PRIUSQUAM AND DUM CLAUSES IN PLAUTUS

BY

MABEL ETTA KENT

A Thesis submitted to the Department of Latin
and the Faculty of the Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Master's Degree

Approved: *A. T. Walker*
<u>Department of Latin</u>

July, 1917.

CONTENTS

Priusquam and Dum Clauses in Plautus

-oOo-

The construction following antequam and priusquam
has until recently not had complete investigation and
exhaustive study. The treatment of these clauses in
the grammars is found to be more or less unsatisfactory,
owing in part to incomplete or indefinite statements.
It is the purpose of this thesis to examine all the
theories regarding this construction, in the light of
a complete collection of examples of antequam and prius-
quam clauses occurring in Plautus. It has seemed wise
to include in the discussion the dum clause also, since
it is similar to the priusquam clause and different
from other temporal clauses in this respect, that there
is always opportunity for the anticipation of the action
of the subordinate clause, on the part of the actor of
the main clause. Therefore all dum clauses in Plautus
have been collected and examined. It is found that
Plautus uses priusquam to the complete exclusion of ante-
quam, there being no example of the latter conjunction
in all his writings.

Allen and Greenough say that antequam and priusquam
clauses like other relative clauses, take Indicative or
Subjunctive according to the sense intended, that the

Subjunctive in these clauses is related to that of pur-
pose, and is sometimes called Anticipatory or Prospec-
tive. The idea of purpose seems at first an attractive
theory, but the objection to it is the absence of any
survival of the negative which would very often have
been necessary in the paratactic form, if they were of
volitive origin; this is referred to later in this thesis
in the discussion of Hullihen's treatment of clauses.
It may be added that Hullihen, although he recognizes a
volitive origin for part of the antequam clauses, has
found it necessary to recognize also an Anticipatory use
of the mode in which there is no idea of volition. In
the clauses introduced by dum, "until," Allen and Green-
ough make the presence or absence of the idea of inten-
tion or expectancy determine the mood to be used.

Lane treats the subject under two heads, General
statements and Particular statements. Of the General
statements, those in the past are said to be very rare
and to employ the imperfect Subjunctive. (The single ex-
ample in Plautus of past general statement employs Im-
perfect Indicative.) No explanation is given for any use
of the Subjunctive except that in past particular state-
ments where, he says, that when the action of the protasis
was forestalled or when action conceivable or purpose was
expressed, these conjunctions regularly introduce the
Subjunctive. "Action conceivable" may be intended to

cover those Subjunctive clauses which do not express
either action forestalled or purpose, but the phrase is
too vague and indefinite to be of service. Lane calls
the Subjunctive with dum an extension of the Subjunctive
of desire, and says the clauses express something ex-
pected or proposed. But in a clause of proposed action,
or intention, the idea of expectancy is of course pres-
ent and if in those clauses which express something ex-
pected there is no idea of intention or proposed action,
then the Subjunctive employed is not the Subjunctive of
desire.

Harkness' treatment is of no practical value. The
bare statement that the Imperfect and Pluperfect are put
in the Subjunctive tells us only that Imperfect and Plu-
perfect Indicative are not used. There is no basis given
for distinction in the use of moods and no guide for
their interpretation in translation.

Gildersleeve says the Indicative present, perfect
and future perfect are used when the limit is stated as
a fact, the Subjunctive when an ideal limit is given, or
when the action is expected, contingent, designed, or
subordinate. The meaning of "ideal limit" is not clear
and definite, though a note adds that an ideal limit in-
volves necessary antecedence but not necessary subsequence.
The action in these clauses is always subordinate and
there seems to be no point in assigning subordinate ac-
tion as one reason for use of the Subjunctive. Gilder-

sleeve's is the only grammar to call attention to the
fact that the Subjunctive of historical tenses is ex-
ceptional after a negative and he offers no explana-
tion of the fact.

Bennett, in his Grammar, says the Subjunctive is
used in antequam priusquam clauses to represent the
action as anticipated, while the Indicative is used to
denote an actual fact. Dum, "until" also uses the In-
dicative or Subjunctive with the same distinction. In
his "Syntax of Early Latin," published in 1910, how-
ever, a totally different explanation of both these
clauses is given.

Bennett's explanation of the use of the Subjunc-
tive in antequam and priusquam clauses and also in pot-
iusquam clauses is based upon the premise that quam is a co-
ordinate conjunction, and properly followed by the same construction that precedes it.
Since quam is admittedly relative and generally regarded as a subord-
inate conjunction, this statement is surprising, and is
all the more so because it is found in the treatment
of clauses which he has grouped under the heading "The
Subjunctive in Subordinate Clauses."

