STUDY GUIDE TO *WHEELOCK'S LATIN*

by Dale A Grote,

Department of Classical Studies
University of North Carolina, Charlotte

Table of Contents

Chapter	Content	Page
	Preamble and Preface by Dale A. Grote	1
1	First and Second Conjugation Verbs: Indicative, Imperative, and Infinitive	3
2	Cases; First Declension; Agreement of Adjectives	8
3	Second Declension; Masculine Nouns and Adjectives; Word Order	15
4	Neuters of the Second Declension; Summary of Adjectives; Present Indicative of *Sum*; Predicate Nouns and Adjectives	20
5	First and Second Conjugations: Future Indicative Active; Adjectives of the First and Second Declension in *-er*	24
6	*Sum*: Future and Imperfect Indicative; Possum: Present, Future, and Imperfect Indicative; Complementary Infinitive	27
7	Third Declension: Nouns	30
8	Third Conjugation (*duco*): Present Infinitive, Present and Future Indicative, Present Imperative Active	34
9	Demonstrative Pronouns: *Hic*, *Ille*, *Iste*	38
10	Fourth Conjugation and *-io* Verbs of the Third: Present and Future Indicative, Present Imperative and Active Infinitive	44
11	Personal Pronouns *Ego* and *Tu*; Pronouns *Is* and *Idem*	48
12	Perfect System Active of All Verbs; Principal Parts	53
13	Reflexive Pronouns and Possessives; the Intensive *'Ipse'*	62
14	I-Stem Nouns of the Third Declension; Ablative of Means, Manner, and Accompaniment	69
15	The Imperfect Indicative Active; Ablative of Time	75
16	Adjectives of the Third Declension	~~75~~ 80
17	The Relative Pronoun	86
18	The Passive Voice for the 1st and 2nd Conjugations in the Present System; Ablative of Agent	92
19	Perfect Passive System of All Verbs; Interrogative Pronouns and Adjectives	97
20	Fourth Declension; Ablatives of Place from Which and Separation	107
21	Third and Fourth Conjugations: Passive Voice of Indicative and Present Infinitive	110
22	Fifth Declension; Summary of Ablatives	117
23	Participles	120
24	Ablative Absolute; Passive Periphrastic; The Dative of Agent	128
25	All Infinitives Active and Passive; Indirect Statement	134
26	Comparison of Adjectives; Declension of Comparatives	141
27	Special and Irregular Comparison of Adjectives	145
28	Subjunctive: Present Active and Passive; Jussive; Purpose	149
29	Imperfect Subjunctive; Present and Imperfect Subjunctive of *Sum* and *Possum*; The Result Clause	153
30	Perfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive Active and Passive; Sequence of Tenses; Indirect Questions	157
31	*Cum* with the Subjunctive; *Fero*	165
32	Adverbs: Formation and Comparison; *Volo*	170
33	Conditions	179
34	Deponent Verbs; Ablative with Special Deponents	183
35	Dative With Special Verbs; Dative With Compounds	193

The original text of Grote's *Study Guide to Wheelock Latin* can be downloaded from Wiretap a 700Kb file in one piece. In the preamble of the guide, Grote noted explicitly: "I call the guides 'Study Guide to Wheelock,' and have made them available for free use to anyone who'd like use them. [...] So far as I'm conncerned they can be copied and sent anywhere." The present HTML version is prepared by Tze-wan Kwan of RIH, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. In preparing the HTML version of this work, all files are linked relatively so that the whole package can be easily remounted by anyone on the Internet. If you are interested in making a "desk copy" of these guides on your own machine, here is a zipped copy of the whole package!
Page set up on July 1, 1996.

Latin Textbook (Based on *Wheelock's Latin*)
STUDY GUIDE TO *WHEELOCK LATIN*

by
Dale A Grote
UNC Charlotte

[This copy FTP'd from milton.u.washington.edu, 19-Jan-93]

From FFL00DAG@UNCCVM.UNCC.EDU Tue Jan 19 18:15:19 1993
Date: Tue, 19 Jan 93 21:08:32 EST
From: FFL00DAG@UNCCVM.UNCC.EDU
Subject: Re: Latin Textbook
To: Thomas Dell

Thomas,

I call the guides "Study Guide to Wheelock," and have made them available for free use to anyone who'd like use them. I think the answer to your question, therefore, is "Yes." I sent them up so they could get some good beta-testing. So far as I'm conncerned they can be copied and sent anywhere.

Dale A. Grote
FFL00DAG@UNCCVM.BITNET
Department of Foreign Languages
UNC Charlotte
Charlotte, NC 28223
704-547-4242

12/30/92

PREFACE TO MY COLLEAGUES

Wheelock's Latin is now, and probably will be for sometime in the future, the most widely used introductory Latin book used in American colleges and universities. And with good reason. His exclusive emphasis on the details of Latin grammar squares with the general expectation that students acquire a rudimentary, independent reading ability in real Latin after only two semesters of study. Surely Wheelock has its drawbacks and limitations, but it is still the best text around.

A growing difficulty with the book has become apparent in recent years, a problem that is entirely external to the text itself: students are less and less able to understand his explanations of Latin grammar because their grasp of English grammar is becoming more tenuous. This obsolescence hardly comes as a surprise, since the main outlines of Wheelock's grammar were set down in the forties and fifties, when it was safe to assume that college students were well versed in at least the basics of English grammar. We may lament this change, write heated letters to school boards and state legislatures, but all this is of little help when confronted as we are with classrooms filled with beginning Latin students who have never learned the difference between a participle and a pronoun, or who have never heard the word "case" in their lives.

As the years went by, I found that I was required to dedicate unacceptable amounts of class time to discussions of elementary grammatical concepts and to redrafting Wheelock's explanations into forms my students could understand, leaving less time for actually confronting Latin in the classroom. The results were predictable: it became nearly impossible to complete the forty chapters of grammatical material in two semesters. The third semester had to be called into the service of the basic grammar of the language, thus reducing the reading we could do and delaying the feeling of mastery and independence that drives students on to read more.

Slowly, I began to compile a rather extensive body of notes and exercises designed to teach the basic grammatical concepts to students of Latin, as they needed them, while learning Latin from Wheelock, and to slow down and recast Wheelock's treatment of the grammar into language which they could understand on their own. My intention for these notes was to get the repetitive transfer of basic information out of the classroom, so that we could spend more class time reviewing, translating, and drilling. These notes, therefore, represent nothing more than what I found myself repeating year after year in front of a class. By setting them into a written text, however, and removing it from the daily classroom agenda, there is no doubt that I have greatly increased the productivity of class time. Whereas I previously struggled to finish twenty chapters in a semester, my first semester class now easily finishes twenty-seven chapters in the first semester, with time left over for some connected readings. In the second semester, we have time to do considerable amounts of extended reading after the forty chapters of grammar have been covered.

There is really nothing miraculous about this increased productivity. In fact, it was to be expected. Previously, students, who could make neither heads nor tails of Wheelock, relied on my in-class presentations to explain Latin grammar to them. After the grammar was explained, they would review their classroom notes, and begin the chapter exercises, without ever having read Wheelock, which had been replaced by my lectures. In essence, then, I was doing their homework for them, but I was doing it in class, not outside of class. By removing basic grammar from the class by putting it into a workbook, I only transferred the time spent on learning Latin grammar outside the class, and freed up time in class for drilling and taking specific questions.

An unexpected, and admittedly self-interested, advantage I reaped from these printed notes was that students who tend to fall behind, or to miss class (and fall behind), had a body of notes which they could use on their own to catch up, and -- perhaps more importantly -- to which I could refer them when they came knocking at my door to find out "if they'd missed anything important in class." Previously this presented a real moral bind. Either I spent hours reteaching the class (or classes) for them, in the (usually vain) hope that they would reform once they had been set up on a sure foundation, or I sent them away uninformed, knowing that things would only get worse for them because they couldn't possibly draw the information they needed from Wheelock by themselves. Now, I refer them to my notes, express my willingness to answer their specific questions after they've worked through them, and send them on their way, hoping for the best.

Here's how I've incorporated these notes into my syllabus and classroom routine. In the first place, going through my notes for each chapter is entirely optional. I make no assignments from them, nor do we use class time to go over any of the exercises they contain. Instead, I merely assign the Practice and Review sentences of, say, Chapter 5, for the next class period. How the students learn the material in Chapter 5 is entirely their affair, though I do recommend they read my notes. If, however, a student can understand Wheelock perfectly, then s/he is under no obligation to read my presentation of the chapter. Most students do read my notes instead of Wheelock. After reading my notes, I recommend that they read Wheelock's chapter, which provides a compressed "review" of what I leisurely set out in my chapter notes. For an added review and translation exercises, I also recommend that students work through Wheelock's Self-Help Tutorials before turning to the specified assignment. After so much preparation, students regularly find the sentences quite straight-forward. In class, then, after a verbal review of the important concepts in the chapter, we work quickly through the sentences, then, in the time remaining, we sight read either from the Sententiae Antiquae, or from the book 38 Latin Stories designed to go along with Wheelock. My class covers three chapters per week -- one chapter per day, since we meet MWF for an hour and half. Classes meeting five times per week, of course, would divide the material differently.

I would like to stress again that I don't claim to have created anything new, revolutionary, or destined to reshape the way Latin is taught for the next 25 years. Perhaps I do have one claim to originality, insofar as my book combines a grammar text and workbook, but I hardly think that's worthy of much note. I merely believe that I have put together a study guide which will help teach Latin from Wheelock more efficiently by making more classroom time available for direct contact with the language itself. The text is not meant to intrude directly on classroom work. It is for students use at night, by themselves, to prepare for classes and exams. I myself designate the book as an optional purchase and make it available at a nearby copy store, and at first a substantial fraction of my class doesn't buy it. After three weeks, however, nearly all of them have a copy. My students, at least, find the book very helpful, and frequently make remarks about it on their course evaluations. For what it's worth, here are their remarks from last semester.

> "The book the instructor made that goes along with Wheelock's book provided a much better understanding of Latin."
>
> "His notebook that went along with the Wheelock book was also immensely helpful. The explanations were thorough and easy to understand."
>
> "The workbook that he created to go along with the text helped a lot in the understanding of the work."
>
> "Dr. Grote's handbook for the class is a great teaching tool and helped students be prepared for class."
>
> "Grote's handbook -- especially helpful."
>
> "He supplies a handbook written by him that helps a great deal in learning Latin."
>
> "Dr. Grote's book was very helpful! His explanations are elaborate and very clear. I'd vote for publication!!" [Emphases in the original]

I'm providing you draft of my book for the usual reasons. I would appreciate your making the text available to your students -- as I do -- at a copy shop and calling their attention to it. Would you please take note of their reactions, positive and negative, and send them along to me during or at the end of the semester. I would greatly value, of course, any remarks you would care to make about my presentations. Since I'm preparing the copy myself, any corrigenda you spot would save me a lot of embarrassment. If you have any questions I've left unanswered, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Dale A. Grote
UNC Charlotte
Department of Foreign Languages
Charlotte, NC 28223
(704) 547-4242

CHAPTER 1

"First and Second Conjugation Verbs: Indicative, Imperative, and Infinitive"

VERBS: THE BASICS OF CONJUGATION

Let's start simply: a verb is a word which indicates action or state of being. Everyone ought to know that. Look at some of the different forms of a simple verb in English, the verb "to see":

GROUP I	GROUP II	GROUP III
I see.	I saw.	I am seen.
I do see.		I was seen.
I am seeing.		I will be seen.
I will see.		I should have been seen.
I should be seeing.		
I would see.		
See.		
I want to see.		

And so on; there are several left out. Look at the first group for now. You can detect something interesting going on here. You have a basic form of the verb -- "see" -- and it's undergoing changes. One kind of change is that different words are put before it, another is the "-ing" suffix attached to the end, and another is the addition of a suffix "-s" when you want to say "he/she/it sees".

You can see that the verb "to see" has a basic form, which is being modified slightly to show that the verb is being used in a different way. This modification of a verb to show different aspects or conditions of the action is called "conjugation" (kahn juh GAY chion), and a verb is said to "conjugate" (KAHN juh gate) when it's modified to exhibit these different conditions. A verb, therefore, has a basic form or set of forms, which then conjugate in order to change the way its meaning is to be understood in a particular context. These basic forms contain the core meaning of the verb, but the way the action is being applied and the circumstances under which the action is changing.

Now look at the second group -- it's really a group of one. Here you have an entirely different form: "saw". How do you know that it's a part of the verb "to see?" From your experience with English, of course. This form of the verb is an entirely different stem, yet it's still just a variation of the basic verb "to see". So a verb can change its form entirely and still be a part of the same family of meaning. So also with the third group. "Seen" is another stem of the basic verb "to see", and your native English sense tells you it's merely a variation of a verb you already know: "to see". Again, we can put all kinds of words in front to conjugate it, but with this stem, no changes actually affect the stem itself. There's no such form as "seening", for example.

Now let's try an experiment. Suppose you're not an English speaker and you come across the word "saw" while you're reading something. You don't know what it is, so you try to look it up in the dictionary just as it is: "saw". Unless you have a very unusual dictionary you won't find it. Why not? Because "saw" is a variation of a more basic form. In the same way, would you expect to find an entry in a dictionary for the word "stones?" Of course not, because "stones" is just the plural form of "stone", a form you can easily deduce from the basic form "stone", if you know the rules of English grammar. So before you can use a dictionary, you already have to know something about the language. And that's entirely understandable. How big would a dictionary have to be to list all the possible varieties of every word in the language? Consequently, before you look up a word in a dictionary, you must first reduce it to a form under which the dictionary will list it, and that often takes patience and some mental effort.

Let's go back to the verb "to see". It has three different stems in its conjugation -- "see, saw, seen" -- and to use the verb intelligently you must know them all and you must know the rules governing their use. We call these forms, the "principal parts" of the verb. You'll notice in English the way these principal parts are conjugated is by piling up all kinds of words in front of them. These words change the aspect of the action. To sum up, to use any verb fully, you must know two things: (1) all the principal parts of the verb, and (2) the rules governing the conjugation of English verbs. This is also true of Latin verbs.

LATIN VERBS: THE BASICS

As you may have guessed, Latin verbs have different rules governing the way they conjugate. For the most part -- almost exclusively -- Latin verbs conjugate by attaching endings to the stems themselves, without all the separate helping words put in front of the stem as in English to tell you how to understand the action. So for a Latin verb, you must learn two things: (1) the stems, and (2) how the stems are modified at their ends to show different conditions under which the action is occurring. Let's look at English again. Here is the conjugation of the verb "to see" in the present tense.

SINGULAR	PLURAL

4

I see	we see
you see	you see
he, she, it, sees	they see

With the exception of the form "sees", the differences among these forms is made by the preceding word. In this instance, the change is in the person who is performing the action. Now look at the Latin translation for the verb English verb "to see" with these modifications.

	LATIN	ENGLISH
1st	video	I see
2nd	vides	you see
3rd	videt	he/she/it sees
1st	videmus	we see
2nd	videtis	you see
3rd	vident	they see

As I told you before, Latin conjugates its verbs by attaching endings to the root of the verb itself, and here you can see it happening. The common feature of the verb "to see" in Latin is the stem "vide-" and to show changes in person and number, Latin adds a suffix. These suffixes are called the "personal endings", because they indicate the person and the number of the conjugated form of the verb. Let's set these personal endings out:

1st person	-o	=	I
2nd person	-s	=	you (singular)
3rd person	-t	=	he, she, it
1st person	-mus	=	we
2nd person	-tis	=	you (plural)
3rd person	-nt	=	they

Now try your hand at conjugating some other Latin verbs. The verb meaning "to warn, advise" in Latin has the stem "mone-"; the verb meaning "to be strong" in Latin has the stem "vale-"; and the verb meaning "to owe, ought" in Latin has the stem "debe-". Translate the following into Latin.

we owe, ought	debemus
they see	_____
she advises	_____
you (pl.) are strong	_____
they warn	_____
you (sg.) are strong	_____
I owe, ought	_____
we see	_____

CONJUGATIONS OF LATIN VERBS

You now know the single most important characteristic of Latin nouns: they conjugate by adding suffixes to a stem. You also now know the most common kind of suffix: the personal endings. Next you need to know something more about the stems. There are four groups of Latin verbs, called "conjugations", determined by the final vowel attached to the end of the stem.

- The verbs you've been working with have stems which end in "-e". Verbs whose stems end in "-e" are called **"2nd conjugation"** verbs.
- If, however, the stem of the verb ends in "-a" then it's called a **"1st conjugation"** verb.
- Verbs whose stem ends in short "-e" are called **"3rd conjugation"**.
- And verbs whose stem ends in "-i" are called **"4th conjugation"**. Like this:

1st	2nd	3rd	4th
lauda-	vale-	duc-	veni-
ama-	vide-	ag-	senti-

5

cogita- mone- carp- audi-

The first several chapters of Wheelock are concerned only with the first and second conjugations, so for now we'll postpone any further discussion of the third and fourth conjugation. But for now, you need to recognize that the principal difference between the four conjugations of Latin verbs is in the vowel that comes between the stem and the personal endings. All four conjugations follow the same rules for conjugating: stem (which includes the characteristic stem vowel) + personal endings.

You have already worked with second conjugation verbs. Now let's have a look at an example of a first conjugation verb. We'll use the verb "to love" as the example, which has the stem "ama-". So "ama-" means "love" but to use it in a sentence, we have to add the personal endings. The stem of the verb is "ama-", so to conjugate it, we just add the personal endings to it, following the same rules that apply to second conjugation verbs. Fill in the stem and personal endings in the blanks on the following chart but hold off filling in the conjugated forms for now.

	STEM	+	PERSONAL ENDING	=	CONJUGATED FORM
1st	_____	+	_____	=	_____
2nd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
3rd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
1st	_____	+	_____	=	_____
2nd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
3rd	_____	+	_____	=	_____

Now for the conjugated forms. If you follow the rules of conjugation that apply for second conjugation verbs, you should write the form "amao" for the first person singular. But listen to how easily the two vowels "a" and "o" can be simplified into a single "o" sound. Say "ao" several times quickly and you'll see that the two sounds are made in the same place in the mouth. Over time, Latin simplified the sound "ao" to just "o". The final written form is "amo", not "amao". So write "amo" for "I love". Aside from this small irregularity, however, the personal endings are attached directly to the stem without any alteration or loss of the stem vowel. Fill in the rest of the conjugated forms. (If you're unsure of yourself, check your work against the paradigm on page 3 of Wheelock.)

Now conjugate another paradigm of a second conjugation verbs: "mone-"

	STEM	+	PERSONAL ENDING	=	CONJUGATED FORM
1st	_____	+	_____	=	_____
2nd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
3rd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
1st	_____	+	_____	=	_____
2nd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
3rd	_____	+	_____	=	_____

THE ENGLISH PRESENT TENSES

Look at the following conjugated forms of the English verb "to see".

I see.
I am seeing.
I do see.

Each of these forms refers to present time -- and are therefore present tenses -- but each is different. We're so accustomed to these different present tenses in English that we can hardly explain what the different meanings are, even though we're instantly aware that there is a distinction being made. Try to explain the differences among "I see", "I am seeing" and "I do see". It's difficult, but these different present tenses are essential to the way we speak. In reality English is one of the few languages which has these three present tenses, and it's very hard to foreign students of English to learn how and when to use

them. "I see" is called the Simple Present tense; "I am seeing" is called the Present Progressive; and "I do see" is called the Present Emphatic. Now try to come up with the differences. The point of this is that Latin has only one present tense. So, when we see "laudas", for example, it can be translated into English as "you praise", "you do praise", or "you are praising". We have to let our native sense of the simple present, the present progressive, and the present emphatic tell us which to use.

THE IMPERATIVE

Another conjugated form of Latin verbs is the "imperative" mood, or the direct command. Its name is its definition. It's how you turn a verb into a direct command: "Look here", "Watch out", "Stop that", etc. To form the imperative mood of any Latin verb, follow these rules:

```
Second Person Singular      stem
Second Person Plural        stem + te
```

Form the imperative mood of the following Latin verbs:

```
          lauda-

singular              _____________________

plural                _____________________

          mone-

singular              _____________________

plural                _____________________
```

THE INFINITIVE

Verb forms which specify no person -- 1st, 2nd, or 3rd -- we call "infinite" or "infinitive", which means, literally, "without boundary". That is to say, the form is not bounded by or limited to a certain person. Theoretically, there are many verb forms which are "infinite", but in common usage the word "infinitive" is generally limited to forms which are translated into English as "to x" (where "x" is the meaning of the verb). To form the infinitive, a "-re" suffix is added to the stem.

```
lauda  +  re    =    laudare  (to praise)
mone   +  re    =    monere (to warn)
```

DICTIONARY CONVENTIONS FOR VERBS

As you can see, each verb has at least six different forms (there are many, many more which you'll learn later), and, for obvious reasons, it would be impossible for a dictionary to list all six of these possibilities under separate entries. That is, you can't look up "laudant" just as it's here, anymore than you could look up "they are saying" under "they" in an English dictionary. You have to strip the conjugated form of the verb down to the form under which the dictionary will give it to you. For the English "they are saying", obviously, you would look up "say", because you know the conventions an English dictionary uses for listing an English verb. What are the conventions for a Latin dictionary? If you see a form like "laudant" in a text you're reading and want to look it up, how do you do it? What is its "dictionary" form?

The dictionary form for a Latin verb is not the stem, but the first person singular. This means that when you want to look up "laudant" you have to look it up under the conjugated form "laudo", not under its raw stem "lauda-". What you have to do to look up a Latin verb, therefore, is to imagine what the verb looks like in the first person singular and look it up under that. There is no reason it has to be like this; Latin dictionaries could have adopted any other of a number of different conventions for listing verbs, but this just happens to be the way it is. A consequence of this is that the first personal singular of a verb is considered to be the basic form of the verb. So, I'll say, for example, "The Latin verb for "to see" is "video", which is really saying "The Latin verb for "to see" is 'I see.'" Again, this is just conventional, but it's how it's done. To repeat, in order to look a verb up in the dictionary, you first have to reduce it to its first person singular form. In the case of the conjugated form "laudant" you would follow this process.

1. The "-nt" suffix is the third person plural personal ending, so you take it off; that leaves you with "lauda-".
2. You remember that verbs conjugate by adding personal endings to the stem, so "lauda-" is the stem. But you can't look it up under the stem alone, because a dictionary lists verbs under the first person singular. You must reconstruct the first person singular to look this verb up.
3. Next ask yourself what the conjugation of a verb like "lauda-" is going to be, first or second conjugation? Since the final vowel of the stem is "-a-", the verb you're looking at is a first conjugation verb. And what does the first person singular or a first conjugation verb look like? It's "lauda + o = laudo" (since the "a" and the "o" contract to just "o"). So we say that "laudant" is from "laudo", just as we might say in English "seen" is from "to see".
4. Now you've simplified the verb to something you can look it up under -- "laudo" -- and the translation is "to praise".
5. The second entry for a verb in the Latin dictionary is its infinitive form. After "laudo", therefore, you see "laudare".

Since you know that an infinitive is the stem plus the ending "-re", you can easily see the true stem of the verb simply by dropping off the final "-re" infinitive ending. This confirms the fact that the verb you're looking up is a first conjugation verb.

6. Now translate "laudant". With the personal ending brought back in the translation is "they praise" (or "they are praising", or "they do praise").

I know this may seem tedious at first, but concentrate on internalizing each one of these steps. You'll benefit immensely when the grammar becomes more complicated. The moral of all this is that you should never go browsing around in the dictionary hoping to find something that might match the word you're looking up. You must think carefully about what you're looking for before you turn the first page of the dictionary. (You'll hear me say this repeatedly.)

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

debeo, debere	This verb has an apparently odd combinations of meanings -- "to owe; should, must, ought" -- until we remember that our English verb "ought" is really an archaic past tense of the verb "to owe". As with the English verb "ought", the Latin verb "debeo" is often followed by an infinitive to complete its meaning: "I ought to see" = "Debeo videre". An infinitive which completes the meaning of another verb is called a "complementary infinitive".
servo, servare	Despite its appearance, this verb doesn't mean "to serve". Be careful with this one.

12/31/92

8

CHAPTER 2

"Cases; First Declension; Agreement of Adjectives"

CASES AND INFLECTION

Consider the following sentence: "The girl saw the dog". How can you tell that this sentence does not mean that the dog is seeing the girl? The answer is obvious to an English speaker. "Girl" comes before the verb, and "dog" comes after it, and this arrangement tells us that the "girl" is performing the action of verb, and the "dog" is receiving the action. We say that the one who is performing the action of the verb is the "subject" of the verb. So "girl" is the "subject" of "saw". The dog, however, is the "object" of the verb, since it's the object of the action. And in English, we generally show these functions -- subject and object -- by position relative to the verb. The subject of the verb tends to come before the verb, the object tends to come after it.

But position isn't the only way we show which word is the subject and object of a verb. Now consider this sentence: "Him I like, them I despise". Obviously this sentence has an usual arrangement for rhetorical purposes, but how can you tell who is doing what to whom? Even though English grammar shows grammatical relationship between words in a sentence mainly by position, in many instances a change in the word itself provides you additional help. The word "him", although it comes first in the sentence, is not the subject because its form -- "him" instead of "he" -- is not the one used to indicate that it's the subject of the verb. We use the form "he" to show that. Furthermore, the word "I" is the form we use when the first person is subject of the verb. Hence, the words "he" and "I" change their forms as their grammatical function in the sentence changes. The change in form of a word to show grammatical functions is called "inflection".

The English personal pronouns change quite a lot to show you how they're being used in the sentence. Watch.

	FORM	FUNCTION
First Person Pronoun	I	subject
	my	possessor (it owns something
	me	object (something is being done to it)
	we	subject
	our	possessor
	us	object
Second Person Pronoun	you	subject
	your	possessor
	you	object
	you	subject
	your	possessor
	you	object
Third Person Pronoun	he,she,it	subject
	his,her,its	possessor
	him,her,it	object
	they	subject
	their	possessor
	them	object

This inflection (change of form to show grammatical function) in the pronouns is very useful for helping us to understand each other -- although, as you can see, the second person pronoun "you, etc" doesn't inflect nearly so much as the first and third. The plural forms are even identical to the singular forms. We can still get by.

In English, inflection is rather limited, and we rely on position mainly to tell us what the words in the sentence are doing to each other. The only grammatical functions that involve a change in form for all nouns is the possessive case and the plural forms, where we attach an "-s" to the end of the word. (In written English we even include an apostrophe "'" mark to help us see the difference between a pluralized noun and a noun that's in the possessive case.) For example

SINGULAR		PLURAL	
apple	subject	apples	subject
apple's	possessor	apples'	possessor

apple	object	apples	object

Watch how we combine position with inflection in English to make sense to one another. As you can see, position is the principal guide.

> "These apples' [plural, possessor] cores are hard, but apples [plural, subject] are usually soft. When you [singular, subject] buy apples [plural, object], you [singular, subject] should first pick up each apple [object, singular] and bounce it [singular, object] off the floor several times. Then check its [singular, possessor] skin. If it [singular, subject] is bruised, discretely put it [singular, object] back with the other apples [plural, object], making certain that no one [singular, subject] is watching you [singular, object]".

Unlike English, languages which rely primarily on inflection of words to show grammatical relationship are called "inflected" languages. English, though it has some inflection, is not an inflected language. Latin, however, is an inflected language, because it relies almost entirely on changes in the words themselves to indicate their grammatical function in a sentence.

The different grammatical functions a word can have in a sentence is called "case". In English there are three recognizable different cases, that is grammatical functions, a word can have: the subjective case, the possessive case, and the objective case. So we say there are three cases in English. In Latin there are six difference cases. Here are the Latin cases. (Don't try to memorize them all at once here. Just read through the list; there will be plenty of time to firm up your familiarity of them.)

LATIN	APPROXIMATE ENGLISH EQUIVALENT
Nominative	(Subjective)
Genitive	(Possessive Case)
Dative	(Object of words like "to" or "for")
Accusative	(Objective Case)
Ablative	(Adverbial Usages: "by", "with")
Vocative	(Direct Address)

We'll look at the way these cases are used in Latin in the next part of these notes, although some of them won't be difficult at all: the nominative, genitive, and accusative cases are almost the same as their English counterparts. The ablative, dative and vocative will need some explanation. Before then, however, let's look at how a Latin noun inflects to show all these different cases.

Let's look at some English pronouns which inflect to show the three different cases. Do you remember "they, their, them?" The pronoun is inflecting through its different cases, but we can definitely spot a pattern of similarity among the three forms. There is a definite root of the word. The root (that is, the part of the word that contains the meaning of the word) is "the-" to which then the endings "-y", "-ir" and "-m". So we could say that the word is inflecting by adding certain case endings to a stem. The stem contains the core of the meaning of the word, and the endings merely inflect or alter its grammar.

This is precisely how Latin nouns show their different cases: they add additional letters to the end of the basic form of the word. This basic form that does not change throughout its inflection is called the "stem". There are, consequently, two parts of a Latin word that you must note: the stem and the case ending. The stem contains the meaning of the word and its gender (masculine, feminine, or neuter). The case ending will tell you (1) how the noun is being used in its sentence, and (2) whether the noun is singular or plural. Let's watch a the Latin noun "puella" (girl) as it inflects through its different cases:

	SINGULAR	APPROXIMATE ENGLISH TRANSLATION
NOMINATIVE	puella	girl
GENITIVE	puellae	of the girl
DATIVE	puellae	to/for the girl
ACCUSATIVE	puellam	girl
ABLATIVE	puella	by/with the girl
VOCATIVE	puella	girl
	PLURAL	
NOMINATIVE	puellae	girls
GENITIVE	puellarum	of the girls
DATIVE	puellis	to/for the girls
ACCUSATIVE	puellas	girls
ABLATIVE	puellis	by/with the girls
VOCATIVE	puellae	girls

The stem of the Latin word is clearly visible. It's "puell-" to which different endings are being attached. The endings are:

SINGULAR	PLURAL

NOMINATIVE	-a	-ae
GENITIVE	-ae	-arum
DATIVE	-ae	-is
ACCUSATIVE	-am	-as
ABLATIVE	-a	-is
VOCATIVE	-a	-ae

There are many other nouns in Latin which follow this same pattern of case endings when they inflect. This pattern of endings is called the "first declension" (deh CLEN shion) and you can see the strong presence of an "-a-". There are four other declensional patterns in Latin, but a noun will belong to only one of them. Hence we can say that "puella" is a first declension noun. The other declensions are called, not surprisingly, the second, third, fourth and fifth declension, and are distinguished form one another in part by the thematic, or characteristic, vowel that appears in its endings.

REVIEW

This is a lot of information to absorb in one sitting. Stop now for a while, then read through this review statement before starting on the next section of this chapter.

A language whose nouns show their grammatical function in the sentence by changes in the noun itself, and not by position, is called an inflected language. The different grammatical functions a language recognizes are called cases. In English, there are three cases. They are the subjective, the possessive, and the objective. In Latin there are six cases. They are the nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, ablative and vocative cases. A Latin noun has two parts which you must note: it has a stem, which contains the noun's basic meaning and its gender; and it also has a case ending which tells you the noun's case and its number. A pattern of endings which are added to the end of a noun to show its grammatical function is called a declension. Each noun in Latin belongs to one declension. The declensions are called the first, second, third, fourth and fifth declensions.

THE FIRST DECLENSION

Let's have a look at another first declension noun: "pecuni-" (money).

SINGULAR

	STEM	+	CASE ENDING	=	INFLECTED FORM
N/V.	pecuni	+	-a	=	_____
GEN.	pecuni	+	-ae	=	_____
DAT.	pecuni	+	-ae	=	_____
ACC.	pecuni	+	-am	=	_____
ABL.	pecuni	+	-a	=	_____

PLURAL

	STEM	+	CASE ENDING	=	INFLECTED FORM
N/V.	pecuni	+	-ae	=	_____
GEN.	pecuni	+	-arum	=	_____
DAT.	pecuni	+	-is	=	_____
ACC.	pecuni	+	-as	=	_____
ABL.	pecuni	+	-is	=	_____

Let's try a few more paradigms. Decline the noun "patri-" (fatherland) and vit-" (life).

SINGULAR

	patri-	vit-
N/V.	_____	_____
GEN.	_____	_____

DAT.	_____	_____
ACC.	_____	_____
ABL.	_____	_____
	PLURAL	
N/V.	_____	_____
GEN.	_____	_____
DAT.	_____	_____
ACC.	_____	_____
ABL.	_____	_____

GENDER

All Latin nouns possess what is called "gender". That is, a noun will be masculine, feminine, or neuter. Don't confuse this kind of grammatical gender with biological gender. There is nothing biologically feminine about nouns which are grammatically feminine, nothing biologically masculine about nouns which are grammatically masculine, and nothing biologically neuter about nouns which are grammatically neuter. It's just that nouns have a feature which we call gender by convention. And this is a feature which cannot change in a noun. A noun may change its case or number, but a noun will never change its gender. This is a fixed feature, and you must be told what gender a noun is when you look it up in the dictionary. This is important to remember, because although the vast majority of first declensions nouns are feminine, not all of them are. You must memorize the gender of each noun as you would learn its meaning.

DICTIONARY CONVENTIONS FOR GENDER AND DECLENSION

The dictionary therefore must tell you many things about a noun you're looking up -- and you must know how the dictionary tells you what you need to know. Latin dictionaries follow the following conventions for listing nouns.

1. The first entry in the dictionary is the noun in the nominative case.
2. The second entry is the genitive singular ending. This is essential, because many of the declensions have identical nominative singular endings. There is no way to be certain, therefore, to which declension a noun belongs simply by looking at the nominative singular. But in all declensions, the genitive singular endings are different. The genitive singular ending of the first declension is "-ae", that of the second declension is "-i", that of the third is "-is", that of the fourth is "-us", and that of the fifth is "-ei" If you know the genitive singular of a noun you know what declension the noun follows. Another reason you must have the genitive singular form given to you is that the stem of the noun is often not visible in the nominative singular. Sometimes the stem changes slightly from the nominative to the other forms. Again, you cannot predict what kind of stem change will occur simply by looking at the nominative. But you will be able to see it in the genitive singular. (This kind of stem change never occurs in the first declension, but it does in the second and the third.)
3. The last entry is the gender of the noun, which cannot be deduced even if you know everything else about the noun. You must be given it.

Put all this together, and typical dictionary entries for first declension noun will look like this:

```
patria, -ae (f)
pecunia, -ae (f)
poeta, -ae (m)
agricola, -ae (m)
```

Now look up the following nouns in your dictionary and write out the grammatical information you are given.

ENGLISH	FULL ENTRY	DECLENSION	STEM
band	_____	_____	_____
brother	_____	_____	_____
care	_____	_____	_____
city	_____	_____	_____
day	_____	_____	_____

dread _____ _____ _____

TRANSLATION OF THE CASES

What I'm going to give you now is just the bare outline of how these cases can be translated into English. There will be plenty of time for further refinement in the future -- and we'll have to do some refinement -- but for the time being, these guide lines will get you well on your way.

NOMINATIVE CASE

A noun in the nominative case is often the subject of a verb. For example, in the English sentence "The tree fell on my car", the "tree" is in the nominative case because it's the subject of the verb "fell". If this were a Latin sentence, the word tree would be in the nominative case form. The rule of thumb for now is that if you see a noun in the nominative case, try to translate it as the subject of the verb in its sentence.

GENITIVE CASE

This case shows that one noun belongs to another noun. The noun which is the owner is put into the genitive case. Like this in English: "The car's door is open". "Door" is the nominative case because it's the thing which is open -- it's the subject of the verb "is" -- and the door belongs to the car, so "car's" is put into the genitive case. So for now, every time you see the genitive case, translate the noun with the English preposition "of" or use the genitive marker "'s". For example, if "portae" is in the genitive case, translate it either as "the door's" or "of the door".

DATIVE CASE

The dative case shows that a noun is indirectly affected by the action of the sentence. Take for example, in the English sentence "George gave the ball to the girl". George is the subject of "give" and the thing George is giving is the "ball". So the thing most directly affected by George's action is the ball. It's the direct recipient of the action. But George then gave the ball to the girl, so the girl is also being affected, but only indirectly. Therefore, the girl is the "indirect object" of the action of the sentence. English can also indicate the indirect object simply by position: by putting the indirect object before the direct object. Like this: George gave the girl the ball. In Latin, the word for "girl" would be in the dative case, and so would have the dative case ending of the declension to which the word "girl" belongs. So the form would be "puellae". Again, a rough rule of thumb: when you see the dative case, try to translate it with the prepositions "to" or "for" and see which of the two makes the most sense.

ACCUSATIVE CASE

The noun which is directly affected by the action of a verb is put into the accusative case. In English we call this case the "direct object" which is a little more descriptive of its function. It's the direct object of some action. In the example above, the "ball" is in the accusative case because it's the direct object of George's action of giving. In Latin, therefore, the word for ball would have the characteristic accusative case ending attached to its stem. The accusative case is also used after some prepositions, but we'll look at that later.

ABLATIVE CASE

The ablative case is rather complicated. Let's just say for now that when you see a noun in the ablative case, translate it by using the prepositions "with" or "by". We'll study the various meanings of the ablative case separately in later chapters.

VOCATIVE CASE

If you want to call someone or something by name to get some attention, then you use the vocative case. "Dog, get out of the house!" "Dog" is in the vocative case. The form of the vocative case -- that is, the ending you attach to the stem to form the case -- is almost always identical to the nominative form of the word. For that reason, the nominative and vocative forms are often listed together in a declensional pattern, instead of being given separate listings. The vocative case is very easily distinguished from the nominative case, though, because a noun in the vocative is always set off from the rest of the sentence with commas and is often preceded by in the interjection "O" -- the Latin equivalent of our "hey": "O puellae, date poetae rosas" (Hey girls, give roses to the poet.)

So let's put all this together into a chart you can use when you're translating a Latin sentence. The sooner you've memorized this guidelines, the easier it'll be for you to work through Latin sentences:

	THE CASES
Nominative	the subject of a verb
Genitive	use "of" or "-'s" ("-s'") for the plural
Dative	use "to" or "for", or put the noun before the direct object
Accusative	the direct object of a verb or object of a preposition
Ablative	use the prepositions "with" or "for"
Vocative	use the English "hey" or "Oh"

Would it be of any use, now,' thought Alice, `to speak to this mouse? Everything is so out-of-the-way down here, that I should think very likely it can talk: at any rate, there's no harm in trying.' So she began: `O Mouse, do you know the way out of this pool? I am very tired of swimming about here, O Mouse!'

(Alice thought this must be the right way of speaking to a mouse: she had never done such a thing before, but she remembered having seen in her brother's Latin Grammar, `A mouse--of a mouse--to a mouse--a mouse--O mouse!' The Mouse looked at her rather inquisitively, and seemed to her to wink with one of its little eyes, but it said nothing.

`Perhaps it doesn't understand English,' thought Alice; `I daresay it's a French mouse, come over with William the Conqueror.' (For, with all her knowledge of history, Alice had no very clear notion how long ago anything had happened.) So she began again: `Ou est ma chatte?' (Where is my cat?) which was the first sentence in her French lesson-book.

AGREEMENT OF ADJECTIVES AND NOUNS

An adjective is a word which modifies or qualifies a noun. "A red leaf:" "leaf" is the noun and "red" is telling you something more about it. That's pretty simple. To indicate which noun an adjective is modify we use position in English: i.e., we put the adjective right next to the noun.

"A red leaf with a brown stem fell off the tall tree onto the flat ground".

There is no question about which adjectives are modifying which nouns. No one, except perhaps a deconstructionist, would think the author is trying to say that the ground is red or that the stem is flat. Position makes this clear. In Latin, however, where position is not so important, adjectives have to be put together with their nouns differently. Instead of using position, Latin adjectives take on some of the characteristics of the nouns they're modifying: i.e., they undergo changes to match the noun they're modifying.

So what properties do nouns have in a Latin sentence. Well, they have case -- they have to have case to work in the sentence -- and they have number (singular or plural) and they have gender (masculine, feminine, or neuter). Remember this about gender: a noun can change its number and case, but it can only have one gender; it cannot change its gender. So each noun has number, gender, and case. An adjective has to be able to acquire the number, gender, and case of the noun it's modifying. So how does it do that? It does it by declining. And in this respect it resembles a noun: nouns decline to get different numbers and cases; so do adjectives. But there is an important difference. Latin nouns are either masculine, feminine or neuter, and they can never change their gender. The noun "porta, -ae (f)" is forever feminine. The noun "poeta, -ae (m)" is forever masculine, etc. But for adjectives to be useful, they have to be able to become any one of the three genders; i.e., adjectives have to be able to be masculine, feminine or neuter to match the gender of the noun they're modifying. And how do they do that? They accomplish this by using endings from different declensions (and you'll learn these other declension in the next couple of chapters). So here are two critical differences between adjectives and nouns: (1) each adjective can have any of the three genders, but each noun can have only one gender; (2) each noun will belong only to one declension, but adjectives can span declensions. You'll see much more of this later, but for now you need to know that adjectives use endings of the first declension to become feminine, and, therefore, to modify nouns which are feminine in gender. So try this. Decline the expression "big rose":

	magna	rosa
N/V.	_____	_____
GEN.	_____	_____
DAT.	_____	_____
ACC.	_____	_____
ABL.	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____
GEN.	_____	_____
DAT.	_____	_____

ACC.	_____	_____
ABL.	_____	_____

Now look at these endings for the adjective and the noun. They look alike, don't they. But this is dangerously deceptive. Get this in your head: agreement means same number, gender, and case, not look-alike endings, even though in this limited example and in all the examples in this chapter they do look alike. Consider this problem. The noun for poet is a masculine noun in the first declension: "poeta, -ae (m)". Now, for an adjective to agree with it, it must have the same number, gender and case. Right? But adjectives with first declension endings are masculine. So, will the endings of an adjective modifying the noun "poeta" be the same as those as "poeta". I.e., will the pattern for "great poet" look like this?

	SINGULAR	
	magna	poeta
N/V.	magna	poeta
GEN.	magnae	poetae
DAT.	magnae	poetae
ACC.	magnam	poetam
ABL.	magna	poeta
	PLURAL	
N/V.	magnae	poetae
GEN.	magnarum	poetarum
DAT.	magnis	poetis
ACC.	magnas	poetas
ABL.	magnis	poetis

The answer is "no", because the forms "magna, magnae" etc. are feminine in gender because adjectives use first declension endings to become feminine in gender but the noun "poeta" is masculine. Therefore the adjective will have to use endings from another declension and the forms will not look alike. You'll see all this in the next two chapters. But remember: agreement means having the same number, gender, and case, not having the same endings. Okay?

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

tua, mea The words "tua", which means "your" and "mea", which means "my" are the first and second person singular possessive adjectives, and they consequently must "agree" in number, gender and case with whatever is being possessed. "tu-" and "me-" are the stems of the word, and the "-a" is the adjectival suffix. What causes students concern is that they can't quite bring themselves to make the adjectival suffix of the singular possessive adjectives plural. For example, they balk at "meae rosae" (my roses), because they assume somehow that the entire word "me-" must become plural. This isn't necessary. Think of it this way: the "me-" or "tu-" part of these words refer you to the person doing the possessing, the adjectival suffix refers to whatever is being possessed.

12/31/92

15

CHAPTER 3

"Second Declension; Masculine Nouns and Adjectives; Word Order"

THE SECOND DECLENSION

A declension is a pattern of endings for the different cases and numbers which a noun falls through. Latin has five declension, though the great majority of nouns fall into the first three. In this chapter, you'll learn one part of the second declension. (You'll get the other part of the second declension in Chapter 4.) Let's look again at a paradigm for the first declension endings and compare them to endings of the second declension. Decline the noun "puella, -ae (f)".

	puella, -ae (f)	amicus, -i (m)
Nom.	_____	amicus
Gen.	_____	amici
Dat.	_____	amico
Acc.	_____	amicum
Abl.	_____	amico
Voc.	_____	amice
N/V.	_____	amici
Gen.	_____	amicorum
Dat.	_____	amicis
Acc.	_____	amicos
Abl.	_____	amicis

As you can plainly see, "-a-" is the dominant vowel of the first declension. With the exception of the dative and ablative plural, all the case endings have an "-a-" in them. Now let's compare the first declension with the second. Although it's a little more difficult to see in places, the dominant vowel of the second declension is "-o-". Once you see this difference between the first and second declension, you can detect some of the similarities.

1. the accusative singular of both declensions adds "-m" to the thematic vowel: "-am" and "-um" (originally "-om").
2. the ablative singular is just the long thematic vowel: "-a-" and "-o-".
3. the genitive plural is the ending "-rum" added to the thematic vowel: "-arum" and "-orum".
4. the dative and ablative plural are formed alike: First Declension: "a-" + "-is" = "-ais" = "-is" Second Declension: "o-" + "-is" = "-ois" = "-is"
5. the accusative plural in both declensions is the thematic vowel + "-s:" "-as" and "-os".

So let's set out the cases endings for the second declension:

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Nom.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____
Voc.	_____	_____

2ND DECLENSION NOUNS IN -ER AND -IR; STEM CHANGES

As I said, this is the basic pattern of endings for nouns of the second declension, and all second declension nouns will basically use these endings. There are second declension nouns, however, which do not follow this pattern precisely, but which use slight variations of it. To begin with, not all second declension nouns end in "-us" in the nominative singular. Some end in "-er" and one common noun ends in "-ir". So go back to the blank for the nominative singular and add the variant nominative endings "-er" and "-ir".

Let's have a look at a second declension noun that ends in "-er" in the nominative singular: "puer, -i (m)" (boy). Just to review, how do you know that this noun belongs to the second declension? The answer is the genitive singular ending listed as the second entry. It's "-i", the genitive singular ending of the second declension. So what will the form of "puer" be in the genitive singular? That's easy too. It'll be "pueri", (stem + "-i). Now let's decline "puer" through all its cases in both numbers.

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Nom.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____
Voc.	_____	_____

Let's try another second declension noun which ends in "-er" in the nominative singular: "ager, agri (m)" (field). The nominative is the "-er" type you saw in "puer", but look at the genitive singular. Instead of just giving you an abbreviation for the genitive singular ending -- "-i" -- the dictionary is telling you something more. Here you have a full form, "agri", for the genitive entry of the noun. The case ending obviously is "-i", so the noun belongs to second declension. If you take off the genitive singular ending "-i" you're left with "agr-", and what's that?

We need to pause here and refine what we mean by a "stem" of a noun. As you probably recall, the stem of a noun is the basic form of the noun to which you then add the case endings. But despite the attractive notion that the "stem" of a noun is the nominative singular minus the case ending, a stem of a noun is really the form which is the root of all cases except the nominative singular. This is not to say that the nominative singular will never be the true stem of the word. In some declensions it is. But not always. Look at "ager" again. The stem of the word is found not by looking at the nominative entry, but by dropping the genitive singular ending from "agri", leaving "agr-". So the true stem of this word is "agr-", not "ager-". Hence we say that "ager" is a stem changing noun, or that it has a stem change. This is because the stem is not apparent in the nominative entry. Let's decline "ager, agri (m)". Remember, the stem is "agr-":

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
N/V.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____

Can you see now why it's important that a dictionary begin to decline the noun for you by giving you the genitive singular? If you weren't given "agri", after "ager", you wouldn't know the declension of the noun, nor would you know that "ager-" is not the true stem. If a noun is not a stem-changing noun, then the dictionary will simply put the genitive ending in the second entry. But if it's a stem changing noun, the dictionary must indicate that. Examine the following nouns and see how the dictionary conveys the necessary information.

ENTRY	STEM	MEANING
gener, -i (m)	gener-	son-in-law
magister, -tri (m)	magistr-	teacher
socer, -i (m)	socer-	father-in-law
liber, -bri (m)	libr-	book
vesper, -i (m)	vesper-	evening
signifer, -i (m)	signifer-	standard bearer

The noun "vir, -i (m)" represents another class of second declension nominative singular endings. Is there a stem change indicated in the genitive singular? No, there isn't, so it behaves just like "puer". Decline it.

17

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
N/V.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____

NOUNS ENDING IN -IUS

Nouns whose stem ends in an "-i-" need a closer look. "Filius, -ii (m)" is a second declension noun and the stem is "fili-" ("filius" minus the "-i" of the genitive singular). But the second entry has an extra "-i". What's that all about? Don't be disturbed. Often when a stem ends in an "-i-" the dictionary likes to reassure you that despite its odd appearance, the genitive singular form really ends with two "i's": "filii". Similarly, the dative and ablative plurals: "filiis". It may look odd, but there was a noticeable difference in the way the two "i's" would have been pronounced. The first is short, the second is long, so "filii", would have be pronounced "FEE leh ee". But in fact even the Romans weren't very comfortable with this arrangement, and often the "i's" were simplified to one long "-i-" to "fili" or "filis". To be consistent, Wheelock always uses the double "i".

