

[inside front cover: marginalia and Leefeldt's name]

---

[front endpaper:]

Index Page 93

[plus, a post-it note in a different hand:]

4/1/88

Dear Harold<sup>1</sup>

Carroll Leefeldt gave me this notebook which he found among his fathers books.

It might do for the Trentoniana Collection.

E. Ciccolella<sup>2</sup>

---

[in Leefeldt's hand:]

Our aim is to derive the rules governing the use of [grammatical] mood in an unknown tongue (Latin).

We make use of [addition: "a"] translation.

A translation is an equivalent expression of thought.

An hypothesis: All human minds observe same laws of acting.

Then the Romans & we would use the same type of sentence to express the same thought.

If, then, a statement is expressed in Latin by a declaratory sentence, its (English) translation will be a declaratory sentence.

This will not, however, allow us to assert, a priori, that because the English verb is in Indicative mood, the Latin very will be in Indicative mood.

Our method of procedure is to take a Latin sentence and its English translation.

Now, note—if the English sentence is declatory [emended with addition: "ra" to spell "declaratory"], the Latin sentence is also declaratory.

Note mood used in the Latin sentence (Indicative).

Then state rule in terms of each factor.

(Factors, in this case, are "Indicative mood" & "declaratory sentence.")

Rules: The declaratory sentence in Latin has its verb in Indicative mood.

The indicative mood is used in a declaratory sentence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Harold W. Thompson, Director of the Trenton Free Public Library from 1979 to 1988. This note constitutes the only known provenance for this notebook.

<sup>2</sup> Probably Erasmo Ciccolella, longtime Trenton educator.

In evolution of language, the simple sentence came first.  
Simple thoughts closely related logically are united to form a complex sentence.  
Logic is the science of thought-structure.  
Grammar is the science of sentence structure.  
Logical relations preceded [erroneous second “e” struck] grammatical relations.  
The infinitive is a verbal noun.  
The participle is a verbal adjective.

See “Caesar,” Book I, XXXII, first sentence.<sup>3</sup>

Translation: This speech having been delivered by Divitiacus, all who were present began, with much weeping, to ask aid of Caesar.

“all began” makes a statement,

“all began” is translation of “coeperunt”

then “coeperunt” makes a statement.

But “coeperunt” is in Indicative mood.

Therefore: The indicative is used to make statements (~~P-100~~)<sup>4</sup>

—                      —                      —                      —                      —                      —<sup>5</sup>  
The meaning of a verb is completed by the use of an infinitive. (~~105~~)

“were present” is verb of a dependent (relative) clause

“were present” = “aderant”

then “aderant” is verb of a dependent clause

“Aderant” is indicative mood

“were present” makes a statement

therefore, “aderant” makes a statement

Therefore: The indicative makes statements in dependent clauses. (100)

Statement in dependent clauses are in indicative mood. (~~104~~)

“(This speech) having been delivered” is independent in structure of the rest of the sentence.

“(This speech) having been delivered” = “Hac oratione habita”

Then “Hac oratione habita” is independent.

“Having been delivered” is a participle

“Having been delivered” = “habita”

---

<sup>3</sup> Two of Julius Caesar’s writings survive to the present—his commentaries on the Gallic War and Roman Civil War, which remain staples of basic Latin education due to their frank, simple prose. Given the mention of Divitiacus, a Gaulish leader, the work referenced must be *Commentarii de Bello Gallico* (Commentaries on the Gallic War). The cited sentence, in Latin, is “Hac oratione ab Diviciaco habita omnes qui aderant magno fletu auxilium a Caesare petere coeperunt.” See [https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Caesar/Gallic\\_War/home.html](https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Caesar/Gallic_War/home.html)

<sup>4</sup> Possibly refers to a textbook page, or to a page in an earlier version of the index on page 93.

<sup>5</sup> I render Leefeldt’s original dashed lines thus.

Then “habita” is participle. “Habita” & “oratione” are both in ablative case.

Therefore: A noun and a participle in Ablative case, in independent construction, are used to express an allied thought. (103)

The Ablative Case is used when a noun and a participle are used in independent construction to add a related thought. (110).

Note: This is called the “Ablative Absolute.”

“Habita” and “oratione” are used in the thought-relation of subject and predicate.

The Ablative case has three main relations, — the “with-”, the “from-”, the “in-”relations (Result of combination of cases)

“Ablative absolute” is the “with-” relation.