"Quam" is a coordinate conjunction," Bennett says,
"and as such is properly followed by the same construc-
tion after it as before it. Hence where a Subjunctive
precedes, it is only natural that one should follow."
In the fifty eight examples of potiusquam with the Sub-
junctive which he quotes, thirty six have what he calls

a perfectly natural and legitimate use of the Subjunctive, since they are preceded by clauses containing the Subjunctive. In the remaining twenty two examples which employ the Subjunctive after Indicative leading clauses, Bennett says we have a purely formal extension of this use, following the analogy of the clauses just mentioned and due to the frequency of such clauses. In the same way he explains by analogy the use of the Subjunctive in antequam and priusquam clauses following the Indicative.

Although no authority is found for classifying quam as a co-ordinate conjunction, grant for the sake of argument that it is such, and let this explain all uses of the Subjunctive in clauses preceded by the Subjunctive; grant also that the use of the Subjunctive in clauses preceded by the Indicative is explained by analogy. If the Subjunctive following quam had become so fixed a habit that it was used even when the Indicative preceded and the use of the Subjunctive was not to be otherwise explained, it is inconceivable that the Indicative should ever be used in a quam clause following the Subjunctive.

The examples of priusquam clauses from Plautus, however, show not only that there are Indicative clauses following the Subjunctive but that there are actually more Indicative clauses following the Subjunctive, than there are Subjunctive clauses following the Subjunctive, while the examples quoted by Bennet from all Latin literature from the earliest period down to 100 B.C. show

only one more case of what he calls the natural and leg-
itimate use of the Subjunctive with antequam and prius-
quam than of those explained by analogy.

The following table shows the frequency with which
the Indicative antequam priusquam clauses and the Sub-
junctive antequam priusquam clauses follow the Indicative,
Subjunctive, Imperative, and Infinitive, in the main
clauses, in Plautus.

Priusquam clauses	Main Clauses			
	Indic.	Subj.	Imp.	Inf.
(60) Indicative	34	11	5	10
(25) Subjunctive	4	9	3	7

The following table shows the same facts in regard
to the examples from early Latin as given by Bennett.

Antequam Priusquam clauses	Main clauses			
	Indic.	Subj.	Imp.	Inf.
(82) Indicative	45	15	9	13
(42) Subjunctive	2	16	12	12

Bennett assumes that there is attraction following
the Imperative, as well as the Subjunctive and Infin-
itive, but this is extremely doubtful. The fact that
the Indicative follows the Subjunctive almost as freq-
uently as Subjunctive follows Subjunctive proves con-
clusively that there did not exist a fixed habit of us-
ing Subjunctive after quam, and as this is the basis of
Bennett's explanation of the Subjunctive in antequam

priusquam clauses, his theory must be rejected and dis-
carded as being inconsistent with the facts.

Unlike the action of other temporal clauses the
action of the dum clause as well as that of the ante-
quam priusquam clauses follows the main action and there-
fore there is always a possibility of foresight of the
subordinate action by the actor of the principal clause.
This resemblance of the dum clause to the antequam pri-
usquam clause suggests that the same explanation would
satisfy the use of the Subjunctive in both types of
clauses. According to Bennett, however, the Subjunctive
following dum goes back to paratactic optatives, dum
being the oblique case of a substantive meaning "the
while." It must be admitted that the Subjunctive with
dum could be explained thus, with less objection than
the antequam priusquam Subjunctive can be referred to
the volitive, for it is not necessary in the dum clause,
as it usually is in the antequam and priusquam clauses
to supply a negative in order to reduce the sentence to
paratactic form with volitive meaning in the clause
which becomes subordinate in the hypotactic sentence.

Bennett supports his theory by the argument that
the bulk of such clauses in early Latin occur after verbs
of awaiting, expecting and verbs of similar meaning, but
this fact supports Hale equally well in referring these
clauses to the Anticipatory Subjunctive. Hale's theory
is also supported by the fact that in Greek the clauses

corresponding to the dum clauses in Latin, when they do
not employ the infinitive, use the Subjunctive and the
Subjunctive so used is invariably the Anticipatory. An
additional reason for believing this usage to be of
Anticipatory origin is that the volitive and optative
Subjunctive is not replaced freely by the Present Ind-
icative in any other construction.

Hullihen has collected all the examples of ante-
quam and priusquam clauses from the whole of Latin lit-
erature and made statements regarding their use. He
divides the sentences which even in early Latin employed
the Subjunctive after antequam and priusquam into four
classes.