In the vocative singular, however, the "i" at the end of the stem does cause a change. "Filius" is an "-us" ending second declension noun so the vocative singular should be "filie". But short "i" and short "e" are so similar in sound that some simplification was inevitable. The final form is not "filie" but "fili". So also in the name "Virgilius": not "Virgilie", but "Virgili". Decline "filius, -ii (m)".

	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Nom.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____
Voc.	_____	

ADJECTIVES

Let's review for a moment. You remember that adjectives are words which qualify nouns, and that an adjective will "agree" with the noun it modifies. By "agreeing" we mean that it will have the same number, gender, and case as the noun it's modifying. You also know that an adjective must be able to modify nouns of all three genders, and that to modify a feminine noun an adjective uses the case endings from the first declension. For example, translate and decline "great wisdom". "Wisdom" in Latin is "sapientia, -ae (f)", a feminine noun of the first declension, as you can tell from the entry. "Great" is the adjective modifying "wisdom" so it must agree in number, gender and case with "sapientia". The stem of the adjective is "magn-", and the case endings you must use are those of the first declension, since "sapientia" is feminine.

SINGULAR

	great	wisdom
N/V.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____

PLURAL

N/V.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____

What happens when an adjective needs to modify a masculine noun? To modify a masculine noun an adjective uses the case endings from the second declension. That's fine and good, but we have a problem. Which of the three singular nominative forms of the second declension do they use: "-us", "-er", or "-ir?" The answer is that some adjectives will us "-us" and some will use "-er". (None use "-ir".) All the adjectives we'll be looking at for the next two chapters use the "-us" ending and decline after that pattern. In chapter five you'll get the "-er" type, so I'll postpone discussion of that kind until then (although there's nothing really very complicated about it). Let's suppose you want to modify the noun "poeta, -ae (m) with adjective for "great?" Look up "great" in the dictionary and write down what you see. (Make sure you look it up! I'll wait right here.)

great _____

Now what kind of an entry is this? The convention for listing an adjective is different from that for a noun. The first entry tells you how an adjective modifies a masculine noun, the second tells you how it modifies a feminine noun, and the third how it modifies a neuter noun (and we'll learn about that in the next chapter). So let's look at the first entry: "magnus" tells you that the adjective uses the "-us" type endings from the second declension to modify a masculine noun; the "-a", which stands for the nominative singular of the first declension, tells you that it uses first declension endings to modify feminine nouns; the "-um" tells you which endings to use for neuter nouns. Now, how did you find the stem of "-us" type nouns of the second declension? Do you remember? You simply drop off the "-us" ending, and that's the stem. What's the stem of the adjective "magnus, -a, -um?" I hope you guessed "magn-". So an entry like this is a short-hand way of saying this:

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
	-us	-a	-um
	-i	-ae	
	-o	-ae	
	-um	-am	
	-o	-a	
	-e	-a	
magn- +			
	-i	-ae	
	-orum	-arum	
	-is	-is	
	-os	-as	
	-is	-is	

So decline "great poet". (WARNING: Remember that agreement means same number, gender, and case; not form which look alike!)

	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
	great	poet	great	poets
Nom.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Voc.	_____	_____	_____	_____

APPOSITION

Consider this English sentence: "Daniel, my brother, you were older than me [sic]". You can easily see that "brother" is giving you more information about "Daniel"; that is, "brother" is modifying or qualifying "Daniel". In this sense, at least,

"brother" is acting like an adjective. But since "brother" is a noun, not an adjective, it cannot qualify another noun in quite the same way an adjective does. We call this modifying relationship between nouns "apposition". We would say "brother" is in "apposition" to "Daniel".

In Latin also, nouns can be set in apposition to each other for modification. So one noun is modifying another noun -- something like an adjective modifying a noun. But, obviously a noun cannot agree with the noun it's modifying the same way an adjective does. And why not? Nouns all have gender inherent in them, so a noun can never change its gender to a agree in gender with a noun it's modifying. But it can agree with the noun it's modifying in case, and it will. In Latin, when a noun is in apposition to another noun, the noun doing the modifying will agree with the modified noun in case. "Gaium, meum filium, in agris video". (I see Gaius, my son, in the fields.) "Gaium" is accusative because it's the direct object of the verb "video". Therefore the word for "son" must also be in the accusative case, since it's telling us more about Gaius, and Gaius, as the object of the verb "to see", is in the accusative case.

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

de + abl.; in + abl.	Like English, prepositions in Latin will take the noun they're governing in a case other than the nominative. We wouldn't say in English "with I" or "to she:" we say "with me" and "to her". But in Latin, some prepositions will have to be followed by the accusative case; others by the ablative case. (And some can be followed by both, though the meaning changes slightly.) Therefore, whenever you learn a preposition, you must also memorize the case it takes.
pauci, -ae	This is an adjective, but unlike others adjectives, the word for "few" has no singular forms. (That's logical.) So the dictionary starts its listing in the nominative plural. As you can see, the "-i" and the "-ae" endings are the second and first declension nominative plural endings. So this adjective declines like "magnus, -a, -um" with the exception that it has no singular forms.
meus, -a, [-um]	The adjective means "my", and it agrees with whatever is being owned. The stem is "me-". It has an irregular vocative singular ending. Instead of "mee", you have "mi". So it's "mi amice" for "Hey, my friend".
Romanus, -a, [-um]	This is an adjective, but it can be used as a noun. Like "American". It's an adjective -- like "American Pie" -- but it can also be used for a person: "she's an American", or "The Americans are coming". Hence, "Romani" can mean "the Romans", and "Romana" can mean a "Roman woman". On the other hand, we can also say "Romana patria": "the Roman fatherland"; or "Romani libri": "Roman books".

12/31/92

2°

CHAPTER 4

"Neuters of the Second Declension; Summary of Adjectives; Present Indicative of Sum; Predicate Nouns and Adjectives"

Despite its lengthy title, you'll find that much of this chapter only adds incrementally to concepts you've already learned. That's the way it's going to be for most of these chapters. Now that you've learned the basics, the details will be much easier for you to grasp.

NEUTERS OF THE SECOND DECLENSION

The second declension is the pattern of cases ending which has an "-o-" for its thematic vowel. The nominative singular has three possible forms -- "-us", "-er", and "-ir". Sometimes nouns which end in "-er" in the nominative undergo a stem change from the nominative to the genitive singular. To find the real stem of the noun, you simply drop off the genitive ending "-i" from the second entry in the dictionary. Finally, you may remember that the vast majority of nouns ending in "-us", "-er", and "-ir" in the nominative singular are masculine.

What you learned in the last chapter was not the whole story on the second declension. The second declension is divided into two parts: the part you know, and a set of endings which you're going to learn now. This second part contains only neuter nouns. This is important to remember. Unlike the first declension and the first part of the second, whose nouns could be either feminine or masculine, all nouns which follow this second part of the second declension are neuter. Next, the endings of this pattern are nearly identical to those of the second declension you already know. The differences are that (1) the nominative singular ending is always "-um"; (2) the stem is found by dropping off nominative "-um" ending and there is never a stem change; (3) the neuter nominative and accusative plural endings are "-a". You don't have to worry about the vocative singular; it's the same as the nominative singular. Remember, the only place in Latin where the vocative differs from the nominative is in the singular of "-us" ending second declension nouns and adjectives.

A dictionary entry for a noun of this type will look like this: "x"um, -i (n) (where "x" is the stem). Since there is never a stem change, the second entry only gives you the genitive singular ending so that you can see the declension of the noun. The "-um" of the nominative singular and then the "-i" in the genitive tell you that the noun is a neuter noun of the second declension, and that it therefore fits into the subcategory of the second declension. Here are some examples for you to decline and a second declension noun of the "us" type for comparison:

	numerus, -i (m)	periculum, -i (n)	consilium, -ii (n)
Nom.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____
Voc.	_____		
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

There are a couple of hard and fast rules pertaining to the inflection of all neuter nouns, no matter which declension they belong to, which you may want to commit to memory:

1. the nominative and accusative forms of neuters nouns are always like each other, and
2. the nominative plural -- and hence neuter plural because of rule (1) -- is always a short "-a".

ADJECTIVES

You recall that adjectives are words which modify nouns, and that in Latin an adjective must agree with the noun it's

modifying. By "agreeing", we mean it must have the same number, gender, and case. An adjective acquires number and case by declining through a declension -- just like nouns -- but how does an adjective change gender? An adjective changes gender by using different declensional patterns. If an adjective needs to modify a feminine noun, it uses endings from the first declension; if it has to modify a masculine noun, it uses the second declension endings which are used by "-us" and "-er" ending nouns. So how do you imagine will an adjective modify a neuter noun? Let's look at a dictionary entry for a typical adjective: "magnus, -a, -um".

The first entry, as you recall, tells you which declension the adjective uses to modify a masculine noun. It tells you by giving you the nominative singular ending of the declension it uses. The second entry is the nominative singular ending of the declension the adjective uses to modify a feminine noun. The third entry is the nominative singular of the declension the adjective uses to modify a neuter noun.

So how does the adjective "magnus, -a, -um" modify a neuter noun? It uses the "-um" neuter endings of the second declension, so "magnus", when it's modifying a neuter noun, will follow the same pattern as a noun like "periculum, -i (n). Write out all the possible forms of the adjective "great". (Check your work against Wheelock, p. 18.)

"magnus, -a, -um"

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
Nom.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____
Voc.	_____		
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

THE VERB "TO BE"

As in most languages, the verb "to be" in Latin is irregular -- i.e., it doesn't follow the normal pattern of conjugation of other verbs. Wheelock says it's best just to memorize the forms by sheer effort and rote. That's a perfectly acceptable suggestion. But the verb is actually much more regular than it may first appear. If you wish, you may try to follow my discussion about the verb to get a glimpse behind its seemingly bizarre appearance. If not, just memorize the forms outright and skip over the paragraphs in between the lines of asterisks.

****

For those of you going on with me, let's recall a couple of things. A verb conjugates by adding personal endings to the stem of the verb. You find the stem of the verb by dropping of the "-re" ending of the infinitive, and what you're left with is the stem. The final vowel of the stem tells you the conjugation of the verb: "-a-" for a first conjugation, "-e-" for the second conjugation, etc. So let's have a look at the infinitive of the verb "to be" to find its stem. The infinitive is "esse". What kind of an infinitive is this?

We need to back up a little. Although you were told otherwise, the real infinitive ending of a Latin verb is not "-re" at all, but "-se". Why does the "-se" become "-re"? It's an invariable rule of Latin pronunciation that an "-s-" which is caught between two vowels -- we call it "intervocalic" -- turns into a "-r-". So the reason "laudare" is not "laudase" is that the original intervocalic "-s-" became an "-r-". So let's look again at the infinitive for the verb "to be": "esse". If we drop off the infinitive ending "-se", we're left with the stem "es-" for the verb. But the stem has no final vowel. For this reason we call "esse" an "athematic verb", because its stem ends in a consonant, not a vowel, as other verbs do. To conjugate the verb, we should therefore add the personal endings directly to the final "-s" of the stem. This is what the formula should be (don't fill in the conjugated form yet).

STEM + PERSONAL ENDING = CONJUGATED FORM

22

1st	es	+	m	=	_____
2nd	es	+	s	=	_____
3rd	es	+	t	=	_____
1st	es	+	mus	=	_____
2nd	es	+	tis	=	_____
3rd	es	+	nt	=	_____

Try to pronounce the final form for the first person singular "esm". Do you hear how you're automatically inserting a "u" sound to make the word pronounceable? It sounds like "esum". Try to pronounce "esmus". The same thing happens between the "s" and the "m". You almost have to insert a "u". Now pronounce "esnt". Same thing, right? This is what happened to these forms. Over time, a "u" sound became a part of the conjugation of the verb, and the initial "e-" of the stem of all the forms with this "u" was lost. (I can't account for that.) Write out the resulting forms. Now look at the remaining forms. Is there any trouble adding an "s" or a "t" to the final "s-" of the stem? No. In fact, in the second person singular, the "s" of the personal ending just gets swallowed up by the "s" of the stem: "es + s = es". Where there was no complication in pronouncing the forms, the "e-" of the stem stayed. Now write out the remaining forms of "to be" in Latin.

****

As with other Latin verbs, the basic form of "to be" is considered to be the first person singular, and that's how the verb will be listed in the dictionary, followed by the infinitive: "sum, esse". So when I want to refer to the Latin verb "to be", I'll say the verb "sum". You can also see why it's going to be important to memorize all these forms well. You can't look up "estis" or "es". You must reduce these conjugated forms to a form that will appear in the dictionary: you must know that these forms are from "sum".

THE SENTENCE: SUBJECT AND PREDICATE

We divide sentences into two parts: the subject, which is what's being talked about, and the predicate, what's being said about the subject. Basically, the subject is the subject of the verb, and the predicate is the verb and everything after it. For example, in the sentence "Latin drives me crazy because it has so many forms", "Latin" is the subject, and everything else is the predicate. Of course, the full story of subject and predicate is more involved than this, but this will get us by for now.

PREDICATE NOMINATIVES, TRANSITIVE AND INTRANSITIVE VERBS

In Latin the subject of a verb is in the nominative case. You know that. So it may seem to follow that, if the subject of the verb is the subject of the sentence, that the nominative case should be entirely limited to the subject of the sentence. That is, we shouldn't expect there ever to be a noun in the nominative case in the predicate. Nouns in the nominative case should be the subject of verbs, and the subject of verbs is in the subject clause of the sentence, not in the predicate. But we do find nouns in the nominative in the predicate. When we do, we call them, logically enough, "predicate nominatives". How does it happen that a nominative case shows up in the predicate, after the verb?

We divided verbs into two broad classes: verbs which transfer action and energy from the subject to something else (the object), and verbs in which there is no movement of energy from one place to another. Consider this sentence: "George kicked the ball". Here George expended energy -- he kicked -- and this energy was immediately applied to an object -- the ball -- which was changed as a result of what George did to it. We call a verb like this a "transitive" verb and the object affected by it the direct object. In Latin, the direct object of a transitive verb is put into the accusative case. Now look at this sentence: "The river is wide". Is the river doing anything in this sentence to anything else? Does the verb "is" imply that the subject is acting on something else? No. There is no movement of activity from the subject to something else. Verbs like this are called "intransitive" and don't take direct objects. In Latin that means they are not followed by an accusative case. Some more examples of this: "The dog was running away", "We'll all laugh", "The clown didn't seem very happy".

Sometimes it's hard to tell whether a verb in English is transitive or intransitive. A rule of thumb is this. Ask yourself, "Can I 'x' something?" (where "x" is the verb you're investigating). If the answer is "yes" then the verb is transitive; if "no" then it's intransitive. "Can I see something?" Yes; therefore the verb "to see" is transitive. "Can I fall something?" No; therefore "to fall" is intransitive.

THE COPULATIVE VERB "SUM"

The verb "to be" is obviously an intransitive verb -- there is no movement of energy from the subject to an object -- but it has an interesting additional property. What are we actually doing when we use the verb "to be?" We are in effect modifying the subject with something in the predicate. In the sentence "The river is wide", "river" is the subject and "wide" is an adjective in the predicate that is modifying "river". Even though it's on the other side of the verb and in the predicate, it's directly tied to the subject. In Latin, therefore, what case would "wide" be in? Think of it this way. "Wide" is an adjective, and it's modifying the "river", even though it's in the predicate. Adjectives in Latin must agree in number, gender and case with the nouns they modify, so "wide" has to be in the nominative case. It's modifying "river", right? What the verb "to be" does is to

tie or link the subject directly to something in the predicate, and for that reason we call the verb "to be" a "linking" or "copulative" verb. This principle has a special application in Latin, which has a full case system. When the verb "sum" links the subject with an adjective in the predicate, the adjective agrees with the subject.

```
Donum      est   magnum.      Dona      sunt  magna.

nominative =  nominative   nominative  =   nominative
neuter     =  neuter       neuter      =   neuter
singular   =  singular     plural      =   plural
```

When "sum" links the subject with a noun in the predicate, however, we have a bit of a problem. Nouns have fixed gender, so the noun in the predicate can't agree with the subject noun in quite the same way an adjective can. A noun in the predicate has its own gender which it cannot change. But a noun in the predicate which is tied to the subject by "sum", will agree with the subject in case. Think of the verb "sum" as an equal sign, with the same case on both sides.

```
Mea vita      est    bellum (war).
nominative     =    nominative
feminine       ~     neuter
singular       =     singular
```

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

Look at these two dictionary listings:

```
1.   bellum, -i (n) "war"
2.   bellus, -a, -um "beautiful"
```

The first is an entry for a noun, the second an entry for an adjective. What are the differences? An entry for a noun starts with the nominative singular form, then it gives you the genitive singular. It actually starts to decline the noun for you so that you can tell the noun's declension and whether the noun has any stem changes you should be worried about. The final entry is the gender, since nouns have fixed gender which you must be given. For a noun, therefore, you must be given

1. the nominative form,
2. the stem,
3. the declension, and
4. the gender.

An entry for an adjective, by contrast, has different information to convey. For an adjective, you must know which declension it'll use to modify nouns of different gender, and that's what the "-us, -a, -um" is telling you. But there is an important omission from the adjective listing. There is no gender specified, and how could there be, adjectives change their gender. As you'll see later, this is the one sure sign that a word you're looking at is an adjective: if it has declension endings listed but no gender.

You may also be concerned that, given the similar appearance of these two words, you may mix them up in your sentences. Certainly there will be some overlap of the two forms. For example, "bella" is a possible form of the noun "bellum" and the adjective "bellus, -a, -um". But there are also many forms which "bellus, -a, -um" can have which "bellum, -i (n)" can never have. For example, "bellarum" can't possibly come from a second declension neuter noun. Neither can "bellae", "bellas", "bellos", "bella", and some others. If you see "bell- something" in your text, first ask yourself whether the case ending is a possible form from the neuter noun for war. If not, then it's from the adjective for "pretty". In the instances where the forms do overlap, you'll have to let context and your good judgment tell you which it is.

12/31/92

CHAPTER 5

"First and Second Conjugations: Future Indicative Active; Adjectives of the First and Second Declension in -er"

FUTURE TENSE OF FIRST AND SECOND CONJUGATION VERBS

When you want to put an English verb into the future tense, you use the stem of the verb and put "will" in front of it: "I see" becomes "I will see"; "They have" becomes "They will have"; etc. We call the additional word "will" a "helping verb", or, more learnedly, an "auxiliary verb". No matter what you call it, the "will" is modifying the way the listener will understand the action of the verb "to see" and "to have". In Latin, the future tense is formed differently, but it still involves the addition of something to the stem of the verb. The formula for forming the future tense of first and second conjugation verbs in Latin is this: "stem + be + personal endings". The stem of the verb, you remember, is what's left after you've dropped off the "-re" of the infinitive (the stem includes the stem vowel). The "-be-" is the sign of the future and is attached directly to the stem. Then you add the normal personal endings you used in the present tense directly to the tense sign "be". So let's start to conjugate the future tense of a first and second conjugation verb. Here are the tables. (Don't fill in the conjugated form just yet.)

I. FUTURE OF THE FIRST CONJUGATION: laudo, laudare

STEM	+	TENSE SIGN	+	PERS. END.	=	CONJUGATED FORM
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____

II. FUTURE OF THE SECOND CONJUGATION: moneo, monere

STEM	+	TENSE SIGN	+	PERS. END.	=	CONJUGATED FORM
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____
_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____

All this seems quite logical and straight-forward. But these is one glitch: the short "-e-" of the tense sign "-be-" undergoes some radical changes when you start attaching the personal endings.

1. Before the "-o" of the first person singular, the short "-e-" disappears completely, leaving "-bo".
2. Before the "-nt" of the third person plural, it becomes a "-u-", leaving the form "-bunt".
3. And before all the other endings, it becomes an "-i-", for "-bis", "-bit", "-bimus", and "-bitis".

As you can see, the short "-e-" in fact never stays what it is in any of these forms. And you may very well be wondering to yourself why I'm showing you all this. Why can't you simply memorize the future endings as "-bo", "-bis", "-bit", "-bimus", "-bitis", and "-bunt", without having to look any farther back into its history. The answer is you can certainly remember just the final forms if you wish, but this problem of the short "-e-" changing to other vowels occurs repeatedly in Latin, and instead of memorizing by rote each time you come across it, it just seems easier to learn the rule governing the changes, rather than encountering the changes each time as unique phenomena. It's hard to believe now, but knowing the deeper rules will make your lives simpler in the future. Now that you know the rules, go back and fill in the conjugated forms of the

future tense.

FIRST AND SECOND DECLENSION ADJECTIVES IN -ER

Look at this adjective: "stultus, -a, -um". Do you remember what this entry is telling you? An adjective spans the first and second declensions to get the endings it needs to modify nouns of different genders. This entry is telling you that the adjective for "stupid" (stem: "stult-") uses second declension "-us" type endings when it modifies masculine nouns, first declension endings when it modifies feminine nouns, and the "-um" category of neuter endings of the second declension to modify neuter nouns.

Now let's look a little more closely at the second declension. It has two parts, you may remember: the section reserved entirely for neuter nouns -- those ending in "-um" in the nominative singular -- and the section used by masculine and feminine nouns (the vast majority are masculine). There is a variety of nominative singular endings in this second group: "-us", "-er", and "-ir". The nouns which followed the "-us" type second declension presented two problems: to find the stem, you simply dropped off the "-us" ending of the nominative case. But for the second declension nouns which ended in "-er" in the nominative singular, you had to be more careful. For some of them, the stem was the form of the nominative singular, but for others the "-e-" of the "-er" dropped out from the stem. Then you used the reduced form for all the other cases. The dictionary has to tell you which "-er" ending nouns had stem changes, and it does so in the in second entry for the noun.

```
puer, -i (m)
liber, -bri (m)
ager, agri (m)
```

The stem of "puer" is "puer-", the stem of "liber" is "libr-", the stem of "ager" is "agr-". Okay, so much by way of review.

Now look at this word as it appears in the dictionary: "liber, -a, -um". What is this? Is it a noun or an adjective? You can tell it's an adjective because there is no gender listed for it. (Remember, an adjective has to be able to change its gender, so it has no fixed gender, as a noun does.) An entry for an adjective has to tell you how it will acquire different genders -- which declensional pattern it will use to become masculine, feminine and neuter -- and, you may recall, the first entry shows you the masculine nominative, the second the feminine nominative, and the third the neuter nominative.

So have a look again at this adjective. The second entry looks familiar -- it's the nominative singular ending of the first declension. This tells you that the adjective "liber" become feminine by using first declension endings. The "-um" should look familiar, too. That's its neuter ending, telling you it uses the "-um" endings of the second declension to modify neuter nouns. But what's the first entry? You know that this is telling you how the adjective becomes masculine, but what about the "-er".

You've probably already figured out by now that the adjective is going to use the second declension endings to modify masculine nouns, and that it's going to use the "-er" ending in the nominative singular. So for "free soul", you would write "liber animus". But what is the stem of the adjective? Remember that "-er" ending nouns of the second declension often change their stems when they move out of the nominative singular. The dictionary tells you about that in the second entry for the adjective in the genitive singular. That is, the dictionary actually starts declining it for you. But how will it tell you whether an adjective in "-er" has a stem change?

The rule is this. An adjective in "-er" which changes its stem (i.e., drops the "-e") will use the changed stem in all genders and numbers and cases except for the nominative masculine singular. So all you need to see to know whether the adjective is going to change its stem is the next entry -- the feminine nominative singular -- to know about the stem. Look at this entry.

```
          M        F        N

pulcher, -chra, -chrum
```

There, do you see it? The second entry shows you not only how the adjective becomes feminine, but also that the stem for all other cases except the masculine nominative singular is "pulchr-". Look as this adjective: "noster, nostra, nostrum". Stem change, right? Now look at this again: "liber, -a, -um". There is no stem change since it is not indicated in the second entry. So the stem is "liber-" throughout its inflection. Let's do a few exercises. Translate and decline the following.

	beautiful	fatherland	our	son
Nom.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____	_____

Voc.			_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____	_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

animus, -i (m)
In the singular the word means "soul, spirit", the vapory seat of self-awareness. But in the plural it often takes on another meaning. It may mean "courage", like our expression "high spirits", "spirited", as in "The losing team put up a spirited struggle". It happens often in Latin that a word will acquire new meanings in the plural. C.p., the meaning of the English word "manner" in the singular with its meaning in the plural: "manners".

noster, -tra, -trum
This is an adjective which means "our". That is, the adjective agrees with the thing that is "ours". Therefore, it has a plural form only if the noun it's agreeing with is plural. Students are often lured into thinking that "noster" will have only plural case endings because "our" is first person plural. Remember, "noster" will have plural cases endings only if it's agreeing with a plural noun: "noster filius" (our son) or "nostri filii" (our sons).

igitur
Wheelock tells you it's post-positive: it never is the first word in a Latin sentence (and it's usually the second word.) Despite our tendency to put the English "therefore" at the beginning of the sentence, "igitur" is never first. Remember.

-ne
We form questions in English by juggling word order around, and by using auxiliary verbs. But Latin doesn't have that option since word order doesn't work in the same way. To ask a question in Latin, put "-ne" at the end of the first word of the sentence. The word to which it is attached becomes the point of inquiry of the question: "Amasne me?" (Do you love me?), "Mene amas?" (Is it me you love (and not someone else)?)

propter + acc.
As you know, prepositions in Latin take certain cases. "Propter" takes the accusative case -- always -- and we translate it, "because of". Don't be thrown off by our English translation. "Propter" does not take the genitive case in Latin. It takes the accusative.

satis
When we say "I have enough money", we use "enough" as an adjective modifying "money". In Latin the word for "enough" is a noun, not an adjective. Latin follows "satis" with the genitive case, and says in effect "I have enough of money" (Habeo satis pecuniae.) You'll be pleased to know that "satis" does not decline -- it is always "satis".

12/31/92

27

CHAPTER 6

"Sum: Future and Imperfect Indicative; Possum: Present, Future, and Imperfect Indicative; Complementary Infinitive"

The two verbs which are the subject of this chapter are closely related -- "possum" ("to be able") uses the forms of the verb "sum" ("to be") -- so you don't have to learn two separate irregular verbs outright. You can tie them together.

SUM, ESSE: FUTURE TENSE

You have already learned the present tense of the irregular verb "sum". And those of you who followed my expanded notes on these forms know the whole truth about the present tense. Those of you who skipped them, I recommend you go back to that section and read them now. They will help you with this discussion.

Do you remember how you formed the future tense of the first and second conjugation verbs? It was something like this:

```
stem + tense sign + personal endings = conjugated forms
```

The verb "sum" follows this formula exactly, but it has a tense sign for the future you haven't seen before. Let's start at the beginning.

1. The stem of the verb "to be" is "es-".
2. The tense sign for the future is short "-e-". For the first and second conjugations, the tense sign of the future was "be-", and the short "-e-" of the tense sign underwent changes when the personal endings were added to it. Do you remember what they were? The short "-e-" future tense sign will undergo the same changes.
3. The personal endings are the same you've been using all along: "-o" or "-m", "-s", "-t" etc.

So let's set up a construction table for the future of "sum". For now, fill in all the information except the conjugated form.

FUTURE TENSE: "sum, esse"

	STEM	+	TENSE SIGN	+	PERS. END.	=	CONJUGATED FORMS
1st	_____		_____		_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____		_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____		_____		_____
1st	_____		_____		_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____		_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____		_____		_____

There is one more thing you need to know before you can finish this off. It's a rule of Latin pronunciation that whenever an "-s-" is between two vowels (when it's "intervocalic", as the professionals say), it changes from "-s-" to "-r-". Now look at the stem of "sum". "Es-" plus the tense sign "-e-" will put the "-s-" between two vowels, so the "-s-" of the stem will become an "-r-": "ese-" = "ere-". That, then, will be the base to which you add the personal endings. Now fill out the conjugated forms -- and remember the changes the short "-e-" is going to go through. (Check Wheelock, p. 27.)

SUM, ESSE: IMPERFECT TENSE

The imperfect tense is a new tense for you, and we're not going to look very deeply into it here. For now, just remember that the imperfect tense of "sum" is our "was" and "were". At least don't call this the past tense; call it the imperfect tense. The imperfect tense is formed along the same lines as the future tense:

```
stem + tense sign + personal endings = conjugated forms
```

Obviously, since this is a different tense, the tense sign is not going to be the same as the future tense sign. The tense sign of the imperfect is "-a-". One other slight difference is that the imperfect tense uses the alternate first person singular ending: "-m" instead of the expected "-o". And don't forget the rule of "-s-": when it's intervocalic, it changes to "-r-". Fill out the following table:

IMPERFECT TENSE: "sum, esse"

	STEM	+	TENSE SIGN	+	PERS. END.	=	CONJUGATED FORMS
1st							
2nd							
3rd							
1st							
2nd							
3rd							

POSSUM, POSSE: PRESENT, FUTURE, IMPERFECT TENSES

In Latin, the verb "to be able" is a combination of the adjective base "pot-" ("able") plus the forms of the verb "sum". To say "I am able", Latin took the adjective "pot-" and combined it with the present tense of "sum". To say "I will be able", Latin used "pot-" plus the future of "sum". To say "I was able", Latin used "pot-" plus the imperfect of "sum". For the verb "possum", then, it is the verb "sum" provides the person, number, and the tense.

In the present tense, there is one glitch: wherever the verb "sum" starts with an "s-", the "-t-" of "pot-" becomes an "-s-" also. So you see "possum" instead of "potsum" (from "pot + sum"), and so on. (When a consonant turns into the consonant which it is next to, we call this "assimilation". So we would say "t" assimilates to "s".)

The one real oddity of the verb is its infinitive. We might expect "potesse" ("pot + esse") according to the rules, but the form "posse" is just one of those unexpected moments in life where things get out of control. You might want to remember it this way: the English word "posse" is a group of citizens who have been granted power to make arrests: that is, they have "ableness". Fill out the following charts for the verb "possum, posse".

PRESENT TENSE: possum, posse

	ADJECTIVE	+	CONJUGATED FORM OF SUM	=	CONJUGATED FORM
1st	pot				
2nd					
3rd					
1st					
2nd					
3rd					

FUTURE TENSE: possum, posse

	ADJECTIVE	+	CONJUGATED FORM OF SUM	=	CONJUGATED FORM
1st					
2nd					
3rd					
1st					
2nd					
3rd					

IMPERFECT TENSE: possum, posse

	ADJECTIVE	+	CONJUGATED FORM OF SUM	=	CONJUGATED FORM

1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____

The only real difficulty with "possum" is the English translations for it. If you stick with "to be able", "will be able", and "was/were able", you'll get through just fine. But you can also translate "possum" with the English verb "can". But "can", although it is popular in English, is loaded with oddities. For one, it has no future tense -- "I will can??" -- and secondly, the imperfect tense is "could", which is also a conditional of some kind or another in English: "Do you think I could have a dollar?" Try to stay with "to be able" for now, but be aware of the possibilities of "can".

THE COMPLEMENTARY INFINITIVE

If you were to walk up to a stranger and, out of the blue, say "I am able", you'd be answered by a pause. The stranger would be expecting you to complete your thought: "Yes, you're able to do what?" That's because "to be able" requires another verb to complete its sense, and the form the completing verb will have is the infinitive. It needs a completing infinitive (or "complementary infinitive"). This is true in Latin as well. "Possum" in all its forms will be followed by another verb in the infinitive form: "Poterunt videre nostros filios". (They will be able to see our sons.)

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

liber, -bri (m)
How are you going to keep the noun for "book" distinct in your mind from the adjective for "free": "liber, -a, -um". For one, the "-i-" in "liber, -bri (m)" is short, but it's long in "liber, -a, -um". Next, there is a stem change in "liber, -bri (m)" but not in "liber, -a, -um". So if you see an inflected form "libr- something", then you know the word means "book(s)". Remember this by recalling their English derivatives: library is from the stem-changing "liber, -bri (m)", and "liberty" is from "liber" in which there is no stem change. For the most part, derived words come from the stem of the nouns, not the nominative singular.

vitium, -ii (n)
Please don't confuse this with the word for life "vita, -ae, (f)". Keep them straight this way: "vicious", which comes from "vitium", has an "-i-" after the "-t", but "vital", which comes from "vita", does not. "Vitia" means "vices" or "crimes"; "vita" means "life".

Graecus, -a, -um
Like "Romanus, -a, -um", this adjective can be used as a noun: "Graecus" can be translated as "a Greek man", and "Graeca" as "a Greek woman", or as an adjective: "Graecus liber" = "a Greek book".

-que
As Wheelock tells you, this word (called and enclitic because it "leans on" another word and never stands alone in a sentence) is attached to the end of the second word of two that are to be linked. Think of it this way: "x yque" = "x et y".

ubi
If "ubi" comes first in a sentence which is a question, always translate it as "Where". "Ubi es?" (Where are you?) But when it is in the middle of a sentence, it can be translated as either "where" or "when", and does not mean that a question is being asked. You must try them both out to see which of the two possibilities makes the most sense.

insidiae, -arum (f)
We translate this word, although it is always plural in Latin, as the singular "plot", or "treachery". It's going to happen often that ideas which are conceived of as plural in Latin are thought of as singular in English.

12/31/92

30

CHAPTER 7

"Third Declension: Nouns"

The third declension is generally considered to be a "pons asinorum" of Latin grammar. But I disagree. The third declension, aside for presenting you a new list of case endings to memorize, really involves no new grammatical principles you've haven't already been working with. I'll take you through it slowly, but most of this guide is actually going to be review.

CASE ENDINGS

The third declension has nouns of all three genders in it. Unlike the first and second declensions, where the majority of nouns are either feminine or masculine, the genders of the third declension are equally divided. So you really must pay attention to the gender markings in the dictionary entries for third declension nouns. The case endings for masculine and feminine nouns are identical. The case endings for neuter nouns are also of the same type as the feminine and masculine nouns, except for where neuter nouns follow their peculiar rules:

1. the nominative and the accusative forms are always the same, and
2. the nominative and accusative plural case endings are short "-a-".

You may remember that the second declension neuter nouns have forms that are almost the same as the masculine nouns -- except for these two rules. In other words, there is really only one pattern of endings for third declension nouns, whether the nouns are masculine, feminine, or neuter. It's just that neuter nouns have a peculiarity about them. So here are the third declension case endings. Notice that the separate column for neuter nouns is not really necessary, if you remember the rules of neuter nouns.

	Masculine/Feminine	Neuter
N/V.	----------	----------
Gen.	-is	-is
Dat.	-i	-i
Acc.	-em	(same as nom.)
Abl.	-e	-e
N\V.	-es	-a
Gen.	-um	-um
Dat.	-ibus	-ibus
Acc.	-es	-a
Abl.	-ibus	-ibus

Now let's go over some of the "hot spots" on this list. The nominative singular is left blank because there are so many different possible nominative forms for third declension nouns that it would take half a page to list them all. You needn't fret over this though, because the dictionary's first entry for a noun is the nominative singular. You'll have to do a little more memorization with third declension nouns because you simply can't assume that it'll have a certain form in the nominative just because it's third declension -- as you could with first declension nouns, where they all end in "-a" in the nominative.

The same is true for neuter nouns in the nominative singular -- although the possible forms for neuter nominative singulars is much more limited. It's just not worth the effort to memorize them. And remember, the accusative form of neuter nouns will be exactly the form of the nominative, so there's a blank in the accusative slot for neuter nouns. It'll be whatever the nominative is.

STEMS OF THIRD DECLENSION NOUNS

One very distinctive characteristic of nouns of the third declension is that nearly all of them are stem-changing nouns. But the concept of stem-changing nouns is not new for you. You've already worked with it in the second declension with nouns ending in "-er" in the nominative. Look at this entry for a second declension noun: "ager, agri (m)". The first entry for a noun is the nominative singular, the second is the genitive where you learn two things: (1) the declension of the noun (by looking at the genitive ending), and (2) whether there is a stem change from the nominative to the other cases. In this instance we learn that "ager" is a second declension noun -- because the genitive ending is "-i" -- and that there is a stem change. The stem of noun is "agr-", so it'll decline like this:

N/V.	ager	N/V.	agri
Gen.	agri	Gen.	agrorum
Dat.	agro	Dat.	agris
Acc.	agrum	Acc.	agros
Abl.	agro	Abl.	agris

Now look at an example entry for a third declension noun: "rex, regis (m)". Use your experience with second declension "-er" type masculine nouns to draw out all the important information you need about this noun. What's its stem? Now decline

it.

N/V.	rex	+	--	=	rex
Gen.	_____		_____		_____
Dat.	_____		_____		_____
Acc.	_____		_____		_____
Abl.	_____		_____		_____
N/V.	_____		_____		_____
Gen.	_____		_____		_____
Dat.	_____		_____		_____
Acc.	_____		_____		_____
Abl.	_____		_____		_____

How did you do? Check your answers against page 31 in Wheelock. The nominative form is just what's listed in the dictionary -- there is no ending in the nominative singular to add. Next, the stem of "rex" is "reg-", which you get by dropping off the "-is" genitive ending of the third declension from the form "regis" which the dictionary gives. Now decline this noun:

"corpus, corporis (n)".

N/V.	_____	+	_____	=	_____
Gen.	_____		_____		_____
Dat.	_____		_____		_____
Acc.	_____		_____		_____
Abl.	_____		_____		_____
N/V.	_____		_____		_____
Gen.	_____		_____		_____
Dat.	_____		_____		_____
Acc.	_____		_____		_____
Abl.	_____		_____		_____

Did you remember the two rules of neuter nouns? Check your answers on page 31. How are you doing? Try to decline a couple more for some more practice.

	pax, pacis (f)	virtus, virtutis (f)	labor, laboris (m)
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____	_____

32

Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

One of the difficulties beginning students have with third declension nouns is that dictionaries only abbreviate the second entry, where you're given the stem of the noun, and it's often puzzling to see just what the stem is. Look over this list of typical abbreviations. After a very short time, they'll cause you no problem.

ENTRY	STEM	ENTRY	STEM
veritas, -tatis (f)	veritat-	oratio, -onis (f)	oration-
homo, -inis (m)	homin-	finis, -is (f)	fin-
labor, -oris (m)	labor-	libertas, -tatis (f)	libertat-
tempus, -oris (n)	tempor-	senectus, -tutis (f)	senectut-
virgo, -inis (m)	virgin-	amor, -oris (m)	amor-

ENTRY	STEM
corpus, -oris (n)	_____
honor, -oris (m)	_____
humanitas, -tatis (f)	_____
frater, -tris (m)	_____
mutatio, -onis (f)	_____
pater, -tris (m)	_____
pestis, -is (f)	_____
scriptor, -oris (m)	_____
valetudo, -inis (f)	_____
cupiditas, -tatis (f)	_____

MODIFYING THIRD DECLENSION NOUNS

Modifying a third declension noun is nothing to cause any alarm. It's done the same way you modify first and second declension nouns: put the adjective in the same number, gender, and case as the target noun, and away you go. What causes beginners in Latin some discomfort is that they can't quite bring themselves around to modifying a third declension noun with an adjective which uses first and second declension endings.

Let's go through this step by step. Suppose you want to modify the noun "virtus, -tutis (f)" with the adjective "verus, -a, -um". You want to say "true virtue". You know that "virtus" is nominative, feminine and singular, so for the adjective "verus, -a, -um" to agree with it, it must also be feminine, nominative and singular. So look at the adjective's listing closely: how does "verus, -a, -um" become feminine? From the second entry, you see that it uses endings from the first declension to modify a feminine noun. Since "virtus" is feminine, verus" will use first declension endings. You now select the nominative singular ending from the first declension -- "-a" -- and add it to the stem of the adjective. The result: "vera virtus". Try some more. Decline the following expressions.

	evil	time	small city
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

mos, moris (m)
In the plural, "mos" takes on a new meaning: in the singular in means "habit", in the plural "character". This isn't hard to understand. What a person does regularly to the point of being a habit eventually becomes what he is: it becomes his character.

littera, -ae (f)
Like "mos, moris", in the plural "littera" takes on an extended meaning. In the singular it means "a letter of the alphabet"; in the plural it means either "a letter (something you mail to someone)" or "literature". To say "letters", -- as in, "He used to send her many letters" -- Latin used another word. "Litterae" is one letter.

post + acc.
Means "after", but it is only a preposition in Latin, and cannot be used as a conjunction. For the English "after" in this sentence, "post" is not a correct translation: "After I went to the zoo, I went to the movies".

sub + acc./abl.
This preposition, like a few others you'll see, can be followed by the accusative or the ablative case. When it takes the accusative it means motion to and under something; when it takes the ablative it means "position under". "She walked under the tree" -- in the sense that she was not beneath the tree at first but then walked there -- would be "sub" + accusative in Latin; "She sat under the tree" would be "sub" + ablative. Similarly, if you say "She walked under the tree" in the sense that she was walking around under the tree, that would be "sub" + ablative because no motion toward was involved.

12/31/92

CHAPTER 8

"Third Conjugation (duco): Present Infinitive, Present and Future Indicative, Present Imperative Active"

PRESENT INFINITIVE AND PRESENT TENSE

You remember that Latin verbs are divided into groups called "conjugations", and the conjugations are distinguished from one another by their thematic vowels. The thematic vowel of the first conjugation is "-a-"; the thematic vowel of the second is "-e-". You can tell what the stem vowel (its thematic vowel) of a verb is -- and thereby its conjugation -- by dropping the "-re" ending from the infinitive, which is given to you in the dictionary.

```
laudo  laudare       stem: lauda-   1st conjugation
moneo  monere        stem: mone-    2nd conjugation
```

Now look at the dictionary entry for the verb "to lead" in Latin: "duco, ducere". Simply by looking at the first entry, you might think that this verb is going to be a first conjugation verb -- it looks like "laudo". But the next entry looks something like a second. Find the stem: it's duce-. You have to look closely, but the "-e-" of the stem is short. This is the characteristic vowel of the third conjugation: short "-e-".

Even if you're not watching the long marks, you can still tell a second conjugation verb in the dictionary from a third. The first entry for a second conjugation verb will always end in "-eo", and then the second entry will end "-ere". The first dictionary entry of a third conjugation ends simply with "-o" and then the second entry is "-ere". So if the first entry of a verb looks like a first conjugation verb in the first person singular and if the infinitive looks like a second conjugation verb, then you have a third conjugation verb. Identify the conjugations of the following verbs:

ENTRY	CONJUGATION	ENTRY	CONJUGATION
doceo, docere	_____	audeo, audere	_____
amo, amare	_____	tolero, tolerare	_____
duco, ducere	_____	valeo, valere	_____
scribo, scribere	_____	ago, agere	_____

We'll use "duco" as our example (paradigm) of third conjugation verbs. Now let's see about conjugating a third conjugation verb in the present tense. You remember the formula for all verbs in Latin in the present tense: it's just the stem plus the personal endings "-o", "-s", "-t", etc. Fill out the following table, except for the conjugated form.

PRESENT TENSE OF "duco, ducere"

	STEM	+	PERSONAL ENDINGS	=	CONJUGATED FORM
1st	_____		_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____		_____
1st	_____		_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____		_____

What we need to know is what happens to the stem vowel when you start attaching the personal endings. In the first and second declensions this presented no problem, because the stem vowels are long and strongly pronounced. But short vowels always cause difficulties in languages and are subject to changes. You already have experience with what happens to the short "-e-" before personal endings. Do you remember how you form the future tense of first and second conjugation verbs? You insert the tense sign "-b-" in between the stem and the personal endings. And then the short "-e-" changes:

```
laudabo    -    laudabo ("-e-" disappears)
laudabs    -    laudabis
laudabt    -    laudabit
```

laudabmus	-	laudabimus
laudabtis	-	laudabitis
laudabnt	-	laudabunt

This is what happens to short "-e-" before the personal endings. In third conjugation verb, then, what is going to happen to the short "-e-" of its stem? Right. It's going to undergo precisely the same changes. Now go back to the table and fill out the conjugated forms of "duco". (Check the answers in Wheelock, p. 35.)

FUTURE TENSE

Third conjugation verbs form the future tense in a way entirely different from that of the first and second conjugation. First and second conjugation verbs insert a tense sign -- "-be-" between the stem and the personal endings. Third conjugation verbs do two things:

1. For the first person singular, they replace the stem vowel with an "-a-" and use the alternate personal ending "-m" -- instead of the more regular "-o".
2. For all the other forms, they lengthen the short "-e-" of the stem to long "-e-". Since the "-e-" is now long, it no longer goes through any of the changes it went through in the present tense. It simply stays "-e-". (Except of course where long vowels normally become short: before "-t", and "-nt".)

Fill out the future tense of the verb "duco".

	STEM	+	TENSE SIGN	+	PERS. END.	=	CONJUGATED FORMS
1st	duc		_____		_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____		_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____		_____		_____
1st	_____		_____		_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____		_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____		_____		_____

FUTURE OF THIRD CONJUGATION VS. PRESENT OF SECOND CONJUGATION

The way a third conjugation verb forms its future presents an interesting problem. Write out the present tense of the second conjugation verb "moneo, monere", and next to it write out the future of the third conjugation verb "mitto, mittere" (to send).

	moneo	mitto
	PRESENT	FUTURE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

As you can see, except for the first person singular, the endings of both these verbs look the same: the personal endings in both these verbs are preceded by an "-e-". The present tense of a second conjugation verb almost always looks like the future tense of a third conjugation verb, and this could cause you some problems when you're reading and translating. But not if you keep your wits about you.

Suppose that you see a form like this in a text you're reading: "legent". What do you do with it? First you recognize the "-nt" as an ending that's attached to verbs, so the word you're looking at is a verb. You want to look this verb up in the dictionary, so you must simplify it to its basic form, which is the first person singular. You remember that a verb is conjugated by adding personal ending, so to reduce this form, you drop of the "-nt". This leaves you with "lege-".

Now the next thing you have to consider is the "-e-": is it the stem vowel of a second conjugation verb, or is it the lengthened "-e-" of a third conjugation verb as the tense sign for the future? That is, is this a present tense form of a second conjugation verb (stem + personal endings), or is it a future of a third (stem + lengthened "-e-" + personal endings). What do you do next to find out? You've gone as far as you can with you preliminary analysis of the form. Now you have to proceed provisionally.

Suppose that the verb is a second conjugation, what will the dictionary entry look like? The first entry is the first person singular, the second is the infinitive, so, if this is a second conjugation verb, the entry will be "legeo, legere". Right? Because all second conjugation verbs end in "-eo" in the first person singular. So you've reduced the conjugated form "legent" to a form you can look up.

The next step is to look it up -- but look for exactly what you've supposed the form to be. Look for both "legeo", and "legere". Look it up. You didn't find it, did you? But if your analysis was correct, "legeo" must be there. But it's not. What does that tell you? It tells you that "legent" is not a form of a second conjugation verb. (If it were, you would have found "legeo" in the dictionary, but you didn't.) Go back to the other possibility: "legent" could be the future of a third conjugation verb, where the "-e-" is the sign of the future. So if this is correct, what will the dictionary entry be? It'll be "lego, legere". Check it out. This time you found what you were looking for: "lego" means "to read". So how do you translate "legent?"

```
leg-        -e-        -nt
read       will       they
```

Or "they will read".

The moral of this is that your lives used to be fairly simple. An "-e-" before the personal endings always used to indicate a present tense of a second conjugation verb. Now it could mean a future of a third conjugation verb as well. You have to proceed cautiously now, and make sure you have thoroughly mastered your grammar before you start reading. You'll also have to use the dictionary more deliberately and intelligently than you had to before. And that means thinking your forms through before you turn to the dictionary.

IMPERATIVE

Do you remember the formulae you followed for forming the imperative of first and second conjugation verbs? It was this:

```
Singular:      stem  +    0
Plural:        stem  +    te
```

And so you came up with forms like this: "lauda", "laudate", "mone", "monete", etc. Third conjugation verbs follow the same formulae, but don't forget that pesky short "-e-" stem vowel. If there is something added to it, it changes to an "-i-" (or "-u-" before the ending "-nt"); if there is nothing added to it, it stays short "-e-". So how are you going to form the imperative of the verb "mitto?" Think.

```
Singular   mitte  +   0    =   _____
Plural     mitte  +   te   =   _____
```

This is how all third conjugation verbs will form their imperatives -- except for four very common verbs. The verbs "duco", and three other verbs you'll get later, form their singular imperatives by dropping the stem vowel altogether: "duc" not "duce". But the plural imperatives are quite regular: "ducite".

