc te amabo ut* — — — *sinas*; Eun. 537. *amabo ut illuc transeas*; Men. 524; Truc. 872; etc.

4) Cf. Chapter III. p. 26.

5) See Morris, A. J. P. XVIII. p. 144.

6) E. g. Pacuv. *Niptra* I. 244, R. *cedo tuum pedem mi* — — — *ut* — — — *ablum lassitudinemque minuam*; Cato, R. R. V. 4. *opus rusticum omne curet uti sciat facere*; Most. 12. *sine modo venire salvum, quem absentem comes*.

7) For the use of *licet* in concessive clauses see Chapter X. p. 45. Cf. discussion of constructions with *licet* in *Archiv für lat. Lex.* XI. pp. 9—26.

these verbs *facio* is by far the most common and will therefore be treated at greater length.

*fac* or *face*.

Capt. 439. *fac fidelis sis fideli*.

Epid. 567. *fac videam*.

Most. 400. *aedes iam fac oclusae sient*.

Ennius, Sat. 30 f. V. *fac amicos eas et roges veniant operamque mutuum dent et messim hanc nobis adiuvent*.

Ennius, Heduphaget. Varia, 39. V. *Surrenti elopem fac emas*.

Pacuv. Il. I. 208 R. *fac — — — hanc operam mihi des*.

Adelph. 813 seq. *fac quam plurimum illis relinquant*.

Trin. 174. *fac sciam*.

Cato, R. R. V. 7. *opera omnia mature conficias face*.<sup>1)</sup>

Cato, R. R. XXXII, 1. *Vineas arboresque mature face incipias putare*.

Most. 854. *Tranio, age canem istam a foribus aliquis abducat face*.

*facito*.

C. I. L., I. 198, Exempl. Meinian. 13 tab. *facito det de consili maioris partis*.

C. I. L., I. 119, Lex Jul. Munic. 206. *denuntietur facito*.

C. I. L., I. 197, Tab. Bantin. l. 10. *facitoque ioudicetur*.

Ib. l. 11. *aut bona eius poplice possideantur facito*.

Most. 216. *at hoc unum facito cogites*.

Cato, R. R. XXV. 1. *facitoque studeas bene percoctum siccumque legere*.

Cato, R. R. LXV, IX. 1. *facito calescat*.

Cato, R. R. XLI. 4. *eos — — — facito sint*.

Adelph. 500. *hoc tu facito cum animo cogites*.

*facite*.

Heaut. 28. *facite aequi sitis*.

Adelph. 24 seq. *facite aequanimitas*<sup>2)</sup> — — — *ad scribendum augeat industriam*.

*Other forms*.

Heaut. 398. *tu nunc sola reducem me in patriam facis*.

Cato, R. R. XX. 1. *labeam bifariam faciat habeat*.

*faxo*.

a) Capt. 1010. *at nunc liber in divitias faxo venies*.

Bacch. 715. *iam faxo hic erunt*.

1) *Fac* is followed by *facio* in inscriptions found at Pompell, e. g. C. I. L., IV. 1071. *MODESTVM·AED·PANS·FAC·FACIAS*. "Pansa, see that you elect Modestus for the aedleship."

2) Fleckesen indicates a lacuna between *acquanimitas* and *ad*.

Pseud. 49. *faxo scies.*

Andr. 854. *iam facinus faxo ex me audies.*

Eun. 285. *ne tu istas faxo calcibus saepe insultabis frustra.*

Rud. 365. *scibus faxo.*

Ib. 578. *exarescent faxo.*

Ib. 1351. *iam ego faxo exhibit senex.*

b) Aul. 578. *ego faxo et operam et vinum perdiderit simul.*

Capt. 801. *Qui mi in cursu opstiterit, faxo vitae is opstiterit suae.*

Men. 521. *faxo haud inultus prandium comederis.*

Poen. 346. *deferto ad me, faxo actutum constiterit lymphaticum.*

Trin. 60. *faxo haud tantillum dederis verborum mihi.*

c) Amph. 972. *faxo haud quicquam sit morae.*

Bacch. 864. *faxo se haud dicat nactam, quem derideat.*

Most. 68. *ervom tibi aliquis cras faxo ad villam adferat.*

Most. 1133. *ego ferare faxo, ut meruisti, in crucem.*

Adelph. 209. *cupide accipiat iam faxo ac bene dicat secum etiam esse actum.*

Trin. 882. *et meum nomen et mea facta et itinera ego faxo scias.*

#### Other verbs.

Bacch. 85. *rapidus fluvius est hic: non hac temere transiri potest.*

Most. 108. *illud saepe fit: tempestas venit.*

Lucilius, Sat. IV. 154, M. *verum illud credo fore: in os prius accipiam ipse.*

The examples of *facio* given above naturally fall into two groups, viz., a) Simple sentences in the imperative (*fac, facito, facite*), followed by clauses in the subjunctive, to which may be added other forms of *facio* in the second and third person, as *faciat* and *facis*, which are used in the same way as *fac*, etc.; b) the aoristic form *faxo*, followed by the future or future perfect indicative and the present subjunctive.

Sentences like *fac: videam*, and *fac: fidelis sis fideli* reveal the paratactic origin of the sentences in the first group. First a volitive or optative subjunctive was used independently, i. e. "may I see," and "be thou faithful to the faithful." The imperative was then added, still leaving the clauses independent.<sup>1)</sup> The subordinate clause is also often found introduced by *ut*, a construction which

1) It should be remembered that by the term *independent* the present writer here has reference only to the form, and to the fact that man in an early stage of culture did not understand the nature of the relation. This is, of course, what Schmalz means (Lat. Synt. § 265). He does not imply, as Morris thinks, (Lat. Synt. p. 117), that to us *Surrenti elopem fac emas*, for instance, is not as much a complex sentence as *fac ut rem tractes*.



originated from an independent use of *ut* with the subjunctive,<sup>1)</sup> and which became the formal way of expressing the subordination.<sup>2)</sup>

Regarding the use of *faxo* there are several points that call for notice. Space does not allow a detailed discussion of the opposing theories that have been held. The problem that has confronted the syntactist is this. *Faxo* is found joined both with the future indicative and the present subjunctive, but with no distinction in meaning. The construction with the indicative predominates in the early writers, the ratio being about 4 to 1 in Plautus.<sup>3)</sup> In the later writers this ratio is reversed. This fact caused Madwig<sup>4)</sup> and others who followed him, to suggest that the subjunctives were due to errors in the codices, and for this reason changed all the subjunctives in Plautus to indicatives. This was rendered more easy since most of the subjunctives belong to the third and fourth conjugations, in which the present subjunctive and the future indicative are alike in the first person singular and differ only in a letter in the second and third persons.

Another theory has also been held. It has been stated<sup>5)</sup> that there is no certain instance of a future indicative in Plautus, in other words, that the indicatives might just as well be turned into subjunctives. The later prevalent use of *faxo* with the subjunctive, and the fact that no other form of the verb *facio* is found used together with the indicative, have been held up as favoring this view.

There is, however, no good reason for questioning the codices. Such forms as *erunt*, (Bacch. 715), *scibis*, (Rud. 365), *exibit*, (Rud. 1351), *insultabis*, (Eun. 285<sup>6)</sup>), can not be accounted for by a mistake of the scribe. The predominance of the subjunctive after *faxo* in later Latin is sufficient proof that also this reading is correct.<sup>7)</sup> The conclusion of Ashmore in the paper quoted above is undoubtedly right. "The indicative represents the earlier and more colloquial use. The subjunctive came in by degrees, as the style of writing became more formal, until in the Augustan age it is the rule." It

1) Cf. *volo*, etc., followed by *ut* and the subj. Chapter I. p. 18.

2) *Facio* with *ut* and the subjunctive: Pomponius, Arusp. II. 10—11. *bucco, puriter fac ut rem tractes*; Cato, R. R. XXII. 1. *facito uti ducas*; Ib. V. 6; VIII. 2; XXIII; XXV. 1; XXXI. 1; XXXIII. 1; XLVIII. 2; LXX. 2; LXXXV; CLI. 4, etc.; Amph. 982; Capt. 337; Ib. 411; Most. 1145; Andr. 37; 483; 712; Heaut. 925. See Sjögren, *De part. copul.* pp. 77 ff., and Persson, *Adn. Plaut.* pp. 8 ff.

3) Cf. Ashmore, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* XXVIII, (1897), p. viii, "There are 41 indubitable instances of *faxo* with the future indicative; 12 indubitable instances of *faxo* with the present subjunctive; 2 instances where Ritschl records a variant reading with the present subjunctive."

4) *Opusc. acad.* II. 77.

5) See Freeman and Sloman, *Andria*, note l. 854.

6) "The only instance of a future after *faxo* in Terence", Ashmore. *ib.*

7) Cf. Weninger, l. c. pp. 43 ff.

should be added, that the use of the subjunctive, undoubtedly, came into vogue through analogy from the use of the subjunctive after other forms of *facio*, and through the similarity of the forms of the present subjunctive and the future indicative, mentioned above. *Faxo scias, etc.*, became a stereotyped formula and was used in all periods. *Ut* is never found in the later writers,<sup>1)</sup> but forms other than the first person were used.<sup>2)</sup>

*Faxo* was also used with the future perfect, as is shown by the examples given on page 54. Because of the similarity of this tense to the perfect subjunctive, a difficulty has also here been caused similar to the above. The original form, in all probability is, however, the indicative.<sup>3)</sup>

Other verbs are also found, contrary to the statement of Weissenhorn,<sup>3)</sup> which are followed by complementary consecutive clauses. The sentences are, however, few and irregular in construction.

### CHAPTER III.

#### INDIRECT QUESTIONS AND EXCLAMATIONS.

Numerous instances of paratactic indirect questions and exclamations are found. They may be arranged in two classes: a) clauses in which the indicative mood is used; b) clauses in which an original<sup>4)</sup> subjunctive is used. Only a few of the many examples can be here given.

##### 1. With the Indicative.

- a) Sext. Turp., Epicl. II. 50, R. *Quaeso, edepol: quo ante lucem te subito rapis.*  
 Most. 35. *quaeso non sunt.*  
 Most. 149. *cor dolet, quom scio ut nunc sum atque ut fui.*  
 Most. 478. *quis id fecit: cedo.*  
 Most. 614. *vide: num moratur.*  
 Capt. 623. *dic mihi: quis illic igitur est.*  
 Rud. 333. *opsecro: quis hic loquitur.*  
 Bacch. 692. *nunc hoc tibi curandumst — — — quid vis curem.*  
 Aul. 634. *redde huc sis: quid tibi vis reddam.*  
 Bacch. 558. *dic: quis est.*

1) In Plautus it is found at least once, Asin. 902. *faxo ut scias.* Cf. Ashmore, Trans. Am. Phil. Ass. Vol. 28 (1897), p. viii.