1.   Sentences in which there is expressed volition
on the part of some one connected with the principal
action.

2.   Sentences in which antequam (priusquam) is
felt to be antequam (priusquam) ut, and equivalent to
ut non-----prius. In this, the conception is that the
principal action occurs too soon for the dependent ac-
tion to occur first, the most convenient English trans-
lation being "too soon for" or "before" with could pre-
fixed to the verb. e.g. nam antequam verbum facerem, de
sella surrexit et abiit, "he departed too soon for me
to say a word first."

3.   Sentences in which the action of the subord-
inate verb is conceived of as looked forward to by some

one intimately connected with the action of the main
clause; this use he calls Prospective.

4. Sentences in which he states that the Sub-
junctive is used because the clause does not refer to
any definite action or time of occurrence, as in the
generic sentence, the sentence of repeated or habitual
action.

In many of the examples quoted by Hullihen in his
first group as volitive in origin, it is necessary to
use a negative in order to change the sentences into
paratactic form with the Subjunctive having volitive
meaning. exire ex urbe priu'quam lucescat volo. Amph
533. "I wish to go out of the city; may it not become
light first."

priu'quam Venus expergiscatur, deproperant sedulo
sacruficare. "They hasten to sacrifice; may Venus not
awake first."

priu'quam recipias anhelitum, uno verbo eloquere.
"Don't recover your breath first; speak out in one word."

If the Subjunctive following antequam priusquam
expressed volition, there would have been present in the
greater number of cases in the paratactic form, a neg-
ative, and this negative would have survived in the hyp-
otactic sentence as it has persisted in the volitive
clause after verbs of fearing. While it may be said
that this use of the Subjunctive originate in those
clauses in which no negative would have been present,

and after becoming established there spread to other
clauses, there is no justification for assuming this, and
the fact that the negative does not occur in the ante-
quam priusquam clauses proves that the Subjunctive in
these clauses is not of volitive origin.

In the second class, where the antequam, (priusquam)
is equal to ut non --- prius Hullihen says we have an-
other way than the usual one of conceiving the simple
relation before, and one which originated in Latin be-
cause of the comparative nature of the conjunction. Hul-
lihen says that the usual statement "that the Subjunctive
is used when the dependent action is prevented by the
action of the main clause" is referable to this category
but is too narrow, if it is meant this Subjunctive is
confined to those sentences in which the action of the
dependent clause is prevented absolutely by the leading
action, the verb in the main clause being thus limited to
a few special meanings such as morior, interficio, and
the like. I find no such statement as the one quoted
by Hullihen and it surely can not be rightly called the
"usual statement." Hullihen says the Subjunctive in
these clauses is due to the comparative rather than "pre-
vention," prevention being only an incidental character-
istic, and varying from absolute to temporary or partial.
He gives two examples of absolute prevention:

multi prius incendio absumpti sunt quam hostium ad-

ventum sentirent (Livy 35, 27, 7) "Many were killed by
the fire before they knew of the enemy's arrival."

priusquam pervenirent ad eum locum quem aggredi
volebant, confixi conciderunt. (Nepos datam 9.5) "Be-
fore they arrived at the place which they wished to ap-
proach these fell, pierced through."

As an example of partial or temporary prevention
he gives the following:

nam antequam verbum facerem, de sella surrexit et
abiit. (Cic. Verr. 2,4,47) "he departed before I could
speak a word." ("too soon for me to speak a word first.")
These three sentences however can be classed as antic-
ipatory as the notion of foresight is clearly present in
all of them.

"These clauses," Hullihen says, "approach very close
to the volitive type and probably grew out of them as did
other result clauses from those of purpose by a shift in
the point of view." He admits that every action which
occurs before another occurs too soon for the other to
occur first and says that an extension of the original
principle might be made to cover a very wide field. Al-
though he says he has referred to this category only
those examples in which the context plainly points to
this conception, an examination of the examples shows
the distinction to be very faint.

The following from Caesar (B.G. 4,14.1) cleriter
octo milium itinere confecto, prius ad hostium castra

pervenit quam quid ageretur, Germani sentire possent. "he
quickly completed a journey of eight miles and arrived at
the enemy's camp before the Germans could realize what
was happening," Hullihen places in his second group, but
it could be referred to the first group with as much reason
as this sentence which he classifies volitive:

priusquam ea pars Menapiorum quae citra Rhenum erat
certior fieret, flumen transierunt, "They crossed the
river before that part of the Menapii which was on this
side of the river were informed." (B.G.4,4,7)

Also the following example is in his second class.

prius in hostium castris constiterunt quam plane ab
his videri----quid rei gereretur posset. "They stood in
the enemy's camp, before these could clearly see what
was going on." But it might with equally good grounds
be referred to the volitive group, where the following
is classified:

Caesar priusquam se hostes ex terrore ac fuga recip-
erent, in fines Suessionum contendit (β.𝓖,2,12,2) "Caesar
hastened into the territory of the Suesssiones before
they should recover from their terror and flight."