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

scribo, -ere — One way to memorize the conjugation of verbs is to learn them with the proper accentuation. A second conjugation verb is accented on the stem vowel in the infinitive, so say "MOH neh o, moh HEH reh" for the second conjugation verb "moneo, monere". The stress accent on a third conjugation falls on the syllable before the stem vowel. So say, "SREE boh, SCREE beh reh" for the third conjugation verb "scribo, scribere". Similarly "DOO keh re" for "ducere", "MIT teh re" for "mittere" and so on.

copia, -ae (f) — Another one of those words which have a different meaning in the plural. In the singular "copia" means "abundance"; in the

	plural -- copiae, -arum (f) -- it means "supplies, troops, forces".
ad + acc	Means "to" and "toward", always with a sense of "movement to. Students often "ad + acc". with the dative case of indirect object, which we often translate into English with the preposition "to". Contrast these two examples: "I am giving you a dollar ("you" would be dative case) and "I am running to you" ("you" would be in the accusative case governed by "ad").
ex, e + abl.	Students sometimes get hung up on when to use "ex" or "e". Use "ex" before any word you like, but use "e" only before words which start with a consonant. If you wish, use "ex" only. That way, you'll always be right.
ago, agere	An idiom with this verb which Wheelock is going use a lot is "ago vitam", which means "to live" (to lead a life). Another is "ago gratias" + dative, which means "to thank". The person being thanked is in the dative case: "Populus hominibus gratias agent".
duco, ducere	Means "to lead", but can also mean "to think". This extension is logical: we want our leaders to be thinkers too, don't we?

12/31/92

CHAPTER 9

"Demonstrative Pronouns: Hic, Ille, Iste"

ENGLISH: THIS, THESE; THAT, THOSE

Consider the following expressions:

this car	that car
these cars	those cars

The words "this", "these", "that", and "those" are obviously telling you a little something more about "car" or "cars". They are indicating the relative spacial location "car" or "cars" have to the speaker. When we say "this car" or the plural "these cars", we are referring to the car or cars which are nearby: "this car right here"; "these cars right here". For the most part, when we say "that car" or "those cars", we mean cars which are some distance from us: "that car over there", or "those cars over there". It would sound odd for someone to say "that car right here" or "these cars way over there". So the words "this", "these", "that", and "those", are telling us more about the words they're attached to; that is, they qualify or modify their nouns. And we call words which modify other nouns "adjectives".

As you know, in English adjectives hardly ever change their form to "agree" with the thing they're modifying.

"tall tree" and "tall trees"
"bad boys" and "bad girls"

This is different from Latin adjectives, which must change endings to show the different numbers, genders, and cases of the nouns they modify. But look again at the adjectives "this" and "that". When the nouns they modify become plural, the adjective itself changes form: from "this" to "these"; from "that" to "those". These two are the only adjectives in English which actually change their forms to match a grammatical feature of the nouns they're modifying. They have slightly different forms to indicate a change in number of the nouns they modify.

So, these words are adjectives, since they qualify nouns, and since their main purpose is to "point out" the nouns, we call them "demonstrative adjectives" because they "point out" or "point to" (Latin "demonstrare"). This is very important to remember: these words are "demonstrative adjectives".

THE LATIN DEMONSTRATIVE ADJECTIVES: ILLE, HIC, ISTE

Latin also has demonstrative adjectives roughly equivalent to our "this" and "that". Now remember, since these words are adjectives in Latin, they must be able to agree with the nouns they're modifying. Therefore, these demonstrative adjectives must be able to decline to agree with all three different genders. For the most part, the Latin demonstrative adjectives decline just like the adjectives you've see so far. That is, they add the first and second declension endings to their stems. But there are some unexpected irregularities which you simply must memorize:

1. The nominative singulars are irregular.
2. The genitive singular for all genders is "-ius".
3. The dative singular for all genders is "-i".

Keep these irregularities in mind and decline the demonstrative adjective "that". Its dictionary listing includes all the nominatives -- just as an adjective like "magnus, -a, -um" does -- so that you can see its declension pattern. The adjective for "that" is "ille, illa, illud". (You can check your work in Wheelock, p. 39.)

STEM: ill-

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____

Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

As you can see, the inflection of the demonstrative adjective "ille" is quite recognizable after the nominative, genitive and dative singulars. With some more time, however, you'll become well-acquainted with the irregulars forms "-ius" and "-i" of genitive and dative singulars. All the demonstrative adjectives and pronouns in Latin use these alternative genitive and dative singular endings, as do some adjectives. In fact, we call this declensional pattern the "heteroclite" declension, because it seems to be borrowing the genitive and dative singular forms from somewhere else.

Let's turn now to the demonstrative adjective for "this". The stem is "h-", and it follows the pattern set by "ille": unusual nominatives, alternative endings for the genitive and dative singulars. But there are four additional things to note about its declension:

1. In the genitive and dative singulars, the stem lengthens to "hu-" from "h-".
2. In all the singular cases and genders, and in the neuter plural nominative and accusative, the particle "-c" is added to the end of case endings for a little extra emphasis: like "this here" in English. We call the "-c" an "epideictic" (eh peh DAY tick) particle.
3. When the epideictic particle "-c" is added to a case ending which ends in an "-m", the "-m" becomes an "-n".
4. The neuter nominative and accusative plural endings are "-ae", not "-a", as you might expect from the second declension.

This is quite a list of oddities, and students have some difficulty mastering this demonstrative adjective. Keep you finger on this list of irregularities and try to decline the Latin demonstrative "this": "hic, haec, hoc".

STEM: h- (or hu-)

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

Finally, there exists in Latin a demonstrative adjective that has no real translation into English, though we can readily recognize its meaning. It can only be rendered into English by an inflection of the voice, one implying contempt, disdain, or outrage. Read this exchange:

X: "Did you see the movie I was telling you about?"
Y: "What movie?"
X: "You know, the one about mass killing, torture, moral outrages and general profligacy. The one you said no one in his right mind ought to see?"
Y: "Oh, that movie".

The final "that" in this dialogue corresponds to the Latin demonstrative adjective "iste, ista, istud". There is nothing complicated about the declension of "iste"; It uses the alternative genitive and dative singular endings "-ius" and "-i", and the neuter nominative and accusative singular is "-ud" (like "illud"). Aside from that, it uses the standard first and second declension endings.

STEM: ist-

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
N/V.			
Gen.			
Dat.			
Acc.			
Abl.			
N/V.			
Gen.			
Dat.			
Acc.			
Abl.			

USING THE HETEROCLITE DECLENSION

As irritating as it may to have to memorize more endings, the heteroclite declension has a nice advantage. It can often help you establish the case of a noun. You know that the declensions have forms which overlap. For example, the form "consilio" from the noun "consilium, -ii (n) can be either the dative or ablative case singular. But if it's modified by a demonstrative adjective, you can tell immediately which of the two it is:

huic consilio (dative)
hoc consilio (ablative)

Write out the number, gender and case the following nouns are in:

	NUMBER	GENDER	CASE
1. illae civitates			
2. illas civitates			
3. isti puero			
4. isto puero			
5. illi amores			
6. illos amores			

ADJECTIVES USING THE HETEROCLITE ENDINGS: -IUS AND -I

As I mentioned, there are some adjectives in Latin which use the alternative genitive and dative endings. Aside from that, however, these adjectives follow the normal declensional patterns. There are very few of them, but they are important adjectives which get a lot of use. You've got to know them:

alius, -a, -ud	"other"
alter, -a, -um	"the other"
nullus, -a, -um	"no, none"
solus, -a, -um	"sole, alone"
totus, -a, -um	"whole; entire"
ullus, -a, -um	"any"
unus, -a, -um	"one"

Judged by their dictionary entries alone, these adjective look deceptively normal. They appear to be the standard variety

adjectives of the first and second declensions. But their genitive and dative singulars are not the standard kind. Watch this declension of the expression "the other man alone":

Nom.	alter	vir	solus
Gen.	alterius	viri	solius
Dat.	alteri	viro	soli
Acc.	alterum	virum	solum
Abl.	altero	viro	solo

ALIUS AND ALTER

"Alius, alia, aliud" is the adjective which means "other", and it's one of those adjectives which follow the heteroclite declension: "-ius" and "-i" for the genitive and dative singulars. For a totally mysterious reason, Latin tends to replace the genitive singular of "alius" with the genitive singular of "alter". Hence we find "alterius" in place of the expected "aliius" in the declension of "alius". After that oddity, the declension of "alius" regains its sanity:

	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
N/V.	alius	alia	aliud
Gen.	alterius	alterius	alterius
Dat.	alii	alii	alii
Acc.	alium	aliam	aliud
Abl.	alio	alia	alio
		etc.	

THE DEMONSTRATIVE ADJECTIVES USED AS DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

So far, so good. The demonstrative adjectives "hic", "ille", and "iste" modify nouns and point them out. Essentially this is their nature. They are demonstrative adjectives. But they have a very common extended use. They are frequently used as "demonstrative pronouns". Because these words can be used either as adjectives or as pronouns, we often call them just "demonstratives". We'll say "hic" is a demonstrative, instead of calling it a demonstrative adjective or pronoun. So what does this mean -- demonstrative pronoun? The demonstrative part of it you understand: it means something which points out or gives emphasis. But what is a pronoun? Without getting overly ambitious about setting down an eternally unassailable definition, let's just say for now that a pronoun is a word which takes the place of another word in a sentence. Here are some examples of pronouns in English:

"It just missed her".
"She has a most interesting way of speaking".
"Does he have it"?

As you can see, the underlined words are referring you to something or someone which has already been mentioned sometime before, so to recall them we only have to use a sign marker or abbreviation. The word or idea which the pronoun is replacing is called the "antecedent" (an te CEE dent). In additional to replacing their antecedents, pronouns also tell you a little something about the nature of the antecedent. For example, in the first sentence, you can tell that the antecedent of "it" is singular and inanimate; the antecedent of "her" is singular and feminine and animate. This is an important rule to remember about pronouns: "Pronouns get their number and gender from their antecedents".

Let's look at the English third person pronouns. We divide the third person pronoun into two groups -- those which refer to animate objects (mainly humans) and those which refer to inanimate objects. Our third person pronoun observes the distinction between the genders masculine and feminine of animate things in the singular; in the plural, however, they make no distinctions among gender or animate and inanimate.

	Singular		
	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
Nom.	he	she	it
Pos.	his	her	its
Obj.	him	her	it
	Plural		
Nom.		they	
Pos.		their	
Obj.		them	

Latin pronouns are much more observant of the gender of their antecedents -- as they would likely be, because of the importance of grammatical gender in Latin. Consequently by looking at the forms of the demonstrative pronouns "hic", "ille", or "iste", you can tell much more about their antecedents. This makes constructions in Latin much more flexible. Look at this sentence. "Non poteram haec videre". How would you translate the "haec?" You can tell that it is neuter, accusative plural from its form and from the way it's being used in the sentence. (It's the direct object of the verb "videre".) So its antecedent is neuter in gender, and plural. So what's our plural, accusative third person pronoun? It's "them". So this sentence would be translated "I was not able to see them". In English, you see, this sentence could mean that I am looking at men, women, or rocks, since the pronoun only tells us that the antecedent is plural. But Latin also tells us the gender of the antecedent, so it can be much more specific. Now let's look at a pronoun with a little more context.

"Civitas est magna, sed non possum hanc videre".
(The city is large, but I can't see it.)

Remember that a pronoun gets its number and gender from its antecedent, but it gets its case from the way it's being used grammatically in the sentence. The antecedent of "hanc" is "civitas"; they are both singular and feminine. But "hanc" is accusative because of the way it's being used: it's the direct object of the verb "videre". We would translate this into English: "The city is large, but I don't see it". Notice that even though the pronoun in Latin is feminine in gender -- "hanc" -- we don't translate it "her", because we use "she", "her", and "her" only for things which are biologically female. Unlike Latin, our nouns don't have grammatical gender. Now try this: "Est bona femina, et hanc amamus". (She is a good woman, and we love her.) This time, since the antecedent is biologically feminine, we would translate "hanc" with our feminine pronoun: "She is a kind woman and we love her". You'll have to take a little care when you translate the pronouns into English: you'll use our pronouns "he" and "she", and so on, only when the antecedent of the Latin pronouns are biologically masculine or feminine. Otherwise you'll use our neuter "it", "its", "it", and "them".

One final thing to remember about the demonstratives "hic", "ille", and "iste". They all three show much more emphasis than does our simple "he, she, it", but we have no way to translate that extra bit over into English. Latin has a weaker third person demonstrative which is equivalent to our "he, she, it" -- you'll learn it later -- but for now you'll be translating "hic", "ille", and "iste", as if they were equivalent to "he, she, it". It's just something we can't get over into English very easily. Try a few short exercises. Translate into Latin.

1. Your (sing.) books are good, and we love them [use a form of "hic".]

_____

2. Your (sing.) book is good, and we love it [use "ille".]

_____

3. The danger is great, and I fear ["timeo"] it [use "iste".]

_____

4. The dangers are great, and I fear them [use "iste".]

_____

5. She is your [pl.] daughter, and we are giving her [use "hic"] the money.

_____

6. They are your [pl.] daughters, and we are giving them [use "ille"] the money.

_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

locus, -i (m) — Something a little unusual happens to "locus" in the plural. In the singular, "locus" means either a physical place or a place in a book (a passage in literature). As "loci, -orum

	(m)" it means only passages in literature. To say "places" as in physical places (regions), Latin use a neuter derivative from "locus": "loca, -orum (n)". So "locus" actually has two different forms in the plural, each with different meanings: "loci" means "passages"; "loca" means "regions".
enim	Like "igitur", "enim" is postpositive.
in + acc./abl.	Like "sub" + accusative or ablative, "in" will take its noun either in the accusative or the ablative case. When it takes the accusative in means motion into; with the ablative it shows only position, with no motion into involved. You can keep these two straight by translating "in" + accusative always as "into". Say "in" for "in" + ablative.
nunc	It's the temporal "now", not the logical "now". "Nunc" would be a translation for "Now it's raining", not for "Now it's time to end this chapter".

CHAPTER 10

"Fourth Conjugation and -io Verbs of the Third: Present and Future Indicative, Present Imperative and Active Infinitive"

REVIEW OF VERBS

Despite its epic-sized title, you'll find that there is really not so much to learn in this chapter after all. You already know the present and future tenses of the first three conjugations, and you know how to form their imperatives and infinitive. Let's have a look at what you know so far about these verbs.

1. The Present Tense

   To form the present tense of verbs of all conjugations, you simply take the stem of the verb (which includes its stem vowel) and add the personal endings.

2. The Future Tense

   To form the future tense of all conjugations, you take the stem of the verb, then you add on a tense sign for the future, and then you add the personal endings. For first and second conjugation verbs, the tense sign of the future is "-be-"; for the third conjugation, the tense sign is "-a-/-e-".

3. The Imperative Mood

   To form the imperative mood in the singular, you use just the stem (without any additional ending); for the plural you add the ending "-te" to the stem. (The exceptions to this rule are the third conjugation verbs "duc" and three others you haven't seen yet which lose their stem vowel short "-e" in the singular. Their plural imperatives, however, resurrect the stem vowel and are entirely regular: "ducite".)

4. The Infinitive

   The infinitive is just the stem plus the ending "-re" for all conjugations.

I. First Conjugation: amo, -are

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERATIVE	INFINITIVE
1	_____	_____		
2	_____	_____	_____	
3	_____	_____		_____
1	_____	_____		
2	_____	_____	_____	
3	_____	_____		

II. Second Conjugation: moneo, -ere

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERATIVE	INFINITIVE
1	_____	_____		
2	_____	_____	_____	

3	_____	_____		_____
1	_____	_____		
2	_____	_____	_____	
3	_____	_____		

III. Third Conjugation: mitto, -ere

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERATIVE	INFINITIVE
1	_____	_____		
2	_____	_____	_____	
3	_____	_____		_____
1	_____	_____		
2	_____	_____	_____	
3	_____	_____		

FOURTH CONJUGATION: PRESENT, FUTURE, IMPERATIVE, AND INFINITIVE

This is going to be easy. Look at the entry for the Latin verb "to hear": "audio, -ire". Take a close look. What's the stem vowel, and what, therefore, is the stem of the verb? Remember, you discover the stem of a verb by dropping the "-re" infinitive ending. What's left is the stem (including the stem vowel). So the stem of the verb "to hear" is "audi-". And it's to this stem that you add the various tense signs, personal endings, and so on to conjugate the verb. Four conjugation verbs are verbs whose stem ends in a long "-i-". So how are you going to form the present tense of this verb? The formula of the present tense -- as you know already -- is: stem plus personal endings. (There is no intervening tense sign for the present tense). In other words, fourth conjugation verbs are verbs having an "-i-" for its stem vowel, and it follows precisely the same rules as the other conjugations for forming the present tense, with the one exception that in the third person plural, an extra "-u-" is inserted between the stem vowel "-i-" and the "-nt" personal ending. How about the future tense? The fourth conjugation uses the same tense sign as the third conjugation for the future tense, inserting the letters "-a/e-" between the stem and the personal endings. Because the "-i-" is long it "survives" the addition of endings. How about the present imperative? It's just like the other conjugations: the stem alone in the singular, and the stem plus "-te" for the plural. And finally the present infinitive? The stem plus "-re".

So you can see that the principal difference between the fourth conjugation and the others you've seen so far is the quality of the stem vowel. Conjugate the fourth conjugation verb "to come".

IV. Fourth Conjugation venio, -ire:

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERATIVE	INFINITIVE
1	_____	_____		
2	_____	_____	_____	
3	_____	_____		_____
1	_____	_____		
2	_____	_____	_____	
3	_____	_____		

THIRD CONJUGATION i-STEM: PRESENT, FUTURE, IMPERATIVE AND INFINITIVE

The third conjugation contains a subset of verbs, called "i-stems", that seem to imitate the fourth conjugation. The third conjugation, as you know, contains verbs whose stem vowel is short "-e-". The short "-e-" is almost entirely hidden in the conjugation of the verbs because it changes to a short "-i-" or short "-u-" before the personal endings in the present tense. Still it follows all the same rules as the other verbs when deriving its different forms. Both the i-stem and non i-stem third conjugation verbs have the stem vowel short "-e-" -- that's why they're both third conjugation verbs. But the "i-stem" third conjugation verbs insert an extra "-i-" in some places in their conjugation. These places are really quite easy to remember, if you know fourth conjugation verbs: a third conjugation "i-stem" verb inserts an extra "i" everywhere a fourth conjugation

verb has an "-i-". In fact, you might want to think of a third conjugation "i-stem" verb as a failed fourth conjugation verb -- as a verb which "wants" to be fourth. Here's the dictionary entry form many 3rd conjugation i-stem verbs. Notice the extra "-i-" in the first entry, and the short "-e-" of the infinitive in the second:

capio, -ere
rapio, -ere
cupio, -ere
facio, -ere
fugio, -ere

Let's have a closer look at all this. Write out the present tense of the following verbs. Remember, a third i-stem verb has an extra "-i-" every where there's an "-i-" in the fourth conjugation.

	THIRD (non i-stem)	FOURTH	THIRD i-STEM
	mitto, -ere	venio, -ire	capio, -ere
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____

As you can see, the fourth and third i-stem verbs look identical. But there is a difference. Go back and put in the long marks over the stem vowel long "-i-" of "venio". The "-i-" is long in the second person singular and plural, and in the first person plural. Now compare the forms of "venio" with those of "capio" -- you can see the differences. The "-i-" of a fourth conjugation verb is long by nature and "wants" to stay long wherever it can. The stem vowel of a third conjugation verb is short "-e-" which turns into short "-i-" or "-u-". But it will never become long "-i-" regardless of what ending is added to it. Now, the difference between a short and long vowel may seem rather subtle to us, but look again. In Latin pronunciation, the accent of a word falls on to the second to the last syllable if the vowel in the syllable is long. If it is short, then the accent goes back to the third to the last syllable. So, what's the difference in the way these forms would have been pronounced?

capimus is pronounced CAH peh muhs
audimus is pronounced owh DEE muhs

Similarly

capitis is pronounced CAH peh tis
auditis is pronounced owh DEE tis

So the difference for a Roman between these verbs in some the forms would have been quite striking.

What about the future tense of the third conjugation i-stem verbs? They look just like the fourth conjugation verbs: stem(i) + "a/e" + personal endings.

	THIRD (non i-stem)	FOURTH	THIRD i-STEM
	mitto, -ere	venio, -ire	capio, -ere
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____

Now let's consider the imperative mood. In this case, there is no difference at all between the third i-stem verbs and the third non i-stems. And why should there be? They both have the same stem vowel: short "-e-".

	THIRD (non i-stem)	FOURTH	THIRD i-STEM
	mitto, -ere	venio, -ire	capio, -ere
SINGULAR	_____	_____	_____
PLURAL	_____	_____	_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

You must be more alert now when you're looking in the dictionary for a form. The third i-stem verbs and fourth conjugation verbs look the same in the first person singular. You mustn't decide -- even unconsciously -- which conjugation a verb is before you've checked with the second entry. The second entry, as you know, tells you the stem vowel -- and the stem vowel tells you the conjugation. Pay attention.

-ficio, -cipio	The short "-a-" of the verbs "facio" and "capio" change (or "grade") to short "-i-" in compound forms of the verb -- i.e., when a prefix is attached. It will save you a lot of time if you learn to recognize the root "facio" in the verbs "perficio", "conficio", "interficio", etc. instead of having to treat every derived form as an entirely new vocabulary item.

01/05/93

CHAPTER 11

"Personal Pronouns Ego and Tu; Pronouns Is and Idem"

THE ENGLISH PERSONAL PRONOUNS

You know what a pronoun is. It's a word which takes the place of a noun in a sentence. The word it's replacing is called the antecedent. So we can ask, "What is the antecedent of this pronoun", whenever we see a pronoun in a sentence. That is, we are asking, "To what noun is this pronoun pointing?" Read the following paragraph and pick out the pronouns; ask yourself what the antecedent is for each pronoun.

> "George asked Larry to go pick up the apple. He wanted an apple so he told him to get it. But Larry couldn't find it, so he couldn't give it to him. Larry told him, 'If I had found it, I would have given it to you, but I couldn't find it.' He turned to Sue sitting nearby and said to her, 'He's a failure. Can you find it for me?' Sue said she didn't know where it was either. 'I guess you're just out of luck", she told him".

Alright, that's enough of that. You see how useful these pronouns are. If it weren't for pronouns, you'd have to repeat every noun and every name each time you wanted to refer to them, no matter how obvious the reference was. If you don't believe me, try reading the paragraph again substituting the antecedent for each of the pronouns. Pronouns are useful, and in this paragraph you saw all kinds of pronouns in all kinds of shapes and varieties, referring to different antecedents and performing different grammatical task in their sentences. This variety in form is not merely random. The differences among "he, she, it", among "his, her, its", and "him, her, it" are critical; they tell you (1) what the likely antecedent is, and (2) how the pronoun is being used in the sentence of which it's a part.

If the speaker is referring to him/herself, or to a group of people of which he/she considers himself to be a part, in a sentence, he/she uses the first person pronoun. In English, the first person pronoun has three forms to indicate different cases (grammatical function).

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	I	we
Possessive	my	our
Objective	me	us

If the speaker is referring to the person or people to whom he/she is directly talking, he/she uses the second person pronoun. (Notice that the cases are not so clearly visible in the morphology of this pronoun; notice also that English makes no distinction between second person pronoun in the singular and plural.)

Case	Singular	Plural
Nominative	you	you
Possessive	your	your
Objective	you	you

Now take a close look at these pronouns. What don't they tell you about their antecedents? You can see the difference in number in the first person pronoun, but you can't in the second. What else don't you know about the antecedents? Do you know their genders? Do you know simply by looking at the form of, say, "me" whether the person referred to is male, female, or neuter? No. In English (as well as in Latin), the first and second pronouns make no distinction in the forms among the possible genders of their antecedents. Think about this for a moment. Why should the languages have evolved this way? Why is it not important for a speaker to be able to indicate differences in gender in he first and second persons? Try to figure it out. Well, let's take a step backwards for a moment: what is the first person? It's the speaker or speakers of the sentence, right? And what is the second person? It's the person or people whom the speaker(s) is (are) directly addressing. So should it be necessary for someone who's speaking to indicate his or her own gender to the listener(s)? Look, I surely know what gender I am, so there's no reason to indicate in the grammar of my sentence what gender I am. Furthermore, the psychology of language is such that there is an assumed (or real) audience to whom I am directing my thoughts. There is always an implied second person in everything written. So, if I'm standing directly in front of you, talking to you, you should have no doubt about my gender, because you can see me. Therefore it would be superfluous for me to add special gender markings to my first person pronouns to tell you what gender I am. That is plainly visible. For this reason, then, the first person pronouns make no distinctions among the genders of their antecedents.

Can you guess now why the second person makes no distinctions among the genders, either? Right, because if I (the first person) am directly addressing you (the second person), then I should be able to tell your gender too. You know my gender, and I know your gender, because we're standing in front of each other. As the first person in our conversation, I don't need to remind you, my audience, of your own gender, do I?

Now let's look at the first and second pronouns in Latin. They'll make distinctions in number. And, to be useful in Latin, they'll have to decline through all the cases just like Latin nouns. Here they are:

	1st Person	2nd Person
N/V.	ego	tu
[Gen.	mei	tui]
Dat.	mihi	tibi
Acc.	me	te
Abl.	me	te
N/V.	nos	vos
[Gen.	nostrum/nostri	vestrum/vestri]
Dat.	nobis	vobis
Acc.	nos	vos
Abl.	nobis	vobis

Look at the following examples. You'll see how useful these pronouns are.

1. Mittam ad vos filium meum. (I will send my son to you.)
2. Ego scribo has litteras. (I write this letter.)
3. Ego vos video, atque vos me videtis. (I see you, and you see me.)
4. Cum vobis in terram illam veniam. (I will come into that land with you.)
5. Cum te in terram illam veniam. (I will come into that land with you.)

THE "WEAK" DEMONSTRATIVE ADJECTIVE IS, EA, ID

So what about the third person pronouns? Here there's a problem, one which plagued, and continues to plague, the Romance languages derived from Latin. First off, the third person pronoun is going to have to tell you more about their antecedents than the first and second person pronouns did. If I (the first person) am talking to you (the second person) directly, I certainly know what gender you are. But if I am talking to you about something else (which is the third person) or if I am talking to you about several things, it would be nice if I could refer the gender of these topics of conversations. Look at the following passage.

> "I've got to tell you a story. Yesterday I saw Betty and Steve. He asked her for an apple. She told him that she didn't have any. When he asked her again, she told him to go buy his own apples".

Let's look at this little narrative more closely. The first "He" -- how do you know that it's referring to Steve and not to Betty. That's easy; it's because "he" is masculine and not feminine. If the antecedent had been Betty, then you would have had "She" in place of "He". Another thing "He" tells you about the antecedent is that the antecedent is singular. If the antecedent had been plural, then "He" would have been "They". Right? One last thing. Look at the antecedent for "He". What case is it in? It's in the objective (or accusative) case because it's the direct object of the verb "saw". Now look at the pronoun "He". What case is it in? It's in the nominative case. Why? Because in its sentence it's the subject of the verb "asked". Now look at the pronoun "his" in the last line. What case is it in? This time the pronoun is in the possessive (or genitive) case, again because the grammar of the sentence it's in requires it to be in the genitive case. Even though all the pronouns are pointing to the same antecedent, they are all in different cases in their own sentences. Here is a rule you must remember:

> "A pronoun gets its number and gender from its antecedent, but it gets its case from the way it's being used grammatically in its own sentence".

Remember that; you'll need it very soon. Now let's get on with the Latin third person pronoun. Here's what the Latin third person pronoun must do: it must be able to show the number and gender of its antecedent, and it must be able to inflect through the entire case system.

Let's look once more at the English third person pronoun, so that you can see how unbelievably flaccid and corrupted it is in comparison to the majestic power of the Latin 3rd person pronoun.

	Singular		
	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
Nom.	he	she	it
Gen.	his	her	its
Acc.	him	her	it
	Plural		
	Masculine-Feminine-Neuter		
Nom.	they		
Gen.	their		

Acc.	them

As you can see the English third person pronoun is so feeble it's hardly worth learning. In the singular, some of the case forms are identical, and in the plural it makes no distinction among the genders: "They" can refer to a group of men, women, or rocks. So it's not very useful.

But look at the Latin third person pronoun. The third person pronoun starts its life as a weak demonstrative adjective. It means something like "the" and it agrees with the noun to which it's attached: "the book". Then, like the other demonstratives you've seen -- "ille", "hic", and "iste" -- it can be used independently as a pronoun. Let's see how it works.

First the morphology. The stem is "e-" and basically it's declined just like the other demonstratives you've seen before. You remember the heteroclite declension which has the irregular "-ius", and "-i" for the genitive and dative singulars? The nominative singular of the third person demonstrative is a little odd, and the genitive and dative singular use these alternative endings Try to fill in the declension. Don't forget, now, the stem of the demonstrative is "e-" to which the case endings are going to be added. Except for the genitive and dative singular, it will use the standard first and second declension endings which all standard adjectives use.

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
N/V.	is	ea	id
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____
N/V.	ii, or ei	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

First let's see how the weak demonstrative "is, ea, id" works as an adjective. Don't forget that as with the demonstratives "ille", "hic", and "iste", "is" can be used both as an adjective and as a pronoun. When used as a demonstrative adjective, "is" has about the same force as our article "the", although as you'll see Latin doesn't use "is, ea, id" in some places where we would use our "the". Briefly, we may say this: Latin uses "is, ea, id" as a demonstrative adjective to give a little emphasis to something which has already been talked about. Like this:

"I have a book".
"Well, then, give me the book".
"The book is on the table".
"Okay, thanks. I'll get the book myself".

The underscored "the's" are candidates for the Latin "is, ea, id", because the book the two are talking about has already been identified, and the speakers are calling just a little attention to it. Can you see also how "is, ea, id" differs from the strong demonstrative adjectives "ille" and "hic?" Can you feel the difference between saying "Give me the book" and "Give me that book" or "Give me this book?" In English we have a weak "this" that corresponds nicely to the Latin "is, ea, id" used as an adjective. We can say for example "I like this book", without placing much emphasis on the "this". That is, we're not saying "I like this book [and not that one over there]".

Here are some examples of "is, ea, id" used as weak demonstrative adjectives. Of course, without a context it may be a little difficult to see precisely the shades of feeling, but at least you can see the grammar involved.

1. Eos libros vobis dabimus. (We will give the [or these] books to you.)
2. Eas litteras ad me mittet. (He will send the [or this] letter to me.)
3. Ei libri sunt boni. (The [or these] books are good.)
4. Animi earum feminarum valent. (The courage of the [or of these] women is strong.)
5. Nulla civitas ea bella tolerare poterat. (No city was able to endure the [or these] wars.)

Now translate these into Latin, using "is, ea id" for "the".

1. They will send you the [this] money.

_____

2. I will give you the money of the [these] men.

_____

3. The [these] boys are not thinking.

_____

4. I will come with the [this] tyrant.

_____

5. That man will discover the [this] plot.

_____

IS, EA, ID AS PRONOUN

Now, how does a mild-mannered weak demonstrative adjective become the redoubtable third person pronoun, the glory of the Latin language? Let's think back. Remember the demonstrative adjectives "ille", "hic", and "iste?" You remember that they can be used as adjectives, to add emphasis to the noun they're modifying.

- "Ille liber est bonus." (That book is good.)
- "Hic vir est malus." (This man is evil.)
- "Cicero videt istas insidias." (Cicero see this plot.)
- "Possum superare vitia illa." (I can overcome those faults.)
- "Habeo pecuniam illarum feminarum." (I have the money of those women.)

That's all fine and good. But you also remember that the demonstrative adjective can be used, just like all other adjectives, without a noun explicitly stated, but only implied. In order to supply the correct noun, you must do two things: (1) you must examine the form of the demonstrative, and (2) you must examine the context. Watch:

> "Illae feminae sunt ibi, sed illas videre non possum".

How do you translate the "illas?" Well, "illas" is feminine, accusative plural, right? It's in the accusative because it's the direct object of the verb "videre". But why is it feminine and plural? Because the noun which has been left out -- that is, the things to which "illas" is referring -- is feminine and plural. And what is that? Look at the context. "Feminae" is feminine and plural.

> "Those women are there, but I can't see those women" (or, more idiomatically in English, "but I can't see them").

When the demonstratives are used without a noun, they are taking the place of a noun. And words which take the place of a noun are called pronouns. Hence the metamorphosis from demonstrative adjective to demonstrative pronoun is complete.

Now let's take a look at the weak demonstrative adjective "is, ea, id". It will undergo the same process from adjective to pronoun. Because there is only a weak demonstrative force attached to "is, ea, id", we can translate it into English simply as our third person pronoun: "he", "she", "it", etc.

```
"Videstisne meos amicos?"
"Video eos".

"Do you see my friends?"
"I see them".
```

All you have to do when you see the weak demonstrative adjective in a sentence without a noun is to treat it just like third person pronoun: check the antecedent and find the appropriate English equivalent. Read these sentences (go very, very slowly and be reasonable):

> "Cicero amat Romam, et in ea beatam vitam agit. Atque ego civitatem eius amo. Toti amici eius sunt Romani. Vitae eorum sunt beatae. Et eas magna cum sapientia agunt. Ei igitur sunt beati. Cicero eos amat, et ei eum amant. Olim civitas eorum in periculis magnis erat, sed ea superare poterat, quoniam viros multos bonorum morum invenire poterat".

(Cicero loves Rome, and he is leading a happy life in it. I also love his city. All his friends are Romans. Their lives are happy, and they are leading them [they are leading their lives] with great wisdom. They are therefore happy. Cicero loves them, and they love him. Formerly their city was in great danger, but it was able to overcome them [the dangers], since it was able to find many men of good character.)

THE DEMONSTRATIVE idem, eadem, idem

This is simple. Latin adds an undeclinable suffix to the end of the inflected forms of the demonstrative "is, ea, id" and comes out with "the same". Like the demonstrative "is, ea, id", the resulting form can be used either an adjective -- "eadem femina" (the same woman), or as a full-blown pronoun -- "video easdem" (I see the same (feminine) things). Remember, the syntactically important information comes before the "dem" suffix: "eisdem", "eaedem", etc.

The addition of the suffix cause some distortion of the spelling of "is, ea, id". First, in the nominative singular masculine, the "s" of "is" collides with the "d" of "-dem" and disappears, but the "i" of "is" becomes long as a result. In the nominative singular neuter instead of "iddem" we get "idem". No big surprise here. Finally, and this isn't much of a surprise either, wherever the case ending of "is, ea, id" ends in an "m", the addition of "dem" changes the "m" to an "n". Decline "idem, eadem, idem".

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

nemo — the pronoun for "nobody" has more than its share of oddities:

(1) the stem of the word is nemin-;
(2) it uses the third declension endings;
(3) it's potentially masculine or feminine -- "no man" or "no woman";
(4) like English "nobody", it's only singular;
(5) it uses the genitive singular of the adjective "nullus, -a, -um" instead of its expected form of "neminis";
(6) in the ablative singular it uses "nullo" (m. and n.) or "nulla" (f.) instead of the expected "nemine". (Consequently, the only place "nobody" in Latin distinguishes among the genders is in the ablative. Why that should be I haven't the foggiest idea.)

Nom. nemo
Gen. nullius
Dat. nemini
Acc. neminem
Abl. nullo, nulla

CHAPTER 12

"Perfect System Active of All Verbs; Principal Parts"

VERBS: PRINCIPAL PARTS

Let's pretend you're native French speakers learning English and you want to look up the English equivalent of the French verbs "voir", "avoir", "prendre", and "regarder". Turn to your French-English dictionary and you find this:

```
     voir:     "to see",      pret. "saw",    pt. "seen"
    avoir:     "to have",     pret. "had",    pt. "had"
  prendre:     "to take",     pret. "took",   pt. "taken"
 regarder:     "to look"
```

What's all this about? Why are there three entries for the first three verbs? Wouldn't it have been enough for the dictionary just to have listed the infinitive "to see" for "voir", "to have" for "avoir", etc.? Of course not; and why not? Consider our verb "to see"? What tenses of the verb are formed from the stem indicated in the infinitive "to see?" Let's list a few.

```
        Present Simple:          "I see"
    Present Progressive:         "I am seeing"
       Present Emphatic:         "I do see"
             Imperative:         "See"
          Future Simple:         "I will see"
     Future Progressive:         "I will be seeing"
              Imperfect:         "I was seeing"
    Present Conditional:         "I may see"
```

You can see that if you know a few basic tricks, you can use the infinitive form "to see" as the basis for several tenses and moods in English. "To see" provides the raw material. But there are tenses English uses that are not formed from the infinitive "to see". How about the preterit (the simple past tense)? Can you form the simple past from "to see"? No, English uses another form of the verb to form this tense, and unless you know what that form is, you can't use the verb "to see" in the preterit tense. Therefore, the dictionary must give you the form English uses: "saw". So the second entry in the dictionary for the English verb "to see" is the preterit form. Look at the second entries for "to have" and "to take". Their preterits are "had" and "took". Do we get any other tenses from this form of the verb? No, just one: the preterit tense.

Look at the third entry, "seen". For what tenses, voices and moods does English use this form? A lot of them. Here are some:

```
          Present Passive:       "I am seen"
           Perfect Active:       "I have seen"
        Pluperfect Active:       "I had seen"
           Perfect Passive:      "I have been seen"
    Future Perfect Active:       "I will have seen"
   Future Perfect Passive:       "I will have been seen"
         Past Conditional:       "I might have seen"
```

With the three forms given in the dictionary, you have all the raw material from which you can build every possible tense, mood, voice and number of the verb "to see". Therefore, to know an English verb thoroughly, and to be able to use it in all its possible applications, you must know all three of its basic forms. Once you know them, you simply apply the rules for the formation of the different tenses, voices, and moods. We call these three forms the principal parts of the verb. English verbs have three principal parts: the infinitive, the preterit, and the perfect participle.

Fine, now look at the verb "to look". Why aren't there two more principal parts listed after the infinitive? Well, what are the next two principal parts? The verb goes: "to look", "looked", and "looked". As you can see, the second and third principal parts are derivable from the first principal part: you simply add "-ed" to the "look". There are hundreds of verbs in English that work this way. Their second and third principal parts are simply the first principal part with the suffix "-ed". Verbs which operate like this are called "regular" (or weak). If a verb is regular, you don't need to be given the second and third entries separately. That is, once you know the first principal part, you know the next two, and thus have all the basic material you need to form all the possible tenses, moods and voices of the verb. On the other hand, verbs whose principal parts are not readily derivable from the first principal part are called "irregular" (or strong) verbs.

So what have I convinced you of so far? All possible tenses, voices and moods of an English verb are reducible to three different principal parts. If a verb is irregular (strong), you must learn the principal parts by memory, but if it is regular (weak), you can easily derive the second two principal parts from the first.

I'll go even further. The verb systems of all languages operate this way. To work with the verb, to know it completely, you must know its principal parts. Then you have to know what to do with them; you have to know the rules and the laws of the grammar of the language. But first you have to have the basic materials laid out in front of you, and that means knowing the principal parts of the verb you're working with.

LATIN VERBS: PRINCIPAL PARTS

Latin verbs have three principal parts (three different stems), but by convention we say that they have four. Up to this chapter, I've been misleading you slightly by calling the basic verb form of the present and future tenses the "stem". That was justifiable when, so far as you knew, there was only one stem for verbs. But now you must realize that the word "stem" is no longer limited to just one possible part of the verb. The stem with which you are so familiar is really only the first principal part. Let's look again at the first principal part.

What tenses do we get from the first principal part? You know two of them already. The first principal part is the stem from which Latin forms the present, future, and the imperfect tenses (you haven't had the imperfect tense yet, except in the verb "sum" and "possum"). And remember, you use the infinitive -- the second principal part -- to tell you what the stem of the first principal part is. Here are the formulae for the present and future tenses.

```
PRESENT:   first principal part + no tense sign + personal endings
FUTURE:    first principal part + tense sign    + personal endings
```

Take a couple of minutes to review these forms. Write out the present and future tenses, and then the imperative mood, of the paradigms of the four conjugations (including the third i-stem verb):

I	II	III	III i	IV
laudo, -are	moneo, -ere	duco, -ere	capio, -ere	audio, -ire
		PRESENT TENSE		
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
		FUTURE TENSE		
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
		IMPERATIVES		
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

This, then, is the big picture of the sum total of your knowledge of Latin verbs. All the tenses and moods you know are based on the first principal part of the verb -- the first entry you see in the dictionary. As I said before, there is one other tense based on this stem, the imperfect, and you'll be getting it soon enough. For reasons which you needn't worry about yet, we call all the tenses derived from the first principal part of the verb the tenses of the "present system". So we say that the first principal part is the root of the present system of the Latin verbs. Now on to some new territory.

THE PERFECT SYSTEM OF LATIN VERBS

As you saw, English verbs have three roots from which different voices, moods and tenses are derived. A Latin verb uses its first principal part to form the present system: the present, future, and imperfect tenses. And this would have suited the Romans just fine, if their language had had only three tenses, but it has six (one less than English). We divide the tenses into two major systems: the present system (which you know), and the perfect system (which you are about to learn). The perfect system uses the remaining two principal parts -- the third and the fourth -- as its base. For this chapter, we're going to be concerned only with the tenses formed off the third principal part.

I. The perfect system is composed of three tenses: the perfect; the pluperfect, and the future perfect.

   A. The perfect tense is used in Latin just as we use our preterit and our perfect tenses: "I saw" or "I have seen".
   B. The pluperfect tense is used to talk about an action which has taken place before another action in the past. In English, we use the preterit of the auxiliary verb "to have" with the past participle (the third principal part) of the verb: "I had seen". E.g., "Before you came to the door, I had already seen your face through the window."
   C. The future perfect tense is used to talk about an action which will have taken place before another event in the future. In English we use the future of the auxiliary verb "to have" with the past participle of the verb: "I will have seen".

The perfect, pluperfect, and future perfect tenses in the active voice only are formed from the third principal part. The perfect system passive, as you will see in a few chapters, uses the fourth principal part, not the third. Let's look first at the perfect tense active.

The perfect tense is formed exactly according to the formula for the formation of the tenses you already know. It's made up of personal endings which are then added to a stem. The differences are (1) that the perfect tense uses the third principal part in place of the first and (2) that the perfect tense uses a different set of personal endings. The personal endings the perfect tense uses are:

1st	-i	I
2nd	-isti	you
3rd	-it	he, she, it
1st	-imus	we
2nd	-istis	you
3rd	-erunt	they

You can see how some of these endings resemble the endings used in the present system, but they all must be memorized as entirely discrete items. They're actually very handy. For example, if you see a conjugated verb which ends in "-isti", "istis", or "- erunt", you'll know right away that you've got a perfect tense and that the stem which the ending is attached to is the third, not the first, principal part.

Okay, so where are we now? To form the perfect tense, Latin uses these perfect personal endings and puts them onto the third principal part of the verb. So let's have a look third principal parts of verbs.

This may sound like small consolation, but in the perfect system, the distinctions between the different conjugations melt away. You undoubtedly remember all the differences between the conjugations in the present system: each conjugation has a different stem vowel and, what's even worse, the first and second conjugations form their futures entirely differently from the third and fourth conjugations. But in the perfect system, once you get to the verb's third and fourth principal parts, you needn't worry any longer whether the verb is a first, second, third, third-i, or fourth conjugation. The fourth conjugation will not form, say, its future perfect differently from the first or second conjugations. All the conjugations obey exactly the same rules in the perfect system. But getting to the third principal part is the first thing you've got to think about.

THE FIRST CONJUGATION

Remember the verb "to look" in English? "To look" is a regular verb in English, which means that its second and third principal parts are formed by adding "-ed" to the first principal part: "to look", "looked", and "looked". Because it's regular, the French dictionary didn't list the second and third principal parts separately. Anybody with any business looking up English verbs in the first place should at least know how regular verbs work. It's only when the second and third principal parts aren't regularly formed that they need to be listed. The first conjugation in Latin forms its principal parts by predictable and regular modification of the first principal part. Like this:

I	II	III
laudo	laudare	laudavi

Let's go slowly. First off, the dictionary lists the first principal part in the first person singular. (There is a good reason for this, as you'll see next semester.) So you see "laudo" instead of "lauda-". To see the stem vowel, and hence to see the conjugation, you must look to the second principal part, where the stem vowel is revealed by dropping off the infinitive ending "-re". In the same way, the third principal is listed in the dictionary in the first person singular perfect tense; that is, with the "-i" of the first person singular. To see the stem, you must drop of the "-i". So the true stem of the third principal part is "laudav-". As you can see from this example, the third principal part of the verb "laudo" is just the stem of the first principal part -- "lauda-" plus "v". And all first conjugation verbs form the third principal part in just this way. First conjugation verbs are therefore "regular" in the system of principal parts. If you recognize a verb is first conjugation from its first two dictionary entries, you now can derive the third principal part on your own without having to be given it by the dictionary. Write out the second and third principal parts of some of the first conjugation verbs you already know:

I	II	III
amo	_____	_____
cogito	_____	_____
tolero	_____	_____
supero	_____	_____

As you can see, there's really nothing to this. Once you know that a verb is first conjugation, you can easily derive its principal parts. For this reason, a dictionary need tell you only a verb is first conjugation, and from there you'll be able to derive the other parts on your own. It's the same as with regular English verbs. Given the first part, you know the other two (provided that you remember your grammar!). A Latin dictionary tells you that a verb is first conjugation by simply putting a (1) (or (I)) directly after the first entry. For example, "certo (1)". This tells the verb is first conjugation, and with that knowledge alone you know the rest of the principal parts: "certare, certavi".

Now let's put the third principal part to work. And remember, these are the rules which will govern the use of the third principal parts of all the conjugations, first through fourth. Use the first conjugation verb "laudo (1)" as your paradigm.

PERFECT TENSE

Remember that to form the perfect tense of a verb you use the stem of the third principal part (what's left after you drop the "-i") to which you add the perfect personal endings.

	3RD P.P.	+	PERS. END.	=	CONJUGATED FORM
1st	_____	+	_____	=	_____
2nd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
3rd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
1st	_____	+	_____	=	_____
2nd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
3rd	_____	+	_____	=	_____

PLUPERFECT TENSE

Another tense of the perfect system of tenses (tenses which use the third and fourth principal parts of the verb) is the pluperfect tense. To form the pluperfect tense, you use the imperfect tense of the verb "sum" for the personal endings which then attach to the third principal part.

	3RD P.P.	+	PERS. END.	=	CONJUGATED FORM
1st	_____	+	_____	=	_____

2nd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
3rd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
1st	_____	+	_____	=	_____
2nd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
3rd	_____	+	_____	=	_____

FUTURE PERFECT TENSE

The future perfect uses the future of the verb "sum" as the personal endings (with the exception of the third person plural where it is "-erint" instead of the normal future form "-erunt".

	3RD P. P.	+	PERS. END.	=	CONJUGATED FORM
1st	_____	+	_____	=	_____
2nd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
3rd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
1st	_____	+	_____	=	_____
2nd	_____	+	_____	=	_____
3rd	_____	+	_____	=	_____

Simple. And fairly logical, too. The third principal part already contains within it the notion of past tense. To make it even more past, you add the inflected forms of the imperfect of the verb "sum" as the personal endings. Thus the name: "plu" (more) "perfect" (completed). For the future perfect, you throw the idea of a completed action into the future by adding the inflected forms of the future of the verb "sum" as the personal endings. The exception in the third person plural is actually fairly easy to account for. You remember the future third person plural of "sum" is "erunt". But if Latin had used this form, and not "erint", the third person plural future perfect would have been dangerously close to the third person plural perfect: "laudaverunt".

Now you have it. You know all the rules for forming the entire perfect system active of any Latin verb. Once you know the third principal part, you simply apply these formulae and away you go. Let's trudge on now to the second conjugation verbs. There's a lot of regularity there too as far as the formation of the third principal part goes. But the ugly specter of irregularity (and hence the need for rote memorization) starts creeping in.

