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Priusquam and Dum Clauses in Plautus

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 priusquam 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 antequam, 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 purpose, and is sometimes called Anticipatory or Prospective. 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 Greenough make the presence or absence of the idea of intention 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 example in Plautus of past general statement employs Imperfect Indicative.) No explanation is given for any use of the Subjunctive except that in past particular statements 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 expected or proposed. But in a clause of proposed action, or intention, the idea of expectancy is of course present and if in those clauses which express something expected 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 Pluperfect 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 involves necessary antecedence but not necessary subsequence. The action in these clauses is always subordinate and there seems to be no point in assigning subordinate action 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 exceptional after a negative and he offers no explanation 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 Indicative or Subjunctive with the same distinction. In his "Syntax of Early Latin," published in 1910, however, a totally different explanation of both these clauses is given.

Bennett's explanation of the use of the Subjunctive in antequam and priusquam clauses and also in potiusquam clauses is based upon the premise that quam is a coordinate conjunction, and properly followed by the same construction that precedes it. Since quam is admittedly relative and generally regarded as a subordinate 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 construction 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 Subjunctive 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 Bennett 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 legitimate use of the Subjunctive with antequam and priusquam than of those explained by analogy.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priusquam clauses</th>
<th>Main Clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indic.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antequam Priusquam clauses</th>
<th>Main clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indic.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bennett assumes that there is attraction following the Imperative, as well as the Subjunctive and Infinitive, but this is extremely doubtful. The fact that the Indicative follows the Subjunctive almost as frequently as Subjunctive follows Subjunctive proves conclusively that there did not exist a fixed habit of using 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 discarded 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 antequam priusquam clauses follows the main action and therefore 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 priusquam 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 Indicative in any other construction.

Hullihen has collected all the examples of antequam and priusquam clauses from the whole of Latin literature 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 action to occur first, the most convenient English translation being "too soon for" or "before" with could prefixed to the verb. e.g. nem 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 subordinate 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 Subjunctive 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 sacrificare. "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 negative, and this negative would have survived in the hypotactic 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 antequam 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 another way than the usual one of conceiving the simple relation before, and one which originated in Latin because of the comparative nature of the conjunction. Hullihen 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 "prevention," prevention being only an incidental characteristic, 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 aggregi volebant, conficii conciderunt. (Nepos datam 9.5) "Before they arrived at the place which they wished to approach 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. (Cie. 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 anticipatory 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. Although 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 recuperant, in fines Suessionum contendit (B.G.4,11,2) "Caesar hastened into the territory of the Suessssiones 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 context. 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 Indicative after Cicero.

In the third class, the Prospective Subjunctive is recognized and is explained as an extension of the Subjunctive 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 Anticipatory Subjunctive contributed largely to the Subjunctive of Indirect 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 "antequam ut" examples of Hullihen, as has been suggested before, 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 anticipatory 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 way."

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 fourth 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 regular usage, and while the Subjunctive is sometimes 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 occur in Plautus at all, and that Cicero uses it only twice, both times in his later writings. According to his own statement, the Present Indicative is characteristic of archaic Latin and the Subjunctive, although it occurs as early as Lucretius and Varro, is not the established usage until the time of Columella in whose writings it occurs most frequently. These facts indicate 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 Indicative 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 negative 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 Indicative after negative clauses.

The negative also affects mode usage, but this Hullihen does not mention. The negative makes the action of the antecedent 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 removes 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 detailed 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 conglomerate 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 ἀν or ἴ. The feeling of futurity is expressed by the verb itself, and the ἀν or ἴ 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 Anticipation, not that of will, or at least proves that the construction has been under the influence of constructions of the anticipatory type.

The Subjunctive of Anticipation is used in Homeric Greek in independent sentences, but its use in paratactic form in Latin had been displaced by the Future Indicative 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 developed forms of expression. Good examples of this are found in declarations exactly corresponding to Indicative 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 priusquam 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 follows: the construction becoming familiar in the case
of the regular anticipation of one event by another is then employed even where circumstances make actual prevision 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 example, 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 narration, according to the strict earlier use, the Subjunctive 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 confusion 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, urbes etque Romam caperent, in Italiam Galli transcenderunt. "Two hundred years, in fact, before they were to besiege 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 begun.

The Anticipatory Subjunctive in the priusquam and dum clauses maintains itself pretty firmly against the corresponding Future and Future Perfect Indicative. Plautus has only two examples of Future, and five of Future Perfect 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

Dedisti daturum id me mulierem priusquam a me abiret. Bacch 1030

Utinam te priusquam vidisset, malo cruciatus in Sicilia peribaret. Rud 494.

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

Priusquam moritur, mihi dedit. Cura 637.

2. Clauses not expressing anticipation.

Pedibus plumbeis qui perhibetur priusquam venisset quam tu advenisti mihi. Ep 628

Phillipos dedit audum, priusquam me evactasisti foras. Poen 416

Priusquam hinc abibit quindecim miles minas dederat. Pseud 53.

Priusquam istam adii, sordido vitam oblectabas. Asin 144.

Priusquam 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 priu'me ne quis inspectarent quam
rete extraxi ex aqua! Rud 1168
priu'perí 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 ves
pervenat. Rud 626.
priu' quam Venus expurgiscatur, priu' deproperant
seculo sacrificare. 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 extinxit
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.

unum 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.

nem 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.

menu' 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.
aperte 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 aji 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 en non virginem, priu' quam te machaerae ob-
icio? Curc 567.
numquid priu' quam abeo me rogaturv's? Trin 198.
da sauium etiam priu' quam abitis. Asin 940.
properas ire ab his regionibus priu' quam te iubeo
mulcari? Trin. 984
quid cessas dare potionis aliquid priu' quam percipit insanias? 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. 1406.

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 puqnam pugnabo, abo aliam puqnam clamam. 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 te adivero. Per 219.

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


2. Clauses not expressing anticipation.

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

si ire occupias 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 opseruavit 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 donee
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 exeat. 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 servum abducre. Poen 787.
non licet manere (cena coquitur) dum cenem? Asin.935.
dum occasio ei rei reperiatur, interim mutuom ar-
gen tum roges. Trin. 757.
opperiamur dum exeat aliquis. M.G. 1249.
quid meliust quam ut me suspendam tantisper dum aps-
cedet 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 ex-
agogam. Truc 715.
mane dum edormiscat unum somnum. Amph 697.
ne exspectetis meas puans dum praedicem. Truc. 482.
on illum exspectare id oportet dum eris se suscitet.
Rud 922.
ego me amitti donicum ille huc redierit, non postulo
Cap. 339.
opperire dum ecfero ad te argentum. Ep. 633.
manet e dum ego huc redeo. Rud 879.
suadeo ut abeant dum reciris. Rud. 880.
egeo 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 expustesunt 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 excozero lenoni malam rem aliquam.

Per 52.

Many dum clauses have been omitted from the classification 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.