Use of the Ablative case in this construction is the result of usage. Compare, — English “Nominative Independent”, the Greek “Genitive Absolute.”

There are two classes of verbs:- transitive & intransitive.

Transitive verbs require an object.

Intransitive verbs do not require such an object.

This object makes closer definition possible, — “I am painting,” “I am painting a picture.”

The accusative was first the case of effect, — the subject being the cause. “I build a house”

Infinitive may be an accusative in relation, — as, — “petere” object of “coeperunt”

The origin of the infinitive may have been in the Dative Case.

See “Caesar,” Book I, XXXII, Second sentence.<sup>6</sup>

Translation: Caesar noticed the Sequari alone of all, to do [additions: “(none)” and “(were doing)”] of these things which the others did, but, sad with head bent forward, to look [addition: “(were looking)”] upon the ground.

— — — — —  
“Animadvertit” is covered by former rule. (~~P-100, No. 1~~)

— — — — —  
“Facere” complimentary infinitive. (~~P-102, No 1~~)

Compare “facere” and “petere” (~~P-3~~)

Note, — “petere” follows closely “coeperunt.” “They began to ask.” “facere” is separated by “animadvertit” by “Sequanōs”

“He noticed the Sequans were doing.” [addition: “to do”]

“Sequanos” is accusative, — object of “animadvertit”

“Sequanos” and “facere” are in thought-relation of subject and predicate.

---

<sup>6</sup> “Animadvertit Caesar unos ex omnibus Sequanos nihil earum rerum facere quas ceteri facerent sed tristes capite demisso terram intueri.”

Therefore “facere” acts as predicate in a clause which is object of “animadvertit.”

Therefore “Sequanos” is accusative as object of a transitive verb rather than as subject of “facere.”

[the last part of this page is written on paper pasted onto the original page]

Then we have the infinitive making a statement (with the accusative) in a dependent clause.

So we have found that statements in dependent clauses are made by the Indicative, Subjunctive, or Infinitive.

Now let us see in what way the [addition: “clause with the”] Infinitive differs from the clause with the Indic[ative] & the Subj[unctive]

All three clauses are subordinate, this one alone is “object clause.”

Then in an object clause a statement is made by the Infinitive and Accusative.

Rules: Subject of an object clause is in Accusative Case ~~111~~

Verb of an object clause is in the Infinitive.

Accusative case is subject of an object clause ~~109~~

The infinitive is the verb of an object clause. ~~102~~

— — — — —

“facerunt” = “did”

“did” is the verb of a dependent clause

Then “facerent” makes a statement in a dependent clause.

But “facerent” is in the Subjunctive Mode [*sic*].

So the Subjunctive Mode makes statements in dependent clauses.

Now we have statements in dependent clauses made by the Indicative, Infinitive and Accusative, and Subjunctive.

But “facerent” is part of the object of “animadvertit” and as such is an object clause.

This eliminates the Indicative, for the Indicative does not make statements in object clauses.

Then we must compare “Sequanos facere” and “quas [addition: “ceteri”] facerent.”

Although both are objects of “animadvertit,” – “quas facerent” also qualifies “Sequanos facere,” – that is, – the one object clause is subordinate to the other.

Rule: The Subjunctive is used in a clause depending on an infinitive with subject Accusative. (101)

“intueri” = “were looking”

“were looking” is in same construction as “were doing” [addition: “(“facere”)]

Then, “intueri” and “facere” are in same construction, and the reasoning about “facere” applies equally to “intueri”

Then “intueri” is an infinitive used like “facere” and has as its subject “Sequanos”

Then “facere” and “intueri” are, relatively to one another, coordinate.

In teaching, state rules from the contents of pupils’ minds.

In formulating a plan, note ability and maturity of the pupil.

Consider the subject to be taught and the pupil’s knowledge relative to that subject.

Have your material [Latin text].<sup>7</sup> Develope [*sic*] factors by questions and then the rules by questions.

This process is one of question and answer, called the Inductive process or method.

“Presentation” is that part of method, by which we get the matter before the class by questions and answers.

These questions should grow, the one out of the one preceding.

If the pupils have forgotten a point necessary to the presentation of the work, have them recall by association or review, the point forgotten.