THE SECOND CONJUGATION

Many, very many, second conjugation verbs form their third principal part regularly off the first principal part. Like this:

I	II	III
moneo	monere	monui
doceo	docere	docui
timeo	timere	timui
terreo	terrere	terrui

If we look into this more closely, we can see that the third principal of these verbs is formed simply by adding "-v-" to the stem of the first principal part, just as it's done for first conjugation verbs. But when the "-v-" of the third principal part comes up against the "-e-" of the stem of a second conjugation verb, the result is one, solitary "-u-". So for ther verb "moneo", the third principal is "monevi" which becomes "monui". So also with many second conjugation verbs. The third principal part is formed regularly.

Now, as I said, many second conjugation verbs form their principal parts just this way, and if you remember this, you won't be confronted with such a daunting list of forms to memorize. There is some order to it. But there are enough verbs differing from this regular pattern that you can't take for granted that you can deduce the principals parts from the first for every second conjugation verb. The dictionary can't simply put a (2) next to the first entry and leave it up to you to derive the rest of the parts. The dictionary must give you the parts as separate entries. Here are the second conjugation verbs you've had so

far. You can see that the rules work fairly well, but there are deviations.

I	II	III
debeo	debere	debui
doceo	docere	docui
habeo	habere	habui
valeo	valere	valui
video	videre	vidi
remaneo	remanere	remansi

Let's consolidate our ground now by doing a few exercises. Produce the following forms, and try to do it from memory at first.

1. They will have had. _____
2. I had seen. _____
3. You (pl.) remained. _____
4. We will have called. _____
5. She will be strong. _____
6. You (s.) have tolerated. _____
7. They had taught. _____
8. You (pl.) had had. _____
9. We have loved. _____
10. They thought. _____

THE THIRD CONJUGATION (including the i-stems)

Now you have to batten down the hatches; all hell is about to break loose. The third conjugation is where irregularity is the norm. You must simply learn the principal parts of third conjugation verbs outright, but, as I will try to show you, reason isn't completely banished from the third conjugation. Our minds can get a toe-hold in here, too, and impose some order. Some classifiable things happen to third conjugation verbs as they form their principal parts.

A. Reduplication of Initial Consonant

Often the third principal part of a third conjugation will begin by doubling the initial consonant of the first principal part and putting an "-e-" or "-i-" in between the two of them:

pello	pellere	pepuli
disco	discere	didici
do	dare	dedi

B. The Aoristic (or Sigmatic) Perfect

Many verbs add an "-s-" to the end of the first principal part to produce the third principal part. Often the "-s-" is hidden in an "-x-" or another consonant which comes about from the collision between the "-s-" and the consonant at the end of the verb.

mitto	mittere	misi
dico	dicere	dixi
scribo	scribere	scripsi
vivo	vivere	vixi

C. Change in the Medial Vowel and Loss of Stem Nasal

Very often a vowel in the first principal part which is near

the end of the verb will change in the third principal part: it will lengthen from a short to a long vowel; or it will grade, often from an original "-a-" to a long "-e-". Nasals, "-m-" or "-n-", in the first principal part may also be dropped in the third principal part.

ago	agere	egi
facio	facere	feci
fugio	fugere	fugi
vinco	vincere	vici

By now you must be wondering why I'm troubling you will all these patterns. Isn't it enough to have to memorize the principal parts without being burdened with all this? Well, yes, you are going to have to memorize the principal parts of the verbs you're given in the vocabulary, that's true. But, there are more words out there in Latin than you can easily memorize before you begin to read Latin. For much of your reading, you're going to have to rely not on pre-memorized vocabulary items, but on your powers of deduction. Suppose you see this form in your text: "receperant".

Okay, you recognize the "-erant" ending as the third person plural pluperfect. From this realization you can make another deduction. If you're in the perfect system, then the "-erant" was attached to the third principal part of the verb, and you know that the first entry in a dictionary is the first principal part, not the third. This could be a problem. Can you look up "been" in the dictionary in English? No, of course not. That's because "been" is a principal part of "to be" and it'll be listed under "to be". So how are you going to look up "recep-"? You'll never find it just like that in a dictionary. You must recreate the first principal part of the verb to look it up. What are you going to do?

Think a little. What else can you deduce about this verb? For one, it's not a first conjugation verb. They all look like "-av-" in the third principal part. So you won't find it under "recepo, -are". It could be a second conjugation verb, even though most of those have third principal parts ending in "-u-": like "habui" and "docui" from "habeo" and "doceo". Still, it might be worth a shot; so you look up "recepeo", expecting to see "recepere" and "recepi" listed as its principal parts after it. (Don't forget, what you're looking for is a verb whose third principal part is "recepi".) But there is no "recepeo, -ere, -cepi". Then in bitter frustration you forget my stern warning not to go browsing in the dictionary, and you look at all the entries beginning with "recep-" hoping to find that third principal part "recepi". But you fail.

Now you start thinking to yourself. "Suppose this is a third conjugation verb? Sometimes strange things happen to verbs as they go from the first to the third principal part. Is there any evidence of reduplication? No. Any hidden -s- sound at the end that throwing off my search? No. Whats left? Grote once said something about the medial vowel changing, so I'll try that. I look up r-e-c-?-p-. Because that -e- could have been something else in the first principal part, Ill stay flexible on it: the verb could be recap- or recip-."

Leave yourself some intelligently limited flexibility. Now you find it, "recipio, -ere, -cepi". You see, this works sometimes. That's why I showed you the major patterns of variations.

FOURTH CONJUGATION

The formation of the third and fourth principal parts of a fourth conjugation verb is quite straight forward. There are enough irregular forms to warrant separate listing in the dictionary -- they aren't all regular derivatives from the first principal part as in the first conjugation -- but many verbs do have regular principal parts. Here are a few fourth conjugation verbs.

sentio	sentire	sensi
venio	venire	veni
invenio	invenire	inveni
audio	audire	audivi

MORE DRILLS

Try to memorize the third principal parts of the verbs in the list Wheelock gives you on pages 55-6. Here they are again in a little more manageable form. Fill in the blanks using the vocabulary list on pp. 56-7, but try to do as much from memory as possible. Then you can use this list as a study sheet. Cover up the Latin, and try write out the complete entry for each verb. A complete entry now is all four principal parts. You'll have to do it several times for these forms to stick, but these verbs are absolutely essential for the rest of your study, and a little effort now will greatly simplify your work in the future. You must know these words and form from English to Latin. (You don't have to memorize the fourth principal parts yet. You should just know that they are out there.)

	I	II	III
to love	_____	_____	_____
to think	_____	_____	_____

to wander	_____	_____	_____
to save	_____	_____	_____
to overcome	_____	_____	_____
to endure	_____	_____	_____
to call	_____	_____	_____
ought	_____	_____	_____
to teach	_____	_____	_____
to have	_____	_____	_____
to give	_____	_____	_____
be strong	_____	_____	_____
to see	_____	_____	_____
to remain	_____	_____	_____
to drive	_____	_____	_____
to send	_____	_____	_____
to write	_____	_____	_____
to live	_____	_____	_____
to feel	_____	_____	_____
to come	_____	_____	_____
to do	_____	_____	_____
to conquer	_____	_____	_____
to flee	_____	_____	_____
to take	_____	_____	_____
to lead	_____	_____	_____
to be	_____	_____	_____
to be able	_____	_____	_____

TRANSLATE INTO LATIN

1. "I came, I saw, I conquered (don't use supero (1))".

_____

2. I will have begun. _____
3. She had taught. _____
4. They lived. _____
5. We had. _____
6. You (pl.) have written. _____
7. They sent. _____

8. They have been. _____

9. We have found. _____

10. He had fled. _____

11. You couldn't see us. _____

12. You (s.) had seen. _____

13. They came. _____

14. She remained. _____

15. We felt. _____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

deus, -i (m) The short "-e-" of the stem causes the word some grief in the plural:

Nom. di (instead of dei)
Gen. deorum
Dat. dis (instead of deis)
Acc. deos
Abl. dis (instead of deis)

12

CHAPTER 13

"Reflexive Pronouns and Possessives; the Intensive 'Ipse'"

FIRST AND SECOND PERSON REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS

In Chapter 11 you studied the first, second and third person pronouns. Here's what you should remember about them. The first and second person pronouns don't show any gender; there aren't three forms, for example, for "I": one that's feminine, one that's masculine, and another that's neuter. The first and second person don't have to indicate different gender for reasons which are grounded psychologically in the nature of language itself. Another thing is that Latin uses the weak demonstrative adjective "is, ea, id" as its third person pronoun. Here making distinctions among the three genders is very important, so the third person pronoun has thirty possible forms: five cases in three genders in both the singular and the plural. Remember all that? Let's go on. Look at these English sentences.

"We saw you there".
"You saw me there".
"You saw us there".
"We are coming with you".
"You are giving it to us".

And so on. If you had to, you could put each of these sentences into Latin, using the appropriate number and case of the first and second person pronouns. But I have something else in mind. As you can see in each of these sentences the person of the pronoun of the subject is different from the pronoun that appears in the predicate. In the sentence "We saw you there", the subject pronoun is first and the pronoun in the predicate is second. And similarly for the rest of the sentences. This is because in each of these sentences some one is doing something to or with someone else.

Now look at these sentences. They're not in standard English, but I'm going to make a point.

"You saw you".
"I saw me".
"I bought me an apple".
"We like us".

In these sentences, unlike the first batch, the person of the subject pronouns is the same as the pronouns in the predicate. In "You saw you", both the subject and the predicate pronouns are second person. And so on with the other three. Now, I warned you, these sentences are not in standard English, but suppose a foreigner who's just learning English wrote them out. Is there any question in these sentences about who's doing what to whom? No. In "I saw me", the speaker is obviously trying to say that he saw himself. He's trying to say that the subject of the verb is performing an action on itself, not on something or someone else. So even though they don't qualify as good English, these sentence can be understood. The subject of the verb is performing an action that affect the subject itself; and because the person of the pronouns in the subject and the predicate is the same, you can see that.

When the subject of a sentence performs an action which affects itself, then the pronouns in the predicate are called "reflexive", because they send you "back" through the verb to the subject. A reflexive pronoun is a pronoun in the predicate of the sentence that refers you to the subject. And in the first and second persons, this task could be easily accomplished by using pronouns that have the same person. It's really not necessary to have separate forms in the first and second person for non-reflexive pronouns on the one hand and reflexive pronouns on the other. One set of forms can do double duty. English, however, does have separate forms. Rephrase the sentences above using the English reflexive pronouns. As you can tell, we use a form of the pronoun with the suffix "-self" attached to them:

	FIRST PERSON	SECOND PERSON
Singular:	myself	yourself
Plural:	ourselves	yourselves

Latin, however, being the wise and economical language it is, has no separate forms for reflexive and non-reflexive pronouns in the first and second persons. It simply uses the personal pronouns you've already seen.

Video me.	(I see myself.)
Videmus nos.	(We see ourselves.)
Videtis vos.	(You see yourselves.)
Vides te.	(You see yourself.)

And so on, and so on. In the first and second persons, if the pronoun in the predicate is the same number as the subject pronoun, the pronoun in the predicate is referring to the subject and is therefore de facto reflexive.

There is one interesting feature worth of comment. Will a reflexive pronoun ever be in the nominative case? Think about it. When a pronoun is nominative, it is the subject of the sentence. But a reflexive pronoun by definition is in the predicate and

is receiving in some way the action which the subject of the sentence is performing. So a reflexive pronoun will never be in the nominative case. That's why you see Wheelock listing the reflexive pronouns like this:

	FIRST PERSON	SECOND PERSON
Nom.	-------	-------
Gen.	[mei]	[tui]
Dat.	mihi	tibi
Acc.	me	te
Abl.	me	te
Nom.	-------	-------
Gen.	[nostri/nostrum]	[vestri/vestrum]
Dat.	nobis	vobis
Acc.	nos	vos
Abl.	nobis	vobis

No nominatives. Actually, a better way to say this would be to say that Latin has no separate forms for the reflexive pronoun in the first and second persons at all; it simply uses the existing pronouns reflexively.

THIRD PERSON REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS

In the third person things are a little more complicated. You remember that the third person pronoun needs to show gender, because, unlike the first and second persons, the gender of the topic of conversation may not be obvious. The same kind ambiguity is possible in the third person with regard to reflexive and non-reflexive pronouns. It may be possible that the third person subject is performing an action which is affect another third person. Consider this:

"He saw him".
"They saw them".
"She saw her".

Here the person of the pronouns is the same in each of these sentences, and in the first and second persons you need to know that the subject is acting on itself. But that's not going to work in the third person. You can't tell whether the "her", for example, in the predicate of the third sentence is the same female which is the subject of the sentence. "She" could be seeing another female. The third person must have one form for the reflexive pronoun and another for the non-reflexive pronoun, since the possibility of ambiguity is real if the forms were the same. In English, we use the old stand-by: the suffix "-self" for the reflexive: "He saw himself"; "They saw themselves"; "She saw herself".

In Latin as well the standard third person pronoun "is, ea id" won't do; different forms are required for the third person reflexive pronoun -- that is, for a pronoun which will refer you to the subject of the sentence and not to some other third person. Latin does indeed have separate forms, but unlike the barbarous prolixity of English, Latin keeps its forms to a bare minimum.

Look at it this way. All the third person reflexive pronoun has to do is to refer you to the subject of the sentence. The pronoun itself does not have to tell you the gender or the number of the subject of the sentence. The subject itself can tell you that. The reflexive pronoun only has to point you back to the subject, and if you remember the subject of the sentence you're reading or listening to, you can mentally bring forward the number and gender.

Try it this way. Suppose in English the sign "*" is the reflexive third person pronoun. It tells you to go back to the subject of the sentence, so every time you see it, you plug in the words "the subject"

"He saw *". = "He saw [the subject]".
"They saw *". = "They saw [the subject]".
"She bought it for *". = "She bought it for [the subject]".

Do you see. In all three sentence you get a full understanding of what's going on without having to be told by the reflexive pronoun what the gender and number of the subject is. But in English we'd have to say:

"He saw himself".
"They saw themselves".
"She bought it for herself".

But really, in sentence #1, we don't need to be told again by the reflexive pronoun that the subject is masculine and singular. Yet this is precisely what English does. Similarly for the other two. Does the speaker of the English sentence really think our attention spans are so short that we have to be reminded after a second or two what the subject of the sentence is? Evidently.

In Latin, no such stupidity is impugned to us. The Latin third person reflexive pronoun is simply a sign which directs us back to the subject of the sentence. It declines, of course, because it may be used in the different cases (not the nominative), but it

tells us nothing about the number or gender of the subject. It just tells us, 'no matter what the subject of this sentence was, think of again.' Here's the reflexive third person pronoun.

SINGULAR AND PLURAL

Nom.	----------
Gen.	[sui]
Dat.	sibi
Acc.	se
Abl.	se

How do we translate this into English? Remember that the English third person reflexive pronoun indicates number and gender, so when we bring a Latin third person reflexive pronoun over into English, we have to reinsert the number and gender of the subject. Like this: "Ea se videt". To a Roman ear it means, "she sees [the subject] For us, we have to repeat the gender and number in the reflexive pronoun. We would say, "she sees herself". Let's try a few more.

"Ei homines se viderunt".	(The men saw themselves.)
"Eae se vident".	(The women see themselves.)
"Vir se videt".	(The man sees himself.)
"Eae litteras ad se mittent".	(They (the women) will send a letter to themselves.)

Of course, in the sentences Wheelock gives you it may be impossible to say precisely what the gender of the third person subject is if it isn't explicitly stated, as in the examples above. For example, "Se videt" could be translated as "he sees himself", "she sees herself", or "it sees itself Without a context, it's impossible to decide. Choose whichever you prefer.

DRILS

Translate into Latin.

1. I see you (pl.). _____
2. They see us. _____
3. They will send us the letter. _____
4. She sees herself. _____
5. The tyrant loves himself. _____
6. The tyrants love themselves. _____
7. Give yourself to philosophy! _____
8. He gives himself to philosophy. _____
9. She will not see them. _____
10. He will not see him. _____
11. The farmers can't see them. _____
12. The farmers can't see themselves. _____

So let's collect ourselves. Here's what we've covered so far. (1) In the first and second persons in Latin there are no new forms for the reflexive pronouns. If a pronoun in the predicate is the same person as the subject, then the pronoun is reflexive. This is because the pronoun in the predicate must be referring to the same person as the subject of the sentence. Additionally, for this reason, the reflexive pronoun will never be in the nominative case. If it were in the nominative case it would be the subject of the verb and hence not in the predicate; and all reflexive pronouns must be in the predicate. Despite this inherent simplicity of reflexive pronouns in the first and second persons, English nevertheless adds "-self" or "-selves" to the end of the non-reflexive pronouns to form the reflexive pronouns. Strictly speaking, it's not necessary to distinguish formally the non-reflexive from the reflexive pronouns in the first and second persons; context could do that for you. The third person reflexive pronoun must differ in form from the third person non-reflexive pronouns. But all the third person reflexive pronoun need do is to point you back to the subject of the sentence. Because you remember the subject of the sentence, it's not really necessary for the reflexive pronoun itself to remind you of the gender and the number of the subject. The Latin third person reflexive pronoun therefore does not in itself make any distinctions in number and gender. It simply works as a sign pointing you back to the subject. To translate the Latin reflexive pronoun properly in English, however, you

must resupply the gender and number to the pronoun.

REFLEXIVE AND NON-REFLEXIVE POSSESSIVES

On to new business. Read this English sentence: "I see my daughter". Now is there any question whose daughter this is? It's the daughter of the subject of the sentence. And how do you know that? Because the possessive "my" is first person and the subject of the sentence is first person. So the subject of the sentence is being recalled in the predicate, because the subject owns the direct object of the verb. We can call this relationship between "I" and "my" reflexive possession. The subject of the verb is possessing something in the predicate.

You can see that to show reflexive possession no new form of the possessive pronoun is needed. "My" does just fine. Only a dolt would need more information about whose daughter this is. But English has plans for the dolt. The speaker can underline this reflexive possession by inserting "own" after "my".

```
Speaker:  "I see my daughter".
Dolt:     "Whose daughter"?
Speaker:  "I see my own daughter, you dolt".
```

More examples:

```
"Do you have your money?" (reflexive possession)
"Do you have my money?" (non-reflexive)
"Have you seen our friend?" (non-reflexive)
"Hey, we can see our car from here". (reflexive possession)
"I haven't found my book yet". (reflexive possession)
```

Latin has no different forms for reflexive and non-reflexive possession in the first and second persons. There's no need. Latin simply uses the existing possessive adjectives:

FIRST PERSON	SECOND PERSON
meus, -a, -um	tuus, -a, -um
noster, -tra, -trum	vester, -tra, -trum

If the person of the possessive adjective in the predicate is the same as the person of the subject, then the possessive is reflexive. Simple.

```
"Videtis amicos vestros". (reflexive possession)
"Videtis amicos meos". (non-reflexive possession)
```

Let's look just a little more closely at these possessive adjectives. They consists of two parts. There's the stem and the adjectival ending. The stems tell you about the possessor, not about what the possessor is possessing. The stem "me-" of the adjective "meus, -a, -um" tells you that the possessor is singular and in the first person. It doesn't, however, tell you what gender the possessor is. The adjectival ending agrees in number, gender, and case with the object possessed. Got that? You can think of the possessive adjectives of the first and second persons as having two parts: the stem which tells you about the possessor, and the adjectival ending which tells you about what is being possessed.

Now let's get on with the third person. The simple rule that worked so well in the first and second persons isn't going to work here. Look at this sentence: "She had her ticket". The possessive pronoun "her" is the same person as the subject -- third person -- but can you tell from this sentence whether "she" has her own ticket or the ticket of some other female? No, you can't. There is a real ambiguity here, and often in English we have to ask for further information. "Whose ticket?" If the speaker hasn't made it clear, an additional "own" can be used to help out: "She has her own ticket". Now normally we rely on context to clear up any possible ambiguities, but sometimes it's really not clear who's owning what: "They have their books" (Their own or some other peoples' books?). The only thing the possessive pronoun "their" tells you about the possessors is that there is more than one of them. But you can't tell whether these people are the same folks indicated by "they".

In Latin, the same possibility for ambiguity exists; so some solution to the problem is in order. First off, how does Latin show non-reflexive possession in the third person? It uses the genitive of the third person pronoun "is, ea, id". Watch:

```
"Eius librum habuit".          (He/she had his/her book (not his/her
                               own).)
"Eius gladium invenit".        (He/she found his/her sword (not
                               his/her own).)
"Servavit patriam eius".       (He/she saved his/her fatherland
                               (someone else's).)
"Servaverunt patriam eorum".           (The saved their (other
                                       peoples') fatherland.)
```

A couple of things to notice. First, unlike the first and second person possessive adjectives, the possessive in the third person is not an adjective. It does not agree with the thing being possessed. Look at the three sentences above. "Liber" is masculine, "gladium" is neuter, and "patriam" is feminine, yet "eius" didn't change. Similarly, in the last sentence, "eorum" tells you that the owners are plural and masculine, but it has nothing whatsoever to do grammatically with "patriam". In the third person, the possessive pronoun only tells you about who's doing the possessing; it tells you absolutely nothing about the object possessed.

Secondly, the genitive of "is, ea, id" is used to show only non-reflexive possession. "Eius librum habuit" could not possibly mean "he had his own book". It can only mean "he has his [another person's] book". In English, by contrast, the possessive "his" can be used to show reflexive or non-reflexive possession; but the Latin "eius" and "eorum, earum" can only be used non-reflexively. So what does Latin use to show reflexive possession in the third person? How does it say "his own", "her own", "its own" and "their own?"

To show reflexive possession in the third person, Latin uses the "reflexive possessive adjective": "suus, -a, -um". This adjective has a couple of interesting features. First, it's an adjective, so it must agree with the object which is being possessed. You've seen that already in the possessive adjectives of the first and second persons. Second, unlike the first and second persons, the third person reflexive possessive adjective has no different form for the plural number.

Like this. The "-us, -a, -um" part of the adjective agrees with the object possessed. The "su-" part tells you to go back to the subject of the sentence. And that's all it tells you. Like the reflexive pronoun "sui, sibi, se, se", the possessive adjective only tells you that the subject of the sentence is now involved in the predicate, and you shouldn't have to be reminded of the gender and number of the subject.

"Habuerunt suos libros".	(They had [the subjects'] books.)
"Habuit suos libros".	(He had [the subject's] books.)
"Puella habuit suos libros".	(The girl had [the subject's] books.)

But to translate this into English, we have to reinstate the number and gender of the subject in the predicate.

"Habuerunt suos libros".	(They had their own books.)
"Habuit suos libros".	(He had his own books.)
"Puella habuit suos libros".	(The girl had her own books.)

Do you see? The Latin adjective "suus, -a, -um" isn't changing, but our English rendition, because in English we clumsily repeat the gender and number of the subject of the sentence in the reflexive possessive pronoun. Latin doesn't, and there's really no reason it should. The "su-" part of the possessive says, "Go back to the subject". And that's all it has to say to get the message across.

DRILL

Translate (as many as you need to reassure yourself.)

1. I saw you. _____
2. They saw her. _____
3. They saw us. _____
4. I saw myself. _____
5. You saw me. _____
6. You saw yourself. _____
7. You (pl.) saw yourselves. _____
8. We saw ourselves. _____
9. I gave it to him. _____
10. We came with you (pl.). _____
11. We gave it to ourselves. _____
12. They gave it to her. _____
13. Vidimus nos. _____

67

14. Id mihi dedi. _____
15. Vidistis vos. _____
16. Venimus cum vobis. _____
17. Id ei dedi. _____
18. Id vobis dedistis. _____
19. Vidit eum. _____
20. Venerunt cum eis. _____
21. Id eis dederunt. _____
22. Se vidit. _____
23. Se amant. _____
24. Id sibi dederunt. _____
25. Amo meum canem (dog). _____
26. Vidimus amicos nostros. _____
27. Vides tuos amicos. _____
28. Video tuos amicos. _____
29. Videmus vestros amicos. _____
30. Videbitis eius amicos. _____
31. Vidit eius amicos. _____
32. Vidit suos amicos. _____
33. Viderunt eorum amicos. _____
34. Viderunt suos amicos. _____
35. Dederunt id eorum amicis. _____
36. Dederunt id suis amicis. _____
37. He saw himself. _____
38. They saw our friends. _____
39. We saw you. _____
40. They saw themselves. _____
41. I saw your friends. _____
42. They saw your friend. _____
43. I saw my friends. _____
44. We saw our friend. _____
45. They saw themselves. _____
46. They saw their friends. _____
47. I gave it to my friends. _____
48. They gave it to them. _____

49. She came with her friend. _____

50. Venistis cum amicis vestris. _____

51. You (pl.) gave it to yourselves. _____

52. They gave it to their own friends. _____

53. They gave it to themselves. _____

54. He came with their friends. _____

55. He came with his [own] friends. _____

56. He came with his [not his own] friends. _____

57. They gave it to our friends. _____

58. They saw their [own] friends. _____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

ipse, ipsa, ipsum	This pronoun always causes some confusion because of its English translation. It's an emphatic adjective or pronoun, and we translate it with our "him-, her-, it- or them- self (selves)". Because it is the same form we use for our reflexive pronoun, students often mistranslate it. "Ipse" underlines or emphasizes the noun it's modifying or the noun it's replacing. "Ipse id fecit" would mean "He himself did it", not "He did it himself" which means he did it all by himself, or "He did it to himself". "Ipsa id fecit" would mean "She herself did it". "Vidi ipsos viros:" would mean "I saw the very men themselves". You'll have to practice with this demonstrative some.
ante + acc. or adv.	The preposition means "before" as in "ante bellum" (before the war). It can also be used as an adverb, but you won't see it in this book. Wheelock warns you not to confuse it with "anti", which is a Greek word which means "against" or "instead of".

01/05/93

69

CHAPTER 14

"I-Stem Nouns of the Third Declension; Ablative of Means, Manner, and Accompaniment"

THIRD DECLENSION NOUNS

As you learned in Chapter 7, the thematic vowel of the third conjugation case endings tends to be a short "-e-". You also saw that the short "-e-" has a habit of turning into an "-i-". Let's take a look at the third declension endings again. Remember, part of the problem of nouns which belong to the third declension is that their stem -- that is, the root to which the case endings are added -- may be a substantially different form from the nominative singular. You must look at the dictionary listing for the genitive singular to get the true stem of the noun. (And don't forget the laws of the neuter nouns: (1) the accusative is always the same as the nominative; and (2) the nominative plural ending is a short "-a-".) Decline the following nouns:

	homo, -inis (m)	virtus, -tutis (f)	tempus, -oris (n)
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

As you can see, masculine, feminine and neuter nouns of the third declension use the same case endings. The only exceptions are the accusative singular and the nominative and accusative plural of neuter nouns. But this is what neuter nouns do, no matter what declension they belong to: they obey the laws of the neuter. So really, the neuter nouns of the third declension use the same endings as third declension masculine and feminine nouns. The only differences are where neuter nouns are obeying their own peculiar laws.

THIRD DECLENSION I-STEM NOUNS

There is a class of nouns in the third declension which does not maintain this regularity. We call this class of third declension nouns the "i-stems" because an "-i-" turns up in some unexpected places in the case endings. Basically, i-stem nouns use the same endings as the normal, non-i-stem third declension nouns. But in a couple of places, i-stem nouns differ. What is more, i-stem masculine and feminine nouns don't behave the same way neuter i-stem nouns behave. So you're going to have to learn three things in this chapter:

1. how to recognize whether a third declension noun is an i-stem noun;
2. how to decline masculine and feminine i-stem nouns;
3. how to decline neuter i-stem nouns.

First off: how can you tell whether a noun is an i-stem noun of the third declension? The dictionary doesn't tell you explicitly whether a noun is i-stem or not because there are ways to tell simply by looking at the normal dictionary entries for a noun: the nominative case, the genitive case (including the stem), and the gender.

NEUTER I-STEMS

Let's start with the easiest.

I. Rule for Detecting Neuter i-stem Nouns

(a) If a third declension noun is neuter, and
(b) if its nominative case ends in "-al", "-ar", or "-e",
THEN the noun is a neuter i-stem.

This is fairly easy. You look up a noun and the dictionary tells you this: "animal, -is (n)". "Animal" is the nominative case. The next entry tells you the genitive, from which you spot any stem changes and learn the declension of the noun. The "-is" entry tells you there are no stem changes and that the noun is third declension (since "-is" is the genitive ending in the third declension). The final entry is, of course, the gender, and for "animal" it's neuter. Therefore, you have a neuter noun of the third declension whose nominative ends in "-al". So the noun is an i-stem. Simple, isn't it. So if you remember this rule, you'll be able to spot, from the dictionary entry alone, all neuter i-stem nouns of the third declension: if it's a neuter noun which ends in "-al", "-ar", or "-e", then it's an i-stem. And how do neuter i-stems decline? They differ from non-i-stem nouns in four cases:

```
(1)     the ablative singular is a long "-i" instead of the
        normal short "-e";
(2,3)   the nominative (and therefore the accusative) plural
        is "-ia" instead of just plain "-a";
(4)     the genitive plural is "-ium" instead of "-um".
```

Let's have a look. Decline the following neuter i-stem nouns, and compare them to a regular neuter noun of the third declension "corpus, -oris (n)":

	corpus, -oris	animal, -is	mare, -is	exemplar, -is
N/V.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____	_____

MASCULINE AND FEMININE I-STEMS

Masculine and feminine i-stems are both easier and more complicated at the same time. On the one hand, there is only one case where the masculine and feminine i-stems differ from the regular non-i-stems. On the other hand, the detection process is more exquisite. First the detection.

There are two different rules for establishing whether a masculine or feminine third declension noun is an i-stem. But you can get all the information you need by looking at the standard dictionary entry. Here are the two rules.

I. The Parisyllabic Rule (the Equal Syllable Rule)

```
(a)  If a masculine or feminine noun ends in an "-is" or an
     "-es" in the nominative singular, and
(b)  if the nominative singular and the genitive singular
     have the same number of syllables,
     THEN the noun is an i-stem of the masculine and feminine
     type.
```

Let's go right along to the second rule; after that I'll show you some examples.

II. The Double Consonant Rule

```
(a)  If a masculine or feminine noun ends in an "-s" or an
     "-x", and
(b)  if its stem ends with two consonants,
```

THEN the noun is an i-stem of the masculine and feminine type.

Let's look at an example of both these rules. You see this noun in the dictionary: "civis, civis (m)". Is it an i-stem? Well, it's a masculine noun of the third declension. It's not neuter, so you don't have to worry about whether the nominative ends in an "-al", "-ar", or "-e". But you do have to run it through the two rules for masculine and feminine nouns. (The Parisyllabic and the Double Consonant rules apply ONLY to masculine and feminine nouns.) The nominative ends in an "-s", so you have to pursue the double consonant rule a little farther. Look at the stem: it's "civ-". Does its stem end with two consonants? No, so "civis" fails the second provision of the Double Consonant rule.

Now try to run it through the Parisyllabic rule. The nominative ends in "-is", which is the first provision of the rule, so you have to go on. Provision (b) of the Parisyllabic rule also applies to "civis", since the nominative and the genitive cases have the same number of syllables. So, according to the Parisyllabic rule, "civis" is an i-stem noun of the masculine an feminine type.

Another noun: "ars, artis (m)". Follow the steps carefully. Is this an i-stem? Why or why not? Of course it is. It ends in "-s" or "-x" in the nominative (provision (a) of the Double Consonant rule), and its stem, "art-", ends in a double consonant. It fulfills both provision of the Double Consonant rule, so it is an i-stem.

So how do masculine and feminine i-stem nouns decline? The only case where they differ from the non-i-stem nouns is in the genitive plural, where the i-stems insert an "-i-" before the normal "-um" ending of the third declension. And that's it. Decline the following nouns.

	homo, -inis (m)	ars, artis (m)	civis, civis (m)
N/V.			
Gen.			
Dat.			
Acc.			
Abl.			
N/V.			
Gen.			
Dat.			
Acc.			
Abl.			

This may seem like a lot to remember (and it probably is), but try to work slowly through these drills; be deliberate and logical. You'll be surprised at how quickly these rules stick. Which of these nouns are i-stems? If any is an i-stems, indicate which rule applies to it.

	I-STEM (YES/NO)	RELEVANT RULE
ignis, ignis (f)		
dens, dentis (m)		
civitas, -tatis (f)		
rex, regis (m)		
opus, operis (n)		
tempus, -oris (n)		
nox, noctis (f)		
moles, molis (f)		
urbs, urbis (f)		

72

sol, solis (m)	_____	_____
hostis, hostis (m)	_____	_____
dux, ducis (m)	_____	_____
orator, -toris (m)	_____	_____
finis, finis (m)	_____	_____
gens, gentis (f)	_____	_____
laus, laudis (f)	_____	_____
genus, generis (n)	_____	_____
veritas, -tatis (f)	_____	_____
aetas, -tatis (f)	_____	_____

USES OF THE ABLATIVE: MANNER, ACCOMPANIMENT, MEANS

Way back when I promised you that we'd someday have to start cleaning up the ablative case. Today is that day; but this is going to be just a start, and just a review. The ablative case can be used either with a governing preposition or without one. If the ablative case completes the meaning of a preposition, then the ablative itself poses no real problem as far as the translation goes. You simply translate the preposition and then the noun:

de veritate	=	about truth
e civitate	=	from the city
sub mari	=	under the sea
in Graecia	=	in Greece
cum meo filio	=	with my son

In other words, the fact that the noun itself is in the ablative case presents no difficulties. It's in the ablative case because that is the case required by the preposition which is governing it.

A noun can be in the ablative case, however, without a preposition; when it is, the noun takes on a special meaning that is derived from the ablative case itself. As the weeks go by you'll be collecting a list of the uses of the prepositionless ablative case. Up to this point, you have only one use of the ablative case without a preposition: it's the Instrumental Ablative (also called the "Ablative of Means"). Do you remember this one:

"Veritatem oculis animi videre possumus".

Here you have the noun "oculis" in the ablative plural without a preposition, so, as far as you know, this must be an Instrumental Ablative (or Ablative of Means). An Instrumental Ablative shows with what thing the action of the verb is performed, and there as many ways we can translate it into English. We can say,

"We can see truth with the eyes of the soul".
"We can see truth by the eyes of the soul".
"We can see truth by means of the eyes of the soul".
"We can see truth through the eyes of the soul".

Although each of these translations in English have their own feel and association of meanings, they are all legitimate translations of the Latin Instrumental Ablative. Use your own native English sense to tell you which translation to use, but remember the essential meaning of the Latin Instrumental Ablative: it shows with what thing the action of the verb is performed.

CUM + ABLATIVE = ABLATIVE OF MANNER OR ACCOMPANIMENT

One use of the ablative with a preposition needs a little further examination. You probably remember that the preposition "cum" + ablative" means "with" in the sense of accompaniment. This use of the ablative is fairly straight forward, because it works like English.

Veniam cum amicis meis ad nostram patriam.
Invenietis eum cum nostro filio.
Tyrannus erit ibi cum ducibus.

But "cum" + ablative can also mean something that boarders on our adverbs. Well call it the "Ablative of Manner", because it gives you some information about how or in what manner the action was completed. And words which tell you how the action was performed are adverbs.

Now let's pause a second. Don't get this confused with the Ablative of Means. The Ablative of Means will answer the question "With what" the action is performed; the Ablative of Manner tells you "In what manner" the action is being performed. Study these examples. Where would the English be representing a Latin Ablative of Manner, where an Ablative of Means, where an Ablative of Accompaniment?

"She saw the fire with her binoculars".
"Dogs run with their legs".
"He drove the nail in with his hammer".
"He drove the nail in with great haste".
"He drove the nail in with indifference".
"They put the wall up with great speed".

So how does the Ablative of Manner approach the adverb? What is another way to say "with great haste"? We could say "very hastily", and "hastily" is an adverb. How about "with indifference"? "Indifferently". But some of the Ablative of Manner have no nice one-word adverbial equivalent. For example, what would the adverb for "with great speed" be? The Ablative of Manner affords the writer the opportunity to elaborate on the manner in which the action is being performed in a way a simple adverb does not. Now let's look at some examples in Latin. Remember, translate them into idiomatic English.

1. Cum celeritate id fecit.

_____

2. Cum civibus istis nos non iungemus.

_____

3. Cum cura cucurrimus.

_____

4. Gessimus civitatem cum sapientia.

_____

5. Tyrannus civitatem pecunia cepit.

_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

vis, vis (f) In the singular it means "power"; in the plural it means "strength". A very strange noun, with a very strange declension. As you can tell it's third declension and it should be an i-stem noun. (The Parisyllabic rule.) In the singular it's odd but somewhat predictable; but in the plural it changes stems: from "v-" to "vir-". Pay attention, though; it's easy to mix up the plural of "vis" with the 2nd declension noun "vir, -i, (m)". Look it over; and write down the plural of "vir" next to it in the plural. Even though, as you can see, none of the forms of the two words are identical, still students always confuse them. Believe me: you must work a little to keep the two straight.

	SINGULAR	PLURAL	PLURAL OF vir, -i
N/V.	vis	vires	viri
Gen.	vis	virium	virorum
Dat.	---	viribus	viris
Acc.	vim	vires	viros
Abl.	vi	viribus	viris

CHAPTER 15

"The Imperfect Indicative Active; Ablative of Time"

FORMING THE IMPERFECT TENSE

Up to this chapter, you have learned five of the six tenses of Latin verbs. You've seen that the tenses fall into two main classes: the present system -- the tenses formed off the first principal part; and the perfect system -- the tenses which use the third and fourth principal parts. The perfect system tenses are the perfect, pluperfect, and future perfect. The present system tenses are the present, future, and, as you'll see now, the imperfect. You remember that the present system works like this:

```
FIRST PRINCIPAL PART    +  TENSE SIGN   +  PERSONAL ENDINGS
```

In the present tense, there is no tense sign, so the personal endings are added directly to the first principal part. The tense sign for the future tense is "-be-" for the first and second conjugations, but "-a-" or "-e-" for the third and fourth. The imperfect tense also is formed precisely according to this pattern: stem + tense sign + personal endings. So to form the imperfect tense you need to know its tense sign and the personal endings it uses.

The tense sign for the imperfect tense is "-ba-", which is added to the lengthened stem of the first principal part. So what do we mean by lengthened? It means that the stem vowel, if it is not already long, is made long. This obviously applies only to the third conjugation, where the stem vowel is a short "-e-". It becomes long "-e-". The stem vowel of the first and second conjugations are already long -- "-a-" and "-e-" -- so they aren't affected by lengthening. But something odd happens to the stem vowels of the third conjugation i-stem and the fourth conjugation. Their stems vowels lengthen to "-ie-" before the tense sign "-ba-". Finally, the imperfect tense uses the alternative ending "-m" in place of "-o" for the first person singular ending. This makes some sense. Suppose the imperfect were to use "-o" for the first person singular. What would happen? Well, think back: what happens in the first person singular of first conjugation verbs, whose stem vowel is long "-a-"? The "-a-" is elides with the "-o-" and is lost: "lauda + o = laudo". Now if the imperfect were to use "-o" instead of "-m", the same thing would happen and the ending of the verb would be "-bo", which is the same as the future. So, perhaps to avoid confusion, the imperfect tense uses the "-m". Enough on that. So here, then, is the formula for forming the imperfect tense, with notes on the things to remember.

```
FIRST PRINCIPAL PART + ba + PERSONAL ENDINGS
```

1. the stem vowel lengthens;
2. the stem vowel for third i-stem and fourth conjugation verbs is "-ie-";
3. the first person singular ending is "-m".

Now conjugate the imperfect tense for the four conjugations. (Check your work on page 70 of Wheelock.)

1	2	3	3i	4
laudo	moneo	duco	capio	audio

THE MEANING OF THE IMPERFECT TENSE

I told you back in Chapter 12 that there is a good reason the present, future, and imperfect are all collected together under one system -- the present system. Now I'll show you why. All three tenses have an aspect of incompleteness about them; a sense that the action they're describing is in a state of going-on. With the simple future, obviously, the action can't be thought of as having been already finished. Then it wouldn't be in the future. The present, too, is used to talk about something that is going on right as we're talking about it. There's something about the stem of these tenses that infects them with this notion of unfulfillment, of continuation, rather than perfection or completeness.

The imperfect tense, too, although it refers to a past action which, presumably, has already been completed by the time the speaker is talking about it -- the imperfect tense, too, indicates an action that was going on in the past over a length time, or that occurred again and again in the past, and hence is not viewed by the speaker of ever having reached a definite point of

completion. Let's look at some examples of the English imperfect tense; you'll have an instinctive sense for the imperfective idea in the verbs, but try to develop some consciousness about it.

A. Even though the game still was going on, I left the stadium.
B. David always used to like to go to the zoo.
C. She would always come on Tuesdays.

In example A, contrast the imperfect tense "was going on", with the preterit "left". The fact that "I left" is viewed by the speaker as an action that had a definite end; it's something he did in a finite amount of time and something he completed. The fact that the game was still going on, however, is viewed as the general context in which he performed the action of leaving. The game was going on before he left, and, presumably, it continued to go on after he left. The game is viewed as an action with no explicitly conceived beginning and no definite end. Now, of course, the game did start at some definite time in the past, and it's probably over by now, but the way the speaker chose to represent it for his own needs was as an action that extended over an indefinite period of time. In another context he might say, "The game started at 3:30 and ended at 7:00". The point is, there's nothing "inherently" imperfective about the game; the speaker's portrayal of it will make it either perfect or imperfect.

In examples B and C, we have something slightly different. Here English expressions "used to like" and "would come" are indicating things which occurred repeatedly in the past. The Latin imperfect has this sense as well. Because a repeated or habitual action also has the sense of incompleteness -- he or she never stopped doing whatever he or she used to do -- the imperfect tense is also used to express this meaning: repeated or habitual action.

Another use of the Latin imperfect is to show a "state of being" something was in the past: "He was six feet tall" or "I was able to see". Here the sense of continuity is almost a part of the meaning of the verbs. When you say "He was", you're generally talking about something that had some duration in the past: "He was six feet tall". This is why the imperfect tense of the Latin verbs "sum" and "possum" are used much more frequently than the perfects "fui" and "potui". Still, in actual practice, the differences between "eram" and "fui", "poteram" and "potui" are often imperceptible. So let's gather our wits about the imperfect in Latin.

1. It's formed from the lengthened stem of the first principal part. The tense sign is "-ba-", and it uses the "-m" ending for the first person singular.
2. It's used to talk about an action in the past which the writer perceives as going on for sometime when another action occurred. Here our English equivalent might be the preterit of "to be" plus the present participle: "was looking", "were flying", etc. E.g., "It was raining hard in Frisco."
3. It's also used to talk about a repeated or habitual action in the past. Our English translations might be "used" plus the present infinitive, or "would". E.gg., "George used to go to the park on Tuesdays"; "George would go to the park on Tuesdays".
4. It's also used to talk about a state of being in the past. For this reason the verbs which tell you the condition of someone or something in the past are usually in the imperfect tense. E.gg., "Magister discipulos docere non poterat" (The teacher couldn't teach his students). "Meae filiae pulchrae erant" (My daughters were beautiful).

English has a variety of ways of expressing the Latin imperfect tense, as you can see in these three examples. The different ways are not identical, and you'll have to decide which is best by looking at the context of the Latin imperfect.

DRILLS

Translate the following short sentences.

1. Patres suos filios amabant.

_____

2. Eram stultus.

_____

3. Tyrannus mortem timebat.

_____

4. Rex ista pericula vicit.

_____

5. Rex ista pericula vincebat.

_____

6. You (pl.) were not with me.

_____

7. We could not see him.

_____

8. The king was speaking for a long time.

_____

9. The gods used to give men freedom.

_____

10. Caesar himself would always run in these roads.

_____

ABLATIVE OF TIME: WHEN AND WITHIN WHICH

As you saw in the last chapter, the ablative case can either be used with a governing preposition or by itself. When there is a preposition, the ablative poses no special problems per se. You simply translate the preposition and then the noun. The meaning of the preposition overrides any special senses attached to the ablative case. (The one preposition, however, you need to watch out for is "cum", which can either mean "with" in the sense of accompaniment or "with" in the sense of manner.) The only use of the ablative case without a preposition you know so far is the instrumental ablative or ablative of means.

Another prepositionless use of the ablative case is called the Ablative of Time. You can easily spot such a use in Latin. If you see a noun in the ablative case which is not governed by a preposition, and if the noun is some unit of time, then you have an Ablative of Time. But what makes this use of the ablative beastly difficulty for English speaking students is not the Latin, but the variety of English translations we can use to represent the Latin expression of time.

You see, Latin has one construction -- a noun expressing a unit of time in the ablative case -- and English has two ways of translating it, and they both mean something quite different. We call the construction in Latin the Ablative of Time When or Time Within Which, not because Latin has two different construction, but because English does, and when we translate the Latin construction into English, we have to choose which of the two English construction best fits the context. Let's start by looking at some English expressions of time which use prepositions.

1. "They'll be here in an hour".
2. "They came on Tuesday".
3. "In less than five minutes they were all gone".
4. "Snow never falls in the summer".
5. "It'll be snowing in a couple of months".
6. "At that time in human history, there were no alarm clocks".
7. "Within a couple of hours, Caesar had conquered all of Asia".
8. "In the Middle Ages, things were different".

I don't doubt that you had no trouble understanding these sentences and recognizing, in particular, the meaning of the expressions of time. You don't have to scratch your heads and puzzle over them because their exact meanings are embedded unconsciously in your linguistic repertoire. But to translate the Latin Ablative of Time, you must force yourself to understand consciously what these different expressions of time are telling you.

Despite the variety of lexical forms, these expressions of time above fall into only two classes. Let's try something. Before I try to explain the different expressions to you, read these sentences carefully and try to divide them into two groups based on their expressions of time. Trust your instincts. Hints:

(1) don't rely solely on the prepositions to tell you the differences (some prepositions can be used in both expressions of time);
(2) there are an equal number of sentences in each group. Give it a shot (but you'd probably better use pencil).

Put all the sentences that have temporal expressions like that of sentence #1 into Class A; all those like that of sentence #2 into Class B

CLASS A

1. "They'll be here in an hour".

2.

3.

4.

CLASS B

1. "They came on Tuesday".

2.

3.

4.

How did you do? The answer is that the odd numbered sentences comprise one category of expressions of time, and the even numbered another. You undoubtedly did fairly well at this exercise, again, because your native feel for English helped you "sense" the differences and similarities, even though you might not be able to explain your reasons to a non-native speaker of English. If you made errors, correct them now.

Now let's do the tough work. Precisely what is the difference between the temporal expressions in Classes A and B? Well, imagine that a foreign student of English is asking you this question. How would you answer it? Try. It's hard, isn't it? Let's give it a try.

The expressions of time in Class A involve a duration of time but with a definite beginning or end to the action clearly in mind. Sentence #1 tells you that it'll will be another hour (the duration of time) before they start being here (start of something). Sentence #2 tells you that it took an hour (duration of time), but they finally did leave (end of something). And so on with the rest in Class A.

Now notice that the prepositions "in" or "within" can both be used in this kind of expression. That would present no problem, if it weren't for the fact that "in" can be used in the other kind of temporal expression, too. Look at the examples under Class B; you'll see "in" used there, too. The way to tell whether "in" is being used in the sense of Class A is to try to replace it with the preposition "within". If the sentence still makes good English idiom, then "in" means time in the sense explained above. This is why we call this expression of time "Time Within Which", because the English preposition "within" always connotes the proper sense.

WORKS:	"I'll see you in two days" = "I'll see you within two days".
DOESN'T WORK:	"It rains in the summer" ~ "It rains within the summer".

How about Class B; how would you explain the meaning of the expressions of time here? These expression tell you the time at which something is, was or will be taking place. There is no implied sense of the duration of the action with an emphasis on it beginning or its end. This is why we call it "Time When". "I teach Latin on Monday" simply identifies the time I teach as if it were a single point on a time line. Again, English has a variety of prepositions it uses to express this kind of time, as you can see: "See me on Monday at five o'clock in the afternoon".

Okay, so much for English. Remember, the reason we looked at all this was that these two different expression of time in English can both be used for one expression of time in Latin: the prepositionless ablative case. What you have to do when you're translating from Latin to English is decide which English expression is the more appropriate. So let's look at the Latin.

Consider the following Latin sentences. Try to decide how best to translate the expression of time into English: "Paucis horis Caesar in Asiam venit". Which would be best: "within a few hours" or "at, on, or in a few hours"? Undoubtedly "within (or in) a few hours" is the better here. Not "At a few hours, Caesar went into Asia", but "In (or within) a few hours, Caesar went into Asia". Next: "Aetate pueri ludebant" ("ludo" = to play). "Within the summer" or "in the summer"? The last, obviously, since it can be thought to answer the question "time when", not "time within which". One last example: "Una hora Asiam totam vici". Is this telling time "within which" or "time when"? Certainly "time within which" because there's a sense of duration of time with a terminus of the action in mind: "I conquered all Asia within (or in) one hour".