2) E. g. Seneca, Medea. 905, *faxis sciant.*

3) See the discussion of this in Weissenhorn, Parat. Plaut. pp. 11—12.

4) A question already in the subjunctive may become indirect, e. g. Capt. 455. *dubitavi: hos homines emerem an non emerem.* The indirect question was here originally deliberative.

Amph. 421. *signi dic: quid est.*

Rud. 156. *ubi sunt hi homines: obsecro.*

Most. 366. *ubi is est: obsecro.*

Aceius, Dec. I, 12. R. *dice: summa ubi perduellum est.*

Cato, R. R. VI. 4. *vineam quo in agro conseri oportet sic observato.*

Adelph. 325. *Eloquere ergo, te obsecro, quid actumst.*

Hcaut. 430. *ubinam est quaeso.*

b) Most. 829. *specta quam arte dormiunt.*

Ib. 855. *aspice ut placide accubat.*

Ib. 1172. *viden ut astat furcifer.*

Stich. 410. *videte, quaeso, quid potest pecunia.*

## 2. With the subjunctive.

Most. 969. *quo venerim: novi locum.*

Capt. 455. *dubitavi: hos homines emerem an non emerem.*

Bacch. 745. *loquere quid scribam.*

Mere. 386. *dic quid velis.*

Capt. 270. *servosne esse an liber mavelis memora mihi.*

Rud. 1070. *nulla causast quin me condones cruci.*

Amph. 559. *tamen quin loquar haec uti facta sunt: hic nunquam  
ullo modo me potes detertere.*

Andr. 600. *quid causaest: quin in pistrinum recta proficiscar via?*

Phorm. 272. *non causam dico, quin quod meritus sit ferat.*

Apparently direct questions in the indicative are found in the early language joined paratactically to verbs of saying, knowing, and the like. This construction is found at the side of the construction with the subjunctive, and with no distinction of meaning. The only difference between *dic: quid est?* and *dic quid sit* is in form, as is the case with the English, "Tell me, what is it?" and, "Tell me what it is."<sup>1)</sup> The former was the primitive way of joining the propositions, i. e. the indirect question did not differ from the direct in form. Later, however, when the subordinate relation was more clearly felt and it became customary to indicate this relation by the language, the subjunctive was resorted to in the case of Latin, while in English the same concept was expressed by transposition of words.

It is not to be denied that verbs like *obsecro, quaeso, specta, etc.*, very often may be understood as parenthetical.<sup>2)</sup> That is, they were often spoken incidentally with no connection with the question or

1) Cf. Lindskog, Quaest. p. 71. "saepe — imprimis in populi sermone — (interrogationes) rectae et obliquae minimo discrimine secernebantur."

2) E. g. Most. 209. *Cur, obsecro, non eurem?*

exclamation. But in many cases, even where this origin must be conceded, these verbs assumed governing force as in the exclamation *specta: quam arte dormiunt*, and in *ubinam est: quaeso*, and *ubi is est: obsecro*.

In the second group of sentences the subjunctive is not necessarily a sign of subordination. This subjunctive was found in the independent sentence, to which the introductory word was added. Thus *quid scribam?* (deliberative subjunctive), "what shall I write?" when joined to *loquere*, became *loquere quid scribam*.

The same is true of *quin*-clauses that belong to this group. *Quin* (i. e. *qui + ne = why not*) often introduced independent sentences, cf. Phorm. 1015, *sed ea quin sit ignoscenda!* "Why should it not be worthy of pardon!"<sup>1)</sup> In the sentences quoted above *quin* must be understood in this way; e. g. *nulla causa est: quin me condones cruci*, is first equivalent to "why should you not deliver me up to torture? There is no reason why you should not."<sup>2)</sup>

The origin of the later general use of the subjunctive in these clauses is to be understood as follows. When the originally deliberative subjunctive, e. g. *quid scribam: loquere*, because of frequency of use, came to be considered the vehicle of the relational concept, as this was more fully understood, it was analogously employed in the second and third persons and in tenses other than the present.<sup>3)</sup>

In this connection it will be in place to remark that the use of the subjunctive to denote subordination is comparatively late in the development of language. Subordination is expressed by the subjunctive in late Latin, not because such a function is inherent in this mood, but because subjunctives of *wish* and *will*, which were frequently joined paratactically to other expressions, gave the impression, when felt to be subordinate, that this concept was expressed by the mood. The use of the subjunctive in indirect questions was, perhaps, the first step in this development.

## CHAPTER IV.

### INDIRECT DISCOURSE.

In the early stages of language verbs of knowing, perceiving, thinking, and saying were joined loosely to the subordinate statement in

1) See Elmer's note on this line.

2) For the most complete discussion of *quin* see Schnoor, H., *Quaest. Plaut.* pp. 10—39.

3) See Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.* p. 258, §270 et al. For various theories regarding the early indirect question see Becker, *Studia in priscos scriptores Latinos collata*, vol. I. fasc. 1, pp. 115 ff., and Lindskog, *Quaest.* pp. 71 ff., and 92 ff.



the indicative or an original subjunctive.<sup>1)</sup> This construction we find used side by side with the acc. w. inf. construction, and *quod* clauses with the indicative, which in later Latin became the regular forms. The question of the origin of the accusative with infinitive construction is a subject apart from parataxis,<sup>2)</sup> and would, therefore, be out of place here.<sup>3)</sup> In the following list of clauses the order used by Becker<sup>4)</sup> will be partly followed.

1. Verbs of knowing.

*scio.*

- Capt. 440. *nam pater scio faciet quae illum facere oportet omnia.*  
 Adelph. 256, seq. *satis certo scio: numquam ita magnifice quicquam dicam.*  
 Phorm. 636, seq. *nam sat scio: — — — iria non commutabitis verba.*  
 Pseud. 1315. *onerabis scio.*  
 Adelph. 339. *ille infitias ibit, sat scio.*  
 Capt. 971. *pauca effugiam: scio.*  
 Pomponius, Pappus Praet. II. 106, R. *refragant primo, suffragabunt post scio.*  
 Most. 1081. *scio iocaris tu nunc.*  
 Ib. 699. *tota turget mihi uxor, scio domi.*  
 Ib. 334. *scio: in mentem venit modo.*  
 Capt. 326. *scio ego, multos iam lucrum luculentos homines reddidit.*  
 Adelph. 360. *persuasit ille inpurus, sat scio.*  
 Curc. 53. *semper, tu scito, flamma fumost proxuma.*  
 Heaut. 230, seq. *si mihi secundae res de amore meo essent, iam dudum scio venissent.*  
 Hec. 756. *quod pol, si essent alia ex hoc quaestu, haud faceret scio.*  
 Bacch. 635. *scio dares.*

*novi.*

- Rud. 373. *novi: Neptunus ita solet.*  
 Pers. 243. *novi: omnes sunt lenae levifidae.*

1) Cf. Holtze, *Synt. Prisc. Script. Lat.* II. p. 227, "iuxta ponentur duae enunciationes primariae in oratione recta ubi plerumque expectatur ut altera e priore per obliquam orationem suspensa sit".

2) See A. J. P. IV. p. 420.

3) For discussions of the origin of the acc. w. Inf. construction see Herzog, *Neu. Jahrb.* (1873); Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.* § 224; and Lindskog, *Eranos*, I. (1896) pp. 121 ff. The last article gives a resumé of past and modern theories on this subject.

4) *Beiordn. und unterordn. Satzverb. bei den altröm. Bühnendichtern*, (Metz, 1888). Only the part treating the following construction was ever published.

## 2. Verbs of perceiving.

*video.*

Decimus, Lab., Cat. II. 23 R. *video: adolescenti nostro caedis hirulam.*  
 L. Pomponius, Macci Gem. Prior, II. 70 R. *video: erepsti primiter  
 de pannibus.*

Pers. 284. *video ego te: iam incubitatus es.*

Rud. 1331. *Quid istic? necessumst video: dabitur talentum.*

Eun. 713. *non potest sine malo fateri: video.*

Hec. 770. *noster socer, video, venit.*

Ennius, Alex. I. 54 seq. R. *videte: iudicabit inclutum iudicium inter  
 deas tris aliquis.*

Lucilius, 1340, M. *vis est vita, vides, vis nos facere omnia cogit.*

Curc. 325. *vide: ne me ludas.*

Heaut. 212. *vide, sis, nequo hinc abeas longius.*

Cato, R. R. IX. 1. *et id videto: uti aut domino siet.*

Cato, R. R. CVII. 2. *videto: ne aduras.*

*audio.*

Asin, 116. *audin tu: apud Archibulum ego ero argentarium.*

Andr. 228. *audivi, Archylis, iam dudum: Lesbiam adduci iubes.*

*sentio.*

Pseud. 466. *iam pridem tu me spernis: sentio.*

Andr. 436. *praeter spem evenit: sentio.*

## 3. Verbs of thinking.

*intellego.*

Most. 280. *verum illuc est: maxuma adeo pars vostrorum intellegit,*

Pers. 802. *ludos me facitis: intellego.*

*cogito.*

Aul. 698, seq. *nunc ego mecum cogito — — — me illi irasci  
 iniuriumst.*

Cato, Aul. Gell. 16, 1, 4. *cogitate — — — labor ille a vobis recedet.*

Eun. 56, seq. *etiam atque etiam cogita, ere: quae res in se neque con-  
 silium neque modum habet ullum, eam consilio regere non potest.*

*credo.*

Caecilius Stat., Plocium II. 151 seq. R. *nunc credo inter suas aequa-  
 lis, cognatas, sermonem serit.*

C. Lutat. Catulus, Epigr. Aul. Gell. 19, 9, 10. *credo, ut solet, ad  
 Theotimum devenit.*

Amph. 297. *credo misericors est.*

Aul. 39. *credo aurum inspicere volt.*

- Most. 441. *credo expectatus veniam familiaribus.*  
 Most. 1080. *credo haud negat.*  
 Andr. 313. *credo impetrabo.*  
 Capt. 196. *domi fuistis credo liberi.*  
 Capt. 961. *quod ego fatear, credin pudeat quom autumes?*  
 Trin. 115. *haec, si mi inimicus esset, credo haud crederet.*  
 Hec. 129. *si adesset, credo ibi eius commiserescerit.*

*censeo.*

- Heaut. 588. *recte dicit, censeo.*  
 Rud. 1269. *censen hodie despondebit eam mihi, quaeso?*  
 Andr. 578. *num censes faceret?*

*opinor.*

- Asin. 151. *opinor hic ante ostium meo modo loquar, quae volam.*  
 Lucilius, Sat. 216 M. *hic solus vigilavit, opinor.*  
 Rud. 661. *opinor, leno pugnis plectitur.*  
 Rud. 1202. *accedam opinor ad fores.*