This is called “preparation”

Then, in brief, we must have,

1. Aim
2. Rule (Matter)
3. Material
4. Method:
  1. Preparation (if necessary)
  2. Presentation (from which we get rule) [addition: “induction”]
  3. Application (by which we use rule on new cases) [addition: “deduction”]

In teaching the use of “Sequanos” (see page 6) in the accusative as subject of “facere,” the infinitive, develope, from the English, the thought-relation of subject and predicate. In the English, the subject is “Sequani”, – predicate, “were doing.” Then in Latin the subject is “Sequanos”, & predicate, “facere.” Then we see that an infinitive has as its subject a noun in the accusative case.

Rule: Subject of an infinitive is in Accusative case.

It is not necessary, at once to teach the clause as object clause.

---

<sup>7</sup> These square brackets in Leefeldt’s original text.

In developing, always be careful of the first sentence given, which is used as a type.<sup>8</sup>

Try to develop “marks” which will assist in the recognition of certain types; as the word “so,” or some related words, in [addition: “principal clauses of”] sentences containing a “result clause;” the purpose clause answers the question, “Why?”

Discussion of the construction following the verb of “fearing.” [timeō]

Timeo ne venias = I fear that you will come.

(Timeo ut venias = I fear that you will not come.) (101-4)

Now, “timeo” is a transitive verb and is followed by an object clause. Then, why does this object clause not contain the infinitive with subject accusative? (See P 7)

The use of “ne” and “ut” will not explain the construction, or they express only negation or affirmation.

Reasoning from the thought in the translation:

“I fear” = principal clause. It is Indicative mode. It makes a statement.

“You will come” = dependent clause. It is Indicative mode. It makes a statement.

Then in the Latin: “Timeo” = principal clause. It is the Indicative mode. It makes a statement.

“venias” = dependent clause. It is in Subjunctive mode. Evidently then, from the Roman point of view it ~~did~~ does not make a statement. [addition: “(Discussion stopped until we shall have found more uses of subjunctive mode.)”]

From letters of Cicero<sup>9</sup>

Ultinam illum diem videam cum tibi agam gratias quod me vivere coegisti.<sup>10</sup>

Trans: I hope that I may see that day when I shall thank you because you forced me to live.

“I hope that I may see” is the expression for wish.

Then “videam” is the expression of a wish.

But “videam” is in Subjunctive mode.

So we find the Subjunctive mode used to express a wish.

Rule: The Subjunctive mode is used to express a wish (~~101~~)

A wish is expressed by the Subjunctive mode (~~99~~)

We have found the Indicative mode used in the expression of inquiry and of judgement.

We have found the Subjunctive mode used in the expression of a wish (i.e., of emotion)

(101-3)

---

<sup>8</sup> “Type” in this case referring to a model; something “typical.”

<sup>9</sup> Marcus Tullius Cicero, the prolific author and politician in the late Roman Republic. Like with Caesar’s works, his surviving writings are common in Latin education and are prized for their rhetoric.

<sup>10</sup> From “Letters to Atticus” Book 3, Letter 3, one of many sent to Cicero’s friend Titus Atticus. See <https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:abo:phi.0474.057:3:3>

“I shall thank (you)” (is in Indicative mode) [addition: “makes statement”]  
then “agam (gratias)” makes a statement.

It is in Indicative mode.

Rule: Indicative makes a statement (cf P. 3)

“To live” is an infinite complementary of “forced.”

“vivere” is an infinitive complementary of “coegisti”

(“Mē” is in accusative case, object of “coegisti.”)

[A discussion arose as to the similarity of construction of “animadvertit Sequanos facere” and “coegiste me vivere.” As the factors here are the same, and as so the one cannot be translated by the same type of sentence as the other, we conclude that the dissimilarity is to be found in the meaning of the verb; “coegisti” is ~~followed by a statement~~ command. “animadvertit” is statement of action of [addition: “the”] mind.

The evolution of this accusative and infinitive is possibly to be traced from the direct object of a transitive verb, and the indirect object, the infinitive used as a verbal norm in the Dative Case.]

[Contrast was made between the cognate accusative and the accusative of effect. The cognate accusative may have arisen from an attempt to strengthen a statement by repetition “I fight a fight.”]

“Coegisti” = “you forced”

“you forced” is a statement.

“coegisti” is a statement.

“coegisti” is in Indicative.

Rule: The indicative makes a statement. (cf. P. 3)

[Noting “quod,” – “quod” is a subordinate conjunction. From its form, it might be a relative, and evidently in the accusative case.