I know that some of these distinctions can be rather hair splitting. You just have to work with them a lot and keep you mind in high gear at all times. Here is one last test you can use to decide whether an expression of time is a Time When or Time Within Which construction. Try to rephrase the sentence in question in the following way:

"It takes (or took or will take) X Y Z"

[Where X is the subject of the original sentence; Y is the

expression of time, and Z is the infinitive of the original conjugated verb.]

If the resulting sentence preserves the meaning of the original sentence, then the expression of time is Time Within Which. "In three years I'll be out of this place" = "It will take me three years to be out of this place". The rewritten sentence means the same thing as the original sentence, so "in three years" is an expression of Time Within Which. "In the cenozoic era, dinosaurs walked on the earth" ~ "It took dinosaurs the cenozoic era to walk on the earth". The rewritten sentence does not mean the same thing as the original sentence, therefore, "in the cenozoic era" is not an expression of Time Within Which, but Time When.

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

miser, -a, -um	You haven't seen an adjective like this for a while. It uses the case endings of the first and second declensions, but in place of the "-us" ending for the masculine nominative singular, it uses the other ending "-er". Is the "-e-" of "-er" part of the stem?
iacio	There is nothing terribly unusual about this verb. It's a normal third conjugation i-stem. The tricky part comes in recognizing it in a compound verb (when a prefix is attached to it). The first principal part loses the vowel "-a-" altogether: "e + iacio = eicio", which is pronounced "eh YI ki oh". In the third principal part, the vowel returns, but this time as the long "-e-", which is the normal vowel for the third principal part: "e + ieci = eieci", which is pronounced "eh YEAH kee.
inter + acc.	It means either "among or between", so we need to fret over which is the best English translation. Do you remember when standard English calls for "among" and when "between"? Use "between" with two objects; "among" for three or more. "This is a secret just between you and me". "This is a secret we keep among the family members only".

1/08/93

80

CHAPTER 16

"Adjectives of the Third Declension"

Wheelock assures you that there isn't much new material to learn in this chapter, and in a way he's right. You know what adjectives are, and you know the case endings of the third declension. In this chapter, you going to see that a class of adjectives uses the third declension endings to form the different numbers, genders, and cases. Even though these adjectives use the third declension endings, they may modify nouns of all the declension; i.e., third declension adjectives are not restricted to modifying only third declension nouns. But that's nothing conceptually new: you've seen adjectives of the first and second declensions modifying nouns of the third declension. So, as you can see, Wheelock is right to say that this chapter doesn't really confront you will a mass of new material to memorize.

On the other hand, people tend to confuse things which are similar more often than things which are quite distinct from one another. Third declension adjectives work like adjectives of the first and second declensions, but there are some important differences which you must keep straight. Additionally, the endings used by these adjectives are almost identical to the endings which nouns of the third declension use, but only almost. I'm trying to warn you that this isn't going to be an easy chapter. You're going to have grip the book firmly and keep a sharpened pencil nearby. Let's start.

ADJECTIVES

First let's take stock of what you know. You know that adjectives are words which modify nouns, and that they "agree" in number, gender, and case with they are modifying. To agree with nouns, which may be in all the possible cases, numbers and genders, adjectives must be able to decline. The adjectives you're familiar with decline in the first and second declensions: they use first declension case endings to modify nouns which are feminine, second declension endings to modify nouns which are masculine and neuter. The dictionary entry for such adjectives look like this:

```
magnus, -a, -um          miser, -a, -um
bonus, -a, -um           pulcher, -chra, -chrum
bellus, -a, -um          noster, -tra, -trum
```

Things to notice are:

1. adjectives have no inherent gender fixed in the stem, so the dictionary doesn't list a gender for adjectives;
2. sometimes the true stem of the adjective is not identical with the masculine, nominative singular, so you must scan the other listings for stem changes (e.g. the "-e-" of "pulcher" and "noster" is not a part of the true stem);
3. first and second adjectives can modify nouns of any of the other declensions, not just those of the first and second declensions.

ADJECTIVES OF THE THIRD DECLENSION

The name speaks for itself. Some adjectives get their case endings from the third declension. So you have two things to consider:

1. what are the case endings;
2. how does the dictionary distinguish between a third declension adjective from one of the first and second declension: i.e., how can you tell where the adjective is going to get its case endings simply by looking at the dictionary entries.

Let's take up the first point by reviewing the third declension endings for nouns. Decline the following third declension nouns, and don't forget to check whether the nouns are i-stems: "homo, -inis (m)"; "tempus, -oris (n)"; "virtus, -tutis (f)"; "mare, -ris (n)". (If you're unsure of the third declension endings, you should stop right now and review them.)

	man	time	virtue	sea
N/V.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____	_____

Dat.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____	_____

Here are the things to remember about the third declension case endings:

1. the third declension endings are divided into two groups: the non-i-stem endings and the i-stem endings;
2. the nominative singular has many different appearances;
3. basically the case endings are the same for non-i-stem nouns of all three genders. The apparent exception is with the neuter nouns, where the neuter nouns are following their own peculiar set of laws: nominative and accusative cases are always the same, and the nominative (hence accusative also) plural ending is short "-a"
4. With i-stem nouns, however, the endings used by masculine and feminine nouns are slightly different from those used by neuter nouns.

So what endings does a third declension adjectives use? An adjective is going to have to able to modify nouns of all three genders, so a third declension adjective will have to be able to masculine, feminine, and neuter. To do this, a third declension adjective uses the pattern of the i-stem endings, with one further refinement: the ablative singular of the masculine and feminine is long "-i", not short "-e". Cover up the two columns of endings on the right and try to write down the endings third declension adjectives are going to use. Check your work against the answers given in the two right columns.

CASE ENDINGS FOR THIRD DECLENSION ADJECTIVES

	MASC./FEM.	NEUTER	MASC./FEM.	NEUTER
N/V.	----------	----------	-------	-------
Gen.	_____	_____	-is	-is
Dat.	_____	_____	-i	-i
Acc.	_____	_____	-em	-------
Abl.	_____	_____	-i	-i
N/V.	_____	_____	-es	-ia
Gen.	_____	_____	-ium	-ium
Dat.	_____	_____	-ibus	-ibus
Acc.	_____	_____	-es	-ia
Abl.	_____	_____	-ibus	-ibus

So these are the variable case endings which are going to be attached to the stem of third declension adjectives. The endings are almost identical to those of the third declension nouns; so, as Wheelock puts it, there's nothing much new to be learned.

STEMS OF THIRD DECLENSION ADJECTIVES

So you've seen that adjectives of the third declension follow the analogy of first and second declension adjectives: stem + case endings. And you've studied their case endings. Now let's look at the stems of these adjectives and see how they're going to be listed in the dictionary.

First, here's a last look at a good old fashioned adjective of the first and second declensions:

```
bellus, -a, -um
vester, -tra, -trum
```

The entry tells you (1) which case endings the adjective uses for the different genders, cases, and numbers, and (2) whether the stem is the not what it appears to be in the masculine nominative singular. Remember that an adjective listing in the dictionary does not start to decline the adjective, as it does for a noun. Instead it gives you the nominative forms, from which you deduce the declension and any stem changes. These are the things an entry for any adjective must tell you. So how does this work with third declension adjectives?

But before I show you that -- do you get the feeling I'm trying to put this off -- let me give you some good news. There are

82

only two kind of adjectives in the Latin language: those of the first and second declensions, and those of the third. There are no other possibilities. Either an adjective uses the "-us (-er), -a, -um" endings or those of the third declension. So if you see an adjective in the dictionary and the adjective is not of the first and second declensions, then it must be a third declension adjective. There are no adjectives of the fourth and fifth declensions. That's the good news.

Now the bad news. There are three different types of adjectives of the third declension, but the difference is only in the nominative singular. All three adjectival types of the third declension use the case endings you studied above for all the case except the nominative singular. We need to focus now on the nominative singulars of these three types of adjectives. The different class are:

```
(1)   adjectives of two terminations
(2)   adjectives of one termination
(3)   adjectives of three terminations
```

The distinguishing feature among these declensions is how many different endings are possible in the nominative singular.

1. Type (1) adjectives have one ending in the nominative singular for the masculine and feminine genders, and one ending for the neuter gender; that makes two endings, hence "adjective of two terminations".
2. Type (2) has only one ending in the nominative singular for all three genders: hence "adjective of one termination".
3. Finally, obviously, type (3) has one ending in the nominative singular for the masculine gender, one for the feminine, and another for the neuter; that makes endings, hence "adjective of three terminations".

Now, before we zero in on these different types, let me repeat: after the nominative singular, these differences among the three types of adjectives disappear entirely. All three types use the normal case endings you're already good friends with.

ADJECTIVES OF TWO TERMINATIONS

Now, unlike nouns, an entry for an adjective (normally) lists only the nominative case. You know this: in "magnus, -a, -um" the "-us, -a, -um" endings are only the nominatives. Nouns, you remember, list the genitive singular ending after the nominative, and that's for a good reason. You have to be told

1. what a noun's declension is, and
2. whether there is a stem change.

For nouns, because they can't change gender, the next possible form after the nominative singular is the genitive singular. So, in effect, the dictionary must start declining the noun for you so that you can get the information you need. But adjectives, because they can have different genders, need not be "declined" for you. You can get all the information you need about stem changes and case endings by simply looking at the noun in a gender different form the first gender -- the masculine. The entry, therefore, of adjectives typically does not include the genitive singular; it instead moves across the genders in the nominative case. So what does this mean for our third declension adjectives?

All adjectives of two terminations look like this: "stemis, -e".

```
omnis, -e          "all; each, every"
fortis, -e         "strong"
dulcis, -e         "sweet"
difficilis, -e     "difficult"
brevis, -e         "short [in time]; swift"
```

Now think. I told you that adjectives typically will move across the genders in the nominative case, and here you have only two different forms indicated. This means that two of the genders will have identical forms in the nominative. For adjectives listed like this, the "-is" ending is used both for the masculine and feminine genders; the "-e" is used for the neuter in the nominative singular. And, as you can see, the stem does not change. It's evident in the nominative singular of the masculine and feminine genders. You just drop off the "-is". Decline the following expressions:

every	boy	every	girl	every	war

ADJECTIVES OF ONE TERMINATION

These adjectives have only one form in the nominative singular for all three genders. This creates an interesting problem. What will its dictionary entry look like? Most adjectives, remember, simply move across the nominative entries. But an adjective of only one termination in the nominative singular has only one form in the nominative singular. It must give you the information you need about it -- stem changes and declension -- by beginning its declension. Just like a noun, the second entry for an adjective of one termination is the genitive singular. You drop off the genitive singular ending "-is" to find the stem.

Now wait a minute. If an adjective of one termination is listed in the dictionary just like a noun, with the genitive singular as its second entry, how do you know whether the entry you're looking at is telling you the word is a noun or an adjective. Look:

```
potens, -ntis       "powerful"
dens, dentis (m)    "tooth"
```

Here you see the nominative singular entry "potens" followed by the genitive singular "potentis". The stem of the word is "potent-", but a noun of the third declension is list just like this. Look at the word for tooth. How do you know, even before you see the translation, that "potens" is an adjective and not a noun? Right! "Potens" has no gender listed; the noun "dens" does. The form "potens" can be masculine, feminine, or neuter. It's an adjective of one termination. Except in the nominative singular, adjectives of one termination operate just like all the other adjectives of the third declension; they all use the same case endings and obey the same laws. HINT: don't forget the laws of the neuter! Decline the following:

powerful	tooth	powerful	money	powerful	plan

ADJECTIVES OF THREE TERMINATIONS

As the name tells you, these are third declension adjectives which have three nominative singular endings, one ending for each gender. But there is an added twist. These adjectives end in "-er" in the masculine singular, and you know what that means. It means that the "-e-" of the "-er" might not be part of the true stem. Remember this problem with first and second declension adjectives like "miser, -a, -um" and "noster, -tra, trum"? Look at these two entries for third declension adjectives of three terminations:

```
celer, celeris, celere          "swift"
acer, acris, acre               "keen; fierce"
```

Do you see what the dictionary is telling you? The first listing is the masculine nominative singular. The second is the

feminine nominative singular, and it's here you need to look for stem changes. As you can see the stem of "celer" is "celer-"; the stem of "acer", however, is "acr-". So in all its forms except the masculine, nominative singular, the root of "acer" to which the case endings will be added is "acr-". The final entry is the neuter nominative singular. Now, don't forget, the only place where these adjectives have different forms for the three genders is right here, in the nominative singular. After the nominative singular, these adjectives use the normal endings of third declension adjectives. Decline the following.

swift	death	keen	memory	fierce	war

DRILLS

The third declension adjectives can often help you out of some problems. As you'll see once you start reading is that one of the main difficulties with Latin is that it has too few discrete case endings, not too many. The case endings overlap in so many places that it's often difficult to tell what case a noun is in. Having yet another set of endings helps you identify the case of the nouns of nouns these adjective are modifying. For example, look at the form "sapientiae". What case is "sapientiae"? Well, it could be

1. genitive singular,
2. dative singular, or
3. nominative plural.

The "-ae" ending in the first declension is used for three different cases. But suppose you see a third declension adjective next to it with an ending "-es". The "-es" ending in the third declension can only be nominative or accusative plural. "X"es must be agreeing with "sapientiae", so "sapientiae" must be nominative plural since that's the only number, gender, and case the two words have in common. What you've done is this:

The noun "sapientiae" can be

```
genitive singular
dative singular
nominative plural
```

The adjective "x"es must agree with "sapientiae" and its form can be

```
nominative plural
accusative plural
```

Therefore "'x'es sapientiae" must be nominative plural, since it is the only case and number where the case endings of the noun and adjective overlap.

Write out the possible number(s) and case(s) of the following nouns and adjectives. Don't worry about the translations for now, just focus on the endings.

		Number(s)	Gender	Case(s)
1.	omnium puerorum			
2.	celerem puellam			

95

3. potenti regi _____ _____ _____

4. potentibus viris _____ _____ _____

5. fortes feminae _____ _____ _____

6. fortis feminae _____ _____ _____

7. forti feminae _____ _____ _____

8. acres mortes _____ _____ _____

9. acri memoria _____ _____ _____

10. acri bello _____ _____ _____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

adiuvo	Despite its appearance, the verb is not a regular first conjugation. Look carefully at its principal parts: "adiuvo, -are, -iuvi, -iutus". (The "ad-" prefix only adds a little extra emphasis, as with the difference in English between "to help" and "to help out".)
quam	This adverb is used to emphasize an adjective. It doesn't mean "how" as in "in what way". It's used to modify adjectives and means "how" as in "How sweet it is!" or "How tall that young man is!"

01/08/93

86

CHAPTER 17

"The Relative Pronoun"

As has been the case in the last several chapters, this chapter really doesn't confront the neophyte with a lot of new grammatical concepts; it builds on knowledge already mastered. Still it's going to take a little patience, but we'll go slowly. Before we get to the relative pronoun per se, we're going to clean up a syntactical point you've already been working with, but may not have yet a firm conceptual understanding of. Let's look at what we mean by a "clause".

THE CLAUSE

You all remember the junior high school definition of a sentence: it's a complete thought. And by that we mean a thought which includes a noun, either expressed or implied, and a verb, either expressed or implied. That is, a complete thought must involve something which is doing something or which is being held up for description: "The road is blocked"; "The tree fell down"; and so on.

Now, the human mind is a wonderful thing. It reasons and perceives dozens of different kinds relationships between events, things, and ideas. It arranges events and facts logically and temporally, and in levels of priority. That is to say, it takes two or more things, things which are separate ideas, separate visions, and weaves them together conceptually and linguistically into what we "reasoning". The way this reasoning is expressed in language is called "syntax", which literally means "arranging together"; putting together events and things and facts. For example, the two separate ideas or visions -- "the road is blocked" and "the tree fell down" -- might have a causal relationship, which the mind instantly recognizes and expresses linguistically with an appropriate conjunction: "The road is blocked because the tree fell down". The conjunction "because" in this example is spelling out the relationship the speaker perceives between the two ideas. It's arranging them into a cause and effect relationship: that the tree fell down is a fact, and because of that fact, the road is now blocked.

Each thought, idea, or event, when it is expressed in language, is a called a clause. Hence the sentence "the road is blocked because the tree fell" contains two "clauses": the fact that the tree fell is expressed in one clause, and the fact that the road is blocked forms another "clause". It's possible for a sentence to contain only one clause, as in "Roses are red". It's also possible for a sentence to contain an ungodly number of clauses. See whether you can spot all the clauses -- that is separate thoughts -- in this sentence:

> "Since we are looking for the ideal orator, we must use our powers of oratory to portray a speaker free from all possible faults and endowed with every possible merit; for though it is undeniable that the large number of lawsuits, the great variety or public questions, the illiterate masses who make the audience of our public speakers, offer a field to ever the most defective orators, we will not for that reason despair of finding what we want" (Cicero, On the Orator, 26).

Let's back up and take a look at a string of unsubordinated clauses. (The speaker's name is George.)

> "The dog is mean. The dog lives next door. One day the dog bit George. George kicked the dog. George's neighbor came out of the house. George's neighbor owns the dog. George's neighbor screamed at George. George's neighbor called the police. The police came. The dog bit the police. The police shot the dog. George is happy. The dog is dead".

We don't talk like this because our language has developed a whole system of conjunctions and pronouns which allows us (1) to avoid all the unneeded repetition of nouns and (2) to make the logical and temporal relationships between thoughts explicit. There are a hundred ways to cast this string of events and facts which make full use of range of linguistic apparatus English makes available to us. Here's only one:

> "The dog that lives next door is mean, and one day he bit me. So I kicked him. My neighbor, who owns the dog, came out of the house and screamed at me. Then he called the police. When they came, the dog bit them too, so they shot it. I am happy the dog is dead".

You can see here all kinds of linkage between these thoughts, and all kinds of different linguistic apparatus that makes it possible. The kind of linkage we're interested in now is the "relative clause". Let's look at how it's done.

ENGLISH RELATIVE CLAUSES

Here's a bare bones definition of a relative clause: "A relative clause is a subordinate clause which acts like an adjective by providing additional information about a noun in another clause". Now here's an example showing the evolution of the relative clause.

```
CLAUSE 1:       "The five o'clock train is never on time".
CLAUSE 2:       "Hundreds of people take the five o'clock
                train".
```

The two clauses have something in common: the five o'clock train. Two separate facts have been identified about this train:

it's never on time and hundreds of people take it. A speaker may arrange these two clauses however he wishes, subject only to the idea he wished to convey to his listener. If, for example, the most important thing he wants his listener to know about the train is that it is late all the time, clause 1 will have to be logically and syntactically "superior" to the fact contained in clause 2. That is to say, the fact in clause 2 -- that hundreds of people take the five o'clock train -- will be added simply as additional information about the train. In grammatical circles we call the most important element in the sentence the "main" or "ordinate" or "independent clause"; we call any other clause a "subordinate" or "dependent clause", because it is, in a real sense, a subordinate, a worker in the employment of the main clause.

So let's assume that the most important fact the speaker wants to get across is contained in clause 1, and that clause 2 is going to be worked in only as subordinate material. How is this going to happen.

```
STEP 1:     Substitute "the five o'clock train" in clause 2 with
            the appropriate pronoun.  The pronoun will refer the
            listener to the noun stated in clause 1.

            CLAUSE 1:   "The five o'clock train is never on time".
            CLAUSE 2:   "Hundreds of people take it".
```

Now hold on. Why did we chose "it" as the appropriate pronoun to reproduce "the five o'clock train" in clause 2? Well, the noun which the pronoun has to reproduce is singular in number and inanimate, so "it" is the correct choice. Next, what case is "it" in? Look, it's acting as the object of the verb "take" in its clause, so "it" is in the objective (or accusative) case. (This was just a review. You already know that pronouns get their number and gender from their antecedents, but get their case from the way they're being used in their own clause.)

```
STEP 2:     Embed the subordinate clause into main clause.

            SENTENCE:   "The five o'clock train -- hundreds of
                        people take it -- is never on time".
```

We could almost stop here. The two sentences have been merged into one, and clause 2 has been subordinated to the idea in clause 1. That is to say, the structure of clause 1 forms the main architecture of the new sentence. But English developed a further modification to work these two clauses into one sentence. It replaces the pronoun of the subordinate clause with a pronoun which indicates without a doubt that the clause coming up is dependent, or subordinate to, the clause which has just been interrupted. We replace the pronoun with the relative pronoun "who, which" in the proper case and move it to the beginning of the clause. Now the two clauses have been completely welded into one sentence.

```
STEP 3:     Substitute and move the pronoun.

            SENTENCE:   "The five o'clock train, which hundreds of
                        people take, is never on time".
```

And there you have it. Clause 2 has been fully incorporated into the message of the first clause. As soon as you read the relative pronoun "which" in this sentence, your mind automatically understands two things:

1. the clause coming up is not as important as the clause you've just left and
2. the clause coming up is going to give you more information about some thing in the main clause.

So this sentence is saying something like this: "the five o'clock train -- which, by the by, hundreds of people take -- is never on time". And one last pesky question: what case is "which" in? It's in the objective (or accusative) case because it is still the object of the verb in the relative clause: "take". Remember, number and gender from the antecedent, but case from its clause.

Now let's go back to the two clauses when they were independent thoughts.

```
CLAUSE 1:    "The five o'clock train is never on time".
CLAUSE 2:    "Hundreds of people take the five o'clock train".
```

It's also possible that main idea the speaker wishes to get across is the fact contained in clause 2 and will have to subordinate clause 1 into clause 2, in which case clause 2 will provide the basic architecture for the new sentence. Like this: "Hundreds of people take the five o'clock train, which is never on time". Now what case is "which" in? Look at the relative clause. If that doesn't help, look at the sentence from which the relative clause evolved. It came from clause 1, where "the five o'clock train" was nominative. The "which" is simply standing in for it, so "which" must nominative. And it is.

THE ENGLISH RELATIVE PRONOUN: CASE SYSTEM

We're going to look at several more examples of this in a second, but for now I have a few more things to add about the English relative pronoun. Like the other pronouns in English, the relative pronoun preserves three distinct case forms and even distinguishes between animate and inanimate. There is no distinction between the numbers.

	ANIMATE	INANIMATE
Nom.	who	which
Gen.	whose	whose
Acc.	whom	which

Notes:

1. Obviously, since English has lost its grammatical gender, the relative pronoun "who, whose, and whom" are only going to be used for living beings, usually only human beings, though sometimes for animals.
2. A lot of people sniff at "whom" as archaic and elitist. That's possible, but I look at it this way: you should know how and when to use "whom" properly. If you're in a situation where your audience will denounce your pretensions to aristocracy if you use "whom", then don't use it. Don't go into a bar and say "Is this the same team whom the Packers beat last week?" On the other hand, if your listener will dismiss you as a bumpkin and ignoramus if you say "These are the actors who I'd admire", then use "whom". Knowing when to use "whom" correctly is like knowing the difference between a salad and oyster fork. It's not knowledge that's useful every day of your life, but when you need it it's nice to have. In any case, never use "whom" when you should use "who". You'll outrage everyone. If you're in doubt as to which to use, use "who".
3. The nominative and accusative case of the relative pronoun "who, which" has been almost entirely replaced in colloquial English by "that": "The boy that I saw..", "The girl that plays basketball..", The car that is in the garage..".
4. English also has the option of omitting the relative pronoun altogether, and often it does: "The boy whom I saw is six feet tall" becomes "The boy I saw is six feet tall". Latin doesn't have this option. It must always use the relative pronoun.

DRILL

Combine these two English sentences into one. Use the case system of the relative pronoun, and indicate which number and case the Latin equivalent would be in.

Examples:

A. "George kicked the dog. The dog lives next door".

English: "George kicked the dog that (which) lives next door".
Latin: nominative singular

B. "The students don't like Latin. The teachers gave the students a book".

English: "The girls, to whom the teacher gave a book, don't like Latin".
Latin: dative plural

1. "They see the cars. The cars belong to George".

English:

Latin:

2. "George likes hard boiled eggs. George's brother is in jail".

English:

Latin:

3. "Many students are never prepared for class. The professor is writing a very difficult final exam for the students".

English:

Latin:

4. "The rocks fell off the cliff. The rocks were very slick".

English:

Latin:

5. "Betty avoids my brother. My brother's hair is dyed pea-green".

English:

Latin:

THE LATIN RELATIVE PRONOUN

We've done all the difficult work. You understand what a relative clause is: (1) they are subordinate clauses; (2) they are introduced by relative pronouns; (3) the relative pronoun agrees in number and gender with its antecedent, but gets its case from the way it's being used in its own clause; and (4) they modify something in the main clause. Now you have only to learn the declensional system of the Latin relative pronoun and practice with it.

The Latin relative pronoun has a full declensional system. That is to say, it has 30 separate forms: five cases in three genders in both numbers. The stem is "qu-" and it follows basically the pattern set down by the pronouns "is, ea, id", "ille, illa, illud", etc. But there are some substantial variations. Here is the full pattern. Look for regularities first; then go back and collect the deviations.

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
Nom.	qui	quae	quod
Gen.	cuius	cuius	cuius
Dat.	cui	cui	cui
Acc.	quem	quam	quod
Abl.	quo	qua	quo
Nom.	qui	quae	quae
Gen.	quorum	quarum	quorum
Dat.	quibus	quibus	quibus
Acc.	quos	quas	quae
Abl.	quibus	quibus	quibus

Let's start the close up examination by running down the masculine forms first.

1. The nominative case singular is a little unusual: qui, but most of the demonstratives and pronouns are odd in the nominative singular.
2. The genitive and dative singulars (of the genders) use the predictable pronoun case endings "-ius" and "-i", but the stem has changed from "qu-" to "cu-".
3. In the accusative singular you'd expect "quum" ("qu" + "um"); but no such luck: "quem" is the form. The "-em" looks as if it's "borrowed" from the third declension, doesn't it.
4. Things calm down for a while, but the dative and ablative plurals use the "-ibus" ending which they evidently import from the third declension. Notice again that "quibus" is the form for all the genders in the dative and ablative plural.

Now let's have a look at the feminine.

1. Nominative's odd: "quae" instead of "qua". But so what?
2. Genitive and dative singular: stem "cu-" + "-ius" and "-i". Like the masculine.
3. Finally, the dative and ablative plurals aren't "quis" but, like the masculine, "quibus".

And then the neuter.

1. After having seen the masculine and feminine forms of the relative pronoun, the only truly unexpected quirk of the neuter is the nominative, hence also accusative, plural: you get "quae" instead of "qua". Pay attention, now, the form "quae" can be any one of four possibilities:
    a. feminine nominative singular;
    b. feminine nominative plural;
    c. neuter nominative plural;
    d. neuter accusative plural.

   Context will be your only guide.

Now try to write out the forms of the relative pronoun on your own.

MASCULINE FEMININE NEUTER

Nom.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

Nom.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

Okay, now let's take apart a couple of Latin sentences with relative clauses. Translate these sentences, and tell me the number gender and case of the relative pronouns. Try following these steps:

1. Go slowly;
2. First read the entire sentence and try to identify the main clause and the relative clause. The relative clause will begin with the relative pronoun and probably end with a verb;
3. After you've isolated the relative clause, forget it for a moment, and concentrate on translating the main clause -- the main clause is, after all, the most important thought in the sentence;
4. Next, look at the relative pronoun and try to figure out it number and gender -- forget about the case for now. You want to match up the relative pronoun with its antecedent, and the relative pronoun will agree with its antecedent in number and gender.
5. After all that, then you're ready to translate the relative clause. For that you'll need to know the case of the relative pronoun. Look carefully, and use what you know about its gender and number to check off any multiple possibilities.
6. The last step, then, after all the pieces of the sentence have been analyzed separately, is to put it all back together.
7. Go slowly.

1. "Vidi canem qui ex Asia venit". (canis, -is (m) "dog")

Translation: _____

Relative Pronoun: _____

2. "Vidi canes quos amas".

Translation: _____

Relative Pronoun: _____

3. "Puellae, quarum pater est parvus, sunt magnae".

Translation: _____

Relative Pronoun: _____

4. "Vidi pueros quibus libros dedistis".

Translation: _____

Relative Pronoun: _____

5. "Vidi pueros cum quibus venistis".

Translation: _____

Relative Pronoun: _____

6. "Civem quem miseratis laudaverunt".

Translation: _____

Relative Pronoun: _____

Now let's do it the other way.

1. "The tyrant destroyed the cities from which the citizens had fled".

_____

2. "He came with the citizen to whom they had entrusted their lives".

_____

3. "I saw the citizens with whom you had fled".

_____

4. "They have the money with which the tyrant captured the city".

_____

5. "The father whose sons were stupid came out of Asia".

_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

aut...aut	It used like this: aut x aut y = either x or y.
coepi, coepisse, coeptus	The first entry for this verb is the perfect tense, first person singular. The second is the perfect infinitive (which you have seen yet), and the third entry is the fourth principal part. The verb is listed this way because it has no first principal part -- which mean logically that "coepi" has no present system tenses: no present, future, or imperfect. Another way to list this verb would be: "----------, ----------, coepi, coeptus". Verbs which lack one or more principal part are called "defective verbs". To say "I begin", "I will begin", or "I was beginning", Latin uses the first principal part of the verb "incipio, -ere, -cepi, -ceptus.

01/08/93

CHAPTER 18

"The Passive Voice for the 1st and 2nd Conjugations in the Present System; Ablative of Agent"

THE ACTIVE VOICE

Up to this point in Latin, you've been working with verbs only in the "active voice"; that is, in forms which show that the subject of the verb is the agent of the action denoted in the verb. For example, in the sentence "Pueri litteras ad amicos suos mittent", the subject ("pueri") of the verb ("mittent"), and it is the "pueri" who are actually performing the action. And how do we know that the subject of the verb is the author of the action? In the present system, the verb tells you so in the personal ending. Do you remember the personal endings in Latin in the present system:

-o,-m	I	-mus	we
-s	you	-tis	you
-t	he, she, it	-nt	they

You learned that these endings tell you the person and number of the subject, but they actually were telling you more than that, though I kept it from you. Now it's time to come clean: these endings also tell you that the subject of the verb is itself performing the action of the verb. That is to say, these endings tell you the number and person of the subject, but additionally they tell you that the verb is in the "active voice". So these endings are more than the personal endings for the present system; they are the present system "active" personal endings.

THE PASSIVE VOICE IN ENGLISH

The grammars of Latin and English both recognize another "voice"; that is, another relationship the subject of the verb can have to the action of the verb. When the subject of the verb is itself represented as the direct recipient of the action of the verb, the verb is in the "passive voice". In English, the formation of the passive voice is a little clumsy: we use the third principal part of the verb and use it as a passive participle; then we use the verb "to be" in a inflected form as the auxiliary. Like this with the verb "see, saw, seen".

Present:	I	am	seen.
Present Progressive:	I	am being	seen.
Future:	I	will be	seen.
Imperfect:	I	was being	seen.

Can you detect this pattern: inflected form for the verb "to be" plus the passive participle of the verb you're conjugating. Notice that the verb "to be" is doing all the work.

THE PASSIVE VOICE OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM IN LATIN

By contrast, the formation of the passive voice in the present system in Latin is a marvel of simplicity. To begin with, which principal part of the verb do you think the passive voice in the present system will be built upon? If you guessed the first principal part, you did well. Remember, the Latin present, future, and imperfect tenses are formed off the first principal part, regardless of the voice. Next the verb endings you're familiar with are the active voice personal endings for the present system. Logically, therefore, it follows that there must be a set of "passive" personal endings. Here they are; watch for similarities with the active endings:

-or	I am [being]	-mur	we are [being]
-ris [-re]	you are [being]	-mini	you are [being]
-tur	he is [being]	-ntur	they are [being]

These are the endings you add to the normal stems to form the passive voice in the present system. Do you detect the similarities? Only the second person singular and plural endings are totally different from their active counterparts. Now let's take a closer look at how all of this is going to come together.

PRESENT TENSE PASSIVE FOR ALL CONJUGATIONS

The present tense in the active voice is formed simply by adding personal endings to the first principal part. (And remember, this stem includes the stem vowel: an "-a-" for first conjugation verbs, "-e-" for the second, "-e-" for the third, and "-i-" for the fourth.) To form the present tense passive, you simply replace the active personal endings with the passive endings.

The only apparently usual form you're going to see in all this is the second person singular of third conjugation verbs. You remember that the stem vowel of a third conjugation verb is short "-e-" and that it changes when you start adding personal endings. It becomes "-i-" and "-u-". But think back. The infinitive of third conjugation verbs isn't "-ire" but "-ere". That's because when the short "-e-" is followed by an "-r-" it stays short "-e-". So what's that going to mean for the second personal singular passive? The passive personal ending is "-ris", so, since the ending starts with an "-r-", the stem vowel will not change to "-i-" as you might expect, but it will remain short "-e-". So the form will end in "-eris", not "-iris", as you might

have expected. Write out the present tense passive of all four conjugations:

laudo	moneo	duco	capio	audio

FUTURE TENSE PASSIVE OF ALL CONJUGATIONS

To form the future tense passive, just as in the present tense, you simply replace the active personal endings with the passive personal endings. So form the future tense of each verb, without the personal endings first, then simply attach the passive personal endings. But be careful. In the second person singular of all conjugations except the fourth something odd is going to happen. Do you remember this rule of Latin phonetics? "When a short '-e-' is followed by an '-r-' it remains short '-e-'. So what does this mean for us? Watch this

```
lauda  +  be  +  ris  =  laudabris
mone   +  be  +  ris  =  monebris
```

Write out the future tense passive of the paradigm verbs, and don't forget that 3rd and 4th conjugation verbs form the future tense differently from the 1st and 2nd.

laudo	moneo	duco	capio	audio

IMPERFECT TENSE PASSIVE OF LATIN VERBS

Follow the same procedure you did with the present and future tenses passive. Construct the imperfect tense less the personal endings, then use the passive personal endings. The first person singular is "-bar", where the personal ending "-r" is attached directly to the "-ba- tense sign of the imperfect, without inserting an "-o-" as you did in the present and future tenses. Write out the imperfect passive of the paradigm verbs:

laudo	moneo	duco	capio	audio

THE PASSIVE INFINITIVE

The present active infinitive passive is form which is also derived from the first principal part. To form the passive voice of the infinitive of first, second, and fourth conjugation verbs, you simply use the ending "-ri" instead of "-re". In third conjugation verbs, you replace the stem vowel with "-i".

1.	lauda	+	ri	=	laudari	"to be praised"
2.	mone	+	ri	=	moneri	"to be warned"
3.	duc	+	i	=	duci	"to be led"
3i.	cap	+	i	=	capi	"to be captured"
4.	audi	+	ri	=	audiri	"to be taken"

DRILLS

FIRST CONJUGATION VERB: laudo, -are

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____
1	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____

INFINITIVE

_____

SECOND CONJUGATION VERB: deleo, -ere

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____
1	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____

INFINITIVE

_____

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE PASSIVE VOICE

What's the difference between these two sentences?

(a) George kicked the ball.
(b) The ball was kicked by George.

Obviously, in (a) the verb is active, but in (b) it is passive. But what's the difference between the active and passive voice as a matter of presentation? The action being described in both sentences is the same. Both authors are looking at the same action. What's the difference as far as the speakers' emphases are concerned? When we listen to or read English, we attach a certain

priority to the subject of the verb. So in sentence (a) the speaker (or writer) relating the event, but with the focus of his attention on what George is doing. In sentence (b), however, the principle emphasis is on what is being done to the ball, and the fact that George is the one who kick the ball is attached only as further detail.

The order of rhetorical importance begins with the subject, next comes the action performed on it, and then finally the agent who actually performed the action. The sentence would still have been a completed thought even if George's agency had not been mentioned: "The ball was kicked". Similarly, the order of priority in sentence (a) begins with the subject of the verb, then the verb, and finally the object of the action of the verb.

You've probably been told sometime in your education experience to eschew the passive voice. That's probably good advice in general, but when you do use it, make sure that your emphasis in the passive voice construction reflects the real subordination of ideas in your narrative in general. Latin tends to be more skittish of the passive voice than English is, and, as you'll see, it definitely avoided our impersonal passive constructions like "it seems that" or "it is asked that" and so on.

ABLATIVE OF PERSONAL AGENT: AB + ABLATIVE

Look at sentences (a) and (b) again. You can see how sentence (b) is really a modification of (a). The original direct object in (a) becomes the subject of the verb in (b) and the original subject of (a) is expressed by a prepositional phrase in (b) -- "by George".

In the passive voice construction in Latin, the agent of the action, if it is mentioned, is expressed by the preposition "ab" + the ablative case. Wheelock gives you a stern warning: the "Ablative of Personal Agent" is not the "Ablative of Means" (or the "Instrumental Ablative"). The "Ablative of Means" expresses the instrument with which the agent accomplished the action of the verb; the "Ablative of Personal Agent" expresses the agent itself in a passive construction.

"Nulli tyranni ab Romanis laudabantur". (No tyrants used to be praised by the Romans.)
"Multae rosae puellis ab poetis dabuntur". (Many roses will be given to the girls by the poets.)

But when the agent of a passive voice is not animate, then Latin uses the Ablative of Means.

"Omnes his periculis terrentur". (Everyone is frightened by these dangers.)
"Multae urbes vi pecuniae capientur". (Many cities will be captured by the force of money.)

But

"Omnes a malis terrentur". (Everyone is frightened by the evil [men].)
"Multae urbes istis tyrannis capientur". (Many cities will be captured by those tyrants.)

PASSIVE VOICE LIMITED TO TRANSITIVE VERBS

There is one other idem you'll have to observe. As Wheelock tells you, the passive construction is only possible with verbs which are truly transitive: that is, which take direct objects. This makes sense. When you change the voice of a verb from the active to passive, the original direct object accusative becomes the subject nominative. Since only transitive verbs take direct object accusatives, it follows that only verbs that are transitive can have a passive voice.

- (a) "Romani nullos tyrannos laudabant".
- (b) "Nulli tyranni ab Romanis laudabantur".
- (a) "Poetae multas rosas puellis dabunt".
- (b) "Multae rosae puellis ab poetis dabuntur".

DRILLS

Change the voice of the following sentences (active to passive or passive to active):

1. Illi libri nos adiuvabunt.

_____

2. Haec pericula vos terrebant.

_____

3. Hi libri a discipulis meis cum celeritate legentur.

_____

4. Te in via videbo.

_____

5. Magna ira cives movent.

_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

videor, -eri, visus sum

The passive voice of the verb "video" takes on a special meaning; one that is not entirely predictable simply by knowing the rules of translating the Latin passive voice into English. To be sure, "videor" can mean "I am seen", but more often it comes to mean "I seem" or "I appear" and is often followed by an infinitive: "videor legere" = "I seem to be reading". For your future reference, the third person impersonal passive of "video" -- "videtur" does not equal our popular construction "it seems"; rather it means "it seems right". Latin never says "it seem that George is sick"; it says "George seems to be sick".

01/08/93

97

CHAPTER 19

"Perfect Passive System of All Verbs; Interrogative Pronouns and Adjectives"

PERFECT PASSIVE SYSTEM

We divide the Latin tense system into two categories. (1) The present system, active and passive, uses the first principal part of the verb. It includes the present, future and imperfect tenses. Notice, these tenses use the first principal part for both the active and passive voices. The only difference between the active and passive voices in the present system is the personal endings. You learned all about this in Chapter 18. (2) The perfect system active uses the third principal part of the verb and attaches different personal endings to get the three different tenses of the perfect system. Write out the endings:

	Perfect	Pluperfect	Future Perfect
1	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____
1	_____	_____	_____
2	_____	_____	_____
3	_____	_____	_____

Notice, now, that the third principal part is the stem for the perfect system active only. To form the perfect system tense in the passive voice, Latin uses the fourth principal part of the verb. Since it uses a different principal part, the Perfect System Passive is considered to be a different category of tenses. So there are three tense systems in Latin:

1. the Present System Active and Passive;
2. the Perfect System Active;
3. the Perfect System Passive.

The tenses of systems (2) and (3) are the same -- Perfect, Pluperfect and Future Perfect; the only difference is in the voice, and the principal part of the verb on which they're built.

THE PASSIVE VOICE IN ENGLISH: THE PARTICIPLE DEFINED

First, let's look at how English forms its passive voice again. As we saw in Chapter 18, English uses the third principal part of the verb and uses an inflected form of the verb "to be" as the auxiliary or helping verb. That is to say, the verb "to be" will indicate the tense, the number, and the mood of the verb, while the third principal part of the verb will define the specific action involved. For example, for the verb "to see, saw, seen":

Betty	is	seen	by George.
	is being	seen	
	will be	seen	
	would be	seen	
	should be	seen	
	was	seen	
	was being	seen	
	has been	seen	
	had been	seen	
	should have been	seen	
	would have been	seen	

You can clearly see that the constant in all these modifications is the verbal form "seen". The verb "to be" is doing all the work. So let's look at little more closely at the verbal form "seen".

The third principal part of the English verb is called a "participle". Now listen closely; this is going to be an important definition: A participle is a "verbal adjective". That is, an adjective which is derived from a verb. In fact, that's why we call it a participle, because it "participates" in the essence of both a verb and of an adjective. So in the constructions of the English passive voice, the participle "seen" is actually "modifying" the subject of the verb "to be". I can say "Betty is tall" and "Betty is seen", and these two sentences are analogous. In the predicate of both these sentences the subject further modified, since it is linked to an adjective by the verb "to be".

It may seem bizarre to be thinking of a verbal construction as being essentially adjectival, but watch how we can use participles where their adjectival force is quite obvious:

"the written text",
"the spoken word",
"the destroyed city",
"the bewildered students",
"the beleaguered professor", etc.

THE LATIN PERFECT PASSIVE PARTICIPLE

So where are we? English forms the passive voice of all its tenses by using the participle of the verb which it links to the subject with a conjugated form of the verb "to be". Now you already know that Latin forms the passive voice of some of its tenses -- those of the present system -- simply by using special passive endings. The formation of the passive voice of the perfect system, however, doesn't work that way.

The Latin perfect passive system is perfectly analogous to the formation of the English passive voice. The perfect passive system in Latin uses the fourth principal part of the verb, which is then linked to the subject with an inflected form of the verb "sum". The fourth principal part of a Latin verb is called the "Perfect Passive Participle". Let's zero in on all the parts of this description.

1. We call it "Perfect" because the action is considered to have been completed. This is an important difference with the English participle. In English, we might say "Betty is being seen", and the participle doesn't force us to understand that the action is finished. In this example, the action is clearly still going on.
2. We say "Passive" since whatever the participle is going with had something done to it, rather than being the agent of some action. Again, the English participle can be used in conditions where the passive force is not so obvious. In the sentence "I have seen Betty", the participle "seen" doesn't strike us as passive in force, but rather as a part of an active construction.
3. We say "Participle" because it is a "verbal adjective", and for Latin, this is going to have monumental implications. The participle is an adjective, so it must agree in number, gender, and case with the noun is modifying. And if it must agree with nouns, then the participle must be able to decline to get the different numbers, genders, and cases it needs. (This is the feature of the Perfect System Passive which causes students the most trouble. It's difficult for them to realize that the passive voice in the perfect system is essentially adjectival: the verb "sum" linking the subject of the verb with a predicate adjective.)

Now let's look at the fourth principal part of a verb. As you know, the dictionary must give you all the principal parts of the verb you're considering.

1. The first entry is the first person singular of the present tense.
2. The second is the present infinitive, from which you drop the "-re" to get the present system stem.
3. The third is the first person singular of the perfect tense, from which you get the perfect active stem by dropping the "-i".
4. The fourth entry is the perfect passive participle, which is used with the auxiliary verb "sum" in the formation of the perfect system passive.

We've said that the perfect passive participle is a verbal adjective, so it must be able to decline, just like adjectives, in order to agree with the nouns they're modifying.

The perfect passive participles of all verbs declines just like the first adjectives you learned: just like "magnus, -a, -um". That is, it uses endings of the first declension to modify feminine nouns, endings of the second declension "-us" type to modify masculine nouns, and endings of the second declension "-um" type to modify neuter nouns. The dictionaries tell you this in a number of different ways; but they're all telling you the same thing. Some write out the whole "-us, -a, -um"; others abbreviate it by using only the neuter "-um" or the masculine "-us". So you may see the entry for the fourth principal part of "laudo", for example, given in these three different ways:

1. laudatus, -a, -um
2. laudatum
3. laudatus

PERFECT TENSE PASSIVE

So let's put this participle to work. How would you translate this in Latin: "I was praised". Well, the tense is obviously perfect -- that is, the action was completed before it was reported -- so we must use the perfect passive participle: "laudatus, -a, -um". The person is first and the number is singular. Let's assume that the "I" is male. What case is "I"? Obviously nominative -- it's the subject of the verb -- so the form of the participle will be "laudatus" -- masculine, nominative singular. Got that? The participle is going to agree with the subject of the verb. The subject of the verb is nominative, so the participle must be nominative, too. Now what form of the verb "sum" should we use. Of course, we'll use the first person singular, but what tense?

Did you guess "eram" -- "I was"? If you did, that's one demerit. Look, the fourth principal part is the "perfect passive participle" and the "perfect" tells you that the action is considered to have been already completed. That is, in the participle itself is the notion of a past event, so "laudatus" could be translated as "having been praised". Therefore you needn't repeat the idea of past completion in the auxiliary verb "to be". So the correct form of the auxiliary is the present tense: "sum". Think of it this way, and I admit this may seem clumsy: "Laudatus sum" means "I am now in the condition of having been praised". We can bring this over into English as either "I was praised" or "I have been praised". So to form the perfect tense passive in Latin, you use the perfect passive participle + the verb "sum" as the auxiliary in the present tense.

Now let's suppose that the subject "I" is feminine. What changes would this necessitate? Well, the participle is a verbal adjective, so it must agree in number, gender and case with whatever it's modifying. If the subject of the verb is feminine, then the participle has to be feminine, nominative, singular to agree with it. So the participle will have be "laudata". Therefore, if a woman is speaking, should would say "Laudata sum" for "I was praised".

PLUPERFECT TENSE PASSIVE

So how do you imagine Latin forms the passive of the pluperfect tense? Think. You're still going to use the perfect passive participle linked to the subject with a conjugated form of the verb "sum". All perfect system passive tenses do that. But tense will the verb "sum" be in? Right! Now you use the auxiliary verb "sum" in the imperfect tense. What you're doing is adding an additional past idea in auxiliary to the past idea already implicit in the participle. Therefore "Laudatus eram" means "I was in the condition of having been praised" or "I had been praised". And if the subject were feminine: "Laudata eram".

FUTURE PERFECT TENSE PASSIVE

And the future perfect tense? Yes. You use the future of the verb "sum", thus attaching a future idea to the past idea in the participle, and that's the definition of the future perfect tense. "Laudatus ero" therefore means "I will be in the condition of having been praised", which comes out "I will have been praised". And if the subject were feminine "Laudata ero".

PERFECT SYSTEM PASSIVE SUMMARIZED

So let's look at all this. Conjugate in full the three tenses of the perfect system passive, using the verb "laudo". (Carry all the possible genders and check your work against list lists on page 88.)

PARTICIPLE	PERFECT	PLUPERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT
laudatus, -a, -um	sum	eram	ero
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
laudati, -ae, -a	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

THE FOURTH PRINCIPAL PART OF VERBS

In Chapter 12, you realized that you were going to have to memorize the third principal part of all your verbs if you wanted to be able to work with them in all their tense systems. Similarly, now you must go back and memorize the fourth principal parts of your verbs if you want to work with them in the perfect system passive. As with the third principal parts, the formation of the fourth will follow some regular patterns, so the task of memorization will not be as tedious as it at first might seem.

FIRST CONJUGATION VERBS

The vast majority of first conjugation verbs, as you know, are regular. This means that its principal parts are formed regularly using the first principal part as the stem. The third principal part, as you recall, is just the first principal part + "vi". The fourth principal part also is a regular derivation from the first principal part: it's the first principal part + "t" plus the adjectival endings "-us, -a, -um". So for "laudo", the fourth principal part is "laudatus, -a, -um" (lauda + t + us, -a, -um) which is often abbreviated just as "laudatus" or "laudatum". Here are all the first conjugation verbs you've had up to this chapter. Fill out the principal parts, and double check your work. You can use these lists to review from.