Moreover all of these can be classed in his third
group, the anticipatory type, for in each one there is
present the idea of foresight on the part of the actor of
the main clause and the idea of will is due to the con-
text. In fact all examples classified by Hullihen as

volitive in origin can be classified as anticipatory,
and those of his second group which are not anticipatory
are those in which the Subjunctive has replaced the Ind-
icative after Cicero.

In the third class, the Prospective Subjunctive is
recognized and is explained as an extension of the Sub-
junctive of Indirect Discourse. But the question which
naturally arises as to the origin of the Subjunctive of
Indirect Discourse is ignored. It is not enlightening
to have one construction referred to another which is
itself left unexplained. There is much more ground for
believing with Hale that the Subjunctive had originally
the idea of anticipation, and that this Anticpatory Sub-
junctive contributed largely to the Subjunctive of Indir-
ect Discourse being the only way possible to express a
future to a past. Further reference to this theory will
be made later in this thesis. To this original idea of
the Subjunctive, anticipation, the "volitive" and "ant-
equam ut" examples of Hullihen, as has been suggested be-
fore, can be referred since the absence of a negative
proves that they are not of volitive origin.

Among the clauses which are referred to the antic-
ipatory and considered free from any feeling of volition
is this (Bell. Afr. 50, 1) erat convallis---quae erat
transigenda Caesari antequam ad eum collem quem capere
volebat, perveniretur. "There was a valley which Caesar

had to cross before he arrived at the hill which he wished to capture." And the following could with just as much reason be referred to the same class although he classifies it as volitive:

Fidenates---priusquam tantum roboris esset quantum futurum apparebat occupant bellum facere. "The Fidenates, before there was as much force as it was clear there would be, began to make war."

Many other examples could be cited where Hullihen's classification is arbitrary and where given clauses could with equally good grounds be referred to other divisions than those in which Hullihen classifies them.

Even if there had been originally these four general types of Subjunctive usage after antequam priusquam, it is clearly impossible that the types should have remained separate and distinct throughout the whole of literature. Inevitably a blending and fusion of types would take place. If any proof were needed for this statement, Hullihen's own attempt to divide the clauses into these classes convinces one that the distinction, if it ever existed, has become very faint.

The fourt class, Hullihen explains as being used in generic sentences because the clauses do not refer to any definite action or time of occurrence. This conclusion depends upon the unexpressed premise that the Subjunctive is used to express indefinite action or time of occurrence, this is a false premise, however, as the

mode is not so used. In the generalizing relative clause
and in the cum clause of repeated action the Indicative
is the reular usage, and while the Subjunctive is some-
times found in such clauses, indefiniteness of time or
action is not a meaning of that mode.

Although the Subjunctive in generic sentences is
classed by Hullihen as one of the uses found even in
early Latin, his own examples show that it does not oc-
cur in Plautus at all, and that Cicero uses it only
twice, both times in his later writings. According to
his own statment, the Present Indicative is character-
istic of archaic Latin and the Subjunctive, although it
occurs as early as Lucretius and Varro, is not the es-
tablished usage until the time of Columella in whose
writings it occurs most frequently. These facts ind-
icate that the Subjunctive in the generic sentence is
not an original use of the mood, but has been brought
about by causes not yet determined, and influenced,
perhaps, by other constructions.

Hullihen is the first who has explained why the
tense usage is different after a negative leading clause.
Because the conjunctions themselves express subsequent
action, the tenses of antecedent action i.e. the Indic-
ative Present Perfect, Future Perfect, and Pluperfect,
are not employed. But after a negative, the antecedence
and subsequence of the main and subordinate clauses is

reversed and we find the Future Perfect used after neg-
ative future main clauses, while affirmative future main
clauses are followed by the Present, either Indicative or
Subjunctive. The present sentences have Indicative or
Subjunctive Present after affirmative main clauses, but
the Perfect Indicative is regular after negative leading
clauses. In past sentences, the Imperfect Subjunctive
is regular after affirmative clauses, and the Perfect In-
dicative after negative clauses.