This accusative seems similar to the accusative of specification, or the adverbial accusative.

Evidently the relative came before the conjunction, – then we see the evolution of the conjunction “quod” out of the relative “quod,” though through adverbial accus[ative]. Possibly the relative is, in turn, an evolution of the demonstrative.]<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> These three sets of square brackets are Leefeldt’s original.

Discussion of evolution of the conjunction:

Conjunctions are specialized adverbs. The conjunction is in the subordinate clause and, while it was an adverb, modified the verb of that clause, but always relative to the verb of the principal clause. From this, it came to connect those clauses.

See [Cicero's] third oration against Cataline, [chapter] VIII.<sup>12</sup>

“Haec omnia ita sunt administrata ut gesta et provisae esse videantur”

“These things were so done that they seem to have been done (at the command of the gods)”

Here we have two statements: – the first: “were so done”; the second: “that they seem.”

“were so done” = “administrata sunt.”

Then “administrata sunt” makes a statement and it is in the Indicative mode as we would [sic] expect. (100, 1)

“ut videantur” = “that they seem.”

So “ut videantur” makes a statement and we would again expect the Indicative, (see p. 100, 1) but find the Subjunctive.

Reasoning from the thought, the second clause makes a statement of what happened as a result of the first clause.

Then the relation of the first clause to the second is one of cause and effect.

Then “ut videantur” expresses result.

Rule: Subjunctive with “ut” expresses result (101, 5)

Result is expressed by Subjunctive with “ut” (97)

Then we have (Page 101) the Subjunctive expressing emotion, volition, judgement.

Emotion, volition, judgement are subjective: the fact [addition: “reality”] is objective.

Then the Indicative is the mode of reality, the mode of the object; the Subjunctive is the mode of the subject.

See letters of Cicero.<sup>13</sup>

“Te oro ut ad me venias”

I pray you to come to me.

“To come” completes meaning of “I pray” and shows purpose of “I pray.”

---

<sup>12</sup> Lucius Catalina (Cataline) led a failed coup against the Roman Republic in 63 BCE. Cicero, who was one of the consuls for this year, gave several speeches at Cataline's trial; these have likewise become staple texts in teaching Latin. For this quotation, see

<https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:latinLit:phi0474.phi013.perseus-eng1:3.8>

<sup>13</sup> This quotation also seems to come from Cicero's third letter to Atticus.



Then “ut venias” states purpose of “oro.”

But “oro” is a transitive verb, and “ut venias” ~~has the thought relation of~~ is its object.

“venias” is Subjunctive.

Then the Subjunctive with “ut” is used in a substantive clause to express purpose. (101,-6)

See letters of Cicero.<sup>14</sup>

“Senatus decrevit ut L. Opimius videret ne quid res publica detrimenti caperet.”

“The senate decreed that Lucius Opimius [*sic*] should take care that the republica received no injury.”

Sentence is declaratory.

“decrevit” makes a statement.

Then “decrevit” is in Indicative according to rule (100, 1)

“Should take care” is verb in a clause of purpose.

“videret” is in Subjunctive according to rule (101-4)

“received” is verb in a clause of purpose.

“caperet” is Subjunctive according to rule (101-4)

Now “decrevit” is transitive verb and so must have an object, – clause “ut videret” is used as a substantive clause, object of “decrevit.”

But “videret” is also transitive and must have an object, – this object, clause “ne caperet.”

The effect of “decrevit” extends through the whole sentence, so the clause “ne caperet” is also part of its object.

See letters of Cicero.<sup>15</sup>

“Sed eo si veneris, consilium capere potero.”

“But if you come here, I shall be able to consult.”

The sentence is declaratory.

(A condition is that which must be fulfilled, so the conclusion may be true.)

In English, we have many ways of expressing condition. Examples:

If you come, we consult.

If you will/shall come, we shall/will consult.

If you should come, we would consult.

If you had come, we would have consulted.

The difference between these, seems to be one of emphasis only, – ranging from an impossibility to determination.

Futurity and determination seem to have been near together, at the start, in the mind.

---

<sup>14</sup> This quotation in reality comes from Cicero’s first speech against Cataline, Chapter 2, Section 4. The name of the Senator should also be “L. Optimus.” See

<https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:latinLit:phi0474.phi013.perseus-eng1:1.2.4>

<sup>15</sup> Third letter to Atticus.