*spero.*

- Epid. 124. *spero: servabit fidem.*  
 Adelph. 411. *salvos sit spero.<sup>1)</sup>*  
 Andr. 314. *interea fiet aliquid: spero.*  
 Heaut. 553. *non usus veniet, spero.*

4. Verbs of saying.

*dico.*

- Pers. 589. *prius dico: hanc mancupio nemo tibi dabit.*  
 Lucilius, Sat. XXVI., 651 M. *ad enim dicis: clandestino tibi quod  
 commissum foret neu muttires quicquam neu mysteria ecferres  
 foras.*  
 Aul. 346. *dicant: coqui abstulerunt.*  
 Phorm. 334. *dices: ducent damnatum domum.*

*interdico.*

- Capt. 694. *nil interdico aiant vivere.*

*fateor.*

- Aul. 88. *pauper sum: fateor.*  
 Rud. 735. *fateor: ego trifurcifer sum.*  
 Heaut. 158. *ita res est, fateor: peccatum a me maxumest.*

---

1) Cf. C. I. L. passim O. S. T. T. L. *opto sit tibi terra levis.*

*moneo.*

Most. 196. *moneo ego te: te ille deseret actate satietate.*

*Impersonal verbs.*

Amph. 1048. *certumst: intro rumpam in aedis.*

Capt. 778. *nunc certa res est — — —: coniciam in collum pallium.*

Merc. 658. *hoc mihi certissimumst: eo domum.*

Asin. 448. *nunc adeam: optimumst.*

Poen. 1244. *pro hoc mihi patronus sim necessesst.*

The verb *scio* is usually followed by the acc. w. inf. construction, both in early and later Latin writers. In a number of cases, however, it is joined paratactically to the subordinate statement. Lindskog<sup>1)</sup> states that there are 33 instances of this construction in Plautus and 20 in Terence.<sup>2)</sup>

Though it must be admitted that this verb in a number of instances is parenthetical, still the rule stated by Weissenhorn and Kühner<sup>3)</sup> does not hold, that *scio* and other verbs of this class, are always parenthetical when inserted in the middle of the sentence. *Scio* may be parenthetical, when it stands first in the sentence as in Asin. 790, *scio; captiones metuis*,<sup>4)</sup> and on the other hand it may govern another proposition when it is inserted as in Capt. 440, *nam pater scio faciet quae illum facere oportet omnia*. No one will deny that the meaning will be the same, if the construction is changed to, *nam patrem scio facturum esse, etc.*<sup>5)</sup> Aside from this it has been recognized by Schmalz and others, that the parenthetical sentence ought really to be included under the definition of parataxis given above. It is at least certain that many verbs of this kind, which originally were thrown into speech here and there very much in the way of exclamations, afterwards were understood to govern the parallel simple sentence.

*Scio* is followed in most cases by the indicative. The tenses used are the future, future perfect, present, and perfect. In the contrary to fact conditions in which the subjunctive is used after *scio*, this verb was, most probably, at first parenthetical. By continued use the condition was gradually felt to be dependent on the verb. This then

1) *Quaest.*, p. 24.

2) *Scio* followed by *ut* is found in Men. 434. *scio ut me dices: cf. Verg. Aen. XII. 143 seq. scis ut te cunctis — — — practulerim.*

3) *Parat. Plaut.* p. 5; Kühner. *Ausführl. Gr.*, p. 578. ann. 1. "Wenn aber die genannten Verben (i. e. *scio*, etc.) innerhalb des Satzes stehen, so gehören sie nicht hierher. Denn alsdann sind sie als parenthetisch eingeschaltete Ausdrücke aufzufassen."

4) See Lindskog, *Quaest.*, p. 25.

5) For a discussion of this and illustrations of *scio* inserted followed by acc. w. inf., see Becker, *Beiordu. und unterordu. Satzverb.*, p. 11. note 4.



became the established construction, the acc. w. inf. being never used. This explanation seems better, because more simple, than that given by Paul Barth.<sup>1)</sup>

Verbs of perception, *video*, *audio*, *sentio*, and others, similarly introduce a subordinate clause. Under these verbs two classes of constructions may be distinguished, viz.: a) the introductory verb is in the indicative, generally the first person singular; b) the introductory verb is in the imperative or is an interrogative second person; <sup>2)</sup> e. g., a) *video: erepsti primitur de pannibus*; b) *vide sis: nequo hinc abeas longius; cogitate: — — — labor ille a vobis recedet; audin tu: apud Archibulum ego ero argentarium.*

A few of the numerous examples of these classes are given above. In the sentence *non potest sine malo fateri: video*, the first proposition was not at once felt to be dependent on *video*. This verb was an afterthought and was added as such. In Hec. 770, *noster socer video venit* the insertion of the verb seems to indicate that its subordinating function was partly felt. When *video*, *sentio*, etc., come first, the sequence of thought is enough to indicate that the following proposition is dependent on the preceding.

In the second class we distinguish two groups, viz.: a) the verb in the subordinate clause is in the indicative; and b) the verb in the subordinate clause is an original subjunctive, either alone or with *ut* or with the negative *ne*. The first group, which is similar in origin to the class described above (viz. *video*, etc., followed by the indicative) may be illustrated by *audin tu: apud Archibulum ego ero argentarium*; and *videte: iudicabit inclutum iudicium inter deas tris aliquis*. In the second group the forms *vide*, *audi*, *viden*, etc., take the place of an interjection and serve to direct the attention of the hearer to what is to be said.<sup>3)</sup> Still it cannot be said with Becker that the statement following this form was independent. The latter proposition in *et id videto: uti aut domino siet*, is an exhortation or, perhaps better, a direction. In early Latin *ut* with the subjunctive was thus used in independent sentences, (cf. C. I. L., I. 196, 23.

1) *De infinitivi apud scaenicos poetas latinos usu*, p. 48, "Sententiae, quibus continetur condicio, quae vocatur irrealis, rectae semper stant, numquam in formam orationis oblique rediguntur; hoc nimirum fit ea de causa, quia in oratione obliqua coniunctivus non certe dignoset posset, ntrum propter statum condicionalem an per consecutionem temporis positus esset, infinitivus autem modi nota omnino careret ob eamque rem ntriusque membri status, qui dicitur irrealis obtegeretur omnino et occultaretur."

2) That the forms *audin*, *viden*, etc., are used similarly to the imperative has been shown by Lindskog, *Quaest.*, pp. 27, and 40 ff.

3) Becker, *Beiordn. und unterordn. Satzverb.*, p. 27, "*audi* dient ähnlich wie *vide* dazu den Angeredeten auf das Folgende aufmerksam zu machen und wird daher niemals mit dem acc. c. inf. verbunden, sondern hat den Inhaltssatz stets als unabhängiges Aussage- (auch Frage- oder Befehls-) satz bei sich." Cf. Lindskog, *Quaest.*, pp. 40 ff.

HAICE VTEI IN CONVENTIONID EXDEICATIS, "this you are to announce in the assembly"). *Videto* is an additional element further emphasizing the direction. Similarly the sentence *vide: ne me ludas* must be understood, "see to it; don't you fool me".

What has been said above regarding the constructions following verbs of knowing and perceiving applies also in many particulars to the other examples given above after verbs of thinking and saying. For a full list of examples the reader is referred to the work by Becker. Schmalz and Lindskog have added valuable discussions of the origin of the constructions with the several verbs. Especially is to be noted Lindskog's chapters, "Parataxis ad sententias impersonaliter usurpatas,"<sup>1)</sup> (i. e. *certum est*, etc.), and "Parataxis ad verbum quod est dico"<sup>2)</sup>

## PART II.

### ADVERBIAL CLAUSES.

The clauses described above in Part I., serve the function of complements to certain verbs and expressions. They have the value of a noun and may represent the nominative or an oblique case. In the following chapters the subordinate proposition stands in the place of an adverb, and is intimately connected with the principal proposition in thought, the latter containing the main statement.<sup>3)</sup>

These clauses are of later origin and are less frequent. The concept of adverbial relation is not formed with such readiness by the human mind as the concept of subjective and objective relation. The nature of the adverbial relation is, moreover, more difficult to determine. Even where it is evident that an adverbial relation exists between two propositions, it is often impossible to say whether it is conditional, causal, temporal, etc. Each of the following six chapters will include a discussion of one of the following adverbial relations: final, consecutive, temporal, conditional, and concessive. In Chapter XI. the comparative and relative clauses will be treated.

## CHAPTER V.

### FINAL ADVERBIAL CLAUSES.

From the following examples it will be seen that this paratactic construction is found especially after verbs of motion, viz. *eo, sequor*,

1) Quaest. pp. 29 ff. and 41.

2) Ib. pp. 31 ff.

3) Cf. Substantive Clauses, p. 15.

etc. Most frequent is the form *ibo* followed by the future indicative. A number of other verbs, however, are also followed by final clauses.<sup>1)</sup>

Asin. 382. *i, puere, pulta.*

Bacch. 1059. *cape hoc tibi aurum, Chrusale: i, fer filio.*

Caecilius, Plocium II, 178. *abi intro atque istaec aufer.*

Mil. 1185. *huc venito et matris verbis Philocomasium arcessito.*

Amph. 300. *clare advorsum fabulabor, hic auscultet, quae loquar.*

Amph. 949. *evocate huc Sosiam, — — — Blepharonem arcessat.*

Andr. 511. *multa concurrunt simul qui coniecturam hanc nunc faciam.*

Aul. 500. *enim mihi quidem aequomst — — — dari — — — vehicla qui vehar.*

Adelph. 549. *nunc redeo: si forte frater redierit viso.*

Most. 774. *Eon voco huc hominem?*

Heaut. 426. *ibo: adloquar.*

Heaut. 170. *ibo: visam si domist.*

Heaut. 608. *ad Menedemum ibo: dicam hanc esse captam e Caria.*

Capt. 126 seq. *ego ibo ad fratrem ad alios captivos meos: visam ne nocte hac quippiam turbaverint.*

Pers. 77. *nunc huc intro ibo: visam hesternas reliquias.*

Capt. 764. *sequere hac: redducam te ubi fuisti.*

Most. 312. *conveniunt manuplares eccos: praedam participes petunt.*

Curc. 312. *da, obsecro hercle, obsorbeam.*

Capt. 1003. *aut anites aut coturnices dantur quicum lusitent.*

Eun. 150. *id amabo adiuta me: quo id fiat facilius.*

Epid. 267. *continuo arbitretur uxor tuo gnato atque ut fidicinam illam quam is volet liberare, quae illum corrumpit tibi, ulciscare atque ita curetur, usque ad mortem ut serviat.*

Stich. 207. *dicam auctionis causam: ut damno gaudeant.*

Eun. 941, seq. *te — — ulciscar: ut ne inpune nos inluseris.*

Bacch. 224. *veniat quando volt atque ita: ne mihi sit morae.*

The final sentence is, as Gildersleeve states,<sup>2)</sup> ultimately an imperative sentence. An imperative or an independent volitive subjunctive was at first used to express the action desired on the part of the speaker.<sup>3)</sup> The final sentence in its simplest form is found in sentences like *i, puere, pulta*, in which the second imperative plainly denotes the purpose in the mind of the speaker for asking the servant

1) Cf. Weissenhorn, p. 13, who gives only 3 examples from Plautus.