The negative also affects mode usage, but this Hul-
lihen does not mention. The negative makes the action
of the antequam clause precede that of the main clause
and in most instances this makes foresight on the part
of the actor of the main clause impossible, and so re-
moves the reason that requires for the subordinate verb
a mode form expressing anticipation.

Hullihen's statements as to tense usage are found
to be true, but there seems to be no advantage in dividing
the sentences into affirmative and negative groups as
the force of the Subjunctive is the same in both cases.
His main treatise is of course intended to be a complete
thorough detailed treatment of these clauses. In his
paper, however, he states rules intended for use in
teaching. They are altogether too mechanical and too de-
tailed for practical use in teaching, and it would be too
difficult for the pupil to understand and learn them. Even

if they were accurate, it would be better to secure brevity and compactness at the expense of accuracy of detail.

Hale offers an explanation for the use of the Subjunctive which not only satisfies both the antequam priusquam and the dum clause, but has the further great advantage of assigning one origin instead of four as the source of the Subjunctive usage in these clauses. He believes that one of the original meanings of the Latin Subjunctive is that of anticipation, and to this Anticipatory Subjunctive, he refers the use of the mode in both dum clauses and antequam priusquam clauses. While few grammars admit this idea of anticipation as an original meaning of the Subjunctive, Hale in his "Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin," published in 1894 gives the following proof of his theory, which to me seems conclusive.

The Latin Subjunctive, Hale says is a conglommerate of Subjunctive and Optative forms from the parent language. In Greek two families of meanings for the Subjunctive existed in historical times, the volitive in which the mode indicates an action as willed, demanded, required, planned, aimed at and the like, and the Anticipatory in which the mode indicates an act as predicted, counted upon, foreseen, looked forward to, and the like. In Latin, as in languages generally, there is no means of distinguishing by the outward form whether a given

Subjunctive is volitive or anticipatory, but in Greek
as early as Homer the Anticipatory is generally marked
through the use of the particles ἄν or κε .   The
feeling of futurity is expressed by the verb itself,
and the ἄν or κε if employed is only an additional
note in harmony with that feeling. The absence of the
particle proves nothing with certainty about the force
of the mode in a given construction, but its presence
is positive evidence that its force is that of Antic-
ipation, not that of will, or at least proves that the
construction has been under the influence of construc-
tions of the anticipatory type.

The Subjunctive of Anticipation is used in Homeric
Greek in independent sentences, but its use in paratac-
tic form in Latin had been displaced by the Future In-
dicative before the time when Latin literature begins,
just as it had been in Greek before Attic times. In
the beginning of hypotaxis, the anticipatory clause must
have represented the expectation of the speaker, but it
came through use in reporting the expectation of a first
person to express the expectation of a second or third
as well.

The Present Indicative is used with freedom instead
of the Anticipatory Subjunctive in antequam priusquam
clauses after a primary tense, but not after a secondary
tense, where the Anticipatory Subjunctive was a neces-

sity, being the only possible way of expressing a past-
future idea. The explanation given by Hale for this
use of the Present Indicative is that there must have
been, in all probability, in the early history of the
language a time when the form now known as the Present
Indicative was the only modal form existing and served
in a rude way to express all forces of mode and tense.
It is reasonable to believe that there have survived
into classical times some of the primitive uses of the
so-called Present Indicative, alongside of more devel-
oped forms of expression. Good examples of this are
found in declarations exactly corresponding to Indic-
ative deliberative questions, which occur very frequently
in Plautus and Terence and occasionally later.

Hale says the Subjunctive is used in these clauses
to represent the action as foreseen by the actor of the
main clause, while the Indicative is used when there is
no idea of foresight or anticipation. For the prius-
quam clause this distinction breaks down at only two
points, allowing the use of the Subjunctive in generic
sentences where there is no idea of anticipation, and
in certain sentences of past time where the action of
the subordinate clause is not looked forward to by the
actor of the main clause. The former change from the
original Indicative construction, Hale explains as fol-
lows: the construction becoming familiar in the case

of the regular anticipation of one event by another is
then employed even where circumstances make actual pre-
vision impossible. E.g. discunt haec miseri ante quam
sciant esse vitia. "Unfortunately children learn these
things before knowing that they are vices." The same
formula is transferred from man to nature and used in
case of any regularly recurring precedence of one act
by another. While this may not seem to explain fully
the change in the construction, it is certain that the
Subjunctive was an increasing force in the language, and
tended to extend itself to clauses in which originally
the Indicative alone was used, a tendency seen, for ex-
ample, in the generalizing cum clause and the quamquam
clause. However, this use of the Subjunctive appears
only in late Latin and in no way argues against Hale's
theory. It is a later development and a variation from
the usage found in the early Latin writers.