Note our words “shall” and “will,” – the same word is used to denote determination, as is used to denote futurity.

In the development of language, the expression of determination, – i.e., of volition, – seems to have preceded [*sic*] the expression of futurity.

Note similarity of form of the future Indicative, and present Subjunctive.

[Also, – that the Subjunctive is frequently best rendered by the fut. Indicative.]

Conditional sentences may be divided into three classes: the one containing sentences in which the condition is real, (i.e., in accord with facts as they are), the other containing sentences in which the condition is unreal, (i.e., not in accord with facts as they are.) & another, containing conditions of all degrees of possibility between real and unreal.

The condition contrary to fact is used to show the absurdity of a conclusion.

(See Cicero against Cataline) I, VII.

“Se servi me metuerent, ... putarem...”

“If my slaves feared me, [...] I should think [...]”

This (English) is a conditional sentence.

The condition is unreal, (that is, it is not in accord with the facts ~~as they are~~). Time [the grammatical tense] is present.

Then the Latin condition is unreal, the time, present.

The Latin has both verbs in the Subjunctive imperfect.

See “Pro Poeta Archia”<sup>16</sup> X

“Nisi Ilias exstitisset, nomen obruisset tumulus.”

“If the Iliad did not exist, the tomb [of Achilles] would cover thy name.”<sup>17</sup>

English: Condition unreal. Time past.

Latin:           "           "           "

Latin has Subjunctive pluperfect in both clauses.

Rule: In conditional sentences of the “contrary-to-fact” variety, the Latin uses the Subjunctive in both clauses: if the time is present, the imperfect tense, – if past, the pluperfect tense, in both clauses (†††)

See “Cataline” [first oration against Cataline, Chapter VIII]

“Si tecum patria loquatur, nonne debeat impetrare?”

“If your country speaks with you, ought she not to obtain her request?”

Condition is possible.

---

<sup>16</sup> “In favor of Archias the Poet,” Cicero’s legal defense of Aulus Archias, accused of faking Roman citizenship. See [https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:latinLit:phi0474\\_phi016\\_perseus-eng1:10.24](https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:latinLit:phi0474_phi016_perseus-eng1:10.24)

<sup>17</sup> Cicero’s paraphrase of a supposed quote by Alexander the Great during the latter’s visit to Achilles’ tomb. See link above for fuller context.

The Latin uses the Subjunctive present.

Rule: In a conditional sentence of the “possible” variety, the Subjunctive present is used in both clauses (101-8)

See “Cataline I” [Chapter V]

“Se consulis, id suadeo”

“If you consult me, I advise it.”

This condition is true; (the time present.)

Indicative is used in both clauses.

Rule: In a ~~true~~ simple condition, the Indicative is used in both clauses (112-3)

The Indicative mood is used in both clauses of a conditional sentence of the “~~true~~” simple variety. (100-3)

(The Latin Subjunctive is equivalent to the English potential.)

(The Latin Subjunctive is the mode of emotion, volition, and possibility.)

(Three functions are not unusual in one organ, at the beginning.) (Which came first?)

(The Greek expresses volition by the Subjunctive, emotion by the optative.

Then the Latin Subjunctive is equivalent to the Greek Subjunctive and Optative.

Possibility is expressed [addition: “in”] Greek by the Optative with ἄν.<sup>18</sup>

Language, therefore, as we advance, becomes more complex, – more functions being crowded in one form.)

(The word “si” is not essential to the condition)

In the conditional sentence which we called “simple,” the Indicative mood was used in both clauses. Therefore, the Romans must have looked upon the hypothesis as according with fact.

For the beginner, then, we have divided conditional sentences into three classes:

1. Those in which we feel that the condition is real, we call “simple,” because they contain only the idea of condition, unmixed with any idea of possibility or unreality (As “condition,” however, they are no simpler than the others.)
2. Those in which the condition may, or may not be fulfilled, we call “possible.”
3. Those in which the condition is unreal, we call “contrary-to-fact.”

---

<sup>18</sup> Without going too much into Greek, these letters are lowercase alpha (with a stress mark and a symbol for “smooth breathing”) and a lowercase nu. This would be read as “-an.”

In teaching conditional sentences, we would take up the “simple” variety first. It contains “if,” and has no idea other than that of condition.

Care should be exercised in our choice of examples.

We would be much helped in our work by a proper correlation of Latin Grammar and English Grammar.