2) A. J. P. XXIII. p. 254.

3) Cf. Lane's Gr., (New York, 1903), § 1540.

to go over to the house of Demaenetus.<sup>1)</sup> When it was the desire of the speaker, that the person addressed cause a third person to perform some action, the subjunctive was naturally used, since the Latin lacked a third person in the present imperative.<sup>2)</sup> The following sentence, *evocate huc Sosiam, — — — Blepharonem arcessat*, differs therefore, from those just described only in that the performance of the command is transferred from the second person to the third.

Final clauses in the first person after *ibo* and other verbs, did not require the subjunctive. That is, the second clause is not an original volitive subjunctive. Thus *dabo* in Bacch. 366. *nunc ibo: erili filio hanc fabricam dabo* was apprehended at first merely as the continuation of the action of the speaker. He would, therefore, naturally use the future indicative in this proposition as in the preceding. That the latter proposition must often be considered as first expressing the continuation of the action in the first proposition is more clearly seen in propositions which are connected by the coordinate conjunctions *et, atque, etc.*, e. g. Men. 331, *ibo intro et dicam*; Ib. 1035, *nunc ibo in tabernam, vasa atque argentum tibi referam*; Poen. 739, *ibo et pultabo ianuam?*<sup>3)</sup>

Purpose clauses introduced by the relative pronoun *quo*, (early form, *qui*), are best explained by a volitive origin. We may thus understand Capt. 1002, seq. *patriciis pueris aut monerulae aut anites aut coturnices dantur: quicum lusitent*, "jackdaws or ducks or quails are given to patrician children; may they play with them"<sup>4)</sup> Compare the other examples of the same class given above, among which *qui, (quo)*, in the following sentence at least, is used as a conjunction, *enim mihi quidem aequomst — — — dari — — — vehicla qui vehar*.

The established usage in classical times is derived from the inde-

1) Cf. Weissenhorn, Parat., Plaut., p. 13. "Sed nolim haec exempla excitare; nam hi imperativi non tam motionis quam cohortationis vim habere mihi videntur ut quodam modo cognati sint cum imperativis pro interiectione positis, age, agite." It is, however, not apparent why a distinction should be made between Capt. 950, for instance, *ite actutum: Tyndarum huc arcessite*, and Asin. 913, *ibo ad Diabolum: mandata dicam facta*. *Ite* is as much a verb of motion as *ibo*. From the point of view of the master of the slave the logical alternative of *ibo* is *i* or *ite*. In other words, the master will either say, "I shall go", or "go thou", not "let me go". *Ite* is, therefore, from the nature of things volitive and not equivalent to *age, agite*.

2) Because of the infrequency of commands in the third person pres., no special form developed in Latin. A command in the second person differs, however, from a command in the third person only in that it affects but one person. From the point of view of the speaker there is no difference.

3) Cf. Sjögren. *De part. cop. apud Plaut. et Terent.*, pp. 77 ff. and Appendix. Cf. Ballas, *Gram. Plaut.*, (Berlin, 1884), pp. 14 ff.

4) See Delbrück, *Conjunctiv und Optativ*, pp. 59—62.



pendent use of *ut* with a volitive subjunctive.<sup>1)</sup> The negative form was at first *ut ne (non)*, later *ne*.<sup>1)</sup> The sentence quoted above, Stich. 207, *dicam auctionis causam: ut damno gaudeant*, serves to illustrate this. Originally this must have meant, "I shall proclaim the reason of the auction; may they rejoice in my misfortune". This sentence, however, as well as the other three at the end of the list given above, are hypotactic in form. It is because of the predominance of *ut* in these clauses, that also other final clauses, originally differently expressed, adopted this form through analogy. The origin of negative clauses is similar. *Ne* (or *non*) was inserted after *ut*. Later *ne* was itself felt as a conjunction and *ut* was omitted.<sup>2)</sup>

## CHAPTER VI.

### CONSECUTIVE ADVERBIAL CLAUSES.

In consecutive clauses in early Latin the original indicative was still often found. These clauses retained this early form longer than the final clauses described in the preceding chapter. The subjunctive was, however, gradually coming into use from the use of the potential subjunctive in clauses of characteristic, from which the relative clause of result originated, and from the use of the subjunctive in independent sentences.

The following examples illustrate the use of the early indicative or an original subjunctive.

a) Most. 154 seq. *parsimonia et duritia disciplinae alieis eram: optumi quique expetebant a me doctrinam sibi.*

Most. 566. *hic ad me it: salvos sum.*

Pseud. 75 seq. *pumiceos oculos habeo: non quo lacrumam exorare ut expuant unam modo.*

Bacch. 85. *rapidus fluvius est hic: non hac temere transiri potest.*

b) Capt. 503 seq. *ita me miserum — — — reddiderunt: vix ex gratulando miser iam eminebam.*

Most. 146 seq. *ita haec tigna — — — — putent: non vidcor mihi sarcire posse aedes meas.*

Mil. 1047. *nam ita me occursant multae: meminisse haud possum.*

Asin. 390. *ita haec moratast ianua: extemplo ianitorem clamat.*

1) For an independent volitive use of *ut* with subj. see Cato, II. 6. This and other examples are quoted by Lindskog, Quaest., pp. 51 ff.; for *ne*-clauses see Schnoor, Quaest. Plaut., pp. 7 ff.

2) See Lane Gr. § 1947. For a discussion of *ut ne* and *ut non* in final and consecutive clauses see Lindskog, Quaest., pp. 53 ff., and Schnoor, Quaest. Plaut., pp. 7 ff.

c) Bacch. 332 seq. *tantas divitias habet: nescit quid faciat auro.*  
 Capt. 227. *tanta incepta res est: haud somniculose hoc agundumst.*  
 Cas. 341 seq. *at ego sic agam: coniciam sortis in sitellam et sortiar.*  
 Men. 573. *morem habent hunc: clientis sibi omnes volunt esse multos.*  
 Mil. 801. *ille eius modist: cupiet miser.*  
 Pseud. 1250. *magnum hoc vitium vinost: pedes captat primum, luctator dolosust.*

d) Men. 683. *mihī tu ut dederis pallam, — — — — — numquam factum reperies.*

Pers. 795. *quo modo me hodie vorsavisti: ut me in tricas coniecisti?*

e) Heaut. 675. *nil tam difficilest: quin quaerendo investigari possiet.*  
 Heaut. 783. *ita tu istaec tua misceto: ne me admisceas.*

The above quoted sentences fall into five groups. In the first we have two simple sentences placed side by side with no indication in language of their relation. These sentences stand on the lower limit of parataxis. It is only from the thought or from the tone in which they are uttered, that we can say that one of the simple sentences expresses result, e. g. Most. 154 seq. would in later Latin have been expressed, *parsimonia et duritia discipulinae alieis eram, ut optimi quique expeterent a me doctrinam sibi*; and Bacch. 85, *rapidus fluvius est hic, ut non hac temere transiri possit.*

The principal proposition often has an adverb (*ita, sic*) or a pronoun (*tantus, hic, is*), which anticipates<sup>1)</sup> the result in the second clause. After the use of *ut* with the subjunctive became established this adverb or pronoun was considered a correlative to *ut* expressing degree or quality, e. g. Caes. B. G. I. 33. *ipse autem Ariovistus tantos sibi spiritus, tantam adrogantiam sumpserat, ut ferendus non videretur.*

Of the adverbs and pronouns of degree *ita* and *tantus* are of very frequent occurrence. *Sic* is seldom found. In the third group *hic* is more often found than *is*. For a further discussion of anticipatory adverbs and pronouns, the reader is referred to Chapter XII.

Schmalz<sup>2)</sup> discusses and gives examples of another kind of consecutive parataxis in which the subordinate clause originally represented a question. Thus in Men. 683 the *ut* first introduced a question, viz. *mihī tu ut dederis pallam, etc.?* "you gave me the mantle and the bracelet?" The answer is then given, *numquam factum reperies*, "you will find that it was never done." Then the first clause was

1) Cf. Weissenhorn, Parat. Plaut. p. 14, and Bennett, Corn. Stud. IX, (1892), p. 10.

2) Lat. Synt., pp. 400 ff.

felt to be dependent, and the sentence was understood, "you will find that it was never done that you gave me the mantle, etc."<sup>1)</sup>

Quin<sup>2)</sup> in Heaut. 675 is equivalent to qui (abl.) + ne (=non). In later Latin it was used with the force of *ut non*. In this sentence the last proposition is also best understood as an original question, viz., *quin quaerendo investigari possit?* In the last quoted illustration *ne* is not yet a conjunction, but is equivalent to *non*.

## CHAPTER VII.

### CAUSAL CLAUSES.

Causal clauses in early Latin have the verb in the indicative. Two propositions are often found side by side in which the thought is so balanced, that it is difficult to determine which is the subordinate or, if this is possible, to determine what the nature of the subordination is. In the first group sentences of this character are given, but only those in which it is reasonably probable that the relation may be causal. The second group will include sentences in which the causal idea is anticipated in the primary proposition by some word, usually some adjective, as *miser, salvus, stultus, etc.* In the third group will be given examples of clauses which are introduced by the adverbs *ita* and *sic* and the pronoun *tantus*.<sup>3)</sup>

a) Most. 503 seq. *nunc tu hinc emigra: scelestae hae sunt aedes*.<sup>4)</sup>

Ib. 243 seq. *probus homo sum . . . . patronum liberavi.*

Ib. 440 seq. *triennio post Aegypto advenio domum: credo exspectatus veniam familiaribus.*

Lucilius, 678, M. *homines ipsi hanc sibi molestiam ultro atque aerumnam offerunt: ducunt uxores, producunt, quibus haec faciant*<sup>5)</sup> *liberos.*

Amph. 836. *mulier es: audacter iuras.*

Most. 514. *nil ego formido: pax mihi cum mortuis.*

Sextus Turpilius, Leucadia, II. 109 seq. R. *intercapedine interficior, desiderio differor: tu es mihi cupiditas, suavitudo et mei animi expectatio.*

1) Cf. Hor. Epist. I. 18, 16.

2) Cf. Chapter III., p. 26.

3) No attempt will be made to explain the origin of *quod, quia, quoniam* and *quando* with the indicative and the subjunctive. The origin of these constructions, which are found in early writers side by side with those mentioned above, is still obscure. See Zander, *De relat. pron. ea quae est per quod et id quod*: Zimmermann, *Gebrauch der Conjunctionen quod und quia im älteren Latein*, (Posen, 1880); Lindskog, *Quaest. III. Ratio hypotaetica in secundariae structura* pp. 60 ff.; Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*, pp. 375 ff.