II	III	IV

100

amo			
cogito			
conservo			
do			datus
erro			
exspecto			
iuvo			
laudo			
libero			
muto			
paro			
servo			
supero			
tolero			
voco			

(The two exceptions to this regularity of the first conjugation verbs is "do, dare, dedi, datus", and "[ad]iuvo, -iuvare, -iuvi, -iutus". If you look closely, however, you'll see that "do" isn't really a first conjugation verb, since the stem vowel "-a-" is not long.)

SECOND CONJUGATION VERBS

Although second conjugation verbs are slightly less regular than first conjugation verbs, they do tend to follow a pattern in their formation of the second, third, and fourth principal parts. But because there are occasional irregularities in third second conjugation verbs, the dictionary will list all four principal parts of a second conjugation verb. Often the third principal part of a third conjugation verb is the first principal part + vi", which them becomes simplified from "-evi" to just "-ui". The fourth principal part very often ends "-itus, -a, -um". So for the paradigm verb "moneo", the principal parts are "moneo, monere, monui, monitus". Again, here is the complete list of the second conjugation verbs you've had till now. I've left the principal parts of the regular verbs blank for you to fill in on your own. When a verb lack one of the principal parts, I've left no blank. Some verbs have unusual principal parts, which would involve some explanation. Where verbs have principal parts which are outside our interest here, I've inserted dashes. For now, they don't exist and just memorize the principal parts the verbs do have.

audeo		---	---
debeo			
deleo		delevi	deletus
doceo			doctus
habeo			
moneo			
moveo		movi	motus
remaneo		remansi	remansus
teneo			tentus
terreo			
timeo			---

valeo	_____	_____	---
video	_____	vidi	visus

THIRD CONJUGATION VERBS

The third conjugation (-i- stem and non -i- stem) displays several different ways of forming third and fourth principal parts. Each verb is best treated individually as if they were irregular, but certain patters are obvious. Additionally, a great many of our English derivations come from the fourth principal part of the original Latin verb. If you keep this in mind as you try to memorize these forms, you'll find they'll stick more readily.

ago	_____	_____	actus
capio	_____	_____	captus
		coepi	coeptus
committo	_____	_____	commissus
curro	_____	_____	cursus
dico	_____	_____	dictus
duco	_____	_____	ductus
diligo	_____	_____	dilectus
eicio	_____	_____	eiectus
facio	_____	_____	factus
fugio	_____	_____	-------
gero	_____	_____	gestus
iacio	_____	_____	iactus
incipio	_____	_____	inceptus
intellego	_____	_____	-tellectus
iungo	_____	_____	iunctus
lego	_____	_____	lectus
mitto	_____	_____	missus
neglego	_____	_____	neglectus
scribo	_____	_____	scriptus
traho	_____	_____	tractus
vinco	_____	_____	victus
vivo	_____	_____	victus

FOURTH CONJUGATION VERBS

The fourth conjugation sometimes forms third and fourth principal parts regularly by adding "-vi" to the present stem for the third and by adding "-tus, -a, -um" for the fourth. But there are so many irregularities that fourth conjugation verbs are listed with all four principal parts. Here's your list of all the four conjugation verbs you've had up to Chapter 19.

audio	_____	_____	auditus
invenio	_____	_____	inventus

sentio	_____	_____	sensus
venio	_____	_____	ventus

THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN

Do you remember how Latin asks a question? You've learned that enclitic "-ne" is attached to the end of the first word of the sentence to indicate a question. Latin must do this because the word order is so flexible that no rearrangement of the words will indicate necessarily that a question is coming up. In English, we ask a simple question by inverting the subject of the verb with an auxiliary. The statement "You are walking the dog" becomes a question like this: "Are you walking the dog?" But Latin doesn't have all these handy auxiliary verbs, and besides, since Latin doesn't rely on word order much to tell you the syntax of the words in the sentence, inverting words won't help.

So Latin uses the enclitic, and the word the enclitic is attached to is the focus of the question. For example, in the question "Laudatisne filios huius viri?" the point of inquiry is whether you are performing the action of praising. But if we begin the sentence with "the sons" -- "Filiosne huius viri laudatis?" then the focus of the question changes: "Are you praising this man's sons? We can accomplish this effect in English by inflecting our voice when we reach the word that is the point of the question. Now look more closely at each of these questions. Even though each has a different emphasis, all the questions are essentially asking one thing: "If I should turn this question into a statement, would it be true?" That is, the question is about the validity of the predication.

The question "Are you praising this man's sons" is asking whether it is true to say "You are praising this man's sons". We call this kind of question a simple question; it ask for no information that is not contained in its structure. Now look at these questions:

1. "Why are you praising this man's sons"?
2. "When are you praising this man's sons"?
3. "How are you praising this man's sons"?

Here it is taken for granted that the predication is true -- you are praising this man's sons -- and the questions being asked are not whether you're praising the sons, but why, when, or how? These questions are calling for information that is not contained within the syntax of the question; they are asking for specific kinds of additional information. And the kind of information they're asking for is indicated in the words "why, when, and how". We call words which ask for specific kinds of information "interrogatives". Some more questions with another kind of interrogative:

1. "Who's there?"
2. "What's that?"
3. "Whose mess is this?"
4. "Whom are you accusing?"
5. "What are you trying to say?"

In these questions, the predication is taken as true:

1. someone is there;
2. that is something;
3. the mess does belong to someone;
4. you are accusing someone;
5. you are trying to say something.

The information the questions are asking for, however, is temporarily replaced with another word, and the hope is that soon the information will be plugged into the spot where its replacement now stands. What do we call a word which takes the place of another word or idea? Right! We call them pronouns, so these words are interrogative (because they're asking questions) and pronouns (because they're replacing other nouns or ideas): "interrogative pronouns".

The English interrogative pronouns, as you can see in the examples above, have different cases and even genders. The gender is determined by what is be filled in for, but the case is determined by the way the pronoun is being used in the question.

	MASCULINE AND FEMININE	INANIMATE
Nom.	who	what
Gen.	whose	whose
Acc.	whom	what

Do you see any similarity between the interrogative pronouns and the relative pronouns? Of course you do. "Who, whose, and whom" are all forms that can also be used as relative pronouns. Only the interrogative pronoun "what" has no use as an

relative pronoun.

The Latin interrogative pronoun also resembles the Latin relative pronoun. In the plural, the forms of the interrogative pronoun are identical to those of the relative pronoun. In the singular many of the forms of the interrogative pronouns overlap with those of the relative pronouns, but there are some differences:

1. For one, the forms for the masculine and feminine are the same. Consequently, there are only two forms for the nominative singular: one for the masculine and feminine genders, and one for the neuter. Similarly, there are only two forms for the genitive singular -- one masculine and feminine, and one neuter. And so on for all the cases in the singular. Only two forms.
2. Next, two of the forms are just plain different from those of the relative pronoun. (a) For the masculine and feminine nominative singular, the form is "quis", not "qui" or "quae" as you might expect. (b) You might expect "quod" for neuter nominative and accusative singular, but the form is "quid". (c) For the remaining cases of the masculine/feminine forms, the interrogative pronoun uses the masculine forms of the relative pronoun.

Look this description closely over and try to write out the Latin interrogative pronoun (see Wheelock, page 89).

	MASCULINE AND FEMININE	NEUTER
Nom.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
Nom.	_____	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____	_____

Let's look at some examples of how the interrogative pronoun works in Latin. You'll that it has some surprising properties, which the English interrogative pronoun "who, what", etc. doesn't have. "Quis librum tibi dedit?" ("Who gave you the book?") You can tell this sentence is a question, obviously, because it is introduced with the interrogative pronoun and because it ends with a question mark. But the English translation isn't as precise as the Latin. Why not? Look at "quis". It's nominative because it is used as the subject of the verb. But what about its number and gender? It's masculine/feminine in gender and singular in number.

That means that the question was formed in such a way as to imply that there was only one person who gave you the book. Now look at the English "who". Can you tell whether the person asking the question expects there to be only one person who gave you the book? No, you can't. So, in Latin, the questioner reveals more about the kind of answer expected because the pronoun reveals more about the possible antecedent. How would we translate these into English:

a. "Qui librum tibi dederunt?"
b. "Quae librum tibi dederunt?"

We'd have to translate them both as "Who gave you the book?", but look more closely at the Latin. In (a), the question implies that more than one person gave you the book and that they are either all male or mixed male and female. In (b), those who gave you the book are implied to be plural and all feminine. Look at another example. All of these Latin question can be translated into English as "Whose book did Cicero give you?":

"Cuius librum Cicero tibi dedit?"
"Quorum librum Cicero tibi dedit?"
"Quarum librum Cicero tibi dedit?"

The interrogative pronoun in each of these question is in the genitive case because the point of the question is to learn more about the owner(s) of the book. But each question suggests an different kind of answer. Can you spot the different expectations?

INTERROGATIVE ADJECTIVE

Okay, you know that the interrogative pronoun is a word which takes the place of another noun or idea about which certain information is being sought. Because it asks a question we call it "interrogative"; because it stands in for something else, we call it a "pronoun": "interrogative pronoun".

So what is an "interrogative adjective". Start from the beginning. "Interrogative" means that it will be asking a question. "Adjective" means that it will be modifying a noun in the sentence and to modify a noun an adjective must agree with it in number, gender, and case. Putting these two parts together, we come up with this: an "interrogative adjective" is a word which modifies an noun in a way that asks more information about it. How does this work? Look at these English questions:

a. "What child is this?"
b. "Which way did he go?"
c. "For what reason are we doing this?"

In each of these questions, more information is being requested about something which is already expressed in the question. Like this. What's the difference between "What is this"? and "What child is this"? In (a), the answer sought is not restricted to anything specified in the sentence itself. But in the second, the potential responder is directed to limit his reply to something in particular; namely, "the child". The same is true with (b) and (c). (B) is not asking whether he's gone, but which way he went; (c) is not asking what we're doing, but for what reason. So English uses the adjective "which or what" to ask for information specific to something already expressed in the sentence.

Latin also has interrogative adjectives for this purpose, but because Latin is a fully inflected language, the interrogative adjective has many more forms than its English analogue. After all, the Latin interrogative adjective is going to have to agree with masculine, feminine, or neuter nouns in any one of the ten cases and numbers. You'll be pleased to know, however, that you're not going to have to learn anything new, because the Latin interrogative adjective uses the forms of its relative pronoun. Go ahead and write out the forms of the interrogative adjective to refresh your memory. (Remember, it's exactly the same as the relative pronoun).

INTERROGATIVE ADJECTIVE

	MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
Nom.			
Gen.			
Dat.			
Acc.			
Abl.			
Nom.			
Gen.			
Dat.			
Acc.			
Abl.			

Because the interrogative adjective is an adjective, its form is determined entirely by the noun with which it is agreeing in the sentence. Like this:

"Quem librum legebatis?" (What (or which) book were you reading?)

The interrogative adjective "quem" is singular, accusative, masculine because the noun about which the question is seeking more information is singular, accusative, and masculine. Study these examples:

a. "Quibus feminis libros illos dedistis?" (To which women did you give those books?)
b. "A quo viro admoniti sunt?" (By which (or what) man were they warned?)
c. "A quibus viris admoniti sunt?" (By which (or what) men were they warned?)
d. "A qua femina admoniti sunt?" (By which woman were they warned?)

DRILLS

Translate the following short sentences.

1. Cui libros dederunt?

2. Qui ei libros dederunt?

3. A quo libri dati sunt?

4. A quibus hi libri lecti erant?

5. A quibus discipulis hi libri lecti sunt?

6. Quis ab omnibus civibus amatus est?

7. Cuius civitatis ille homo erat?

8. E qua urbe iste tyrannus venit?

9. E quorum urbe iste tyrannus venit?

10. Qui vir ab omnibus civibus amatus est?

11. Who came from that city?

12. Which books did you read?

13. To whom were these books given?

14. Which students read these books?

15. Which citizens loved this man?

16. Whose city was loved by that tyrant?

17. By whom were those books given to the students?

_____

18. By whom was this city loved?

_____

19. To which women was the book given?

_____

20. To which woman was the book given?

_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

senex, senis — This word is much more bizarre than Wheelock lets on. You'll see it mainly as a noun, meaning "old man" or "old woman". Don't expect to see it modifying a neuter noun. It'll always be masculine or feminine. Because it's really a third declension adjective, it'll decline like:

senex	senes
senis	senium
seni	senibus
senem	senes
seni	senibus

novus, -a, -um — Like most ancient civilizations, ancient Rome didn't care much for change. So a way of asking "What's wrong"? was "Quid novum est"?

01/08/20

107

CHAPTER 20

"Fourth Declension; Ablatives of Place from Which and Separation"

FOURTH DECLENSION NOUNS

Let's review a moment. You know that a noun will belong to one declension and one declension only; and you know that a declension is a pattern of case endings. There are five declensions in Latin, and in each of them some case endings resemble those the other declensions. You know, the "-m" is almost always the ending of the accusative singular; "-s" is almost always the ending of the accusative plural; etc. So what makes these declensions truly different from each other? The truly distinctive characteristic of these declensions is the thematic vowel (that is, the vowel which regularly appears in the case endings):

1. The thematic vowel of the first declension is "-a-".
2. The thematic vowel of the second declension is "-o-" (the "-u-" in the declension was really an "-o-" which has been changed).
3. The thematic vowel of the third declension is short "-e-" (which often changes to a short "-i-").

And now the fourth and fifth declensions:

4. The thematic vowel of the fourth declension is "-u-".
5. The thematic vowel of the fifth declension is "-e-". (We'll look at fifth declension nouns later.)

So, how can you tell to which declension a noun belongs? The dictionary must give you that information. But instead of listing a number next to the noun, the dictionary does something else. The dictionary actually starts to decline the noun for you. The first entry in the dictionary is the nominative singular, followed by the genitive singular, which is then followed by the gender. You deduce the declension by looking at the genitive singular ending, which means you must know the forms of the genitive singulars for all the declensions:

1. An "-ae" genitive ending means the noun declines in the first declension, because "-ae" is the genitive singular ending of the first declension.
2. An "-i" genitive ending means the noun is second declension.
3. An "-is" genitive ending means the noun is third declension.

So now let's look at the fourth declension. Like the third declension, the fourth declension can have nouns of all three genders belonging to it: the masculine and feminine nouns will follow one pattern of endings; the neuter nouns will follow another. (Now it happens that the vast majority of fourth declension nouns are masculine and that there are hardly any feminine nouns; but you should keep your guard up anyway.) So here are the different case endings:

	MASCULINE AND FEMININE	NEUTER
Nom.	-us	-u
Gen.	-us	-us
Dat.	-ui	-u
Acc.	-um	-u
Abl.	-u	-u
Nom.	-us	-ua
Gen.	-uum	-uum
Dat.	-ibus	-ibus
Acc.	-us	-ua
Abl.	-ibus	-ibus

Let's take a closer look at these endings. First the masculine and feminine endings:

1. The nominative singular is short "-us", so this ending looks exactly like the "-us" type second declension ending for the nominative singular. So, looking at the dictionary entry for the nominative singular of a fourth declension masculine or feminine noun, you might be lured into thinking that it's of the second declension. To see the difference you must go to the next entry -- the genitive singular.
2. The genitive singular is long "-us", so the dictionary entry for a fourth declension noun will look like this: 'x'us, -us (m./f.), where 'x' is the stem of the noun.
3. The dative singular ending is the "-i" you've seen in the third declension and on the pronouns, which is attached to the thematic vowel "-u-".
4. The accusative singular ending is entirely predictable: it's just the thematic vowel with the ending "-m" attached. This is the way all accusative singulars of masculine and feminine nouns are formed.
5. Equally predictable is the ablative singular: it's just the thematic vowel.
6. The nominative plural works on the analogy of the third declension: the long thematic vowel plus the ending "-s".
7. The genitive plural is odd-looking -- "-uum" -- but it's made up of the thematic vowel plus the genitive plural ending

"-um" you're already familiar with from the third declension.
8. The dative and ablative plurals "-ibus" look like the third declension endings; notice also that the thematic vowel "-u"- has been replaced. It's "-ibus", not "-ubus". Strange.
9. The accusative plural is the same as the nominative plural. You've seen this phenomenon before in the third declension.

Now let's look at the neuter side of the fourth declension. Wheelock tells you correctly that these are rare. And we're lucky they are, because they're somewhat odd.

1. The nominative singular ends in just a long "-u". Odd.
2. According to the laws of neuters, therefore, the accusative singular will also end in long "-u".
3. You would expect the dative singular to have a predictable ending, but look at it: the ending is long "-u". Take a look at the endings in the singular, now. Four of the cases in the singular have the same ending -- long "-u" -- which means you may have a devil of a time deciding which case a noun is in when it ends in long "-u". Context has to help you.
4. Nothing irregular happens in the plural -- if you remember that proposition two of the law of neuters tells you that all neuter nominative and accusative plurals end in short "-a".

One more thing about the fourth declension which might interest you is that there are no fourth declension adjectives. You recall that the first, second and third declensions are patterns of endings which nouns and adjectives can use. The fourth declension contains only nouns.

A list for a fourth declension noun in the dictionary will look like this:

```
metus, -us (m)
fructus, -us (m)
manus, -us (f)
cornu, -us (n)
versus, -us (m)
```

The first entry is the nominative singular, the second tells you the declension and indicates whether there are any stem changes from the nominative form. But, there are no stem changes in fourth declension nouns. Isn't that nice? So decline these nouns. Check you work against Wheelock page 93.

	metus, -us (m)	cornu, -us (n)
Nom.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____
Nom.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____

ABLATIVE OF PLACE FROM WHICH AND SEPARATION

There's nothing really difficult about this bit of knowledge. You've seen for quite some time now that prepositions take certain cases and that the meaning of such expressions is set by the meaning of the preposition. The case the noun is in really has nothing to contribute to the meaning of the expression. For example, "ad" means "to" or "toward" and it takes its object in the accusative case. Therefore "ad urbem" means "to/toward the city".

The prepositions "ab, ex, de" mean something like "from" or "out of" or "away from" and they take the ablative case. So we can say, "Veniunt ex urbe". ("They are coming out of the city".) Got that? Now here's a new twist. If the verb being used explicitly contains the idea of physical separation, then the prepositions indicating separation ("ab, ex, de") are not used. Instead, the thing from which the separation is being made is simply put into the ablative case. We call this prepositionless use of the ablative case the "Ablative of Separation". Like this. The verb "to free", "libero (1)", also carries with it the sense

"to free from". Hence the idea of separation from something is explicit in the verb. So if we wish to say something like this -- "The truth will free us from fear" -- we write "Veritas nos metu liberabit (not "ab metu")". Look at the following examples:

> "Fructibus bonis numquam carebamus". (We never used to lack good fruits.) "Liberavistis nos sceleribus istius tyranni". (You have freed us from the crimes of that tyrant.)

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

fructus, -us (m)	Don't forget the extended senses of the word "fruit": "fruits of our labor", for example.
communis, -e	It doesn't mean "common" in the negative sense of "ordinary"; it means "common" in the sense that many share it. "General" is a better first translation. "Communis opinio" means "general opinion"; "communis salus", "general safety".
careo (2), carui, -----	Pay no attention to the fourth principal part for now, but do look at the construction which follows the verb. "Careo" take the "Ablative of Separation", not the accusative case, as you might be led to expect by our use of the verb "to lack".

01/08/93

110

CHAPTER 21

"Third and Fourth Conjugations: Passive Voice of Indicative and Present Infinitive"

SYSTEMS OF VERBS REVIEWED

In Chapter 18 you learned the passive voice of the present system of tenses -- the present, future and imperfect -- for first and second conjugation verbs. I also added in my notes the third and fourth conjugations, although Wheelock didn't take them up. You'll see in the chapter that the third and forth conjugation verbs follow the same rules for forming the passive voice in the present system as those governing first and second conjugation verbs. Let's do a little review for a moment. Latin verbs have four principal parts. Let's look at them in reverse order.

The fourth principal part is the perfect passive participle, and it is used with a conjugated form of the verb "sum" to form the perfect passive system:

```
          Perfect Passive:      4th prin. part.+ present of "sum"
       Pluperfect Passive:      4th prin. part + imperfect of "sum"
   Future Perfect Passive:      4th prin. part + future of "sum"
```

An important feature to notice about the perfect system passive is that the formulae given above for the three tenses apply to all four conjugations of Latin verbs. Once you get to the fourth principal part of a verb, there is only one set of formulae for forming the different perfect tenses passive. How do you form the perfect tense passive of a first conjugation verb; say "laudo"? The fourth principal part is "laudatus (-a, -um)", so it's like this:

```
laudatus (-a, -um)    sum
laudatus (-a, -um)    es
laudatus (-a, -um)    est

laudati (-ae, -a)     sumus
laudati (-ae, -a)     estis
laudati (-ae, -a)     sunt
```

Now form the perfect tense passive of a fourth conjugation verb; "audio, -ire, audivi, auditus". You follow precisely the same formula set out above: the fourth principal part + "sum"

```
auditus (-a, -um)     sum
auditus (-a, -um)     es
auditus (-a, -um)     est

auditi (-ae, -a)      sumus
auditi (-ae, -a)      estis
auditi (-ae, -a)      sunt
```

Do you see? Even though "laudo" and "audio" are verbs of different conjugations, their perfect system passive are formed according to the same rules.

The perfect system active, similarly, follows the same rules for all four conjugations. To form this system of tenses, you simply find the third principal part of the verb you wish to conjugate and add the perfect system personal endings:

	PERFECT	PLUPERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT
	-i	-eram	-ero
	-isti	-eras	-eris
	-it	-erat	-erit
3rd prin. part +			
	-imus	-eramus	-erimus
	-istis	-eratis	-eritis
	-erunt	-erant	-erint

The purpose of this review is to remind you that verbs of different conjugations differ from one another only in the present system. Strictly speaking, therefore, it is meaningless to talk about forming the perfect system of a first, second, third or fourth conjugation verb. All Latin verb work the same way in the perfect system -- active and passive.

So, the only tense system in which the different conjugations follow different rules is the present system -- in the system which uses the first principal part as its stem. The four conjugations, nevertheless, share many common features. Let's review these differences and similarities.

1. All four conjugations use the same personal endings in the active and passive voices for all three tenses. Write out the

III

personal endings for the present system tenses:

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

2. The imperative mood is formed the same way -- first principal part + endings. What are the formulae?

SINGULAR: 1st principal part + _____

PLURAL: 1st principal part + _____

3. The active infinitives from all conjugations are formed the same way:

1st principal part + "-re".

4. The imperfect tense in all the conjugations is formed the same way:

First Principal Part + ba + active or passive pers. end.

But there are also differences among the conjugations in the present system:

1. The first and most obvious difference among the conjugations in the present system is the stem (or thematic) vowels. This is vowel which appears at the end of the stem, directly before the conjugated endings of the verb. What are the stem vowels for the conjugations?

CONJUGATION	STEM VOWEL
FIRST	_____
SECOND	_____
THIRD	_____
FOURTH	_____

2. Another substantial difference among the declensions has to do with the formation of the future tense.
   a. First and second conjugation verbs form the future by inserting the tense sign "-be-" (short "-e-") between the first principal part and the personal endings (whether active or passive).
   b. But the third and fourth conjugations use the vowels "-a-" and "-e-" as their tense signs for the future. Then they add on the personal endings. Let's do a fast review of all the conjugations in the future tense active voice. Write out the future tense of these verbs.

I	II	III	III-i	IV
laudo	moneo	duco	capio	audio
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

REVIEW OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM IN THE PASSIVE VOICE

You know the present system passive for the first and second conjugation verbs, and you saw that there was nothing very difficult about it. The only difference between the active and passive voices is the different set of personal endings each uses.

1. To form the present tense passive, you add the passive personal endings to the end of the first principal part.
2. To form the future tense passive, you add the passive personal endings to the stem + the tense sign for the future. (In the first and second conjugations the tense sign for the future is "-be-".)
3. To form the imperfect tense passive, you add the passive personal endings to the first principal part + the tense sign for the imperfect tense -- "-ba-".

Write out the present system passive of these first and second conjugation verbs: "amo"; "deleo".

FIRST CONJUGATION: PRESENT SYSTEM, PASSIVE VOICE

amo (1)

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st			
2nd			
3rd			
1st			
2nd			
3rd			

SECOND CONJUGATION: PRESENT SYSTEM, PASSIVE VOICE

deleo (2)

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st			
2nd			
3rd			
1st			
2nd			
3rd			

ACTIVE AND PASSIVE VOICES OF THE THIRD CONJUGATION

Now look again at the rules for forming the present system passive up above. Third and fourth conjugation verbs follow these rules to the letter.

1. Present tense passive is the first principal part + passive personal endings.
2. The future passive is the first principal part + the tense sign for the future + passive personal endings.
3. The imperfect passive is the first principal part + the tense sign for the imperfect + the passive personal endings.

Essentially what you're doing is simply replacing the active personal endings with the passive. Let's have a look at the present tense passive for a third conjugation verb. The stem vowel of a third conjugation verb is short "-e-", but the vowel undergoes some changes when you start adding personal endings to it:

a. it is completely absorbed by the "-o" of the first person singular;
b. it becomes short "-i-" before all the other personal endings except the third person plural;

c. it becomes short "-u-" before the "-nt" of the third person plural. Okay, now try to guess what the present passive forms of a third conjugation verb are going to be. First write down the present tense active of "duco", then go back and change the personal endings from the active to the passive. (Check your answers in Wheelock, p. 97.)

PRESENT TENSE: ACTIVE AND PASSIVE

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

Now let's do the same thing for the future of "duco". Remember, all you're doing is changing the active endings to the passive endings.

FUTURE TENSE: ACTIVE AND PASSIVE

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

Now for something truly horrifying. Write the present and the future tense passive 2nd person singular of "duco" next to each other:

PRESENT	FUTURE
_____	_____

The only difference between these two tenses is the length of the vowel "-e-". In the present tense, it's short, because it represents the original stem vowel, which is a short "-e-" in the third conjugation. In the future tense, the "-e-" is long, because this time the "-e-" is the tense sign for the future. The length of the vowel -- and hence the location of the stress accent -- is the only difference between the present and future second person passive: the present "ducris" is pronounced "DOO ki ris"; the future "duceris" is pronounced "doo KEH ris".

Now let's look at the imperfect tense of the "duco". First write down the form for the active voice, then change it to the passive voice by substituting the active personal endings with the passive personal endings.

IMPERFECT TENSE: ACTIVE AND PASSIVE

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

ACTIVE AND PASSIVE VOICES OF THIRD CONJUGATION I-STEM

So let's go on to the third conjugation "i-stem". The first thing to do is to remain calm. The third conjugation "i-stem" forms its passive voice according to the same rules the "non i-stem" conjugation follows. You're simply going to alter the active forms by replacing the active personal endings with the passive endings. This means that wherever the extra "-i-" shows up in the active voice, it'll show up in the passive voice as well. Write down the active forms first, and then change them to the passive: "capio".

THIRD CONJUGATION I-STEM

PRESENT

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

FUTURE

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

IMPERFECT

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

ACTIVE AND PASSIVE VOICES OF THE FOURTH CONJUGATION

And now, finally, the fourth conjugation. You'll have no trouble with this conjugation, if you remember that the stem vowel is long "-i-". Use "audio".

FOURTH CONJUGATION

PRESENT

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

FUTURE

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

IMPERFECT

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

THE PASSIVE INFINITIVES OF THE THIRD AND FOURTH CONJUGATIONS

To form the passive infinitive of first and second conjugation verbs, you simply replace the normal "-re" ending with "-ri". This is how you form the passive infinitive of fourth conjugation verbs as well. Hence,

1st Conjugation	amare	"to love"	amari	"to be loved"
2nd Conjugation	delere	"to destroy"	deleri	"to be destroyed"
4th Conjugation	audire	"to hear"	audiri	"to be heard"

Notice that these three conjugation have something in common. In each the stem vowel is long: "ama-", "dele", and "audi-". Hence they form their present passive infinitives the same way. But this leave the third conjugation, both "i-stem" and "non i-stem" unaccounted for, because third conjugation verbs have a short stem vowel: short "-e-". To form the passive infinitive of third conjugation verbs, you drop the stem vowel and replace it with long "-i". Hence

Non I-Stem	ducere	"to lead"	duci	"to be led"
I-Stem	capere	"to capture"	capi	"to be captured"

116

DRILLS

Work through Wheelock's Self-Help Tutorials for this chapter to see whether you've thoroughly understood the material. Then try these exercises for a little more practice. Reverse the voice of these sentences.

1. Homines saepe malam laudem audiunt.

2. Ab quibus discipulis hi versus legebantur?

3. Iste tyrannus omnes civitates capiet.

4. Nostri amici nos adiuvabant.

5. Tui amici te non neglegent.

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

causa, -ae (f)	Note well the common use of causa to mean "for the sake of". In this usage, causa is used like a preposition: it is put into the ablative case and its object, which actually precedes it, is in the genitive case. E.g. "artis causa" = "for the sake of art".
finis, -is (m)	Look at what it means in the plural.
quod	You have to be careful with this word. As you probably remember, quod is the form used by the relative pronoun for the neuter nominative and accusative singular.

01/08/93

117

CHAPTER 22

"Fifth Declension; Summary of Ablatives"

THE FIFTH DECLENSION

After your considerable experience with the morphology of Latin nouns, the fifth declension is practically nothing but a review. There are no new concepts you have to juggle while you're working on memorizing another set of forms. This chapter, in fact, should give you a little breather. The fifth declension is simple -- probably the simplest declension in Latin:

1. it has no subcategories or deviant set of endings;
2. the nouns of the fifth declensions never have stems which are not the same as the nominative singular;
3. its thematic vowel "-e-" is transparent in all the case endings;
4. there are no adjectives which use the fifth declension endings;
5. there is only one nominative singular ending;
6. and the vast majority of fifth declension nouns are feminine.

Here are the endings. Take a close look at them.

FIFTH DECLENSION CASE ENDINGS

N/V.	-es
Gen.	-ei
Dat.	-ei
Acc.	-em
Abl.	-e
N/V.	-es
Gen.	-erum
Dat.	-ebus
Acc.	-es
Abl.	-ebus

The nominative singular is always "-es", which makes this declension much easier than the second and the third declensions, in which there are a variety of possible endings for the nominative singular. Therefore, a fifth declension noun will always end in "-es" -- and that is the first entry in the dictionary. But be careful not to make an elementary error in logic. All fifth declension nouns end in "-es" in the nominative singular, but not all nouns which end in "-es" in the nominative singular are fifth declension. "Nubes", for example, ends in "-es", but its genitive is "nubis", clearly telling you that it's a third, not a fifth declension noun. Be sure to check the nominative and the genitive forms for your nouns. A fifth declension noun will look like this: "x"es, -ei (gender).

THE PROBLEM WITH dies, diei (m)

Wheelock shows you the noun "dies" separately, and it's possible to get the impression that it is a paradigm for a subdivision of the fifth declension. It is not. Look at the endings carefully. You'll see the case endings on "dies" don't differ from the endings of "res" in any significant way. The only difference is in the quantity of the thematic vowel "-e-".

By nature, the thematic vowel of the fifth declension is long, and it "wants" to stay long. Often, however, it becomes short when certain endings are attached. For "res", the thematic vowel "-e-" becomes short when you add the genitive and dative singular ending long "-i" (and it also is short before the "-m" ending of the accusative singular). But when the thematic vowel "-e-" is itself preceded by another vowel -- as it is in "dies" -- then it stays long before the genitive and dative ending long "-i". So you get "diei" for the genitive singular, not "dii". Since you're not overly concerned with getting all the long marks right at this point in your study, you might just as well cross out "dies" in Wheelock and forget about it. The stem of "dies" is "die-" to which you add the fifth declension case endings.

ABLATIVE OF MANNER WITH AND WITHOUT cum

Now you get a stylistic variation on the Ablative of Manner construction you've already learned. This really needs no amplification. It's a simple adjustment. The Ablative of Manner, you may recall, is a way to use a noun as an adverb. You use the preposition "cum" with the noun in the ablative case: "Id cum celeritate fecerunt (They did it quickly)". You can also modify the noun being used adverbially with an adjective. Latin likes to turn the word order around some, but this is no great problem: "Id magna cum celeritate fecerunt (They did it with great speed)".

When the noun in this kind of construction is modified by an adjective, Latin has the option of droping the preposition "cum". So this sentence could also be written: "Id magna celeritate fecerunt". But if the noun governed by "cum" is not qualified by an adjective, the "cum" must be used. This is incorrect: "Id celeritate fecerunt"; but this is not: "Id cum celeritate fecit"; neither is this: "Id magna cum celeritate fecit"; nor this: "Id magna celeritate fecit".

SUMMARY OF ABLATIVES

This is just a rehash of old material, but it's good to get all the facts laid out at one time. The uses of the ablative case can be divided into two groups:

1. uses of the ablative with a preposition;
2. uses of the ablative without a preposition.

You really needn't memorize the different uses of the ablative with prepositions. When you have a preposition governing an ablative case, you just translate the meaning of the preposition and then translate the meaning of the noun. The fact that the noun is in the ablative case really doesn't contribute anything to the translation. It's in the ablative case because the preposition requires it. That's all.

One preposition which takes the ablative case requires some special caution, however, and that's "cum". Remember, "cum" means "with" in two different senses:

1. as accompaniment, and
2. as manner.

1. "Id cum amico fecit". (He did it with a friend.)
2. "Id cum cura fecit". (He did it with care.)

It is important, however, that you know all the "prepositionless" uses of the ablative case. Here the ablative case itself, without a preposition in Latin to govern it, takes on special meanings. You simply must know them.

a. Ablative of Means shows the instrument with which the action of the verb was effected. Keep it distinct from the Ablative of Manner, which shows in what manner the action was carried out. Common translations of the Ablative of Means are: "with", "by means of", "through".
b. Ablative of Time is easy to spot. If you have a word of a unit of time in the ablative case without a preposition, it's expressing time. The problem is that Latin used this construction to indicate two different kinds of time which we keep separate in English. The Latin Ablative of Time can express either the Time When or Time Within Which of an action. (See Chapter 15.)
c. Ablative of Separation is a prepositionless use of the ablative case after verbs which strongly contain the idea of separation; so the normal prepositions "ex" or "ab" are dropped, and the ablative case alone is used.
d. Ablative of Manner can be written without a preposition if the noun used as an adverb is modified by an adjective -- as you just saw above.

VOCABULARY PUZZLES:

res, rei (f)

Start by scratching off the first translation "thing". "Res" doesn't mean "thing" in our common sense of "What's that thing on the table"? or "Bring me that thing". It doesn't mean a non-descript object for which we can't quite come up with a name. It means "thing" when we say something like "What's this thing about you're not wanting to learn Latin"? or "Things sometimes get out of control". It means "matter", "affair", or "business" (non-commercial).

res publica (f)

First, this is the origin of our one word "republic", but in Latin it is two words -- the noun "res" and the adjective "publicus, -a, -um" modifying it. Therefore both "res" and "publica" decline:

rei publicae
rei publicae
rem publicam
re publica

etc.

Second, it obviously doesn't mean "public thing" as in "public object", but "public business or affair". Here you can see the

real meaning of "res".

medius, -a, -um — It is an adjective, not a noun, so it can't be used the way our noun "middle" is used. We say "the middle of the city", putting "city" into the genitive case. Latin can't do this, because "medius" doesn't mean "middle", but "mid". Hence they say "medius urbs"; or "media nocte" ("in the middle of the night").

01/18/93

120

CHAPTER 23

"Participles"

Despite its disarmingly simple title, this chapter contains a lot of material -- some of it simple, some of it potentially perplexing -- but all of it overwhelming taken together in one heap. I'm going to break it down into two sections for you. Don't try to do them both in one sitting, unless you find the first section so easy that you need more. The sections are (I) Morphology (formation), and (II) Syntax (use) of the participles.

PART I
BASIC CONCEPTS OF LATIN PARTICIPLES

You already know what a participle is; you've been working with one now for a couple of chapters. A participle is a verbal adjective. That is, an adjective derived from a stem of a verb. The participle you're familiar with is the perfect passive participle -- the fourth principal part of the verb -- which is used in the formation of the perfect system passive. So let's look at it again, this time with a finer eye for detail.

We call the fourth principal part of a verb a participle because it's a verbal adjective. Now, because it's an adjective it must agree with whatever noun it's modifying. That's what adjectives do: modify and agree with nouns. So to agree with its noun, a participle must be able to decline in some way to get the different numbers, genders, and cases it may need -- just as any adjective must. The fourth principle part, therefore, has the adjectival endings "-us, -a, -um" attached to it, and that tells you it declines in the first and second declensions -- like "magnus, -a, -um" -- to get the endings it needs. So every participle in a sentence will have number, gender and case because it is an adjective and it must be agreeing with something in the sentence of which it is a part.

But a participle is a verbal adjective, so it's going to get some of its character from its verbal ancestry. What qualities do verbs have? They have (1) number, (2) person, (3) tense, (4) mood, and (5) voice. So which of these six will participles retain?

1. **Number**
   A participle has number, that's true, but it gets its number -- singular or plural -- from the noun it's modifying. So a participle will have number, but not because it is a verbal derivative, but because it's an adjective.
2. **Person**
   A participle does not have person -- 1st, 2nd, or 3rd. You can't say of a participle, this is in the first person.
3. **Tense**
   A participle will have tense -- after a fashion. It will be either present, future, or perfect. The participle you know is the perfect participle.
4. **Mood**
   A participle is already a mood of a verb. There are the indicative, imperative, subjective, infinitive, and participial moods of verbs. So to say "participle" is already to designate a certain mood.
5. **Voice**
   A participle has voice -- either active or passive. The participle you know is a passive participle; hence it is the perfect passive participle.

So let's summarize all this. Whenever you see a participle in a sentence, you must be prepared to identify its adjectival and verbal components:

ADJECTIVAL	VERBAL
number	voice
gender	tense
case	

FORMATION OF LATIN PARTICIPLES

Now for a pleasant surprise: the Latin participial system is not nearly so complicated as the English system. In English, participles are often compounds of verbal stems and auxiliary verbs: "having been seen", "having looked", etc. In Latin, a participle is a one-word show.

You know that the Latin participles have number, gender, and case, all of which it must have because of its adjectival character. It gets its number, gender, and case in its adjectival endings. The participle which you already know -- the perfect passive participle -- is declined in the first and second declensions. This is important to remember: all participles will have number, gender, and case, and they get them by declining. We'll look at this again.

But what about voice and tense? You know only one participle, and it is passive in voice and perfect in tense. But there are other participles with other tenses and voices. In Latin there are participles of the present, future, and perfect tenses, and of the active and passive voices. (Only the future tense has participles of both voices. There is an active, but not passive

participle of the present tense; there is a passive, but not active participle in the perfect tense.) Here are the formulae for their formation.

I. **FUTURE ACTIVE PARTICIPLE**
The future active participle of any verb is formed by adding "-ur-" and the adjectival endings "-us, -a, -um" to the stem of the fourth principal part of the verb. For example, the future active participle of "laudo" is:

```
laudat + ur + us, -a, -um   =   laudaturus, -a, -um
```

II. **FUTURE PASSIVE PARTICIPLE (THE GERUNDIVE)**
The future passive participle (also called the gerundive [jeh RUHN div] for reasons you'll see in a minute) of any verb is formed by adding "nd" and the adjectival endings "-us, -a, -um" to the lengthened stem of the first principal part of the verb. Hence for the four conjugations:

```
1.    lauda  +  nd  +  us, -a, -um  =  laudandus, -a, -um
2.    mone   +  nd  +  us, -a, -um  =  monendus,  -a, -um
3.    age    +  nd  +  us, -a, -um  =  agendus,   -a, -um
3-i.  capie  +  nd  +  us, -a, -um  =  capiendus, -a, -um
4.    audie  +  nd  +  us, -a, -um  =  audiendus, -a, -um
```

III. **PRESENT ACTIVE PARTICIPLE**
The present active participle is formed by adding the third declension adjectival ending "-ns, -ntis" to the lengthened stem of the first principal part. This adjectival ending is the same ending you saw in the adjective "potens, potentis". (We'll consider the declension a little later.) So the present active participle of the four conjugations look like this:

```
1.    lauda      +   ns, -ntis =   laudans, laudantis
2.    mone       +   ns, -ntis =   monens,  monentis
3.    age        +   ns, -ntis =   agens,   agentis
3-i.  capie      +   ns, -ntis =   capiens, capientis
4.    audie      +   ns, -ntis =   audiens, audientis
```

IV. **PERFECT PASSIVE PARTICIPLE**
The perfect passive participle is given to you as the fourth principal part of the verb in the dictionary with the adjectival endings "-us, -a, -um". The only refinement you should make to your knowledge is that the true fourth principal part of a verb is what is left after you drop off the adjectival endings. The true fourth principal part of "laudo", for example, is "laudat-", not "laudatus, -a, -um". "Laudatus, -a, -um" is the perfect passive participle; "laudat-" is the true stem of the fourth principal part.

So let's go back to the empty table of participles and insert these formulae:

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	4th p.p. + ur + us, a, um	1st p.p. + nd + us, a, um
PRESENT	1st p.p. + ns, -ntis	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
PERFECT	xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx	4th p.p. + us, a, um

SOME PRACTICE WITH PARTICIPLE MORPHOLOGY

Write out the complete participial system of the following verbs:

1. duco, ducere, duxi, ductus -a, -um

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	_____	_____
PRESENT	_____	_____
PERFECT	_____	_____

2. mitto, mittere, misi, missus -a, -um

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	_____	_____

122

PRESENT	_____	_____
PERFECT	_____	_____

3. cupio, cupere, cupivi, cupitus -a, -um

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	_____	_____
PRESENT	_____	_____
PERFECT	_____	_____

4. amo, amare, amavi, amatus -a, -um

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	_____	_____
PRESENT	_____	_____
PERFECT	_____	_____

5. lego, legere, legi, lectus -a, -um

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	_____	_____
PRESENT	_____	_____
PERFECT	_____	_____

TRANSLATING THE PARTICIPLES: THE BASICS

Now let's think about the meaning of these participles. We'll first look at their barest, literal translations. They make really awful sounding English and, I hope, you'll soon discard them, but by learning these rudimentary translations first, you'll be certain to understand the grammar the participles involve.

I. **THE FUTURE ACTIVE PARTICIPLE**
Obviously, the future active participle tells you that the modified noun is about to undertake some action sometime time in the future ("future active"). But this construction has no convenient parallel in English. To translate this in English we used what is called a "periphrasitic" (peh ri FRAS tik) construction. The root of this term is "periphrase" and that's precisely what we have to do to translate the future active participle -- we have to find a periphrase for it, some way of approximating the meaning it would have had for the Roman ear. We "talk around it". The standard periphrases for the future active participle is "about to 'x'" or "going to 'x'", where "x" is the meaning of the verb. For example, for the participle "laudaturus" we would say "about to (or going to) praise"; for "facturus" we would say "about to (or going to) do".

II. **THE FUTURE PASSIVE PARTICIPLE**
This participle, too, has to be brought into English with a periphrase. Since both future participles make use use periphrastic constructions, the translation for the future active participle is often called the "1st periphrastic"; the future passive participle is called the "2nd periphrastic". The periphrase of the future passive participle might be something like this "about to be 'x'ed", or "going to be 'x'ed", where "x" is the meaning of the verb. For example, "ducendus" might be translated "about to be (or going to be) led". But the future passive participle in Latin usually has a special sense attached to it you can't foresee simply by examining the grammar of its constitutent parts. The future passive participle very often implies a sense of obligation or necessity that the action be performed. We can get a feel for it in our construction "to be 'x'ed" with a conjugated form of the verb "to be". Like this:

"This book is to be put on the shelf".
"This point is not to be ignored".

The underlined portions would be represented in Latin with the future passive participle. The next chapter will

straighten all this out. For now, just remember that the future passive participle involves a special meaning that has to be treated separately.

III. **THE PRESENT ACTIVE PARTICIPLE**
The key to the translation is "present and active". This tells you that the noun which the participle is modifying is currently engaged in an action. That is, the noun is the agent of an action, and the action is currently underway. The Latin present active participle can be translated directly into our English present active participle, which is formed from the first principal part of the verb plus the participial suffix "-ing"; egg., "walking", "running", "seeing", etc.

IV. **THE PERFECT PASSIVE PARTICIPLE**
Once again, with this participle the translation is spelled out in its title. The perfect passive participle tells you that the noun which the participle is modifying underwent ("passive") an action that is viewed as having been completed ("perfect"). The surest way to get this over into English is with the rather clumsy auxilary construction "having been" plus the third principal part of the English verb; egg., "having been seen", "having been taken", "having been helped".

For some good practice identifying and translating the participles, look the Self-Help Tutorials in Wheelock, excerises 1-3. You really shouldn't go any futher in this lesson until you feel comfortable about the morphology and basic translations of the participles.

VERBS WITH DEFECTIVE FOURTH PRINCIPAL PARTS

You have already seen many verbs whose fourth principal part is a little odd looking, or which have no fourth principal part listed in the dictionary at all. Verbs which do not have a perfect passive participle as its fourth principal part are called "defective" verbs. But often defective verbs will nevertheless have a future active participle. Now, this may seem to be an impossibility, because the future active participle is a derivative of the fourth principal part of the verb, right? For example, you get "laudaturus" by using the perfect passive participle "laudat-" plus "-ur" plus "the adjectival ending "-us, -a, -um". So if a verb has no fourth principal part, how can you put together a future active participle? Look again. The fourth principal part is the perfect passive participle, and there are many verbs which have no possible passive voice. Verbs which are intransitive cannot be made passive, so, logically, they'll have no perfect passive participle. But the future active participle is a possible form for intransitive verbs. In this case, the dictionary will list the future active participle as the fourth principal part:

fugio	fugere	fugi	fugiturus
sum	esse	fui	futurus
careo	carere	carui	cariturus
valeo	valere	valui	valiturus

PART II: THE SYNTAX OF THE PARTICIPLES

Latin is fond of its participles; it uses them much more often and with many more shades of meaning than English. For this reason, it is critically important that you not rush to grab hold of one-to-one equivalent translations from Latin to English. First you must force yourself to understand the "meaning" of the the Latin construction, and only then look for an English translation which will faithfully reproduce the "meaning" of the Latin. It's in cases like this where basic language instruction truly approaches the relm of the liberal arts. You must understand the meaning of the Latin before you reproduce it in English.

TENSE OF THE PARTICIPLES

This feature of the Latin participle may be the most difficult for students to comprehend. You know that participles have three different "tenses": the present, the future, and the perfect. The present participle indicates an action that is on-going; the future, an action that is going to happen; and the perfect an action that has been completed. But a Latin participle only shows time relative to the tense of the main verb of the sentence. Participles only indicate whether an action

a. is going on at the same time as the action of the main verb -- the present participle;
b. will occur after the action of the main verb -- the future participle;
c. was already completed before the action of the main verb -- the perfect participle.

To keep things simple, we refer to these temporal relationships as

1. time contemporaneous: the present participle
2. time subsequent: the future participles
3. time prior: the perfect participle

Therefore, the participle "ductus" does not mean that the action happened in the absolute past, but that it happened before the action of the main verb. If the main verb is in the future tense, then the action of "ductus" might not have happened yet in absolute time. Similarly, the participle "ducens" does not mean that the action is going on in the real present, but that the action is going on at the same time as the main verb. Therefore, if the main verb is a past tense, the action of "ducens" may

have already been complete by the time the sentence is uttered. And so also for the future participle. The future participle indicates that, relative to the time of the main verb, the action in the participle has yet to take place. "Ducturus", therefore, may represent an action that by the time of the real present has already been completed, if the main verb of the sentence was a past tense. This may be too much to absorb at once, but the tenses of English participles work the same way. So let's forget the Latin for a moment and look at some English examples.

1. The students, about to go home for break, are excited.
2. The students, going home for break, are excited.
3. The students, having gone home for break, are excited.

The main verb of each of these sentences is "are" -- that is, a present tense. The students "are" now excited -- that is, at the time the speaker utters his thought. Now let's look at the participial constructions.

1. In sentence #1, the students have not yet gone home, when they are excited. That is, they are excited now, and then they are going to go home. (There's no doubt it's the prospect of going home that makes them excited.) The participle is therefore indicating an action that will take place after the time of the main verb.
2. In sentence #2, the students are excited and are going home at the same time; consequently the present participle is used, because the action it indicates is contemporaneous with that of the main verb.
3. In sentence #3, the students are now excited -- that's the absolute time -- but before that they had gone home. Therefore the perfect participle is used, since it shows time prior to that of the main verb. They went home and now they are excited.

