There are a small number of 'true' conditional constructions in Lysias 1, i.e. sentences consisting of a protasis introduced by ε i and a separate apodosis.

3 of them are introduced by $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\nu$ with the subjunctive in the protasis and a future indicative in the apodosis. These indicate that the speaker thinks it a real possibility that the event in the protasis will happen:

έὰν οὖν λάβης τὴν θεράπαιναν τὴν εἰς ἀγορὰν βαδίζουσαν καὶ διακονοῦσαν ὑμῖν καὶ βασανίσης, ἄπαντα πεύση.

(Lysias Speeches 1.16)

έὰν ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν περὶ ἑαυτῶν λέγωσι καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ φάσκωσιν εἰς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας οἰκίας εἰσιέναι, οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἄψεται

(Lysias Speeches 1.35)

οί γὰρ τοιαῦτα πράττοντες, ὁρῶντες οἶα τὰ ἆθλα πρόκειται τῶν τοιούτων ἁμαρτημάτων, ἡττον εἰς τοὺς ἄλλους ἐξαμαρτήσονται, ἐὰν καὶ ὑμᾶς ὁρῶσι τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἔχοντας.
(Lysias Speeches 1.47)

There is only one example of a 'future unreal' conditional, with the **optative in the protasis** and **optative with** $\alpha \nu$ in the apodosis. In these sentences the speaker is rather more speculative about the protasis being true, although in this instance he does hope that it will be true:

εἰ τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἔχοιτε, ἥνπερ περὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, οὐκ ἂν εἴη ὅστις οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγενημένοις ἀγανακτοίη, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἂν περὶ τῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐπιτηδευόντων τὰς ζημίας μικρὰς ἡγοῖσθε.

(Lysias Speeches 1.1)

 that the prime difference between imperfect and aorist is an aspectual one and that the imperfect can also be used referring to the past in conditional sentences, when the action is more 'imperfective':

εἴ τινα εἶχε ταύτης μείζω τιμωρίαν ἐπὶ ταῖς γαμεταῖς, ἐποίησεν ἄν.

(Lysias Speeches 1.33)

τί ἄν οὖν βουλόμενος ἐγὼ τοιοῦτον κίνδυνον ἐκινδύνευον, εἰ μὴ τὸ μέγιστον τῶν ἀδικημάτων ἦ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἠδικημένος;

(Lysias Speeches 1.45)

There is an interesting sequence of sentences at section 36. The protasis with the imperfect is followed by a question, which is a 'real' question: 'which was the better course of action'. The 'apodosis' comes in the next sentence, after an implied protasis 'if I had invited him to my house':

εἰ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῆ νυκτὶ ἐγὼ ἐπεβούλευον Ἐρατοσθένει, πότερον ἦν μοι κρεῖττον αὐτῷ ἑτέρωθι δειπνεῖν ἢ τὸν συνδειπνήσοντά μοι εἰσαγαγεῖν; οὕτω γὰρ ἂν ἦττον ἐτόλμησεν ἐκεῖνος εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν.

(Lysias Speeches 1.40)

Another interesting case is found in section 37. We know from the grammar-book explanations that the only thing differentiating real and unreal conditionals is the presence or absence of $\alpha \nu$ in the apodosis. There is one standard 'real' conditional (without $\alpha \nu$) at section 21. As is frequently the case, this is used to make a conditional about something that somebody has claimed to be true:

έγω γὰρ οὐδὲν δέομαι λόγων, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἔργον φανερὸν γενέσθαι, εἴπερ οὕτως ἔχει. (Lysias Speeches 1.22)

In section 37 the first sentence has αv in the apodosis, and so we can translate it as a straightforward 'unreal' conditional. Editors disagree on what to print in the next

sentence: the $\alpha \nu$ is a reasonable suggestion, though without any manuscript support - and given the sense it's unsurprising that this might have been left out by scribes:

εἰ μὲν γὰρ λόγων εἰρημένων ἔργου δὲ μηδενὸς γεγενημένου μετελθεῖν ἐκέλευον ἐκεῖνον, ἠδίκουν ἄν· εἰ δὲ ἤδη πάντων διαπεπραγμένων καὶ πολλάκις εἰσεληλυθότος εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐμὴν ὡτινιοῦν τρόπῳ ἐλάμβανον αὐτόν, σωφρονεῖν <ἂν> ἐμαυτὸν ἡγούμην· (Lysias Speeches 1.38)

We also find a couple of mixed conditionals, where the time-reference in protasis and apodosis is not the same. The first example has the protasis of a future real conditional ($\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\nu$ + subjunctive) but then a present tense in the apodosis:

ταύτην γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ μόνην ἡγοῦμαι σωτηρίαν, ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἰπεῖν ἅπαντα δυνηθῶ τὰ πεπραγμένα.

(Lysias Speeches 1.5)

The second has an imperfect referring to the past in the protasis, followed by a present indicative + α v in the apodosis:

καίτοιγε εἰ προήδη, οὐκ ἄν δοκῶ ὑμῖν καὶ θεράποντας παρασκευάσασθαι καὶ τοῖς φίλοις παραγγεῖλαι, ἵν' ὡς ἀσφαλέστατα μὲν αὐτὸς εἰσήα (τί γὰρ ἤδη εἴ τι κἀκεῖνος εἶχε σιδήριον;), ὡς μετὰ πλείστων δὲ μαρτύρων τὴν τιμωρίαν ἐποιούμην;

(Lysias Speeches 1.41)

The final one is rather tricky: it is a complex sentence with several clauses, and the time-reference gets a bit confused:

οὔτε γὰρ συκοφαντῶν γραφάς με ἐγράψατο, οὔτε ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐπεχείρησεν, οὔτε ἰδίας δίκας ἐδικάζετο, οὔτε συνήδει κακὸν οὐδὲν ὃ ἐγὼ δεδιὼς μή τις πύθηται ἐπεθύμουν αὐτὸν ἀπολέσαι, οὔτε εἰ ταῦτα διαπραξαίμην, ἤλπιζόν ποθεν χρήματα λήψεσθαι·

(Lysias Speeches 1.44)

There is also one 'general' conditional, with $\dot{\epsilon}\dot{\alpha}\nu$ and the subjunctive in the protasis and a present indicative in the apodosis:

οἳ κελεύουσι μέν, ἐάν τις μοιχὸν λάβῃ, ὅ τι ἂν οὖν βούληται χρῆσθαι,

(Lysias Speeches 1.49)

As we have seen, the negative marker used in these clauses is standardly $\mu \dot{\eta}$. Often we find just $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \mu \dot{\eta}$ as a 'pseudo-protasis', which we can translate 'otherwise'. We have to work out the tense and how 'real' it is from the context:

οἷς ὑμᾶς ἀξιῶ τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἔχειν· εἰ δὲ μή, τοιαύτην ἄδειαν τοῖς μοιχοῖς ποιήσετε, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς κλέπτας ἐπαρεῖτε φάσκειν μοιχοὺς εἶναι,

(Lysias Speeches 1.35)

ὅπως τοίνυν ταῦτα μηδεὶς ἀνθρώπων πεύσεται· εἰ δέ μή, οὐδέν σοι κύριον ἔσται τῶν πρὸς ἔμ' ὡμολογημένων.

(Lysias Speeches 1.21)

In addition to the 'strict' conditionals considered above, there are also some clauses introduced by εi which are not conditional, and sentences with conditional force despite having no introductory εi . For example:

σκέψασθε δὲ παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς οὕτως περὶ τούτου τοῦ πράγματος, ζητοῦντες εἴ τις ἐμοὶ καὶ Ἐρατοσθένει ἔχθρα πώποτε γεγένηται πλὴν ταύτης.

(Lysias Speeches 1.43)

έγω δέ, ὦ ἄνδρες, δίκαιον μὲν ἂν ποιεῖν ἡγούμην ὡτινιοῦν τρόπῳ τὸν τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμὴν διαφθείραντα λαμβάνων·

(Lysias Speeches 1.38)