4) Cf. C. I. L. IV. 813. *otiosus locus hic non est: discede morator.*

5) Others read *favcant*.

- b) Amph. 331. *salvos sum: non me videt.*  
 Capt. 284. *salva res est: philosophatur quoque iam.*<sup>1)</sup>  
 Pseud. 80. *miser sum: argentum nusquam invenio mutuom.*  
 Ib. 261. *stultus es: rem actam agis.*  
 Accius, Atreus, I. 214, R. *vigilandum est semper: multae insidiae sunt bonis.*  
 Ennius, Hecuba, I. 164, R. *heu me miseram, interii! pergunt lavere sanguen sanguine.*
- c) Amph. 1056, seq. *quid agam nescio: ita tanta mira in aedibus sunt facta.*  
 Trin. 543, seq. *nemo exstat qui ibi sex menses vixerit: ita cuncti solstitiali morbo decidunt.*  
 Heaut. 978. *vah, rogasse vellem — — — unde mi peterem cibum: ita nos abalienavit.*  
 Capt. 464 seq. *nam hercle — — — oculos effodiam lubens: ita malignitate oneravit omnis mortalis mihi.*  
 Andr. 761. *Di te eradicent: ita me miseram territas.*  
 Most. 546. *pergam turbare porro: ita haec res postulat.*  
 Caecilius Stat., Synephebi, II. 207, R. *nec quem dolum ad eum aut machinam commoliar scio quicquam: ita omnis meos dolos fallacias praestigias praestrinxit commoditas patris.*  
 Capt. 825. *non ego nunc parasitus sum, sed regum rex regalior: tantus ventri commeatus meo adest in portu cibus.*  
 Capt. 868. *te hercle mi aequomst gratias agere ob nuntium: tantum ego nunc porto a portu boni.*  
 Ennius, Thyestes, I. 303 seq. *nolite — — — ad me adire — — —: meo tanta vis sceleris in corpore haeret.*  
 Pseud. 1130. *malum quod tibi di dabunt: sic scelestu's.*<sup>2)</sup>

It is not always possible, as was stated above, to be certain that the idea of cause is present in loosely jointed sentences like those in the first group. The nature of the relation can be known only from the relative order of the propositions, and from their connection in the play. Thus the sentence *nil ego formido, pax mihi cum mortuis*, is probably causal and should not be explained as consecutive, i. e. "I am at peace with the dead, so I have no fear", for, in consecutive sentences, the subordinate clause originally followed the principal statement. The following sentences, however, Rud. 1411, *bene facis: gratiam habeo magnam*, which is quoted by Weissenhorn as causal <sup>1)</sup>,

1) Cf. Pseud. 974. *salvos sum: iam philosophatur.*

2) Weissenhorn P. P., p. 16, "pro particula *ita* uno loco *sic* adhibitum esse inveni."



and Most. 353, *erūs advenit peregre: periit Tranio*, should be classed under asyndetic coordination, that is, the second proposition may be understood as illative, viz., "You act well, therefore I am very grateful", etc.<sup>2)</sup>

In the second group the causal relation is clearer. The expressions *salvos sum, miser sum*, etc., presuppose a cause which is given in the following clause: Verbal expressions like *interii, perii, odi*, and the like are also used in the same way.

The order also of the propositions, as just stated, is often helpful in determining their relation. The sentence from Accius, *vigilandum est semper: multae insidiae sunt bonis*, cannot be understood, "There are many snares set for the righteous, therefore we must always be on the alert", for in illative sentences the explanation always follows. Similarly in early Latin, causal clauses, whether coordinate or hypotactic, generally follow the main statement. It is only after the causal relation is fully understood, that this clause precedes. Even to-day in colloquial language our reasons, as a rule, come second.<sup>3)</sup>

Clauses introduced by *ita* and *tantus* are very frequent. These words serve almost the function of causal conjunctions. If *quod* is substituted for *ita* in Capt. 464 seq., there is no change except that the subordinate relation is more clearly seen, viz. *nam hercle — — — oculos effodiam lubens, quod malignitate oneravit omnis mortalis mihi*. With causal *ita-, sic-, etc.*, clauses should be compared the use of these words in consecutive clauses described in the preceding chapter (p. 35 ff.). In the consecutive sentence *ita, etc.*, are found in the principal proposition,<sup>4)</sup> in causal sentences in the subordinate clause. This may be well illustrated by Andr. 937. *vix*

1) Parat. Plaut. p. 17.

2) Great care must be taken to avoid confusion between parataxis and asyndeton. Many sentences which are really asyndetic are quoted in current textbooks as examples of parataxis. Thus the sentence Most. 39, *di omnes perdant: (nam) aboluisti* quoted in Fay's *Mostellaria*, p. xlv, is not paratactic, but an instance of causal asyndeton. Care is necessary, because it is often difficult to distinguish coordination from subordination, and because asyndeton is very frequent and is found in all kinds of coordination, viz.: Copulative, Most. 111. *venit imber (et) lavit*; Adversative, Most. 49 seq. *tu fortunatus, (sed) ego miser: patiunda sunt, meum bonum me, (sed) te tuom mancat malum*; Disjunctive, Heaut. 643. *melius (aut) peius, prosit (aut) obsit, nil vident, nisi quod lubet*; Causal, Capt. 582. *non mirum facis, (nam) est miserorum ut malevolentes sint*; Illative, Most. 601. *nemo dat: age (igitur) quid lubet*.

3) In sentences like, (quod) *lectus mortui fertur, dicebant feretrum nostri*, (Varro L. L. 5, 166), and (quia) *mulier es, audacter iuras* the second clause was originally added with illative force. The first sentence was, therefore, at first equivalent to, "A *lectus* was brought for the corpse; therefore our forefathers called it *feretrum*. Later the causal concept in the first clause was apprehended.

4) This proposition always precedes. See pages 35 f.

*sum apud me: ita animus commotust metu.* This is evidently a causal sentence. If the arrangement had been, *ita animus commotust metu: vix sum apud me*, then the latter clause would have been equivalent to *ut vix sim apud me*.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### TEMPORAL CLAUSES.

The closeness of relation of temporal, conditional, and causal concepts is even more marked than that of consecutive and causal mentioned in the preceding chapter. For this reason there occur in early Latin writers numerous paratactic sentences, which are difficult to classify. The following are probably all temporal, though several may be understood either as conditional, or concessive.

Cure. 330. *video tuom sodalem: argenti rogo uti faciat copiam.*

Andr. 297. *hanc mi in manum dat: mors continuo ipsam occupat.*

Rud. 151 seq. *quia post cenam, credo, laverunt heri: confracta navis in marist illis.*

Lucilius, XV. 504. M. *cum tecum est, quidvis satis est; visuri alieni sint homines: spiram, pallam, redimicula promit.*

Bacch. 1023. *em specta: tum scies.*

Capt. 338. *ausculta: tum scies.*

Ep. 286. *scibis: audi.*

The preceding examples are sufficient to illustrate temporal parataxis. These illustrations show the most primitive form of sentence-connection. The sentences are joined loosely, and may in some cases be coordinate. This form of speaking, which is purely colloquial, is usually found in lively narration, in which the indicative is usually used. An excellent example of this mode of speaking<sup>1)</sup> is found in Capt. 506. *rogo syngraphum: datur mihi ilico: dedi Tyndaro: ille abiit domum..* Though this narration, undoubtedly, even to-day, could well be given in this loose way, it is easy to see that the subordinate relation exists, even if it is not expressed in words. The sentence is evidently equivalent to, "When I ask for the passport, he gives it to me on the spot. I gave it to Tyndarus who left for home."<sup>2)</sup>

1) Cf. Weissenhorn, Parat. Plaut., p. 22, who calls this construction "*asyndeton temporale*."

2) Cf. Strong, *Introd. to the Study of the Hist. of Lang.*, (London, 1891), pp. 121 ff.; who after showing that all contiguous clauses are more or less dependent on one another, continues: "We already depart a step further from mere coordination in the case where — in grammatically absolutely identical manner — two or more sentences are coordinated in a story: as, e. g., *I arrived at twelve o'clock; I went to the hotel; they told me there was not a single room to be had; I went to another hotel*, etc., where

Often when the relation of thought is not clearly seen, a sentence will suggest different conceptions of the relation to different persons. Thus Eun. 252. is, perhaps, better understood, (si) *negat quis, nego*; (si) *ait, aio*, though the first clauses may be considered temporal, viz., (quom) *negat quis, nego*; (quom) *ait, aio*.

The three sentences in which the imperative is used in the subordinate clause may also be conceived either as temporal or conditional or even as causal, viz., *ausculta: tum scies*, may mean, "when you listen," or, "if you listen, you will know," and *scibus: audi* may be understood either, "when you listen," or, "if you listen," or, "since you listen," etc.

Sentences like Ep. 337. *fecisti iam officium tuum: me meum nunc facere oportet*; and Pers. 272. *pensum — — — confeci: nunc domum propero*, I omit.<sup>1)</sup> The mere presence of the particles *iam* and *nunc* do not make them temporal. Sentences of this kind can all be otherwise explained. The first clause in Ep. 337 is more naturally explained as causal, or the latter clause as illative, viz., "since you have now performed your duty, it is now meet for me to perform mine," or "you have now performed — — —; therefore it is now meet — — —." For a further discussion of temporal clauses see Schmalz, Lat. Synt. II., p. 341.

## CHAPTER IX.

### CONDITIONAL CLAUSES.

In the early stages of language the conditional relation of one proposition to another, which later was expressed by the correlatives *si — — — sic (si + ce)*, *si — — — tum*, or merely *si*, was not indicated in language. For the subordinate clause was used a command, an exhortation, a question, or a direct statement. Examples of these are given below, as well as of clauses introduced by *ni*, and by the preposition *absque*, and instances of *si — — — sic (tum)*, which still show traces of the early correlative use.

a) Mere. 770. *cras petito: dabitur.*

Ep. 24. *operam da: opera reddetur tibi.*

Phorm. 410. *abduce hanc: minas quinque accipe.*

---

each sentence to a certain extent expresses a cause or defines the time of occurrence of the fact which is mentioned in the next. Now though this additional meaning is clearly there, it is a meaning which at the moment of uttering each clause is not necessarily, may, not probably clearly present in the speaker's mind: we might more fully and correctly but perhaps more clumsily say, *I — — —; and when I had — — —; but when — — —; and because — — —.*"

1) Weissenhorn considers these temporal, saying, "neque ab hac structura sunt aliena."