Now let's shift the whole time frame by using "were" instead of "are" for the main verb of the sentence. Remember, it is the tense of the main verb that sets the absolute time of the sentence.

1. The students, about to go home for break, were excited.
2. The students, going home for break, were excited.
3. The students, having gone home for break, were excited.

Read each of these sentences carefully. Even though the main action now has a different meaning for the speaker and his audience -- he's talking about an event that was a fact -- the temporal relationship of the participles to that event does not change.

1. The participial construction in sentence #1 is still talking about something that is subsequent to the time of the main verb;
2. the one in sentence #2 is still talking about an action contemporaneous with the time of the main verb;
3. and the one in sentence #3 is talking about an action prior to the time of the main verb.

Now let's see how this looks in Latin. Translate these sentences into literal English.

1. Puellae, cursurae, matrem vident.

_____

2. Puellae, currentes, matrem vident.

_____

3. Puellae, vocatae, matrem vident.

_____

Now translate these into English -- notice the change of the tense of the main verb.

1. Puellae, cursurae, matrem viderunt.

_____

2. Puellae, currentes, matrem viderunt.

_____

3. Puellae, vocatae, matrem viderunt.

_____

TRANSLATING LATIN PARTICIPLES AS CLAUSES

In many ways, English is a very precise language, especially when it comes to spelling out the relationship a subordinate clause has to the main clause of a sentence. Consider these complex sentences.

a. When the sailors were seen by Polyphemus, they were frightened.
b. Because the sailors were seen by Polyphemus, they were frightened.
c. Since the sailors were seen by Polyphemus, they were frightened.

d. The sailors who were seen by Polyphemus were frightened.
e. The sailors, who were seen by Polyphemus, were frightened.
f. The sailors, although they were seen by Polyphemus, were frightened.

Each of these five sentences is doing the same thing syntactically: each is subordinating one thought to another. The main clause -- the main thought -- is that the sailors were frightened. Subordinate to the main thought is the thought that the sailors were seen by Polyphemus -- the one-eyed monster. So syntactically, these sentences are constructed the same way.

But look at the different ways this subordination is realized and look at the different ways the relationship between the two thoughts is being expressed. In sentence (a), the relationship is strictly temporal -- they were seen, then they were frightened. And it's very possible that they were seen and frightened at the same time for some length of time. Like this:

```
they were seen ---------------

they were frightened -----------
```

In sentence (b), by constrast, the relationship is expressly causal -- being seen made them fear. Hence the subordinating conjunction "because" is used to tell you explicitly that the action in the subordinate clause caused the action in main clause.

Now look at (c). Does the subordinating conjunction "since" express a chronological or causal relationship? The truth is, it can be indicating both! Let's look at the subordinating conjunction "since" more closely. In these examples, "since" is used temporally.

1. Since your children were such monsters at the party, Sticky the Clown is charging double his normal fee.
2. Since you called yesterday, I've been busy cleaning the house.

(1) shows "since" in its causal sense; (2) shows it in the chronological sense. But often you can't tell in which way you ought to understand a "since" in a sentence, and often it has to be taken in both senses at the same time. In sentence (c) above, clearly, it has to be understood in both senses, because both are accurate descriptions of what happened. The sailors were seen and then they were frightened (they weren't fightened until after they were seen); but just as well, the sailors were frightened because they were seen. It's maddening, sometimes. Look at these examples where "since" could expressing a causal, temporal, or both a causal and temporal subordination.

i. Since the town of Hootersville had grown so much, no one could book a room at the Shadey Rest Hotel.
ii. Since you came yesterday, our peaceful home has been reduced to near anarchy.

Now let's have a look at the sentences "d" and "e" from above. As you can see, the same subordination is present. The main idea is still that the sailors were terrified, and the fact that they were seen by Polyphemus is attached to it. In these sentences, however, this latter idea is put into a relative clause -- "who were seen by Polyphemus". That is, it is presented simply as additional information about something in the main clause, as an adjectival clause.

Do you know the difference in meaning between "d" and "e"? It's quite subtle but very real. Read the sentences out loud and ask yourself this: "Is the relative clause picking a group of sailors from among other sailors"? That is to say, are there several sailors around, but only those who were seen by Polyphemus were frightened? Or is no such distinction or restriction implied?

Suppose this is what happened. There's a ship in a narrow bay, surrounded by land on the north, south, and east. There are two hundred men on the deck, one hundred looking north, one hundred looking south. Suddenly Polyphemus appears on a hill to the north. The sailors looking to the north, obviously, see him, and because they are seen by him too, they are frightened. But those looking south do not see him, and they are not frightened. Okay, that's the situation, and you want to sum it up. Only some of the sailors were seen by him and only they were frightened. You could say this "The sailors who were seen by Polyphemus were frightened", and the meaning of the relative clause is that only those seen by Polyphemus were frightened, but the others, who were not seen, were not frightened. We call this a "restrictive" relative clause, because it "restricts" the main clause to a group defined by the relative clause. In written English, a restrictive relative clause is not marked off with commas.

So what about the "non-restrictive" relative clause, which is marked off with commas? Just undo what the "restrictive" relative clause does. The non-restrictive relative clause does not limit the main clause to a group specified by the relative clause. It simply gives you more information about something in the main clause. Suppose that all the sailors on the ship saw and were seen by Polyphemus and they were all frightened. You would say, "The sailors -- who, by the way, were seen by Polyphemus -- were frightened". Study this example.

1. The books which are on the table are not worth reading. (I'm talking about only the books on the table to distinguish them from some other books which may be in the room.)
2. The books, which are on the table, are not worth reading. (There may be others which aren't worth reading, but here are some and they're on the table.)

Now what about translating the Latin participle? As I said at the beginning of this section, English likes to nail down the precise logical and temporal relationships between subordinate and main clauses in its sentences. It accomplishes this with a

wide array of subordinating conjugations. Latin, however, isn't so fussy about stating these relationships precisely. All the sentences "a" through "e" could be represented by one Latin sentence:

```
Nautae, visi ab Polyphemo, territi sunt.
```

The participial phrase "visi ab Polyphemo" could be translated into English different ways.

```
The sailors     having been seen by Polyphemus          were terrified.
                who were seen by Polyphemus
                because they were seen by Polyphemus
                since they were seen by Polyphemus
                after they were seen by Polyphemus
                when they were seen by Polyphemus
                although they were seen by Polyphemus
```

This is the moral: a way to bring a Latin participle is into English is to "promote" it from a single word to a full subordinate clause, one that mixes well with the context. Try your hand at some of the examples in Wheelock's Self-Help Tutorials, and use a variety of subordinating English constructions. Watch the tenses of the main verb and the "relative tense" of the participles.

THE PARTICIPLE AS A NOUN

There isn't really anything shocking about this. You've seen adjectives used as nouns before. You simply noted the number and the gender, and then plugged an appropriate pronoun. The participle, since it's an adjective, can do the same thing. The trick is to find a good way to bring the verbal part of the participle out. A simple solution, for starters, is to "promote" it to a relative clause which captures the meaning, tense, and voice of the verbal root of the participle.

```
opprimens       "he/she/it who oppresses" or "the oppressor"
opprimentes     "they who oppress" or "the oppressors"
oppressus       "he who was oppressed"
oppressi        "they who were oppressed" or "the oppressed"
oppressuri      "those who are going to oppress"
```

THE ACTIVE PARTICIPLE TAKING OBJECTS

We mustn't ever forget that the participle is a verbal adjective, and it always retains its verbal character. The verb "laudo" takes a direct object to complete its sense when it's being used in the active voice.

```
"Romani duces bonos laudaverunt". (The Romans praised the good leaders.)
```

Similarly, when the participle derived from it is in the active voice, it also can take a direct object.

```
"Romani duces bonos laudantes virtutem amaverunt".
(The Romans, who praised good leaders, loved virtue.)
```

Study the following examples of participles taking objects. A very common word-order for participles taking direct objects is to put the direct object between the noun and the participle which agrees with it. Watch for that arrangment. Wheelock (page 306) has a number of excellence little exercises on translating participles.

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

```
Aliquis, aliquid    This pronoun means "somebody", something",
                    "some people", some things". It has two parts:
                    the "ali-" and the "quis, quid" part.  It is
                    very easy to decline this pronoun because it
                    follows the pattern set by the interrogative
                    pronoun "quis, quid".  The one difference is
                    the nominative and accusative plurals, which
                    are "aliqua" and not the expected "aliquae".

                          aliquis   aliquid
                          alicuius  alicuius
                          alicui    alicui
                          aliquem   aliquid
                          aliquo    aliquo

                      aliqui    aliquae    aliqua
                      aliquorum aliquarum  aliquorum
```

127

```
aliquibus aliquibus  aliquibus
aliquos   aliquas    aliqua
aliquibus aliquibus  aliquibus
```

Chapter 23

1. The girls, about to run, see their mother.
2. The girls, running, see their mother.
3. The girls, having been called, see their mother.

1. The girls, about to run, saw their mother.
2. The girls, running, saw their mother.
3. The girls, having been called, saw their mother.

01/08/93

128

CHAPTER 24

"Ablative Absolute; Passive Periphrastic; The Dative of Agent"

Once again, this is a chapter which only expands on principles you've already been working with. The two constructions explained in this chapter all called "idioms" of the language. To put it briefly, an idiom is a construction whose meaning is more than the sum of its parts. That is, you can't simply look at the constituent parts of the construction and deduce the full meaning. For some reason, the language gives these construction special, additional meanings which is not present in its parts.

Just to give one example of an idiomatic construction from English, consider this. We form the present progressive tense in the active voice by using the verb "to be" as an auxiliary verb and the present participial stem of the verb. Like this: "The ants are crawling along the ground". Obviously the ants are the active subject of the verb "are crawling" -- they are the agents performing the action. Now look at this very idiomatic use of the present progressive tense in the active voice. "The tables are crawling with ants". Just like the "ants" in the first sentence, "tables" is the subject of the verb "is crawling", but this time the subject cannot be the active subject of the verb. The tables are not crawling, but the ants are crawling all over the tables. Even though the verb form is the same in both sentence -- "are crawling" -- the grammatical function of the subjects are entirely different. The "ants" are the active agent; the "tables" are passive recipients of the action performed by the ants, expressed in the prepositional phrase beginning with "with". The second construction is an example of an idiom, since the active form of the verb -- "are crawling" -- is over-ridden. The final meaning of the construction cannot be deduced simply by adding up the meaning of its parts. That's an idiom.

REVIEW OF PARTICIPLES

As you learned in the last chapter, a participle is a verbal adjective. The formation of participles from the different verbal stems obeys a few, very regular rules. Let's run through them again. Write out the formulae for forming the different participles:

FUTURE ACTIVE PARTICIPLE

_____

FUTURE PASSIVE PARTICIPLE (GERUNDIVE)

_____

PRESENT ACTIVE PARTICIPLE

_____

PERFECT PASSIVE PARTICIPLE

_____

As you can see, all the participles except the present active use the "-us, -a, -um" adjectival endings, and so present no problem in their declensions. The present active participle, however, declines in the third declension, and behaves like a third declension adjective of one termination of the "-ns, -ntis" type, with the exception of the short "-e-" in place of the "-i-" in the ablative singular . Decline a couple of present active participles just to refresh your memory.

PRESENT ACTIVE PARTICIPLES DECLINED

laudo (1)		moneo (2)	
Masc/Fem.	Neuter	Masc/Fem.	Neuter

duco (3)		capio (3-i)	
Masc/Fem.	Neuter	Masc/Fem.	Neuter

THE ABLATIVE ABSOLUTE: CONSTRUCTION AND SYNTAX

You remember from Chapter 23 that Latin isn't so fussy as English is about spelling out the exact temporal or logical relationship between a subordinate and main clause. In English, we have a bumper crop of subordinating conjunctions for this purpose: "since, because, although, if, even if, if and only if, being as how, seeing as how, before, after, during, while, inasmuch as, who", and on and on. Latin has many of these conjunctions, too, but, always aiming at compression, Latin likes to reduce subordinate thoughts to participles. A very popular way of linking two separate ideas without spelling out the exact relationship they have to each other is the "Ablative Absolute" construction. Let's look at both parts of the description "ablative" and "absolute".

We call a subordinate clause "absolute" when it stands entirely outside of the grammar of the main clause and contains no finite verb. We have a common "absolute" construction in English, which we call the "nominative absolute". Watch:

- "The door being open, everyone could see inside".
- "The key having been lost, I couldn't get in".
- "That said, I now move to my next point.
- "All other things being equal, the procedures are identical".

The first clause in each of these sentences are simply stating a fact that is given as a circumstance under which the action of the main clause takes place. And none of the absolute contructions has a finite verb. Now, obviously there is a logical or temporal relationship between the absolute clauses and the main clauses in each of these sentences, and you could easily recast the sentences to make them explicit. For example,

- "Because the door was open..".
- "Because the key was lost..".
- "Now that that has been said..".
- "If all other things are equal..".

But the speaker has chosen to keep the relationship unstated or implicit. For that reason, the verb is left as a participle and -- this is important -- the participle is not attached to anything in main clause. For example, let's rewrite the original absolute construction in "The key having been lost, I couldn't get in" to "Having lost my key, I couldn't get it". Now the participle agrees with something in the main clause -- "I" and the act of losing the key is specifically attributed to "I" and not left ambiguous.

In the original sentence, the speaker may or may not have been the one who lost the key. It may have been lost by someone else. But in the rewritten version, the guilty party is fingered: "I" lost the key. An absolute construction doesn't do that.

So here are two things to remember about clauses which are absolute: the verb is a participle, and it agrees with something in the absolute clause, not in the main clause of the sentence.

Now for the "ablative" part of the construction called the "Ablative Absolute". Just as the word "ablative" tells you, in Latin the participle and the noun it agrees with are both in the ablative case. For example:

"Hac fama narrata, dux urbem sine mora reliquit".

In this sentence, the main clause is "dux...reliquit". The Ablative Absolute clause is "hac fama narrata". The verb of the clause is the participle "narrata", which in turn agrees with the ablative "hac fama". So how do we translate the Ablative Absolute clause it into English? As always, let's start with the roughest, but most accurate, way. The quickest way to translate an Ablative Absolute clause is to use the preposition "with", followed by the noun, and then the participle in it correct tense and voice: "with this story having been told". So this sentence would come out:

"With this story having been told, the leader left the city without delay".

1. Cane currente, equus magno cum timore campum reliquit.
   "With the dog running, the horse left the field with great fear".
2. Equo cursuro, canis magno cum timore campum reliquit.
   "With the horse about to run, the dog left the field with great fear".

As you can see, the relationship between the clauses of these sentences is clear enough, even though it's unstated. In the first sentence, perhaps we could say, "Because the dog was running, the horse left the field". That is, the horse has some fear of running dogs. In the second, the dog doesn't like running horses, so when it realized that the horse was going to run, it ran away: "Bcause the horse was going to run, the dog left the field".

One last item about the Ablative Absolute clause is that when the participle is in the active voice, it can be followed by objects of its own which are not in the ablative case. That is to say, not every word in the Ablative Absolute clause has to be in the ablative case. Only the noun and the participle agreeing with it are necessarily ablative; the rest of the Ablative Absolute clause will follow the normal rules of Latin grammar. For example:

"Rege haec dicente, omnes cives terrebantur".
(With the king saying these things, all the citizens were terrified.)

The Ablative Absolute clause in this sentence is "rege haec dicente", as you can see by looking at the case of "rege" and "dicente" and by recognizing that the verb of the clause is in the participial mood. These are the two parts of an Ablative Absolute clause: noun and participle in the ablative case. But what about "haec"? Why is it in the accusative case if it's in an Ablative Absolute clause? The answer is that "haec" is the direct object of the action of the participle "dicente", and direct objects are always in the accusative case, regardless of the mood or construction of the verb. Remember, once you have a noun -- "rege" -- and a participle -- "dicente" -- in the ablative case, you have an Ablative Absolute construction. Everything else in the clause is simply additional material which follows the predictable rules of Latin grammar. Let's look at a few more examples.

1. "Bonis viris imperium tenentibus, res publica valebit". (With good men holding power, the republic will be strong.)
2. "Civibus patriam amantibus, possumus magnam spem habere". (With the citizens loving the fatherland, we are able to have great hope.)
3. "His rebus gravibus ab oratore dictis, omnis cupiditas pecuniae expulsa est". (With these serious matters having been said by the orator, all longing for money was driven out.)

THE ABLATIVE ABSOLUTE WITH "BEING"

The Ablative Absolute construction, as you now know, is made up of a noun and a participle agreeing with it in the ablative case. This brings up an interesting problem with the verb "sum", which has no present participle. How would you say, for example, "The king being good, the people were happy"? The clause you would turn into the Ablative Absolute contains the present participle "being", but Latin has no translation for it. In occasions like this, Latin simply leaves the participle out and uses the noun in the ablative case with the adjective agreeing with it: "Rege bono, populus beatus erat". So if you see a clause set off with commas containing a noun and adjective in the ablative case without a participle, just plug in our participle "being".

ABLATIVE ABSOLUTE: TRANSLATIONS

The literal translation of Ablative Absolutes -- "having..", "with..., etc. -- makes for some hellish English. A translation is not complete until we've rendered a thought in one language into a the target language in a smooth, fluent epxression that wouldn't suprise a native speaker. We have to message Ablative Absolutes a little to get them into English.

Because the Ablative Absolute is essentially a participial construction, the same rules that applied to translating participles will apply to the translating the Ablative Absolute. That is,

1. the Ablative Absolute shows time relative to the time of the verb of the main clause -- future participles show time subsequent, present participles show time contemporaneous, perfect participles show time prior;
2. the exact logical relationship between the main clause and the Ablative Absolute has to be reconstructed from the context and expressed by one of our subordinating conjunctions: because, since, after, although, if, inasmuch as, and so on.

So recognizing that an Ablative Absolute clause in a Latin sentence and pluging in the "with" to bring it into English is only the first step in translation. Next you must "promote" the participial clause into a subordinate clause with a finite verb (a verb with person) and decide on the most likely subordinating conjunction. Obviously, this is going to involve some judgment on your part, since the possible subordinating conjunction have very different meanings. For example, here are two possible translations of this Latin sentence: "Civibus patriam amantibus, possumus magnam spem habere".

a. Because the citizens love the fatherland, we are able to have great hope.
b. Although the citizens love the fatherland, we are able to have great hope.

The meaning of (a) and (b) are flatly contradictory; (a) is saying that it's a good thing for citizens to love the fatherland, but (b) says that it's not. But both are possible translations of the Latin sentence. You must first examine the general intention of the author as it appears in the context of his writing before you can translate this sentence into meaningful English. It'll take some practice and patience.

The relationship of tenses should present you little difficulty -- your natural instincts will serve you well. But one item should be mentioned. As you know, a perfect participle shows time prior to the time of the verb in the main clause. If therefore, the participle in the Ablative Absolute is perfect, and if the tense of the main verb is one of the past tenses -- imperfect, perfect, or pluperfect -- then how should you translate the participle when you promote it to a finite verb? Think about it a moment. If the perfect participle is showing time prior to another past event, then what finite tense should you use? The tense which shows time prior to another past event is the pluperfect tense, so you should choose the pluperfect tense to represent the perfect participle of the Ablative Absolute clause. Like this: "Omnibus bonis civibus ex urbe expulsis, tryannus imperium accepit". (When all the good citizens had been expelled from the city, the tyrant took power.)

Take a moment now do these sentences from ***Wheelock's*** **Self-Help Tutorial**. First analyze the sentence literally, then smooth it over into English you'd expect to hear in civil conversation.

8. _____

9. _____

10. _____

12. _____

14. _____

15. _____

16. _____

17. _____

22. _____

25. _____

THE PASSIVE PERIPHRASTIC WITH THE DATIVE OF AGENT

Look at these English sentences:

"This button is not to be pushed".
"You are to remain right here until we get back".
"This door is to be left open".
"You are to do all your homwework".
"This lesson is to be done by tomorrow".

In each of these the subject of the sentence is linked to an infinitive in the predicate by a form of the verb "to be", and they show a sense of duty, necessity, or obligation. This is an idiomatic construction in English. A conjugated form of the verb "to be" plus an infinitive -- either passive or active -- show obligation or necessity. Each of these sentence could have been written in several different ways. We could just as easily say

132

```
"This button        should          be pushed".
                    must
                    ought to
                    has to
```

As I warned you in the last chapter, Latin has an idiomatic use of the future passive participle. If the future passive participle is linked to the subject with a form of the verb "sum", it takes on a sense of obligation or necessity. When it is used this way, we call the future active participle a "gerundive". Do you remember the future passive participle? Let's review its formation for a moment. You for the future passive participle this way:

```
1st principal part  +   nd +   -us, -a, -um
```

Since there is no way to translate this construction directly over into English -- that is, you can't simply translate each word and come up with a true representation of the original intention -- you have to periphrase it. You have to "talk around" (peri) it to translate it. For this reason, the construction "sum + gerundive" is called a "periphrastic" construction, because you must periphrase it to translate it. Let's note three more things about this construction before we look at some examples.

1. The construction links a participle with the subject through a form of the verb "sum". Since participles are verbal adjectives the participle -- the gerundive -- will agree in number, gender and case with the subject to which it is linked. That is, the gerundive modifies the subject of the verb "sum".
2. Because the gerundive is the future passive participle, this construction will always be in the passive voice. That is, the construction will always be saying what should be done.
3. When the passive periphrastic construction expresses the person agent who should be performing the action, the agent is put into the dative case; the agent is not, as is normal for the passive voice, shown by "ab + ablative.

Now let's look at a couple of simple examples of the passive periphrastic.

"Carthago delenda est".
: "Carthago" (Carthago, -inis (f) "Carthage") is the subject and is feminine; so the gerundive, "delenda" (from "deleo" "to destroy") agrees with it. A literal translation, therefore, would be "Carthage is to be destroyed". Some acceptable variations may be: "Carthage ought to be destroyed", "Carthage should be destroyed", "Carthage has to be destroyed", "Carthage must be destroyed". Each of these translations has a different flavor in English, but they are all legitimate renderings of the Latin "Carthago delenda est".

"Carthago nobis delenda est".
: What about the "nobis"? It is in the dative case, so it is expressing the agent of the passive construction. So we should add to our translation "by us". "Carthage is to be (should be, ought to be, has to be, must be) destroyed by us".

Written English tries to be parsimonious of the passive voice, so a final translation of the passive periphrastic might be a conversion to the active voice: "We are to (must, ought to, should, have to) destroy Carthage".

"Haec puella meo filio amanda est".
: "This girl is to be (ought to be, should be, must be, has to be) loved by my son". Or, in the active voice "My son is to (must, ought to, should, has to) love this girl".

"Haec omnibus agenda sunt".
: "These things are to be (must be, ought to be, should be, have to be) done by everyone". Or "Everyone is to (must, ought to, should, has to) do these things".

Finally, the conjugated form of "sum" can be in any of the tenses -- naturally -- so the translation has to reflect the different tenses. Watch:

```
"Haec omnibus agenda erunt".
(Everyone will have to do these things.)

"Haec omnibus agenda erant".
(Everyone had to do these things.)
```

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

```
quisque, quidque        The inflected part of the word come
                        before the suffix "-que".  This is
                        the interrogative "quis, quid" +
                        the suffix, so you already know how
                        it is declined.  It means "each
                        one", so obviously should have no
                        plural forms -- and it doesn't
                        until after Classical Latin.  And
                        that's not your concern for now.
```

CHAPTER 25

"All Infinitives Active and Passive; Indirect Statement"

You've already been working with a couple of infinitive forms of Latin verbs -- the present infinitive active and passive. In this chapter you're going to learn all the remaining infinitives of a Latin verb: infinitives of the perfect and future tenses, both active and passive. Then you'll learn one of the most common uses of infinitives: their use in indirect statement.

TENSES OF THE INFINITIVE: MORPHOLOGY

Let's set out the formulae for all the infinitives you're going to study in this chapter, then we'll work with each in more detail. Here they are:

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE:	fut. act. part. esse	[supine + iri]
PRESENT:	1st p.p. + re	1st p.p. + ri
		1st p.p. + i
PERFECT:	3rd p.p. + isse	4th p.p. esse

FUTURE ACTIVE INFINITIVE

Do you remember how to form the future active participle? You use the fourth principle part + ur + the adjectival endings "-us, -a, -um". (If you're shaky on this, go back to Chapter 23 for a reminder.) The future active infinitive is formed by using the future active participle of the verb and then uses the infinitive of the verb "esse". So the future active infinitive of the verb "laudo" will be "laudaturus (-a, -um) esse". Translating the future active infinitive is a little tricky, however, because we have no simple future active infinitive in English. Two common suggestions -- clumsy though they are -- will at least help you rough-out the Latin until you can polish up the translation: try "to be about to x" or "to be going to x". So "laudaturum esse" can be translated "to be about to (or to be going to) praise".

FUTURE PASSIVE INFINITIVE

This infinitive is put in brackets because it's rare in Latin and won't come up in your work this year, nor in the next most likely. So we can skip it. One thing to remember, however, is that the future passive infinitive is not formed with the future passive participle plus the infinitive of the verb "sum". The future passive participle is the gerundive and has the idiomatic sense of obligation: "must", "ought", "should", etc.

PRESENT ACTIVE AND PASSIVE INFINITIVES

These are the infinitives you've been working with all along. No special explanation should be needed. Remember, though, that the passive infinitives of first, second and fourth conjugations are formed by adding "-ri" to the stem; but the third conjugation deletes the stem vowel and replaces it with a single long "-i".

PERFECT ACTIVE INFINITIVE

The perfect active infinitive is a new form for you: the third principal part with the ending "-isse" attached. The literal translation is our English "to have x". Hence "laudavisse" can be translated "to have praised".

PERFECT PASSIVE INFINITIVE

This infinitive, like the future active infinitive, is made up of a participle followed by the infinitive of the verb "sum". The translation for starters is "to have been xed". Hence "laudatum esse" may be rendered "to have been praised".

DRILLS

Fill in the infinitives for the following paradigm verbs.

1. amo (1)

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE:	_____	_____
PRESENT:	_____	_____
PERFECT:	_____	_____

2. habeo (2), habui, habitus, -a, -um

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE:	_____	_____
PRESENT:	_____	_____
PERFECT:	_____	_____

3. duco (3), duxi, ductus, -a, -um

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE:	_____	_____
PRESENT:	_____	_____
PERFECT:	_____	_____

3 i-stem. capio (3), cepi, captus, -a, -um

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE:	_____	_____
PRESENT:	_____	_____
PERFECT:	_____	_____

4. audio (4), audivi, auditus, -a, -um

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE:	_____	_____
PRESENT:	_____	_____
PERFECT:	_____	_____

THE IDEA OF INDIRECT STATEMENT

So far all the sentences you've been working with in Latin have been in direct speech. The difference between direct and indirect speech is a little difficult to describe completely, but a couple of examples of each may give you a feel for it. Here are some direct statements:

- "She sees her friend".
- "Our times are evil".
- "These things were not known".

In a direct statement, the author cast the thought in a sentence and addresses it directly to the audience. In indirect statement, a thought is treated as the object of a verb, and the thought is being reported to the audience. In English we frequently precede the reported thought, the "indirect statement", with the conjunction "that", or we may omit it.

- "I think [that] she sees her friend".
- "He said [that] our times are evil".
- "We heard [that] these things were not known".

If you analyze these sentences, you see that they are complex sentences (having a main and a subordinate clause). The verb which introduces the indirect statement is the main verb, and the indirect statement, which is treated as an object of the main verb, is the subordinate clause.

There are many verbs which can be followed by an indirect statement, and, naturally enough, they are verbs which conote

some kind of mental activity or speaking or perceiving: verbs like "to think [that]", "to say [that]", to hear [that]", "understand [that]", "to suppose [that]".... In short, there are dozens of verbs which can introduce indirect statement, and it would be futile to try to memorize them all outright. Just use your common sense. If a verb is a "head verb" -- if it implies mental activity or speaking or sensing -- then it can be followed by indirect statement.

In English indirect statement, you can see that the form of the original statement or thought is hardly changed at all when it is put into indirect statement. Like this:

```
    Original Statement:                    "My friends are coming".
As Indirect Statement:  "I think [that]  my friends are coming".
```

Obviously this is going to require some subsequent refinement, but in general, and for now, you can see that English really does very little altering or the original statement when it is made the object of a "head verb" -- i.e., when it is turned into an indirect statement.

LATIN: THE ACCUSATIVE-INFINITIVE CONSTRUCTION

In Latin, this is not true. Latin considerably alters the original statement when it becomes indirect. Two things happen:

1. The subject of the original statement, which is in the nominative case, is put into the accusative case.
2. The original finite verb (the verb which has person, 1st, 2nd or 3rd) becomes an infinitive.

The example sentences above would work like this in Latin:

```
    Original Statement:        "Mei amici veniunt".
As Indirect Statement:   "Puto meos amicos venire".
```

We often call this the accusative-infinitive construction, because the infinitive has a subject which is in the accusative case. The literal translation of the second sentence would be "I think my friends to be coming", and we could make sense of that if we heard someone say it in English like this. In fact, sometimes English can form indirect statement by using this accusative-infinitive construction. For example, you'd have no trouble understanding this: "We think him to be a scoundrel". The original statement behind this is "He is a scoundrel", which then becomes "him to be a scoundrel" after the verb which introduces the thought as an indirect statement. The differences is that in English we sometimes have the option which construction we'll use; but Latin from the period you're studying had only one construction for indirect statement: the accusative-infinitive construction.

There is one more item you need to know before we can pause and try some exercises. As you know, because Latin verbs have personal endings, it's not always necessary to have a subject pronoun expressed in the sentence. We simply look at the personal ending on the verb and insert the correct personal pronoun in our English translation. For example:

```
Meos amicos laudo.      I     am  praising my friends.
Meos amicos laudas.     You   are praising my friends.
Meos amicos laudat.     He    is  praising my friends.

Meos amicos laudamus.   We    are praising my friends.
Meos amicos laudatis.   You   are praising my friends.
Meos amicos laudant.    They  are praising my friends.
```

This shouldn't cause you any anxiety. You've been supplying personal pronouns for twenty-five chapters, and by now it's probably second nature for you. You probably don't even notice any longer that you're doing it. The question, though, is how are we going to make these original direct statements into indirect statements. They have no subjects in their original forms, and you can't just put the verb into the infinitive. Infinitives have no person, so it would be impossible to tell who the agent of the action is.

The solution is really quite simple. You use the accusative case of the personal pronoun which is indicated by the original personal ending on the verb. What that means is that for "laudo", for example, you reconstruct the original nominative form of the personal pronoun -- which would be "ego" -- and then put it into the accusative case -- which is "me" -- and then put the original finite verb into the infintive. The same for the other persons. So these sentence in indirect statement would be this:

```
Meos amicos laudo.      -    Dico me meos amicos laudare.
Meos amicos laudas.     -    Dico te meos amicos laudare.
Meos amicos laudat.     -    Dico eum meos amicos laudare.

Meos amicos laudamus.       -    Dico nos meos amicos laudare.
Meos amicos laudatis.       -    Dico vos meos amicos laudare.
Meos amicos laudant.        -    Dico eos meos amicos laudare.
```

You can see that all indirect statements must have the subject accusative expressed. The infinitive, by its nature, doesn't contain person, so it alone can't tell you its subject. You must have "me, te, etc" or some accusative-subject expressed in indirect statement. Next, how many of you are wondering about the accusative "meos amicos" in the sentences above? You may be wondering how you can tell which accusative is the subject of the infinitive and which is its object, since Latin word order is generally very flexible. That is, what's to keep the first sentence from meaning: "I say that my friends are praising me". Here is one place where word order is very important in Latin.

The normal word order in an indirect statement is this:

Subject-Accusative	Direct Object Accusative	Infinitive
me	amicos meos	laudare

It usually is the case that the first word in the indirect statement is the subject accusative. The next accusative, if there is one, will be the direct object of the verb in the infinitive.

DRILLS Change the following direct statements into indirect statements.

Remember:

1. the original subject nominative becomes the subject accusative;
2. the original finite verb becomes the infinitive;
3. where there is no subject expressed, you must use the appropriate pronoun in the accusative case.

Examples

A. Veniunt cum amicis tuis.

Puto eos cum amicis venire.

B. Veritas sine magno labore inveniri non potest.

Intellegunt veritatem sine magno labore inveniri non posse.

1. Illa puella dona multa patri dat.

Putamus _____

2. Hoc signum ab Caesare dandum est.

Nuntiat _____

3. Spes novarum rerum mollibus sententiis alitur.

Scimus _____

4. Vos iuvamus.

Scitis _____

5. Tyrannus multas copias in mediam urbem ducit.

Nuntiant _____

TENSES OF INFINITIVES: RELATIVE TENSE

Now that you've mastered the basics of the Latin indirect statement, it's time for some refinement. Earlier I said that English generally leaves the form of the direct statement alone when it becomes and indirect statement. English often simply subordinates the original statement to a "head verb" with the conjunction "that", without changing the original statement at all. But this is not always true. Sometimes we do change the form of the original statement when it becomes indirect statement.

Let's assume that someone says "I am coming", and that you wish to report what he said to someone else. You would say, "He says that he is coming". Except of the logical change in person, you haven't changed the form of the original direct statement at all. But suppose that he said this yesterday. That is, yesterday he said, "I am coming". To report this statement as indirect statement, you would say, "He said that he was coming". Here English lets some of the past tense of the main verb of the sentence -- "said" -- infect the original direct statement: "am coming" is changed to "was coming". He didn't say "I was coming", rather he said "I am coming". But because the leading verb is past tense -- "he said" -- English make the original

statement a past tense, too, although logically it shouldn't because it distorts what was actually said. What is worse, it introduces the possiblility for ambiguity. What did he really say? Did he say "I am coming", or did he really say "I was coming"? You can't tell from the sentence "He said that he was coming".

Let's change the example slightly. Suppose he is now saying, "I will come". You would report this as "He says that he will come". No problem. But suppose he said "I will come" yesterday. You would report his statement as "He said that he would come". Once again, you can see that English changes the form of the original statement when it becomes indirect. Here, when a statement referring to the future is reported as a past event, the original simple future becomes the conditional. It's a great big mess.

In Latin there is none of this nonsense. First you have to recognize something about the tenses of the infinitives in Latin: like the tenses of participles, the tenses of infinitives are not absolute, but are only relative to the tense of the leading verb -- the verb which is introducing the indirect statement. Think of it this way. The future tense of a finite verb depicts an action which has not yet occurred, but a future infinitive depicts an action which occurs after the action of the leading verb. The present tense of a finite verb depicts an action which is currently going on, but the present infinitive depicts and action that is going on at the same time as the leading verb. And finally, the perfect tense (or any of the past tenses) of a finite verb depicts an action that has already occurred, but the perfect infinitive depicts an action which occurs before the leading verb. To simplify this we say that a present infinitive shows time contemporaneous, a future infinitive shows time subsequent, and a perfect infinitive shows time prior. Let's look at several examples of this.

1. **Puto eum venire.**
   Here the tense of the infinitive in the indirect statement is present, so it is showing time contemporaneous with the time of the leading verb "puto". This means that I think that he is coming now (while I'm thinking). We may translate the sentence, therefore, "I think that he is coming".

2. **Puto eum venturum esse.**
   Now the tense of the infinitive is future, showing time subsequent to the action of the leading verb. This means that I am thinking now that he will come -- not that he is coming but that he will come. So we can translate the sentence "I think that he will come (or that he is going to come)".

3. **Puto eum venisse.**
   The perfect infinitive shows time prior to the leading verb, so at the moment I'm thinking, the action I'm thinking about has already occurred. So the translation is "I think that he has come (or that he came)".

4. **Putavi eum venire.**
   Since the present infinitive shows time contemporaneous, this means that the sentence must be translated "I thought that he was coming". Do you see why? "Venire" shows time contemporaneous with the action of the leading verb, which is depicting a past event, so we have to translate the sentence into English to show this relationship. The trouble here is not with the Latin. As you can see, the indirect statement "eum venire" doesn't change when we use a different tense of the leading verb. The problem is with our English representation of the Latin.

5. **Putavi eum venturum esse.**
   How are you going to translate this sentence. The future tense of the infinitive shows time subsequent (after) the time of the leading verb, and how do we do that in English? We say "I thought that he would come".

6. **Putavi eum venisse.**
   The translation is "I thought that he had come". Can you explain why? This actually can get a little sticky in English, because we tend to shy away from the pluperfect tense. We might just as possibly say "I thought that he was coming" when we mean that he was coming before I thought about it. In Latin, though, there is no chance for ambiguity. The perfect infinitive "venisse" shows time prior to "putavi", and "putavi is already representing a past event. An event before another event in the past is represented by the pluperfect tense. Hence "I thought that he had come".

THE REFLEXIVE PRONOUN "SE" IN INDIRECT STATEMENT

You're going to get plenty of chances to work with the indirect statement and the tenses of the infinitives soon, but there is one more item in the chapter we have to look at -- although it's really quite simple. Consider the following sentence: "He said that he was a good leader". Is there anyway you can tell whether the sentence means "he said that he himself was a good leader", or "he said that he [somebody else] was good leader"? You can't. This is the same problem we saw before with the third person pronoun: English has no convenient way to distinguish the reflexive from the non-reflexive third person pronoun. In Latin, however, the pronoun "is, ea, id" is always non-reflexive, and the pronoun "sui, sibi, se, se" is reflexive. Consequently, "He said that he [somebody else] was a good leader" is "Dixit eum ducem bonum esse"; and "He said that he [himself] was a good leader" is "Dixit se ducem bonum esse". Remember also that the reflexive pronoun doesn't show difference in number: "Dixerunt se bonos ducos esse" is "They said that they [themselves] were good leaders".

DRILLS

A. Translate from Latin to English

1. Putamus omnes bonos viros vitas beatas agere.

2. Putamus omnes bonos viros vitas beatas egisse.

3. Putamus omnes bonos viros vitas beatas acturos esse.

4. Putavimus omnes bonos viros vitas beatas agere.

5. Putavimus omnes bonos viros vitas beatas egisse.

6. Putavimus omnes bonos viros beatas vitas acturos esse.

7. Putabimus omnes bonos viros beatas vitas agere.

8. Putabimus omnes bonos viros beatas vitas egisse.

9. Putabimus omnes bonos viros beatas vitas acturos esse.

10. Putabimus bonum virum vitam beatam acturum esse.

B. Translate into Latin

1. We hear that you (pl.) are coming.

2. We heard that you (pl.) were coming.

3. We heard that you had come.

4. We heard that you would come.

5. They think that the letter was written by us.

6. They think that the letter is being written by us.

7. They thought that the letter was being written by us.

8. They thought that the letter had been written by us.

9. They thought that we would write the letter.

10. They think that we should write the letter.

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

hostis, -is (m) In the singular, it means an enemy -- one person you don't like. In the plural it means an enemy -- the group of people you don't like -- not a lot of individual

	enemies. It means "enemy" in our sense of an enemy of country.
ait, aiunt	"He, she says/ they say". Its first and second persons don't appear in this book, and it's used only in its present tense forms.
spero (1)	"Spero" takes its infinitive in indirect statement in the future tense. This makes sense, because you generally hope for something that is not now presently the case. "We hope to see our friends" comes over into Latin as "We hope that we will see our friends": "Speramus nos amicos nostros visuros esse".

01/10/93

141

CHAPTER 26

"Comparison of Adjectives; Declension of Comparatives"

DEGREES OF ADJECTIVES

Adjectives are words which attribute a quality to nouns, and in Latin adjectives must agree in number, gender and case they are modifying. You have learned adjectives which decline in the first and second declensions, and those which decline in the third. But up to this chapter the adjectives you've studied attribute qualities to nouns in what is called the positive degree only. That is, they simply attach the quality to the noun. But adjectives can also attribute the quality in way that compares the noun with other nouns by indicating that the noun has more of the quality than another noun, or that it has the most of the quality than at least two other nouns. We call these two other degrees the comparative (more of the quality) and the superlative (most of the quality) degrees.

In English, we form the comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives in two different ways. We use the adverbs "more" and "most", and we use the suffixes "-er" and "-est" added to the base of the adjectives. For example,

POSITIVE DEGREE	COMPARATIVE DEGREE	SUPERLATIVE DEGREE
blue skies	bluer skies	bluest skies
difficult book	more difficult book	most difficult book

For your concerns now, there is only one way to form the comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives in Latin, and that is by adding suffixes to the base of the adjectives. Since adjectives are listed in the dictionary under their base forms -- the nominative singular of the positive degree -- and don't have separate listings for inflected (or derived) forms, you're going to have to do some more work as you read to simplify adjectives in the comparative and superlative degrees down to their dictionary forms so that you can look them up.

THE COMPARATIVE DEGREE OF ADJECTIVES

To form the comparative degree of an adjective, you add the ending "-ior", "-ius" to its stem. Let's have a look at this suffix. Because the word is still an adjective, it's still going to have to decline. The comparative suffix is a third declension ending and declines just like a normal noun of the third declension. This is a little odd, since you might expect the comparative suffix to decline like a third declension adjective, and third declension adjectives are all i-stems. (Look at Chapter 16 if you're not sure what I'm talking about.) Let's look at the declension of this suffix. The masculine and feminine nominatives are "-ior", and the neuter nominative is "-ius". The stem of the ending is "-ior-". Decline the comparative adjectival suffix. The comparative ending "-ior, -ius" essentially tells you that it is a third declension adjective of two terminations. Simply attach the proper third declension case endings to the stem "-ior-". Don't forget the rules of the neuter. (Check your work in Wheelock.)

	MASCULINE AND FEMININE	NEUTER
N/V.	-ior	-ius
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____

How did you do? Do you see the patterns at work? The stem "-ior-" plus the cases endings from the third declension non i-stem. These are the inflected endings you then attach to the stem of the adjectives. So to make any adjective comparative, regardless of its original declension -- 1st and 2nd, or 3rd -- you attach these endings to the stem of the adjective and then decline the adjective in the third declension. This is important to remember. As soon as an adjective is put into the comparative degree, it gets its case endings from the third declension, because that's how the comparative suffix declines.

Let's look at some examples of this.

ADJECTIVE	STEM	COMPARATIVE DEGREE
beatus, -a, -um	beat-	beatior, -ius
fortis, -e	fort-	fortior, -ius
potens, potentis	potent-	potentior, -ius

DRILL

Decline the following expressions:

wiser plan		more powerful city	
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

THE SUPERLATIVE DEGREE OF ADJECTIVES

The superlative degree of adjectives is even easier to form. It's simply the stem of the adjective plus the suffix "-issim-" plus the first and second declension adjectival endings "-us, -a, -um". Hence all adjectives in the superlative degree decline like the simpliest adjectives you know: the first and second declension types, just like "magnus, -a, -um". The only trick is to use the proper stem. For example:

ADJECTIVE	STEM	SUPERLATIVE DEGREE
beatus, -a, -um	beat-	beatissimus, -a, -um
fortis, -e	fort-	fortissimus, -a, -um
potens, potentis	potent-	potentissimus, -a, -um

TRANSLATIONS OF THE COMPARATIVE AND SUPERLATIVE DEGREES

You may well wonder why we need to bother with how the degrees of the adjectives are translated. It's obvious that the comparative will be translated "more X" or "X-er" and that the superlative will be translated "most X" or "X-est". And, in fact these are common ways of translating them into English. But often, very often, the comparative and superlative degrees are used "absolutely"; that is, without anything being direct compared to the quality depicted in the adjective. Latin can use the comparative degree to say "A is X-er than B", but it can also use the comparative degree to say "A is rather X". Similarly, Latin can use the superlative degree to say "A is most X of all", or to say "A is very X". Hence the adjective "longior, -ius" can mean "longer", if there's something being compared, or it can mean just "rather long", if there isn't anything being compared. Similarly, "longissimus, -a, -um", can mean "longest", or it can mean "very long". If there is nothing being compared to the noun with respect to the quality designed in the adjective, then use "rather" or "very" instead of "more" or "most".

THE USE OF THE ADVERB QUAM

The adverb "quam" is used like our word "than" in a comparison to link the two terms of the comparison. "They are more happy than we". Although we tend to slop over it in English, you must remember that in Latin the two things being compared must be in the same case. In the example I just gave, we might be tempted to say "They are happier than us", and we probably should say "us" if we're in a situation when erudition might be the cause of some scorn or suspicion. But technically, because "they" is the point of comparison, and because "they" is in the nominative case, we should use "we" and

not "us". And so also, "They are happier than she [is]". In Latin, the "quam" is like an equal sign: it requires the same case on each side of the comparison. Study these examples.

1. Sunt beatiores quam ego. (They are happier than I).
2. Ille est beatior quam hic. (That man is happier than this man.)
3. Puto illos esse beatiores quam hos. (I think that those men are happier than these men.)
4. Nemo est stultior quam ei qui libros numquam legunt. (No one is more foolish than those who never read books.)

"Quam" can also be used with an adjective in the superlative degree to mean "as X as possible". In fact, sometimes the whole construction is written out like this: "quam potest longissimus": "as long as is possible".

THE POSSESSIVE PRONOUN

There is one other issue I'd like to take up even though it's not in Wheelock. It causes students some confusion. Consider this sentence. "Our city is more illustrious than yours". The final word in the sentence, "yours" is standing in for "your city": "Our city is more illustrious than your city". But English has a way of simplifying the full construction by using a "possessive pronoun". Check both words here: "pronoun", meaning a word which stands in for another, and "possessive", meaning a word that shows possession. The possessive pronouns in English for the different numbers and persons are: "mine, ours, yours, his, hers, its, theirs".

Latin has no equivalent of the possessive pronoun, which we find so useful. Instead, Latin uses the possessive adjective in the number and gender of the noun which has been omitted, and in the case required by the construction of the sentence. Like this.

1. "Veni cum amicis meis; venit cum suis".
   (I came with my friends; he came with his.)
2. "Nostra civitas est clarior quam vestra".
   (Our city is more illustrious than yours.)
3. "Mea mater est sapientior quam tua".
   (My mother is wiser than yours.)

DRILLS

Translate the following sentences into Latin.

1. Your city is rather shameful.
   _____

2. They said that this [woman] is happier than that [woman].
   _____

3. Their friends are wiser than ours.
   _____

4. The tyrant was very harsh. ("acerbus, -a, -um")
   _____

5. This road was as long as possible.
   _____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

quidam, quaedam, quiddam or quoddam

Obviously this word is an inflected form of the relative pronoun "qui, quae, quod" with an indeclinable suffix "-dam" attached. It has a set of closely related meanings which make its translation a little slippery at first. When used as an adjective, it means "a certain" or "some": "quidam auctor" (some author); "quaedam terrae" (some lands), etc. When it is used as a pronoun, it means "somebody", "something", "some people", "somethings". "Quidam putant eum stultum esse" (Some people think he is foolish.) "Quiddam" is the neuter form used when the word is being used as an adjective; "quoddam" when it's being used as a pronoun. "Fecit quiddam consilium" (He made some

	plan); "Fecit quoddam" (He made something). You'll have to work some to keep this word distinct from "quidem" (indeed). I remembered the difference this way. "Quidem" has "-e-", like "indeed". "Quidam" has an "-a-" as when you're saying "ah.". because you can't come up with the name for something.
quam	You've see this before, meaning "how", as in "Quam dulce est beatam vitam agere" (How sweet it is to live a happy life). In this chapter, you learned that it is the adverb of comparison "than", and that it can also be used with a superlative degree of the adjective to mean "as X as possible", where X is the meaning of the adjective.
vito (1)	Students always confuse this with "vivo" (to live). Try to remember this: when you see the verb "vito", it's inevitable (unavoidable) that you'll confuse it with something else.

1/10/93

145

CHAPTER 27

"Special and Irregular Comparison of Adjectives"

The title of this chapter says it all: some adjectives in Latin form their comparative and superlative degrees irregularly. But don't panic. The irregularities are entirely limited either to the stem of the adjective uses in the comparative and superlative degrees, or to the way the comparative or superlative endings are attached to the stem. The irregularities do not affect the way the adjectives decline in the comparative or superlative degrees. You already have experience with irregular comparison in lots of English adjectives:

good	better	best
bad	worse	worst
little	smaller	smallest
much (many)	more	most

If you take a close look at the degrees of these adjectives you can see that for all of them the stem is changed from the positive to the comparative and superlative degrees. It's not "good, gooder, goodest", because English substitutes another stem in place of the one you would expect if you were thoughtlessly following the rules that apply to the regular adjectives. Now look more closely. Even though the stems have changed, you can still often see the regular comparative and superlative endings "-er" and "-est" attached to the irregular stem.