A more satisfactory reason is given for the breaking
down of the original usage at the other point. In nar-
ration, according to the strict earlier use, the Sub-
junctive is employed of an act looked forward to by some
one mentioned in the main clause and seen by him as the
expected limit for that act, while the Indicative is
used of an act looked back upon by the speaker, and seen
by him as the actual limit of the main act. But a con-
fusion seems to arise between the prevision of the nar-

rator and the prevision of the actor, what Hale calls a
kind of historical prevision, and the Subjunctive comes
to be used with freedom where an earlier syntax would
have demanded the Indicative. For example, ducentis
quippe annis antequam Clusium oppugnarent, urbemque
Romam caperent, in Italiam Galli transcenderunt. "Two
hundred years, in fact, before they were to beseige
Clusium and take the city of Rome, the Gauls came into
Italy." It is not within the province of this thesis
to discuss the breaking down of the original usage at
these two points, for no example of either break is
found in Plautus. In this earlier and uncorrupted usage
the variation from the original construction has not be-
gun.

The Anticipatory Subjunctive in the priusquam and
dum clauses maintains itself pretty firmly against the cor-
responding Future and Future Perfect Indicative. Plautus
has only two examples of Future, and five of Future Per-
fect with priusquam, so far as it is able to determine
with certainty, though there are six examples in which
the verb form might be either Future Perfect Indicative
or Perfect Subjunctive, and three in which the form could
be either Future Indicative or Present Subjunctive. Since
it does not seem possible to determine with certainty the
mode in these nine clauses, they are not included in the
classification of examples which follows. These unclass-

ified examples are Ep. 69, M.G. 214, Poen 908, Poen 1267, Pseud 1031, Truc 51, Bacch 100, Aul 154, Stich 197. The following seven references are to priusquam expressions which are either elliptical or incomplete so that they also are not included in the classification. Most 58, Bacch 1017, Most 867, Pers 242, Truc 694, M.G. 1005, Cas 378, With dum the Future Perfect is used three times.

Examples of priusquam clauses in past time.

1. Clauses expressing anticipation

ius iurandum dedi daturum id me mulieri priu'quam a me abiret   Bacch 1030

utinam te priu'quam vidissem, malo cruciatu in Sicilia perbiteres.   Rud 494.

The Subjunctive here is probably due to anticipation, though it may be due to attraction.

priusquam moritur, mihi dedit.   Curc 637.

2. Clauses not expressing anticipation.

pedibus plumbeis qui perhibetur priu'venisset quam tu advenisti mihi.   Ep 628

Phillipos dedi dudum, priu'quam me evocauistis foras.
Poen 416

priu'quam hinc abiit quindecim miles minas dederat.
Pseud 53.

priu'quam istam adii, sordido vitam oblectabas.
Asin 144.

priu'quam intro redii, exanimatus fui.   Aul 208.

prius hanc compressit quam uxorem duxit domum. Cist 616

priu'quam hinc abiit, ipsemet gravidam Alcumenam fecit
uxorem suam. Amph 102.

atque olim, priusquam id extudi, quom illi subblandie-
bar.   Most 221

ut priusquam plane aspexit ilico, eum esse dixit!
Rud. 1131.

priu'quam hinc ad legionem abiit domo, ipse mandavit
mihi ut fidicina emeretur sibi.   Ep 46

qui non circumspexi priv'me ne quis inspectarent quam
rete extraxi ex aqua! Rud 1168

priu'peréi quam ad erum veni. M.G. 119.

priu' tu non eras, quam auri feci mentionem. Trin 976.

utinam te di priu' perderent quam periisti e patria.
Capt. 537.

olim populi prius honorem capiebat suffragio quam
magistro desinebat esse oboediens. Bacch 438.

quid illi ex utero exitiost priu'quam poterat ire
in proelium?   Truc 511.

priu' multo ante aedis stabam quam illo adveneram.
Amph 603.

puer surripitur Carthagine sexennio priu' quidem
quam moritur pater. Poen 67.

multos vidi regionem fugere consili priu' quam rep-
ertam haberent. M. G. 886.

Examples of priusquam clauses in present time.