Aim: To teach the mode used in Simple Conditions

Rule: Simple Conditions are introduced by “si” and have condition and ~~et~~ conclusion, with the Indicative mode in each.

Material: “Se adest, bene est.” If he is here, it is well.

1. Preparation: Pupils know conditional sentences.
2. Presentation: Establish facts of the definition, [addition: “in the English,”] and then transfer to the Latin.

Application: to other sentences.

---

[pages 28 through 74 blank]

---

#### The Indicative

1. Makes statements. (P. 3)
2. Is used in both clauses of a “simple” conditional sentence. (P. 24)

#### The Subjunctive

1. Makes a statement in a clause depending on an infinitive with subject accusative. (P. 8)
2. Expresses a wish, and is, therefore, the mode of volition. (P. 18)
3. Expresses purpose with “ut.” (P. 12)
4. Expresses result with “ut.” (P. 17)
5. Express [sic] purpose with “ut” in a substantive clause. (P. 19)
6. Is used in both clauses of a “contrary-to-fact” conditional sentence. If the time is present, – the imperfect; if time is past, – the pluperfect. (P. 23)
7. Is used in a “possible” conditional sentence, – both clauses, present tense. (P. 24)

#### The Infinitive

1. Is used to complete the meaning of a verb. (P. 3)

2. Is verb in an object clause (P. 6)
3. Has its subject in the accusative-case (P. 11)

#### Statements

1. Are made by the Indicative (P. 3)
2. Are made by the infinitive and accusatives. (P. 6)
3. Are made by the subjunctive in a clause depending on t an infinitive and accusative (P. 11)

#### Conditional Sentences

1. Of the “simple” variety have the Indicative in both clauses. (P. 24)
2. Of the “possible” variety, have the Subjunctive present in both clauses. (P. 24)
3. Of the “contrary-to-fact” variety, have the Subjunctive in both clauses; the imperfect tense, if the time is present; the pluperfect if time is past. (P. 23)

#### A wish

1. Is expressed by the Subjunctive (P. 13)

#### Purpose

1. Is expressed by the Subjunctive with “ut.” (P. 12)

#### Result

1. Is expressed by the Subjunctive with “ut.” (P. 17)

#### The meaning of a verb

1. Is completed by an infinitive. (P. 3)

#### The Participle

1. Is used with a noun in the ablative (in independent construction) to add a related thought. (P. 4)

#### The Subject

1. Of an object clause is in the accusative. (P. 6)
2. Of an infinitive is in the accusative. (P. 11)

### The Accusative

1. Is used as a subject of an object clause. (P. 6)
2. Is used as a subject of an infinitive. (P. 11)

### The Ablative

1. Is used when a noun and a participle, in independent construction, add a related thought (P. 4)

### A clause

1. Is that part of a sentence which contains a subject and predicate.
2. That makes complete sense is a principal clause.
3. Dependent on another clause is a subordinate, or dependent clause.
4. Used in the grammatical relation of a noun, is a noun-clause.

---

[pages 89-92 blank]

---

### Index of Rules

Accusative:	Subject of infinitive	86-2.
	Subject of object clause	86-1.
Ablative absolute		87-1.
Clause:	Definition of	88-1.
	Noun-	88-4.
	Principal	88-2.
	Subordinate	88-3.
Conditional sentences:	“Contrary to fact”	79-3.
	“Possible”	79-2.
	“Simple”	79-1.
Indicative:	In statement	75-1.
	In “simple” condition	75-2.
Infinitive:	Complementary	77-1.
	With subject accusative	77-3.

	Verb of object clause	77-2.
	Meaning of a verb completed	83-1.
	Participle in ablative absolute	84-1.
Purpose:	Expressed by Subjunctive with “ut”	81-1.
	In substantive clause	76-5.
Result:	Expressed by Subjunctive with “ut”	82-1.
Statements:	With Indicative	78-1.
	With Infinitive	78-2.
	With Subjunctive	78-3.
Subject:	Of infinitive	85-2.
	Of object clause	85-1.
Subjunctive:	Expresses “purpose”	76-3.
	_____ “result”	76-4.
	_____ “wish”	76-2.
	In conditional sentences, “contrary to fact”	76-6.
	_____, “possible”	76-7.
	In object clauses	76-1.
	In object clause of “purpose”	76-5.
Wish, – expressed by Subjunctive		80-1.