- Pacuvius, Arm. Iud. I. 30, R. *dic quid faciam: quod me moneris, effectum dabo.*
- Adelph. 123 seq. *postremo aut desine aut cedo quemvis arbitrum: te plura in hac re peccare ostendam.*
- Heaut. 487. *dare denegaris: ibit ad illud illico.*
- Rud. 1007. *verbum etiam adde unum: iam in cerebro colaphos abstrudam tuo.*
- Truc. 614. *tange modo: iam ego te hic agnum faciam et medium distruncabo.*
- b) Phorm. 265. *unum cognoris: omnis noris.*
- Adelph. 120. *fores ecfregit: restituentur, discidit vestem: resarcietur.*
- Amph. 995. *amat: sapit.*<sup>1)</sup>
- Most. 639. *euge, Philolaches patrissat: iam homo in mercatura vortitur.*
- Mil. 711. *sacrificant: dant inde partem mihi maiorem quam sibi.*
- Most. 873. *boni sunt: bonust; improbi sunt: malus fit.*<sup>2)</sup>
- c) Pseud. 1015. *argentum des: abducas mulierem.*
- Most. 912. *nunc ferat sex talenta magna argenti pro istis praesentaria: numquam accipiam.*
- Pers. 836. *nam hercle absque me foret et meo praesidio: hic faceret prostibilem propediem.*
- Men. 1022. *nam absque te esset: hodie numquam ad solem occasum viverem.*
- Capt. 754 seq. *quod absque hoc esset, qui mihi hoc fecit palam usque offrenatum suis me ductarent dolis.*
- Phorm. 188. *absque eo esset: recte ego mihi vidissem.*
- Lucilius, XXVI. 685. M. *si secubitet, sic quoque — — — non impetret.*
- Liv. Andron., Achilles, I. 1, R. *si malos imitabo, tum tu pretium pro noxa dabis.*
- XII Tab. 1.<sup>3)</sup> *ni it: antestamino.*
- Ib. I. *ni pacunt: in comitio aut in foro ante meridiem caussam coiciunto.*
- Ib. 3. *ni suo vivit: libros farris endo dies dato.*

It has already been stated that sentences like those found in the first group, in which the imperative is used, may often be understood either as temporal or conditional.<sup>4)</sup> In the sentences quoted here,

1) Cf. Bacch. 1165. *si amant, sapienter faciunt*, which is frequently quoted in connection with this sentence.

2) The reading in Goetz and Schoell is † *Bonis sum improbis suum, malus fuit*

3) Schoell, Rudolf, *Legis Duodecim Tabularum Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1866).

4) See Chapter VIII, esp. p. 41.



however, the conditional idea is fairly clear. The meaning of *cras petito: dabitur* cannot very well be made anything else than, "if you ask for it to-morrow, it will be given," and the sentence *abduc hanc: minas quinque accipe* is plainly equivalent to *quinque minas tibi dabo, si hanc abduxeris*.<sup>1)</sup> These sentences, whether in the form of a command or a prohibition, have been understood as elliptical. It has been supposed that the condition proper is left out, and that the sentence above, for instance, should be understood, "ask for it to-morrow, if you do, it will be given."<sup>2)</sup> To-day, when conditional relation is so clearly felt that the use of *if* is not always necessary, it is true that these sentences may be regarded as elliptical. It is, however, hazardous to judge the phenomena of early language by our standards. The complexity of our language hampers us, when we attempt to understand the primitive simplicity of language. It is not probable that sentences of this kind, viz., "do it; you will be saved," and "don't do it; you will be hurt," were at first understood as conditional. The command or prohibition was first given. Then the following proposition was added as a reason why the person addressed should act or refrain from acting.

Besides commands in the imperative, questions or direct statements in the indicative were frequently used to indicate the condition. Attempts have been made to show, on the one hand, that all conditional clauses of this kind were originally questions, and on the other, that they were all direct statements.<sup>3)</sup> Most probable is that both modes of expression were used. Eun. 252, for instance, is best understood to have originated from a question, viz., *negat quis? nego; ait? aio*, while Most. 873 need not necessarily be thus understood. It is here more natural to suppose that the statement *boni sunt* is followed upon reflection by *bonust*; cf. the so-called rhetorical parataxis in later writers, e. g. Horace Ars Poet. 25—26, *brevis esse laboro: obscurus fio*. In the developed conditional period, all uses of the indicative in the protasis have been derived from the above construction.

The use of the subjunctive has similarly been derived from the independent use of the subjunctive in paratactic sentences.<sup>4)</sup> The

1) See Elmer's note to this line.

2) Cf. Nutting A. J. P. 24 (1903), p. 35, who in commenting on the sentence, *Don't do it; you will be hurt*, says, "The first clause is not conditional. It is a prohibition. The condition is understood, i. e. if you do that, you will be hurt, don't do it." Cf. Chapter XII., p. 53.

3) Cf. Kühner, l. c., p. 760, c. and Anmerk. 4; Weissenhorn, l. c. p. 19; and Allen and Greenough's Gram. (Boston, 1904), § 511.

4) Cf. A. G. Gram., § 511. See however, Nutting, A. J. P., 24 (1903), pp. 25—39, who questions the current theories which refer the protasis (i. e. the subjunctive) to a volitive or like origin.



sentence, *nunc ferat sex talenta magna argenti pro istis praesentaria: numquam accipiam* was originally equivalent to, "let him now bring six talents, etc., I will never receive them," and *argentum des: abducas mulierem*, was first understood, "pay the money; you may take the woman away."

To these clauses belong also those which are introduced by the preposition *absque* in conditions contrary to fact.<sup>1)</sup> This usage had in the time of Plautus and Terence acquired an established form,<sup>2)</sup> and the clause introduced by *absque* was used almost like a clause introduced by *si*.

The *ni* and *si* — — — (*sic*) sentences given above, may probably be understood as hypotactic. We can, however, still see how the conditional clause became subordinate. In sentences like *ni it: antestamino*, the *ni*<sup>3)</sup> unquestionably was at first a pure negative and the sentence was equivalent to *non it, etc.*, and thus ought to be grouped with the sentences given under b) above.

The early use of *si* — — — *sic (tum, ita)*, *thus* — — — *thus*,<sup>4)</sup> may be illustrated by the two sentences given above, e. g. *si malos imitabo: tum tu pretium pro noxa dabis*, i. e., thus I shall imitate the wicked, then you, etc. It is through its use with the correlatives *sic, ita, tum*, that *si* (originally demonstrative) acquired conditional force. Lindskog gives the following sentences as illustrations of the early use of *si*, without a correlative, *Asin. 699, vehes pol hodie me, si quidem hoc argentum ferre speres*, and, *Mil. 571. ne tu hercle, si te di ament*,<sup>5)</sup> *linguam conprimes*. The first sentence could then be translated, "By Pollux, you will carry me to-day, in that way indeed may you hope to carry this money". The clause, *si te di ament*, is explained similarly in analogy with *Heaut. 463. sic me di amabunt*.<sup>6)</sup>

1) Cf. Ribbeck, *Beiträge zur Lehre von den Latein. Partikeln*. (Leipzig, 1869), p. 23; and Jordan, *Kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Lat. Sprache*, (Berlin, 1879), pp. 313 ff.

2) Jordan, p. 313. "Die Grundform der plautinischen und terenzischen Gebräuche ist eine feste:

<i>absque</i>	{ me }	{ esset }	{ facerem, -es, -et, etc,
	{ te }	{ foret }	{ fecissem.

Der Vordersatz ist stets impersonell; die Grundform ist also zu übersetzen: 'ohne mich (dich, diese Sache) wäre es (würde es sein), ich (du, u. s. w.) thäte es (thätetest es u. s. w.)', oder dem Sinne nach: 'wäre ich nicht da (dagewesen)'".

3) For a discussion of this see Lindskog. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Satzstellung im Latein*, (Lund, 1896), p. 20.

4) Cf. the earlier German, *so* — — — *so*, e. g. *so du willst, so werden wir gehen*.

5) Others read *amant*.

6) Cf. Lindskog, *Quaest.*, pp. 55 ff., and *De enunt. ap. Plaut. et Ter.*, pp. 28 ff.; also Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*, p. 410, § 335.

## CHAPTER X.

## CONCESSIVE CLAUSES.

The simplest form of concessive sentences are those in which the concessive idea is expressed by the imperative and in which the main proposition is found in the future indicative. The similarity of these in construction to conditional and temporal clauses, in which the imperative is used, often makes identification difficult.

Two propositions expressing two opposing ideas are often put in the indicative. In these is seen the close relation existing between coordinate adversative and concessive sentences. This class of paratactic concessive sentences is by far the most numerous.

In addition to illustrations of the above mentioned, the following list will contain sentences showing the earlier use of *quamquam*, *quamvis*, and *licet* in independent sentences.

- a) Rud. 1401. *vel hercle enica: non tacebo.*  
Ep. 36. *sine perdat: alia apportabunt ei Nerei filiae.*
- b) Capt. 615. *ornamenta absunt: Aiace, hunc quom vides, ipsum vides.*  
Capt. 575 seq. *et tu quidem servos es: liber fuisti.*  
Heaut. 79. *rectumst ego ut faciam: non est, te ut deterream.*  
C. I. L., I. 1010. FORTUNA · SPONDET · MULTA · MULTIS:  
PRAESTAT · NEMINI.  
Men. 689. *tute ultro ad me detulisti; dedisti eam dono mihi: eandem nunc reposcis.*  
Trin. 292. *nam hi mores maiorum laudant: eosdem luitant quos conlaudant.*
- c) Merc. 287. *quamquam negotiumst, si quid veis, Demipho, non sum occupatus unquam amico operam dare.*  
Adelph. 205. *id quoque — — — possum ferre, quamquam iniuriumst.*  
Merc. 687. *quamveis insipiens: poterat persentiscere.*  
Bacch. 82. *locus hic apud nos, quam vis subito venias, semper liber est.*  
Trin. 554. *quam vis malam rem quaeras, illic reperias.*  
Asin. 718. *licet laudem Fortunam tamen ut ne Salutem culpem.*  
Capt. 303. *memini quom dicto haud audebat: facto nunc laedat licet.*

The first two sentences quoted show that the imperative was used in the early language to express concession. The fact that the imperative was also used in clauses, which must be understood as temporal and conditional, and the fact that to-day we are often at a loss to

determine just what was the relation between the two simple sentences, show that there existed in the primitive mind no clear concept of any such relation. The first sentence, however, (Rud. 1401) is, as Weissenhorn has shown, plainly equivalent to *licet tu me enices, non tacebo*. In the second example *sine perdat*, which itself is parataxis stereotyped, is equivalent to an imperative.<sup>1)</sup>

These sentences, as well as the following in group b), represent the most primitive form of parataxis. It is impossible to say, whether they, at the time they were written, were conceived as compound or complex. It is, however, easy for us in all these sentences to understand one proposition as concessive, e. g. Heaut. 79, (*etsi rectumst, ego ut faciam: non est, te ut deterream*), but it is equally easy to suppose that the two propositions are coordinate, one being adversative, e. g. C. I. L., I. 1010, *fortuna spondet multa multis, (sed) praestat nemini*. The former is clearly a more complicated concept, and, therefore, later in being formed, that is to say, sentences which at first were considered to be adversative, were later understood as concessive. This is corroborated by the fact that in the early Latin writers numerous instances of these sentences occur which are syndetic, but which still may be understood as belonging to concessive sentences.<sup>2)</sup>

In some sentences<sup>3)</sup> this adversative or concessive concept is emphasized by certain words in both clauses, serving as correlatives, viz., *is — — — idem, hi — — — eosdem, tu — — — ego*, etc., e. g. Trin. 292. *nam hi mores maiorum laudant: eosdem lutitant quos conlaudant*.