1. Clauses expressing anticipation.

exire urbe priu'quam lucescat volo.   Amph 533.

multa exquirere etiam priu' volo quam vapulem.
Merc   167.

praetorquete iniuriae priu' collum quam ad vas
pervenat.   Rud 626.

priu' quam Venus expergiscatur, priu' deproperant
sedulo sacruficare.   Poen   321.

priu' quam recipias anhelitum, eloquere.   Merc.   601.

dicamus senibus legem censeo priu' quam abeamus.
Merc   1016.

ut praestines argento priu' quam veniat filius.
Ep   277.

ut confugiamus priu' quam leno veniat.   Rud.   455.

revoca, priu'quam abeat.   Pseud   241.

animam admittunt prius quam loco demigrent. Amph 240.

ne, ille priusquam spolia capiat, nos exstinxit
fames.   Truc   524.

nullo pacto postest prius haec in aedis recipi quam
illam amiserim.   M.G.   1096.

ut minam mi argenti reddas, priu'quam in neruom
abducere.   Poen 1398.

nunc saluto te, priu' quam eo.   M G   1339.

sed cesso priu' quam perii currere.   Aul 397.

Clauses not expressing anticipation.

quae, priu'quam triuerunt oculi ut exstillent facit.
Pseud.   818.

priu' abis quam lectus ubi cubuisti, concaluit locus.
Amph 513.

uinum priu' quam coctumst pendet putidum.   Trin. 526.

priu' quam sum elocutus, scis sei mentiri volo.
Merc. 155.

priu' quam unumst iniectum telum iam instat alterum.
Poen 919.

priu' quam septuennis est, puer paedagogo dirrumpit
caput. Bacch 440.

priu' quam lucet, adsunt, rogant noctu ut somnum
ceperim. M.G. 709.

prius iam convivae ambulant ante ostium quam ego
obsonatu redeo. Men 276.

nam semper occant priu'quam sariunt rustici. Capt.663.

priu' respondes quam rogo. priu' emis quam vendo.
Merc. 456.

Examples of priusquam clauses in future time.

1. Clauses expressing anticipation.

abducam qui hunc domi devinciant priu'quam tubarum
quid faciat amphius. Men 846.

manu' votat priu' quam penes sese habeat quicquam
credere. Truc. 901.

si quid poscam, usque ad ravim poscam prius quam
quicquam detur. Aul 336.

hunc vicinum priu' conveniam quam domum redeam.
Merc. 560.

ne me sinas senem priu' convenire quam sodalem
viderim. Bacch 175.

cave ne prius in via accumbas quam illi, ubi lectust
stratu', coimus. Most 326.

aperite fores, priu' quam pultando foribus exitium
adfero.   Capt. 832.

adeam optumum est priu' quam incipit tinnire. Asin.448

quid dubito fugere priu' quam ad praetorem trahor?
Poen 790.

priu' quam abis, praesente ted hic apologum agere
volo. Stich 538.

prius quam huc senex venit, lubet lamentari dum
exeat.   Bacch 932.

est etiam priu' quam abis quod volo loqui. Asin. 232.

hanc volo priu' rem agi quam intro refero pedem.
Merc 1010.

opsecro licet complecti priu'quam proficisco? M.G.1329.

manedum, priu'quam abis. Truc. 115.

-   nunc, priu' quam malum istoc addis, certumst iam
dicam patri. Bacch 382.

reddin an non virginem, priu' quam te machaerae ob-
icio? Curc 567.

numquid priu'quam abeo me rogaturu's? Trin 198.

da sauium etiam priu' quam abitis. Asin 940.

tene, priu'quam hinc abeo, savium. Curc. 210.

properas ire ab his regionibus priu' quam te iubeo
mulcari?   Trin. 984

quid cessas dare potionis aliquid priu' quam percipit insania? Men 921.

numquam hic prius edis, quam te hoc facturum adfirmas mihi. Per. 140.

opsecro te ut mea verba audias priu' quam secat. M.G. 1408.

quin mihi adornas ad fugam viaticum priu' quam pereo? Ep. 616.

priu' quam abitis, uos uolo ambas. Poen 1211.

facite ut redeat noster senex priu' quam omnia periere. Most 76.

priu' quam quoiquam convivae dabis, gustato tute prius. Pseud. 885.

priu' quam istam pugnam pugnabo, dabo aliam pugnam claram. Pseud. 525.

neque quiescam usquam, priu'quam aut amicam aut mortem investigavero. Merc. 862.

ne abitas priu' quam ego ad te venero. Ep. 304.

numquam scibis priu' quam ex ted audivero. Per 219.

quos non dabo priu' quam filium convenero. Bacch 921.

nisi hodie priu' comparassit mihi minas quam fuero elocutus postremam syllabam. Ep. 122.