No class of subordinate sentences, perhaps, show more clearly than the concessive the development of parataxis to hypotaxis. The reason for this is partly that the paratactic mode of expressing concession with *quamquam, quam vis, licet*, etc., retained until a very late period its original force, and partly that these verbs survive into classical times as concessive conjunctions. *Quamquam* was at first an indefinite adverb meaning "ever so much", or, "however much". This early meaning can still be seen in the sentences quoted above under c). The sentence, *id quoque possum ferre, quamquam iniuriumst*, thus at first meant, "this also I can endure: it is ever so much unfair!" When the concessive force of the exclamation was recognized, *quamquam* assumed the force of a conjunction.

1) Cf. *sine veniat* and other examples of this kind. See Chapter I., pp. 17, and 20 ff.

2) E. g. Pseud. 421. *atque id iam pridem scusi et subolebat mihi, sed dissimulabam*; Most. 93 seq. *atque hoc haud videtur veri simile vobis; at ego id faciam ita esse ut credatis*; Bacch. 463; Capt. 71. Cf. Weissenhorn, page 20.

3) Trin. 292; Men. 689; Aul. 667; Asin. 408; Amph. 816.

Similarly *quamvis* or *quam vis* was also at first used in independent sentences. The early use is well seen in Men. 318. *quam vis ridiculus est, ubi uxor non adest*, "he is as jolly as you please, when his wife is not near". This early force is still seen in numerous instances in early Latin. *Quam vis* was at first used either with the indicative or with the subjunctive, until the latter became the rule because of the frequent occurrence of the phrase *quam vis*, "as much as you please", in paratactic sentences, of which one member was an independent optative subjunctive.<sup>1)</sup> Thus Bacch. 82. *locus hic apud nos, quam vis subito venias, semper liber est*, is equivalent to "you may come as suddenly as you please; this place of ours is always open". In this sentence, however, though the literal meaning of *quam vis* was not lost sight of, it is probable that the concessive force was already felt. The very fact that one proposition is inserted in another tends to show that it was understood as subordinate.<sup>2)</sup>

The development of *licet* from an impersonal verb to a concessive conjunction went on side by side with the development of *quamquam* and *quam vis*. Its early use is illustrated by the last two sentences above. Compare with these the use of *licet* in substantive clauses.<sup>3)</sup>

## CHAPTER XI.

### RELATIVE AND COMPARATIVE CLAUSES.

The statement of Weissenhorn that no certain indication of paratactic construction of relative and comparative clauses is found in Latin,<sup>4)</sup> was objected to by Becker in the work which he began.<sup>5)</sup> It is reasonable to suppose that the relative and the comparative sentence should offer no exception to the rule, still it must be admitted that instances of parataxis are here few and not easily determined.

1) The optative subjunctive was later also used without *quamvis* to express a concession, e. g. Cic. Verr. V. 4, *sit fur, sacrilegus: at est bonus imperator*. Cf. A. G. Gr. § 526, where this subjunctive is said to be of hortatory origin, and Bennett, Lat. Lang., p. 219.

2) Cf. Lindskog, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Satzstellung im Latein*, (Lund, 1896), p. 36, "Es ist aber selbstverständlich, dass Nebensätze jeder Art allmählich in die Hauptsätze eingeschoben werden. Je mehr der ursprüngliche, parataktische Charakter verswindet und die Nebensätze nur wie Satztheile des übergeordneten Satzes hervortreten, je natürlicher ergibt sich, dass sie allmählich den Platz derselben einnehmen."

3) See Chapter I., p. 20. This subject has been discussed by Kriege, H., *De enuntiativis concessivis apud Plautum et Terentium*, (Halle, 1884), p. 47, and Lindskog, *Quaest.*, p. 51.

4) *Parat. Plaut.*, p. 4. "Seiungenda sunt a nostra quaestione enuntiativa comparativa et relativa, quippe quae certis exemplis paratacticis carere mihi videantur."

5) *Beiordn. u. unterordn. Satzverb.*, p. 6, note 1, "allein es lassen sich doch wie ich später zeigen werde, Spuren der Beiordnung auch bei diesen Sätzen (i. e. comparativa et relativa) erkennen."



The necessary conclusion in the case of the former is, that, while parataxis in the clauses described in the preceding chapters was still in its infancy, the relative was already a real relative and not a demonstrative, or an interrogative, or indefinite pronoun. This is also borne out by the Sanskrit and the Greek, as has been pointed out with clearness by Miles.<sup>1)</sup> Although Sanskrit syntax was in a more primitive state of development than Latin syntax of 100 B. C., no trace of any original or early meaning of the relative can be found. Speculations as to the origin of the relative are, therefore, with our present knowledge futile. Plausible arguments have been given to prove both that *quod*, for instance, in Phorm. 947. *argentum quod habes condonamus te* is in origin an adjective interrogative pronoun, and that it is an indefinite pronoun. Schmalz's explanation is, "*argentum. Quod argentum? Habes! Condonamus te*, d. h. der Sprechende beginnt: *argentum*, er wird unterbrochen: *quod argentum?* antwortet darauf, *habes*, und führt dann den mit *argentum* begonnen Satz durch *condonamus te* zu Ende." According to the other theory the sentence was originally equivalent to *argentum aliquod habes: condonamus te.*<sup>2)</sup> If one of these theories is to be adopted, the latter seems to me the most natural. The process of uniting the words of two speakers seems too bizarre and is as Morris remarks a phenomenon entirely unknown in language.

In addition to examples of the kind given above in which a relative has been traced back to an interrogative or an indefinite pronoun, colloquial sentences occur in which an independent clause, either with or without a demonstrative, takes the place of a relative clause. A few examples of each of these groups will suffice for illustration.

The relative pronouns in the following sentences may be explained as either originally interrogative or indefinite according to which of the above given theories is adopted.

Cato, R. R. CXLVIII, 2. *dominus vino, quid volet, faciat.*

Cist. 703. *quod periit: periit.*

Pers. 75. *sed sumne ego stultus qui rem curo publicam?*

Bacch. 992. *verum qui satis videat, grandes satis sunt.*

Cato, R. R. VI. 4. *qui locus vino optimus dicitur esse et ostentus soli aminnium minusculum et geminum eugeneum — — — conserito.*

1) Comparative Syntax of Latin and Greek, (Cambridge, 1893), Part. I., pp. 22 ff. and Appendix v.

2) For these theories see Zimmerman, *Gebrauch der Conjunctionen quod und quia im älteren Latein*, (Posen, 1880); Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*, p. 369; Bach, *De Attractione quae dicitur inversa*, (Strassburg, 1888); and Lindskog's criticism of Bach in *Eranos* I., (1896), pp. 48 ff.; also *Quaest.*, p. 62; Morris, *Lat. Synt.*, pp. 107 ff.; *Sitzungsbericht d. Kats. Akad. d. Wiss.* (1870), p. 77; Deecke, *Die griechischen und lateinischen Nebensätze*, (Buchsweller program, 1887), p. 39.



Most. 244. *quae pro me causam diceret: patronum liberavi.*

Aul. 716. *hominem demonstratis: quis eam abstulerit.*

Novius, *Tabellaria*, II. 86, R. *qui habet uxorem sine dote, [ei] pannum positum in purpura est.*

Phorm. 947. *argentum quod habes, condonamus te.*

The statement found in grammars that the relative pronoun is never omitted in Latin is not strictly correct. Numerous instances are found both in colloquial and more careful language, in which the relative is either omitted or replaced by a demonstrative. The following examples will serve to illustrate this.

Capt. 506. *dedi Tyndaro: ille abiit domum.*

Pacuvius, *Chryses*, I. 93, R. *mater est terra: ea parit corpus.*

Most. 983 seq. *unus istic servos est sacerrimus, Tranio: is vel Herculi conterere quaestum potest.*

Most. 257. *nunc adsentatrix scelestast: dudum advorsatrix erat.*

This loose way of expressing the relative, found along side of the fully developed hypotactic relative clause, is not offered as an explanation of the early paratactic mode of expression, but to emphasize the fact that the human mind, when not bound by rules, will tend to depart from an established formal mode of expression to one that is more simple. The characters in a play may neglect careful observance of grammatical rules. Poetic license, again, allowed Vergil to write in the same way, e. g. *Aen.* I. 12, *urbs antiqua fuit: Tyrii tenuere coloni*, and *Ib.* 530, *est locus: Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt.*

No attempt will be made here to discuss parataxis in Comparative clauses with any completeness. A few sentences will, however, be given to show that traces exist of their paratactic origin.

Ep. 175. *quouis quotiens sepulchrum vides: sacruficas.*

Rud. 1301. *quanto magis extergeo: — — — tenuius fit.*

Eun. 474. *ita me di ament: honestust.*

Most. 170. *ita me di ament: lepidast Scapha.*

Mil. 974. *quin tu illam iube abs te abire quo lubet? sicut soror eius huc gemina venit Ephesum.*

Phorm. 591. *ego hominem callidiorem vidi neminem quam Phormionem.*

Amph. 682. *quid tu me — — — sic salutas — — — quasi (quam +si) dudum non videris?*

Merc. 897. *amicior mihi nullus vivit: atque is est.*

Mil. 1251. *si parem sapientiam habet ac formam.*

Traces of parataxis are shown in the first four sentences by the omission of the correlatives, *totiens*, *tanto*, and *ut*. In Eun. 474, and

Most. 170, for instance, the first propositions are independent in form, *ita* being frequently used in ejaculations, (cf. Most. 398. *ita ille faxit Iupiter*). To these were added the independent clauses, *sacrificas*, and *lepidast Scapha*. When the two simple sentences were felt to be correlative *ut* introduced the second clause, e. g. Aul. 496. *ita me di amabunt, ut ego hunc ausculto lubens*, "so may the gods help me, as I am glad to hear this man", and Most. 182. *ita tu me ames; ita Philolaches tuos te amet, ut venusta's*.

In Phorm. 591, where *quam* expresses the comparison, the paratactic origin is seen, if understood as follows: *quam Phormio est callidus! ego hominem callidiorum vidi neminem*.