2. Clauses not expressing anticipation.

priu' quam galli cantent, dicat "da, mi vir.' M.G.690.

si ire occipias a meo primo nomine, concubium sit noctis priu' quam ad postremum perueneris. Trin 886.

Examples of dum clauses in past time.

1. Clauses expressing anticipation.

inde huc exii dum crapulam amoverem. Pseud 1282.

lupus opseruauit dum dormitarent canes. Trin. 170.

qui regnum tutarentur, mihi dum fieret otium. M.G. 950

subcustodem foras ableravit dum ab se huc transiret.
M.G. 869.

nam hau mansisti dum ego illam darem.   Truc 843.

non hercle hoc longe destiti instare usque adeo donec
se adiurat anus. Cist 582.

2. Clause not expressing anticipation.

neque quisquam hominem conspicatust donec in navim
subit.

neque credebam mihi Sosiae donec Sosia ilic fecit
sibi uti crederem. Amph 598.

Dum clause in present time not expressing anticipa-
tion.

neque id faciunt donicum parietes ruont. Most 116.

Examples of dum clauses in future time. All these
express anticipation.

ne exspectetis dum illi ad vos exeant. Cist. 782.

dum erus adveniat a foro, opperiar domi. Poen 929.

opperiar erum dum veniat.   Rud 328.

ne exspectetis dum hac dumum redeam via. Pseud 1234

operam date dum me videatis seruom abducere. Poen 787.

non licet manere (cena coquitur) dum cenem? Asin.935.

dum occasio ei rei reperiatur, interim mutuom argentum roges.   Trin. 757.

opperiamur dum exeat aliquis.   M.G. 1249.

quid meliust quam ut me suspendam tantisper dum apscedat haec a me aegrimonia.   Rud 1189.

istas minas qui me procurem dum melius sit des. Curc. 526.

lubet lamentari dum exeat.   Bacch 932.

operam adsiduam dedo dum reperiam.   Asin 429.

oculi spectando dolent manendo medicum dum se ex opere recipiat.   Men 883.

is dum veniat sedens ibi opperibere.   Bacch 48.

nei istunc inuitassitis usque adeo donec qua dumum abeat nesciat.   Rud 812.

iterim praesidebo dum sic faciat domum ad te exagogam.   Truc 715.

mane dum edormiscat unum somnum.   Amph 697.

ne exspectetis meas pugnas dum praedicem.   Truc. 482.

non illum exspectare id oportet dum erus se suscitet. Rud 922.

ego me amitti donicum ille huc redierit, non postulo Cap. 339.

opperire dum ecfero ad te argentum.   Ep. 633.

manette dum ego huc redeo.   Rud 879.

suadeo ut abeant dum recipis.   Rud. 880.

ego hic tantisper, dum exis, te opperiar foris.

Most. 683.

dum auctionem facio, opus est aliquot ut maneas dies.
Poen 1421.

triduom hoc saltem dum miles aliquo circumducitur.
Truc 874.

ut illas serves uim defendas, dum ego erum adduco.
Ruc 774.

perdura dum intestina exputescunt tibi. Curc 241.

mansero tuo arbitratu adeo usque dum peris. Asin 327.

ibi uiuere adeo dum te cupiditas atque amor missum
facit. Merc 656.

non omnis aetas ad perdiscendum sat est amanti, dum
id perdiscat. Truc 23.

aut si respexis, donicum ego te iussero. Aul 58.

usque donec persecutus volpem ero vestigiis. M.G.269.

usque ero domi dum excoxero lenoni malam rem aliquam.
Per 52.

Many dum clauses have been omitted from the class-
ification where either "while" or "until" could be read
for dum. Also the following are not classified because it
is not possible to determine with certainty whether the
form is Perfect Subjunctive or Future Perfect Indicative.
Pseud 1168, Bacch 758, Vid frag V, 3.

A careful examination of these examples and also of
Hullihen's collection of antequam priusquam examples from
the whole of Latin literature leads to the conclusion that
Hale's theory is correct. Owing to the free use of the

Present Indicative in anticipatory clauses instead of the Subjunctive in sentences of present time, which usage Hale admits and explains with complete satisfaction, the sentences of past time furnish the best means of testing his theory. Because of the small number of past sentences expressing anticipation in the collection from Plautus one is not justified in saying that the examples from Plautus conclusively prove Hale's theory. However, there is no example that disagrees with his theory, nothing that contradicts it, and on the whole, the complete collection of priusquam and dum clauses from Plautus bears Hale out in his explanation of the use of the Subjunctive in those clauses.