*Atque (ac)*, originally a coordinate conjunction, acquired the force of a comparative conjunction in sentences like Cic. Orat. II. 6, 24, *non dixi secus ac sentiebam*. In the sentences given above, however, the copulative force can still be felt, e. g. Mil. 1251, *si parem sapientiam habet ac formam*, "if he has equal wisdom and beauty". The translation of this sentence in A. G. Gram. § 384, N. 2, "if he has sense like as his beauty", is based on the false supposition that *ac* already had acquired the meaning of *than* in all sentences of this class.

## CHAPTER XII.

### CONCLUSION.

In summing up the result of the preceding discussion, it can be said, that the relation between the two propositions in the paratactic sentence varies from absolute independence in form to marked indication of the hypotactic nature in sentences which still cannot be classed as hypotactic. That is, parataxis includes the whole field which lies between coordination on the one hand and the expression of subordinate relation by subordinating conjunctions, on the other.

The development of means for expressing relation proceeded naturally. A wish or an exhortation in the subjunctive, joined to a direct statement, gradually came to be considered subordinate and the subjunctive was retained. If *ut* or *ne* preceded the wish or the exhortation, these were retained and assumed the function of conjunctions. An adverb or a pronoun, inserted in one or both propositions, often assumed the force of a conjunction by a similar evolution. Apparently insignificant elements influenced the development this way or that. Several means of expressing the same relation often came into use, as connecting words which earlier had differed in meaning were employed for the expression of new concepts.

In a formal classification of parataxis, therefore, the sentences naturally fall into two groups: those in which there is no indication in written language of the subordinate relation, and those in which the relation of the clauses is suggested by the language. The following scheme will make this clear.

- I. Two simple sentences, placed side by side, one depending on the other, but with no indication of the relation in written language.
  1. Relation expressed by musical means.
- II. Two simple sentences, placed side by side, one depending on the other, in which the relation is indicated by the written language.
  1. Relation suggested by the tense and the mood.
  2. Relation suggested by the position of the simple sentences.
  3. Relation suggested by ellipsis, pleonasm, and prolepsis.
  4. Relation suggested by adverbs or pronouns inserted in one or both simple sentences.
  5. Relation suggested by the position and meaning of the conjunction.

It is not my intention in this chapter to discuss with any pretense at completeness this wide subject. A volume might well be devoted to the discussion, in each class of subordinate sentences, of the means employed in spoken and written language to indicate subordination. The fact, however, that nothing, so far as I know, has been done in this branch of the subject except the discussions of Lindskog<sup>1)</sup> makes it undesirable entirely to neglect it here.

I. In the early grouping of apparently independent sentences, the relation was indicated by musical means.<sup>2)</sup> Such elements as pauses, accentuation, rhythm, and pitch were certainly employed to denote the relation, even if this was done unconsciously on the part of the speaker. A sentence like *amat: sapit*, might, therefore, by the way it was uttered, as well as by attendant circumstances of the conversation, be made to mean either, "he loves, for he is wise; he loves, therefore he is wise; he loves, since he is wise; he loves, though he is wise; he loves, if he is wise", etc. *Amat* can similarly be made the explanatory, illative, causal, concessive, conditional, etc., clause, viz., "he is wise, for he loves", etc., thus doubling the possible number of relational concepts. This factor of musical means has been too much neglected in the study of language, partly because of a prevalent notion that only those elements which we have been accustomed to indicate in writing, belong to language, but mostly because of the elusiveness

---

1) *Quaest.* parts II. and III., and *Beiträge der Satzstellung im Latein*, passim. To his discussions I am partly indebted for subclasses 2, 3, and 5.

2) See *Introductio*, p. 10 and 11.

inherent in the subject which makes classification difficult if not impossible. If stable laws governed the relation of concepts and vocal utterances, then a causal clause, for instance, would be uttered with the same timbre, accent, and pitch to-day, as it was two thousand years ago. The fact, however, is that this relation is not governed by any law. It is rather convention that is the ruling element. Each language has its mode of expressing these relations, and this varies with time and culture. Elements, moreover, which in some languages are left to the vocal organs for expression, are in other languages expressed by written signs as particles and punctuation marks. Thus in Greek and in German, for example, there exist many words which in Latin and in English cannot be expressed in any other way than by musical means. The absence in the ancient languages of punctuation marks in our meaning of the term complicates the matter still more. In determining the nature of these paratactic sentences in Latin we are, therefore, practically limited to the attendant circumstances, i. e. the context, for determination of the meaning. For numerous paratactic sentences of this sort, the reader is referred to the preceding chapters.

II. When we come to the second class of clauses, in which the relation is suggested by the language, we meet a number of elements which are more tangible than those described above but which, nevertheless, though they may suggest the relation, do not always make clear its nature. The following five subclasses do not aim to include all that can possibly suggest the relation in paratactic sentences, but will suffice to point out lines along which further work can be done.

1. In classical times there had been established an almost absolute usage in the sequence of tenses and moods in subordinate sentences.<sup>1)</sup> This was, however, not the case in early Latin. When two independent sentences were joined, as for instance an optative or volitive subjunctive added to a direct statement, each sentence retained its original tense and mood, e. g. *Men. 787, quotiens monstravi tibi: viro ut morem geras?* *Bacch. 558, dic: quis est?* *Rud. 156. ubi sunt ei homines: obsecro?* The absence, therefore, of strict adherence to classic usage is often an indication of paratactic origin.<sup>2)</sup>

2. From the examples given in the preceding chapters it is seen that the subordinate clause either precedes the principal statement, or follows it, or is inserted in the same. This is evidently not without some meaning. In the early paratactic sentence the latter proposition

1) Cf. Kluge, *Die consec. temporum*, praef. p. VI. et al.

2) See Lindskog, *Quaest.*, pp. 88 ff.



obtains its position from the logical sequence of thought, that is, the second proposition is thought last.<sup>1)</sup> This position obtains until one proposition is felt to be a subordinate part of the sentence, i. e. a subject, an object, or an adverbial modifier. When this stage is reached, the propositions may exchange places or one may be inserted.<sup>2)</sup> Thus conditional<sup>3)</sup> and concessive clauses originally preceded, while causal, final, and consecutive followed the main statements. If then we see in the paratactic sentence the logical order retained, the nature of the relation is more easily understood.

3. Ellipsis, pleonasm, and prolepsis suggest paratactic origin of subordinate clauses. Ellipsis is characteristic of colloquial language and disappears when language becomes more formal. Thus Rud. 1255, *ego tibi daturus nil sum, ne tu frustra sis*, would in formal language be expressed, *ego tibi daturus sum; hoc tibi dico, ne tu frustra sis*. The ellipsis of *hoc tibi dico*, is an indication of the original independence of the two clauses. Pleonasm and prolepsis has similarly been shown to originate in parataxis. This subject has been well treated by Lindskog in *Quaest.* pp. 64—88, to which the reader is referred.

4. A pronoun or an adverb is often inserted in one proposition to direct the mind to a word or a phrase in the other. This is the origin of correlation which in its turn is often the stepping stone to parataxis.<sup>4)</sup> The following sentences will serve to illustrate this.

A. In substantive clauses.<sup>5)</sup>

1) Final,

Heaut. 1048 seq. *mi vir, te obsecro: ne facias*.

2) Consecutive,

Adelph. 500. *hoc tu facito cum animo cogites*.

3) Indirect Question,

Lucilius, Sat. IX, 338 seq. M. *non haec quid valeat, quidve hoc intersiet, illud cognoscis*.

4) Indirect Discourse,

Phorm. 137. *unum hoc scio, quod fors feret, feremus aequo animo*.

1) Cf. Lindskog, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Satzstellung*, p. 16, "Wenn der Nebensatz das logisch vorangehende ist, ist sein Platz vor dem Hauptsatze; ist der Nebensatz das logisch nachfolgende, ist sein Platz hinter dem Hauptsatze."

2) Cf. Chapter X., p. 47, note 2.

3) *nisi*-clauses followed the principal clause, see Lindskog, *Beiträg.*, p. 17.

4) See p. 44 on the origin of *si* — — — *sic*.

5) Lindskog, *Quaest.*, pp. 41 ff. gives examples of substantive clauses only.



## B. Adverbial clauses.

## 1) Final,

Men. 331. *ibo intro et dicam te hic adstare Erotio.*

## 2) Consecutive,

Most. 146, *ita haec tigna — — — — — putent: non videor.*

## 3) Causal,

Andr. 937. *vix sum apud me: ita animus commotust metu.*

## 4) Temporal,

Lucilius, Sat. V. 217, M. *et cum id mi visus facere est, tum retia nexit.*

## 5) Conditional,

Livius Andron., Achilles, I. 1, R. *si malos imitabo, tum tu pretium pro noxa dabis.*

## 6) Concessive,

Most. 93 seq., *atque hoc haud videtur veri simile vobis: at ego id faciam ita esse ut credatis.*

## 7) Relative,

Most. 983 seq. *unus istic seruos est sacerrimus Tranio: is vel Herculi conterere quaestum potest.*

## 8) Comparative,

Ep. 175. *quoniam quotiens sepulchrum vides: sacrificas.*

These illustrations of each group of sentences might be indefinitely prolonged. They offer a large field for further research. Each class of dependent clauses could be studied with the purpose of discovering just what part these adverbs and pronouns have played in the development of parataxis to hypotaxis.

5. The relation of the paratactic sentences, finally, may be seen from the position of the conjunction and by its original meaning where this still can be detected. The hypotactic conjunction has developed from adverbs, pronouns, and verbal forms. In some cases these originally belonged to the proposition that became subordinate, in other cases to the principal proposition. In still other instances the conjunction is a compound formed of two words originally found in the two propositions. Thus *ut* and *ne*, for instance, introduced the clause that became dependent, while the conjunction *quod* in substantive propositions belonged originally to the principal proposition.<sup>1)</sup> *Quasi* and *quamquam*, on the other hand are compounds (*quam* + *si*;

1) See Zimmermann, l. c. p. 13, and cf. Paul, Princ. p. 251 "'Ich sehe, dass er zufrieden ist', ist hervorgegangen aus einem: 'ich sehe das: er ist zufrieden'"; also Erdmann, *Untersuch. über die synt. der Sprache Otfrids*, pp. 44 ff. and Lindskog *Quaest.* p. 61.

*quam + quam*), the parts of which originally belonged to the two propositions. It is evident from this that where conjunctions still keep their original position this can be used as one factor in determining paratactic sentences.

In the case of many conjunctions it is now impossible to determine the original meaning. The meaning of several is, however, quite certain. The conjunctions *si (sic)*, *quamvis*, *quasi*, *licet* and others, retained their early meaning longer than others, so that in the sentences where these are used the paratactic origin is clearly evident.

In this last chapter merely an outline has been given of a subject which by itself offers a field for many treatises. It is hoped, however, that this rapid survey has more clearly set forth the principles which have guided the writer in the preparation of the main portion of this dissertation.

18164

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**A** 000 737 992 8