ADJECTIVES WITH IRREGULAR STEMS

The positive degree of the adjective meaning "good" is "bonus, -a, -um", a first and second declension adjective. To form the comparative degree, you use another stem, "mel-", to which you add the comparative adjectival ending "-ior, -ius". Review the comparative endings "-ior, -ius" from Chapter 26 if you have to and decline the adjective "melior, -ius".

	MASCULINE AND FEMININE	NEUTER
N/V.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____

There was really no reason for you to decline this adjective. It follows precisely the same pattern as the regular comparative degree. I just want you to believe that the irregular comparative degree isn't completely irregular: its irregularity is limited to the stem it uses and does not affect its declension at all.

Perhaps you have some bad feelings already about all the new forms you're going to have to memorize. There's no escaping the hard fact that you will have to memorize three forms for irregular adjectives, but there's a way to ameliorate the problem. These irregular stems often are the roots are English words, so if you learn the English derivatives, it will much easier to fix the irregular stems in your memory. For example, from the stem "mel-" we get the English verb "ameliorate", which means "to make better, improve".

Let's move on now to the superlative degree of the adjective "bonus, -a, -um": it's "optimus, -a, -um". Obviously we get the English words "optimist", "optimal", "optimum", and others from this stem, but notice that the superlative degree simply uses the "-us, -a, -um" endings without the "-issim-" infix which the regular adjectives use. You'll have no problem adjusting to this. Here are some more irregular adjectives with a few comments.

POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE
magnus, -a, -um	maior, maius	maximus, -a, -um

(great)	(greater)	(greatest)

The comparative degree "maior" will look more familiar if you add a tail to the intervocalic "-i-": "major". (A Major is greater than a Captain.) Remember, now, that even though it looks a little odd, "maior" will decline quite normally: maioris, maiori, etc., with "ma-" as the stem.

POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE
malus, -a, -um (bad)	peior, peius (worse)	pessimus, -a, -um (worst)

Use the same trick with the intervocalic "-i-" in "peior". "Pejorative" means "derogatory, disparaging", from the Latin sense of "worse".

POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE
parvus, -a, -um (small)	minor, minus (smaller)	minimus, -a, -um (smallest)

The comparative degree looks odd: the adjectival ending "-ior, -ius" seems to be missing. It's there; only the "-i-" is missing. You decline "minor, minus" as you normally would, but just leave the "-i-" off. Try it:

	MASCULINE AND FEMININE	NEUTER
N/V.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____
N/V.	_____	_____
Gen.	_____	_____
Dat.	_____	_____
Acc.	_____	_____
Abl.	_____	_____

POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE
superus, -a, -um (above)	superior, -ius (higher)	supremus, -a, -um (last)
		summus, -a, -um (highest)

The only peculiarity of this adjective are the two superlative degrees which are derived from it. "Summus" means "highest", and so does "supremus", but "supremus" can also mean "last". Think of it this way. We're stand at the bottom of a long ladder that's extending upward. The object which is the highest on the ladder is the "last" we would reach as we ascend. So Latin can say "supremo die" (on the last day). The point is, both "summus" and "supremus" can mean "highest", but "supremus" often can have the extended meaning "last".

POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE
(pro, prae) (before)	prior, -ius (prior, previous)	primus, -a, -um (first)

The adjectives "prior" and "primus" are comparative and superlative degrees of an adjective that doesn't exist in the positive degree. "Pro" and "prae" are prepositions, not adjectives, and they can mean "before".

POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE

147

multus, -a, -um (much; many)	plus, pluris (n) plures, plura (more)	plurimus, -a, -um (very many; most)

The chief difficulty with this adjective, as you can see, comes in the comparative degree. In the singular of the comparative, the adjective "multus" becomes a neuter noun "plus, pluris (n). It isn't an adjective at all. It's a noun which means "more". Latin uses it with a genitive case of the noun: "plus pecuniae" (more of money). Like this:

N/V.	plus	pecuniae	(more money)
Gen.	pluris	pecuniae	(of more money)
Dat.	-----	-----	
Acc.	plus	pecuniae	(more money)
Abl.	plure	pecuniae	(by/with more money)

In the plural, however, the word for "more" becomes an adjective, and declines just as you would expect a normal third declension adjective to decline. One set of forms for the masculine and feminine, and one for the neuter:

	MASCULINE AND FEMININE	NEUTER
N/V.	plures	plura
Gen.	plurium	plurium
Dat.	pluribus	pluribus
Acc.	plures	plura
Abl.	pluribus	pluribus

There is a distinction to be maintained between "plus, pluris, (n)" and "plures, plura". The adjective "multus, -a, -um" means "much" or "many", and these two words, "much" and "many" are not interchangeable in English. We use the adjective "much" when we're talking about something which can't be counted up individually; we use "many" when it can. For example, we say "much mud", or "much money". It would sound odd to say "many muds" or "many moneys". We could possibly say "many muds" we're mudologists and we're talking about many different kinds of muds around the world: Chinese mud, Korean food, French mud, and so on. In this case the mud types would in fact be countable, and the adjective "many" would be appropriate: "There are many muds in the world today. Some tan, some yellowish, and others which are completely black".

Conversely, we wouldn't say "much towels", "much rivers", or "much people", because these are objects which are countable. Latin uses the singular neuter noun "plus, pluris" when referring to uncountable objects, and the adjective "plures, plura" when referring to countable objects. "Plus aeris" (more [of] bronze), and "plures homines" (many people).

SUPERLATIVE DEGREE OF ADJECTIVES IN -R

To form the degrees of regular adjectives, you simply add "-ior, -ius" or "-issimus, -a, -um" to the stem of the adjective. The stem, you remember, is the form you see in all the forms of the adjective except for the masculine nominative singular. When the adjective ends in "-r" in the nominative masculine singular, however, the superlative degree does something slightly different. These rules hold true for all adjectives which end in "-r", not just for a chosen few. Let's look at a couple of examples:

pulcher, -chra, -chrum
liber, -a, -um
acer, acris, acre
celer, celeris, celere

The comparative degree of these adjectives is quite regular. You simply use the stem with the comparative suffix "ior, -ius" attached.

POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE
pulcher, -chra, -chrum	_____
liber, -a, -um	_____
acer, acris, acre	_____
celer, celeris, celere	_____

But to form the superlative degree of these adjectives you do two things: (1) use the masculine nominative singular as the stem, and (2) add the suffix "-rimus, -a, -um". Thus, according to step (1), even if the true stem of the adjective lacks the "-e-" before the "-r", you build the superlative degree from a base ending in "-er". Adding the suffix "-rimus, -a, -um", you

end up with a doubled "r". So for the adjective "piger, -a, -um" (slow), the superlative degree is "pigerrimus, -a, -um" Now write out the superlative degree of these adjectives.

POSITIVE	SUPERLATIVE
pulcher, -chra, -chrum	_____
liber, -a, -um	_____
acer, acris, acre	_____
celer, celeris, celere	_____

SOME ADJECTIVES ENDING IN -LIS

There are six adjectives in Latin ending in "-lis, -e" which have a oddity in the formation of the superlative degree. Wheelock concentrates on only three. The irregularity of these adjectives is that the suffix "-limus, -a, -um" is used in place of "-issimus, -a, -um". The comparative degree, however, is entirely regular. Form the degrees of the three adjectives which use this irregular suffix in the superlative, then compare them to three other adjectives in "-lis, -e" which use the regular superlative suffix. (Remember, this irregularity is limited to only six adjectives ending in "-lis, -e". All other adjectives ending in "-lis, e" form their comparisons regularly.)

POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE
1. Irregular		
facilis, -e	_____	_____
similis, -e	_____	_____
difficilis, -e	_____	_____
2. Regular		
mollis, -e (soft)	_____	_____
mortalis, -e (mortal)	_____	_____
fidelis, -e (loyal)	_____	_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

appello (1)	This verb in the passive voice is a copulative verb, linking the subject to a predicate nominative. "He is called Brutus" would be "Appellatur Brutus", not "Brutum".
maiores, -ium (m)	Obviously this noun is derived from the comparative adjective for "magnus, -a, -um". Used as a noun in the plural, it means "the greaters in age" or the "ancestors".
similis, -e	It takes the dative case as its complement. "Hoc non simile illi" (This is not similar to that.)

01/10/93

CHAPTER 28

"Subjunctive: Present Active and Passive; Jussive; Purpose"

In this chapter, you begin your study of the subjunctive mood of verbs by learning the subjunctive in the present tense and two of the uses of the subjunctive mood: the jussive (JUH siv or JEW siv) subjunctive and the purpose (or final) clause. The first real difficulty for students to overcome when beginning the subjunctive is to realize that there is no one way to translate a Latin verb in the subjunctive mood. The subjunctive mood is one primarily of syntax and is almost always used in subordinate clauses. What you must do is (1) learn the morphology (formation) of the subjunctive mood, and then (2) study the different ways the subjunctive is used in Latin to express what. Once you've understood the intent of the Latin sentence, then you're prepared to bring that meaning over into an appropriate English construction. This all may sound rather metaphysical and frightening, but it isn't really. It just means that the method of assigning one to one correspondences from Latin to English and vice versa, which may have served you so well in the past, can't help you anymore. You'll learn to form the subjunctive in the different tenses, while you collect and study the different uses of the subjunctive. Let's start.

FORMATION OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE: PRESENT TENSE

The subjunctive is one of the moods of a Latin verb. The moods you know so far are: indicative, imperative, infinitive, and participial. The subjunctive mood is limited to finite forms (forms with person) of the verb. Hence you'll not have to worry over the subjunctive infinitive, the subjunctive participle, et cetera.

I. Subjunctive of the First Conjugation Present Tense

To form the subjunctive, present tense, a first conjugation verb simply substitutes the normal stem vowel long "-a-" with a long "-e-". The personal endings, active and passive, are not changed (except that the first person singular ending is the variant "-m" instead of "-o-"). Write out the present subjunctive active and passive of the first conjugation verb "laudo" in the present tense.

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

This wasn't so difficult, but look at these forms again. If you didn't know that these forms were derived from a first conjugation verb, you might think that some of the forms were forms of the indicative from a second or third conjugation verb. The form "laudetis," for example, looks like it could be a present tense from a second conjugation verb, or a future tense of the third conjugation non i-stem verb. The only way to be sure, if you're not totally familiar with the verb you're examining, is to look the verb up and make sure you note its conjugation. When you seen "laudo (1)" in the dictionary, then you can be sure that the form "laudetis" is subjunctive present tense. Let's move on.

II. Subjunctive of the First Conjugation Present Tense

As you're about to see, the way a first conjugation verb forms the subjunctive present tense is actually an exception to the general rule verbs follow to form the present subjunctive mood. All other conjugations form the present subjunctive by inserting a long "-a-" between the stem and the personal endings. This rule is easily seen in the second conjugation: "mone + a + m = moneam"; "mone + a + r = monear"; etc. Write out the present subjunctive, active and passive, of "moneo, -ere".

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

150

1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

III. Subjunctive of the Third Conjugation Present Tense

When you insert the long "-a-" between the stem and the personal endings on a third conjugation verb, the stem vowel short "-e-" drops out entirely, leaving only the "-a-" between the personal endings. Note that many of the resulting forms look exactly like first conjugation forms in the indicative mood. Again, you need to take care from now on and look at your dictionary entries thoroughly. Write out the subjunctive present tense, active and passive, of "duco, -ere".

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

IIIi. Subjunctive of the Third Conjugation i-stems Present Tense

In the present tense, the extra "-i-" of a i-stem verb is present throughout the forms: "capi + a + m = capiam" etc.

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

IV. Subjunctive of the Fourth Conjugation Present Tense

The stem vowel of a fourth conjugation verb is a long "-i-" so it stays part of the stem after the addition of the long "-a-" sign of the subjunctive: "audi + a + m = audiam".

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

Don't forget that there are no subjunctive infinitives, imperatives, or participles. These are all the possible forms of the Latin

subjunctive mood in the present tense. There is no present subjunctive participle, or present subjunctive infinitive. You now know all the subjunctive forms of the present tense.

USES OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD: THE JUSSIVE SUBJUNCTIVE

The first use of the subjunctive you'll learn is the only use of the subjunctive in the main clause of a sentence (except for conditional sentences). All other uses of the subjunctive are restricted to subordinate clauses. The jussive subjunctive is used when a command or exhortation is directed to a first or third person. (When a command is directed toward a second person, as you recall, Latin uses the imperative mood.) To issue a prohibition or negative command in the first or third persons, the negative particle "ne" is used, not "non". We direct commands to first and third persons with our construction "let..". and negate them with "let...not..".

INDICATIVE	JUSSIVE SUBJUNCTIVE
Viros bonos laudamus (We are praising good men.)	Viros bonos laudemus. (Let's praise good men.)
Veniunt. (They are coming.)	Veniant. (Let them come.)
Libros malos non legimus. (We don't read bad books.)	Ne libros malos legamus. (Let's not read bad books.)

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN PURPOSE CLAUSES

A purpose clause is, as the name tells us, a subordinate clause which explain the purpose for which the action in the main clause was undertaken. English has basically two way to show purpose: (1) infinitive, sometimes supplemented with "in order," and (2) a subordinate clause introduce by "so that" or "so" or "in order that" often with the conditional mood of the verb. Let's look at the infinitive showing purpose first.

- "She is coming to help (or in order to help)".
- "They are sending him to tell you what to do".
- "The dog has a long nose to smell better".
- "In order to serve you better, our store has installed anti-theft devices".

Now let's rewrite these sentences using method (2) -- as full subordinate clauses with finite verbs:

- "She is coming so that she may help".
- "They are sending him so that he may tell you what to do".
- "The dog has a long nose so that it may smell better".
- "In order that we may serve you better, our store has installed anti-theft devices".

Some of these may sound rather over-blown; our native English sense leans toward simplicity. But there are many cases where we must we the subordinate clause to show purpose. For example, there is no way, short of considerable re-writing, to simplify these purpose clauses down to infinitives.

- "We are coming so that you won't have to work so hard".
- "She is writing the paper so that you can leave early".

The Latin prose you're studying has only one way to show purpose: a full subordinate clause introduced by "ut" or "ne" (the negative) plus a finite verb in the subjunctive mood. It never uses the infinitive to show purpose, the way English does. We can translate the Latin purpose clause in whichever of the two English purpose construction seems most natural to us, but never try to translate an infinitive showing purpose in English directly into a Latin infinitive.

```
Id facit ut eos adiuvet.

          (He is doing it to help them [or in order to help them,
          or so that he may help them].)

Veniunt ne civitates deleantur.

          (They are coming so that the cities will not be
          destroyed.)

Haec dicit ut discipuli omnia intellegant.

          (He is saying these things so that the students will
          understand everything.)
```

Multos libros legit ne stulta videatur.

(She reads many books so that she won't seem foolish.)

A FINAL WORD

"Real" Latin uses the subjunctive mood nearly as often as the indicative mood, so, obviously, you must thoroughly master the forms and the uses of the subjunctive. But beyond that, you must also begin to read Latin, not word by word, but letter by letter. You must strive to understand every tiny twist and turn of the morphology of the verbs. As you know, the difference between an indicative and subjunctive mood is very often just one letter; it seems like a microscopic difference, but if you fail to note it, your entire sentence will come grinding to a halt. I strongly recommend that you first throw this book down for a few hours and let it "cool" off. Next look over the vocabulary briefly, write down the entire entry for each verb, and turn to the self-help tutorials for this chapter, constantly checking the answers. Then throw the book down. After a few hours -- or the next day - - look over the vocabulary again, and start the assignment. You simply must slow down some and watch your steps carefully as you begin the subjunctive. If you get off the path now, you'll get more and more lost in the future. By the end of Chapter 30, you'll have studied all the forms of the subjunctive and many of its most common uses -- and that's a pretty quick pace.

01/10/93

153

CHAPTER 29

"Imperfect Subjunctive; Present and Imperfect Subjunctive of Sum and Possum; The Result Clause"

FORMATION OF THE IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE

Wheelock tells you that the imperfect subjunctive is an easy form to recognize and to produce. He tells you that it is, in effect, the present active infinitive plus the personal endings, active or passive. Although this may be a convenient way to look at it, it isn't quite true. The actual morphology is just a little more complicated, and, to spare yourself some confusion in the future, you should learn the real history of the imperfect subjunctive. The formula for the imperfect subjunctive is

```
1st principal part   +     se   +    personal endings
```

Because the "s" of the infix "se" will be intervocalic, it changes to an "r," hence giving the appearance of the regular active infinitive ending "-re". The personal endings are those you use in the present system. (Use "-m" instead of "-o" in the first person singular.) So for the first conjugations, the forms look like this:

```
lauda      +    se   +     m    =    laudasem   -    laudarem
lauda      +    se   +     m    =    laudases   -    laudares
```

Let's have a look at the imperfect subjunctive in all its forms in all the conjugations.

I. Laudo (1)

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

II. Moneo, -ere, monui, monitus

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

III. Duco, -ere, duxi, ductus

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

III i. Capio, -ere, cepi, captus

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

IV. Audio, -ire, audivi, auditus

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

As you can see by looking back over these forms, the imperfect subjunctive does in fact look like the present active infinitive with personal endings attached. You can think of it this way if you wish, provided that you're aware that this understanding will have to be revised in the near future.

Wheelock also tells you that the imperfect subjunctive is used in subordinate clause when the verb of the main clause is a past tense. That's ture, but don't worry about it for now. You should just be alerted to the fact that, just like participles and infinitives, verb in the subjunctive mood don't have absolute tense, but rather they express time relative to the tense of the main verb. This will all be explained in Chapter 30. Your task in this chapter is to learn to recognize an imperfect subjunctive when you see it.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF "SUM" AND "POSSUM"

The present subjunctive of "sum" is the stem "si-" plus the active personal endings. (No passive forms, obviously. What would the verb "to be" mean in the passive voice?) The imperfect subjunctive is the first principal part plus "se" plus the active personal endings. Hence

es + se + m = essem

SUM, ESSE

	PRESENT	IMPERFECT
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____

3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

As you no doubt recall, the verb "possum" in Latin is a compound of the adjective "pot-" and the verb "sum". If you add the "pot-" the present subjunctive of "sum," the "t" of "pot-" will always assimilate to "s". Since all the forms of the present subjunctive of "sum" begin with "s". The imperfect subjunctive of "possum" is best thought of as the present infinitive plus personal endings -- the present infinitive of "possum," that is, which is "posse". Write out the present and imperfect subjunctive of "possum".

POSSUM, POSSE

	PRESENT	IMPERFECT
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

THE RESULT CLAUSE

A subordinate clause which shows the consequence or result of something in the main clause is called, naturally enough, a Result (or Consecutive) Clause. We often tip off our listener in English that a Result Clause is comming up by inserting adverbs like "so" or "such" in the main clause, and the result clause itself is introduced by the subordinating conjunction "that".

- "The eclipse made the sky so dark that it seemed like night".
- "They wrote so badly that no one could read the letter".
- "She was such a good athlete that she easily jumped over the fence".

Latin result clauses are also frequently anticipated by adverbs or special adjectives in the main clause -- "ita, sic, tam, tantus, -a, -um". The clause itself it introduced by "ut" when the result clause is positive, and by "ut" with a negative in the clause when the result is negated. The verb is put into the subjunctive mood.

In the positive result clause, when "ut" is used as the subordinating conjunction, you may think that some confusion between a purpose and a result clause is possible: they're both introduced by "ut" and have a subjunctive verb. This is true in theory, but in practice it happens rarely. If you see "ita," "sic," "tam," or "tantus, -a, -um" in the main clause and an "ut" clause, then you know for certain that the "ut" clause is a result clause. In the majority of cases, result clauses are anticipated somehow in the main clause. There is no possibility of confusing a negative purpose clause with a negative result clause. Negative purpose clauses are introduced with "ne;" negative result clauses start with "ut" and then negate the verb in the clause with "non," "numquam" etc., or by using a negative pronoun such as "nemo".

- Id sic fecerunt ut omnes metu liberarentur.
  ("They did it in such a way that everyone was freed from fear".)
- Scripserunt ita male ut nemo litteras legere posset.
  ("They wrote so badly, that no one was able to read the letter".)
- Tantum ferrum tenebat ut territi hostes fugerent.
  ("He was holding such a great sword that the terrified enemy ran away".)

Wheelock gives you several examples in the chapter which show you the difference between purpose and result clauses. You should study them carefully -- and by all means work through his self-help tutorials for this chapter. It takes a while for this all to settle in.

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

ita, sic, tam The adverbs which anticipate result clauses are

	not entirely interchangeable. "Sic" is used primarily to qualify verbs: "Id sic fecit ut..". The other two, "ita" and "tam" can qualify verbs, adjectives or other adverbs: "Via erat tam [ita] longa ut..". or "Tam [ita] male scripserunt ut..". or "Id tam [ita] fecit ut..".
tantus, -a, -um	This adjective for some reason always throws students off at first. It means basically "so great" but some flexibility is required to get this over into smooth English. Study carefully the way this adjective is used.
quidem	It's an adverb meaning "indeed, certainly," and is postpositive (it's never the first word in a sentence or clause.) This poses no problem. But the expression "ne...quidem" is sometimes difficult to spot. "Ne X quidem" means "not even X". Watch out for this. When you see "quidem," check to see whether there is a "ne" one word back. If you miss this construction, you'll mess up the sentence badly.

01/10/93

157

CHAPTER 30

"Perfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive Active and Passive; Sequence of Tenses; Indirect Questions"

As the title indicates, this chapter has a lot of new information it. I suggest that you try to digest it in two sittings: the perfect system subjunctive and the sequence of tenses first, and then the section on indirect questions -- which draws on the first two topics.

PERFECT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE

The perfect system tenses, as you know, are the perfect, pluperfect and future perfect; they are built on the third principal part of the verb (for the active voice) and the fourth principal part (for the passive voice). In the subjunctive mood, however, there is no future perfect tense -- just as there was no future subjunctive in the present system. The subjunctive abhors the future. So you'll be learning only two tenses of the subjunctive for the perfect system: the perfect and the pluperfect. As Wheelock tells you, and this can hardly be overemphasized, verbs of all conjugations operate according to the same rules in the perfect system, so you needn't look at verbs of the different conjugations to know how they're going to work. Once you get to the third and fourth principal parts of the verbs, regardless of their original conjugations, there is only one set of rules all verbs follow.

PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE ACTIVE

The formula for the perfect subjunctive active is:

```
3rd principal part   +    eri  +    personal endings
```

The one oddity is that the personal endings used for the subjunctive mood in the perfect system are not the endings you learned for the perfect system in the indicative; the endings are not "-i, -isti, -it, -imus, -istis, -erunt". The perfect system subjunctive uses the same endings which are used in the present system: "-m, -s, -t, -mus, -tis, -nt". Linguists use this fact as evidence that the subjunctive mood is somehow closely related to the present system of tenses.

PLUPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE ACTIVE

The formula for the pluperfect subjunctive active is:

```
3rd principal part   +    isse +    personal endings
```

As Wheelock tells you, this amounts to the perfect infinitive, which is the third principal part + isse, with personal endings attached to the end. Again, the personal endings are not "eram, eras," etc.; they are "-m, -s," etc.

Let's look at the perfect and pluperfect subjunctive active for a couple of verbs. Write out the forms for the following verbs.

Duco, -ere, duxi, ductus

	PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

Audio, -ire, audivi, auditus

	PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____

3rd _____ _____

1st _____ _____

2nd _____ _____

3rd _____ _____

Rogo (1)

	PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

FUTURE PERFECT INDICATIVE AND PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE COMPARED

Wheelock warns you that the perfect subjunctive is very similar to the future perfect indicative. Let's have a close look. The future perfect indicative is built on the third principal part and uses the future of the verb "sum" for its personal endings (except for the third person plural, where it's "erint" and not "erunt"). Compare the future perfect indicative with the perfect subjunctive from the verb "laudo (1)".

	FUTURE PERFECT INDICATIVE	PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____

As you can see, there is only one person in which these two differ: the first person singular. In all the other forms, they are identical. But you needn't despair. There is an easy way to tell the difference between the future perfect indicative and the perfect subjunctive. You simply look at the context. If you see the form "laudaverint," for example, in a clause where the subjunctive is required, then the form is perfect subjunctive. If, on the other hand, you're in a clause where the subjunctive is not called for, then the form is future perfect indicative. It's as simple as that. You know of two subordinate clauses which require the subjunctive already: purpose and result. In the future you'll be gathering more. This is really the simpliest way to work with subjunctives, since knowing when a verb must be, or probably is, subjunctive greatly reduces the amount of dictionary time spent looking up words. Take this sentence, for example:

"Haec dixerunt ut hac sapientia uteremur".

You don't recognize the verb "uteremur," and just looking at it in isolation, you can see that the conjugated form here could have a number of possible sources. It could be

1. present indicative from a 2nd conjugation verb with a stem in "utere-"
2. future tense indicative from a 3rd conjugation verb with a stem in "utere-" (short "-e-")
3. present subjunctive from a first conjugation verb, stem "utera-"

4. imperfect subjunctive from a 2nd conjugation verb, stem "ute-"
5. imperfect subjunctive from a 3rd conjugation verb, stem "ute-"

But if you examine the context of the form, you'll notice that it's in an "ut" clause, and since all "ut" clause you know so far take the subjunctive, the verb must be in the subjunctive mood, thus eliminating possibilities 1, 2, and 3. This is precisely how Latin is read by even the most advanced readers -- only the experienced reader goes through these steps almost instantaneously. Let's move on.

PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

You recall that the perfect indicative passive is formed from the fourth principal part (the perfect passive participle) with a conjugated form of the verb "sum" in the present tense. The perfect subjunctive passive is formed exactly the same way, only the verb "sum" is in the subjunctive mood instead of the indicative.

laudatus, -a, -um sim

PLUPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

How do you imagine Latin forms the pluperfect subjuctive passive? Remember that the pluperfect indicative passive is the fourth principal part (the perfect passive participle) with a conjugated form of "sum" in the imperfect tense. Take a guess.

laudatus, -a, -um essem

Let's practice a couple of verbs in the perfect system passive subjunctive.

Moneo, -ere,m monui, monitus

	PERFECT PASSIVE		PLUPERFECT PASSIVE	
1st				
2nd				
3rd				
1st				
2nd				
3rd				

Praesto, -are, praestiti, praestitus

	PERFECT PASSIVE		PLUPERFECT PASSIVE	
1st				
2nd				
3rd				
1st				
2nd				
3rd				

SEQUENCE OF TENSES

You now know all four tenses of the subjunctive mood -- there is no future or future perfect of the subjunctive. Next you need to know how these four tenses are used. First you need to recall that verbs show absolute time only when in they're indicative mood; in every other mood, verb show only time relative to the verb in the indicative mood. Once again, only the indicative mood shows real time; when verbs are in the infinitive, participial or subjunctive mood, they can indicate only whether their action takes place before, during, or after the action of the main verb. The rules of the "sequence of tenses" tell you which tense in the subjunctive mood shows which temporal relationship. Let's be clear on this: the sequence of tenses are rules that apply to dependent subjunctives (subjunctive verbs in subordinate clauses) and only to dependent subjunctives.

160

These rules have nothing to do with participles or infinitives or any other form of a verb which has relative tense. This is the sequence of tense of dependent subjunctives only.

For the purposes of these rules, the tenses of the main verb of a sentence are divided into two categories: the primary tenses, and the secondary (or historical) tenses.

Primary Tenses:	Present
	Future
	Future Perfect
	Perfect
Secondary Tenses:	Perfect
	Imperfect
	Pluperfect

This means that if the main verb is in one of the primary tenses, then the sentence is in "primary sequence". If the main verb is in one of the secondary tenses, then the sentence is in "secondary sequence". Now the rules.

1. In primary sequence
    a. a present subjunctive shows time contemporaneous or it may show time subsequent to the action of the main verb;
    b. a construction called the "active future periphrastic" with the present subjunctive of the verb "sum" may be used to show time subsequent to the action of the main verb;
    c. a perfect subjunctive shows time prior to the action of the main verb.
2. In secondary sequence
    a. an imperfect subjunctive shows time contemporaneous or it may show time subsequent to the action of the main verb;
    b. the active future periphrastic with the imperfect subjunctive of the verb "sum" may show time subsequent to the action of the main verb;
    c. a pluperfect subjunctive shows time prior to the action of the main verb.

Let's look at this another way:

MAIN VERB	SUBORDINATE SUBJUNCTIVE	TEMPORAL RELATIONSHIP
	FUT. PERI. + SIM	TIME AFTER
PRIMARY	PRESENT	SAME TIME OR AFTER
	PERFECT	TIME BEFORE
	FUT. PERI. + ESSEM	TIME AFTER
SECONDARY	IMPERFECT	SAME TIME OR AFTER
	PLUPERFECT	TIME BEFORE

Let's have a look at how this works (We'll skip the periphrastic tenses for now.)

1. "Haec dicit ut pericula comprehendamus".
   (He is saying these things, so that we may understand the dangers.)
2. "Via ita longa est ut ad urbem numquam veniant".
   (The road is so long that they never come to the city.)

Both of these sentences are in primary sequence because the tense of the main verb is one of the primary tenses. Therefore any subordinate subjunctives in the sentence can be either in the present or perfect tense: the present tense for action contemporaneous or subsequent to the main verb, the perfect for action prior. The subordinate clause in the first sentence "ut pericula comprehendamus" obviously cannot be depicting an action that occurred before the action of the main verb -- it we already understood the dangers, then there would be no reason for him to be speaking. Therefore the tense of the subjunctive is present. In the second sentence, the result of an activity or state can never be prior to the event or the state. Consequently, a result clause, just a purpose clause, can never be prior to the action of the main verb of the sentence. Therefore, "veniant" is a present subjunctive, showing time contemporaneous or subsequent to the main verb "est" in primary sequence.

Now let's change the sequence of these sentences from primary to secondary by changing the tense of the main verb to one of the secondary tenses: the imperfect. What will happen to the tense of the subordinate subjunctives?

1. Haec dicebat ut pericula _____.

2. Via ita longa erat ut ad urbem numquam _____.

The temporal relationships of the subordinate subjunctive and the main verb are still the same: they're both still showing time contemporaneous or subsequent. But now we're in secondary sequence, so the tense of the subjunctive must change to the imperfect, since the imperfect subjunctive shows time contemporaneous or subsequent in subordinate subjunctives in secondary sequence. The forms will be "comprehenderemus" and "venirent". You'll see many more examples of this soon.

INDIRECT QUESTIONS

The title of this section tells it all: just as statements can be the object of a verb -- becoming "indirect" statements -- so also direct questions can be objects of verbs -- becoming indirect questions. Here are some example of how this is done in English. Rewrite these direct questions as indirect questions after the leading verb "I wonder".

DIRECT QUESTIONS:

a. "What are you doing"?
b. "Why are they here"?
c. "Are you coming"?
d. "How is this done"?

INDIRECT QUESTIONS:

a. I wonder _____.
b. I wonder _____.
c. I wonder _____.
d. I wonder _____.

Notice the the original direct question is changed very little when we make it indirect. The only change we make in English is to "uninvert" the subject and verb: from "what are you doing" to "what you are doing". Let's look at some more complicated examples of indirect question in English, because sometimes more of a change is required to go from direct to indirect questions. Let's your native English sensitivities guide you in the following examples.

DIRECT QUESTIONS:

a. "Did you see her"?
b. "When will he come to help us"?
c. "How many times have they told you this"?
d. "What kind of trouble were they in"?

INDIRECT QUESTIONS:

(a) I wanted to know
_____.

(b) She asked
_____.

(c) They couldn't say
_____.

(d) They don't remember
_____.

As you can see, when the tenses start varying, the original direct question is often reshaped when it becomes indirect. Notice also that there is a variety of verbs which can introduce indirect question -- not just verbs which are asking a question like "to ask" to "inquire" etc.

In Latin, as in English, an indirect question is a finite construction -- that is, the verb of the indirect question has person. This is unlike the indirect statement in Latin, where the original finite verb becomes an infinitive, and the original nominative subject becomes the accusative subject of the infinitive. The mood of the original verb, however, changes from the indicative to the subjunctive. Here are some simple examples to show you how this works.

Dir. Quest.:	Cur venis?	(Why are you coming?)
Indir. Quest.:	Nescio cur venias.	(I don't know why you're coming.)
Dir. Quest.:	Veniuntne nostri amici?	(Are our friends coming?)
Indir. Quest.:	Rogat veniantne nostri amici.	(He is asking whether our friends are coming.)
Dir. Quest.:	Quanta pericula sunt?	(How great are the dangers?)
Indir. Quest.:	Video quanta pericula sint.	(Now I see how great the dangers are.)

OBSERVING SEQUENCE OF TENSE IN INDIRECT QUESTION

As you can see, a sentence with an indirect question embedded in it is essentially a complex sentence, with a subordinate subjunctive in a dependent clause. The part of the sentence which introduces the indirect question is the main clause, and the indirect question itself is a subordinate clause, in which the verb happens to be in the subjunctive verb. So, because this question involves a dependent subjunctive, the rules of the sequence of tenses come into play.

You remember that the tense of the main verb determines the sequence of the sentences, and hence determines the tenses subordinate subjunctives in the sentence can be in. If the main verb is in one of the primary tenses, then the sentence follows the primary sequence: the subordinate subjunctives can be in the present or perfect tenses. If the main verb is in one of the secondary tenses, then the sentence follows the secondary sequence: the subordinate subjunctives can be in the imperfect or pluperfect tenses. Now let's apply these rules to indirect questions.

TIME CONTEMPORANEOUS

When the indirect question is depicting an event that is conceived of as contemporaneous with the action of the main verb, then the subordinate subjunctive is either in the present tense (primary sequence) or in the imperfect tense (secondary sequence).

a. "Nescio quid facias"?
   (I don't know what you're doing.)
b. "Nescivi quid faceres"?
   (I didn't know what you were doing.)
c. "Rogat veniantne nostri amici".
   (He asks whether our friends are coming.)
d. "Rogaverunt venirentne nostri amici"?
   (They asked whether our friends were coming.)

TIME PRIOR

When the indirect question is depicting an event that is conceived of as having been undertaken before the action of the main verb, then the subordinate subjunctive is either in the perfect tense (primary sequence) or in the pluperfect tense (secondary sequence).

a. "Nescio quid feceris".
   (I don't know what you did.)
b. "Nescivi quid fecisses".
   (I didn't know what you had done (or did).)
c. "Rogat venerintne nostri amici".
   (He asks whether our friends came.)
d. "Rogaverunt venissentne nostri amici".
   (They asked whether our friends had come (or came).)

TIME SUBSEQUENT (AFTER)

When the indirect question is depicting an event that is conceived as coming after the action of the main verb, then the subordinate subjunctive is the active future periphrastic with the present subjunctive of "sum" in the present tense (primary sequence) or the active future periphrastic with the imperfect subjunctive of "sum".

a. (a) "Nescio quid facturus sis".
   (I don't know what you will do (you're going to do).)
b. (b) "Nescivi quid facturus esses".
   (I didn't know what you were going to do (would do).)
c. (c) "Rogat sintne venturi nostri amici".
   (He asks whether our friends will come (are going to come).)
d. (d) "Rogaverunt essentne venturi nostri amici".
   (They asked whether our friends were coming (would come).)

Let's summarize all this in one place:

PRIMARY SEQUENCE

	quid facturus sis	(what you will do)
Nescio	quid facias	(what you are doing)
	quid feceris	(what you did)
	sintne venturi nostri amici	(whether our friends will come)
Rogo	veniuntne nostri amici	(whether our friends are coming)
	venerintne nostri amici	(whether our friends came)

SECONDARY SEQUENCE

	quid facturus esses	(what you would do)
Nescivi	quid faceres	(what you were doing)
	quid fecisses	(what you did)
	essentne venturi nostri amici	(whether our friends would come)
Rogavi	venerentne nostri amici	(whether our friends were coming)
	venissentne nostri amici	(whether our friends had come)

SOME ADDITIONAL WORK

It's going to take some time, and a lot of practice, to master all the material in this chapter. I suggest you start by working through Wheelock's answered exercises for this chapter. Read the entire sentence before you get down to translating it. Pass you eyes over every word of it, and don't top until you get to the end of the setnece. Try to size up the architecture of the sentence. Identify the main clause, the main verb, look for subordinate clauses and try to identify them as relative, purpose, result, indirect statement, indirect question, etc. Once you've seen the entire sentence, and once you have a feel for where all the parts of it are heading, then you can begin the work of translating with greater direction. Struggle with the sentence for a while before you look up the answers. Try to make them make sense. (And constantly ask youself what sequence of tense the sentence is following.)

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

cognosco	The "-sc-" inserted before the ending of the verb is call the "inceptive" or "inchoative" infix. It denotes the sense that the action of the verb is only in the process of being realized or in the very beginning stages. "Cognosco," therefore, means "to get to know" or "to become acquainted with," not "to know". In the perfect tense, the verb means "to have gotten to know" or "to have become acquainted with," and this amounts to our present tense "to know". Therefore, we translate "cognovi" not "I knew" but "I know" ("I got know.").
comprehendo	Look at the range of meanings for this verb. All the meanings are related to the idea of getting hold of something. Also, check the third principal part, "comprehendi". Some of the forms of the perfect tense will be identical to those of the present tense: "comprehendit" (he grasps), and "comprehendit" (he grasped); "comprehendimus" (we grasped), and "comprehendimus" (we grasped).

CHAPTER 31

"Cum with the Subjunctive; Fero"

CUM AS A SUBORDINATING CONJUNCTION

You're already well-acquainted with the preposition "cum" + ablative case, meaning "with". There is also a word "cum" which is not a preposition at all, but a subordinating conjunction. Even though "cum" the conjunction looks exactly like "cum" the preposition, the two words actually have different histories. They are not the same word at all. The difficulty with translating the conjunction "cum" is that it has a wide variety of meanings and can take either the indicative or the subjunctive mood in its clause.

Even though we can distinguish some broad classes of meanings, it is still difficult sometimes to tell just which one of them "cum" is using in a given sentence, and therefore which of our several English conjunctions will best translate it. In this respect, "cum" is is similar to our conjunction "as", which has quite a range of meanings, and at times seems to be using many of them all at once. For example,

> "As I was coming in the door, I saw my friend".

Does this sentence mean "I saw my friend because I was coming in the door" or does it mean "I saw my friend while I was coming in the door". It's hard to say, and in fact both could be true at the same time. For if I hadn't been coming in the door at that time I wouldn't have seen my friend. This same kind of fusion of meanings exists for the conjunction "cum", so it will take some sensitivity to the context for you to come up with an accurate translation for "cum".

There are two categories of meanings for "cum":

a. strictly temporal (when);
b. circumstantial (as, whereas, since, because, although).

When "cum" is temporal, the mood of the verb in its clause is often indicative. It is almost always indicative when the tense of the verb in the main clause is present or future tense. When the tense of the main verb is one of the past tenses, then the mood of the "cum" clause is most often subjunctive. But when the "cum" clause is circumstantial, then the mood of its verb is always subjunctive.

A circumstantial "cum" clause can be translated as "since", "because", and "although". This may seem odd, because "although" indicates that there is an incompatibility between the subordinate and main clauses -- that given the circumstances of the subordinate clause, the event in the main should not take place. We call a clause like this "concessive". "Because" and "since", however, indicate a direct causal link between the subordinate and main clauses. How can the same subordinating conjunction denote two such disparate relations? And how will you know which is being represented in a given "cum" clause?

The answer to the first question isn't easy, but perhaps it will help to remember that a "cum" clause is generally circumstantial -- it merely sets a backdrop for the the action in the main clause -- without spelling out what the relationship is between them. You've already seen in participles and ablative absolute constructions that Latin tends to be much less insistent about specifying the exact logical or temporal relationship between subordinate and main elements in its sentences. The answer to the second question is that you must rely on context to tell you which of the relationships is the more plausible. That is, admittedly, somewhat unsatisfactory, but often that is all we'll have to go by. Very often, however, Latin will help the reader along by inserting a "tamen" or some other such word in the main clause if the "cum" clause is meant to be taken as concessive.

Obviously there's more here than you really need to know to get started with "cum" clauses -- and there is still more you'll have to know to read Latin at advanced levels. For your needs, at your stage in Latin, you should know that "cum" clauses are either temporal or circumstantial, have a range of possible meanings which you must consider, and may take the indicative of the subjunctive mood. But when it does employ the subjunctive mood, "cum" clauses must observe the sequence of tenses, which govern the tenses of subordinate subjunctives. Let's look at several examples of the different "cum" clauses.

a. "Cum responderit [fut. perf.], omnia intellegetis".

   This "cum" clause is temporal, and because the subjunctive isn't being used, the sequence of tenses doesn't apply. Tr. "When he answers (will have answered), you will understand everything".

b. "Cum respondisset, omnia intellexistis".

   Now the "cum" clause is subjunctive, so we have to bring in the rules governing the tenses of subordinate subjunctives. Since the sentence is in secondary sequence because of the tense of the main verb, the pluperfect subjunctive in thhe "cum" clause show time prior. Tr. "Because he had answered, you understood everything", or "When he had answered..". or "Since he had answered..".

c. "Cum respondisset, non tamen intellexistis".

Here the "tamen" tells us that the "cum" clause is not causal or temporal but concessive. Tr. "Although he answered, you still (nevertheless) did not understand".

d. "Cum responderet, non aderatis".

In secondary sequence -- "ad + eratis" -- the imperfect subjunctive of the subordinate subjunctive "responderet" shows contemporaneous time. Tr. "When he was answering, you were not present".

e. "Cum responderit, omnia iam intellegitis".

In primary sequence the perfect subjunctive shows time prior. Tr. "Because he answered, you now understand everything".

THE IRREGULAR VERB FERO, FERRE, TULI, LATUS

"Fero" is a very widely-used verb in Latin, as its stem shows up in more than a dozen compound verbs. It's important to master it thoroughly right now, otherwise it will haunt you for as long as you read Latin. Just by looking at the principal part of the verb, you can tell that the verb "fero" is going to be unlike any verb you've seen before. The verb is third conjugation, so the stem of the verb in the present system is "fere-", with a short "-e-" thematic vowel. For the most part, the verb conjugates just like a regular third conjugation verb.

If you look at the second principal part, however, the thematic vowel "-e-" is missing: the infinitive ending "-re" is added to "fer-" not to "fere-". Hence the infinitive form "ferre" instead of "ferere". This is the main irregularity of the verb "fero". In the present tense, the thematic vowel is dropped before some endings. The thematic vowel -- a short "e" -- is dropped before endings that begin with the letters "r"",s", or "t". Keeping this in mind, try to write out the present system active and passive.

I. PRESENT SYSTEM

A. INDICATIVE ACTIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____

Did you get them all? As you can see, the irregularity does not apply at all to the future and imperfect tenses, where the intervening vowels and tense signs come between the stem and the personal endings that would have produced the irregularity. Now the passive voice in the present system indicative.

B. INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____

3rd _____ _____ _____

Once again, the irregularity of the disappeaaring thematic vowel is restricted to the present tense where there is no tense vowel between the stem and the personal endings. Let's look now at the present system subjunctive active.

C. SUBJUNCTIVE ACTIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____

The present subjunctive uses the vowel "-a-" as its mood sign, so the endings are not added directly to the stem. No irregularities here. It looks just like a normal third conjugation verb in the present subjunctive. But look at the imperfect subjunctive. The formula for all imperfect subjunctives is: stem + "se" + personal endings. The "-s-" of the mood sign becomes intervocalic and turns to an "-r-" and "-r-" is one of those consonants the stem vowel doesn't like. So the base form for the imperfect subjunctive becomes "ferre-". And that looks just like the active infinitive. Now the present system of tenses in subjunctive passive.

D. SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____

II. PERFECT SYSTEM

The perfect system, because it is formed from the third and fourth principal parts, is enitrely regular (except that third and fourth principal parts are themselves unusual suppletive forms). For the sake of thoroughness, and to prove to you that the verb is not so irregular as you may think, write out the perfect system for the verb "fero".

A. INDICATIVE ACTIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____	_____

2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____

B. INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____

C. SUBJUNCTIVE ACTIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____

D. SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____

Finally, we should have a look at the imperative, participial, and infinitive moods.

III. IMPERATIVES

Sing. _____

Plur. _____

IV. PARTICIPLES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
FUTURE	_____	_____
PERFECT		_____

V. INFINITIVES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	_____
FUTURE	_____	[_____]
PERFECT	_____	_____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

Confero, conferre, contuli, collatus

As I warned you, the verb "fero" is used in a great number of compound verbs -- prepositional prefixes added to verb roots. Here the preposition "cum" is prefixed to the root "fero", rendering the meaning "to bring together", or "to bring together for comparison". Look at the fourth principal part of this verb. It's not "conlatus" as you may expect, but the "-n-" of the prefix assimilates to the "-l-" of the verbal stem. You've got to be on the look out for this, because if you saw the form "collatus" in your reading and tried to look it up under "colfero" you wouldn't find it. You've got to get good at recognizing the stem "lat-" from "fero" and then allowing yourself some flexibility at coming up with the right prefix.

Se conferre

A verb common idiom with the "confero" is to use the reflexive pronoun to mean "to go" (lit. "to betake oneself"). So "me confero" means "I go", "te confers" means "you go", "nos conferimus" means "We go", "Vos contulistis" means "you went", etc.

Offero, offerre, obtuli, oblatus

It means "to offer", obviously, but look at the third and fourth principal parts: the prefix has been replaced by "ob-". You must simply remember this.

01/10/93

170

CHAPTER 32

"Adverbs: Formation and Comparison; Volo"

ADVERBS

Adverbs, of course, are words which modify verbs; that is, they tell you something about the way in which, or the conditions under which, the action of the verb is undertaken: "quickly", "stupidly", "easily", "suddenly" and so forth. And because they don't agree with their verb in any way, adverbs don't decline or take on a variety of endings to match them with their verbs.

The adverbs you've been working with up to now are, shall we say, "obvious" adverbs. Adverbs like "tamen" or "tum" aren't morphologically related at all to any other words in any way. They aren't derived from adjectives or nouns; they are only adverbs. But if you look at an English adverb like "quickly", you can clearly see how this is a form derived from the adjective "quick". To turn it into an adverb, English simply attaches the ending "-ly".

This may not seem like a monumental discovery, but it does have an important consequence. Since "quickly" is a form which is derivable from "quick" according to a rather straight-forward rule of English grammar, an English dictionary will not list "quickly" as a separate word. You'll find it mentioned in passing only under the entry for "quick", which is its ancestor, so to speak.

Latin also has a set of rules for deriving adverbs from adjectives, and it is important that you know them -- for the same reason it's important to know the English rules of creating adverbs from adjectives: because an adverb which is a derived form from an adjective will not be given a separate dictionary listing. To look up a derived adverb, you'll first have deconstruct it, by undoing the rules that made it an adverb in the first place. You have to reduce the adverb to the original adjective; then you can look the adjective up. Once you have the meaning of the adjective, then you can go back to your sentence and "adverbize" the meaning of the adjective. Let's get started.

Just as there are three degrees of adjectives, so also there are three degrees of adverbs. An adverb in the positive degree is formed off the positive degree stem of the adjective; the comparative degree of the adverb is formed from the comparative degree stem of the adjective; and the superlative degree of the adverb is formed from the superlative degree stem of the adjective. As a brief refresher, here are the rules for forming the degrees of adjectives.

COMPARATIVE DEGREE OF ADJECTIVES

stem + -ior, -ius

ADJECTIVE	STEM	COMPARATIVE DEGREE
longus, -a, -um	long-	longior, -ius
miser, -a, -um	miser-	miserior, -ius
pulcher, -chra, -chrum	pulchr-	pulchrior, -ior
acer, acris, acre	acr-	acrior, -ius
fortis,-e	fort-	fortior, -ius

SUPERLATIVE DEGREE OF ADJECTIVES

A. For adjectives whose stem does not end in "-r"

stem + -issimus, -a, -um

ADJECTIVE	STEM	SUPERLATIVE DEGREE
longus, -a, -um	long-	longissimus, -a, -um
fortis, -e	fort-	fortissimus, -a, -um
potens, -ntis	potent-	potentissmus, -a, um

B. For adjectives whose stem ends in "-r"

stem + -rimus, -a, -um

ADJECTIVE	STEM	SUPERLATIVE FORM
miser, -a, -um	miser-	miserrimus, -a, -um
pulcher, -chra, -chrum	pulcher-	pulcherrimus, -a, um
acer, acris, acre	acer-	acerrimus, -a, -um

C. For the six exceptions whose stem ends in "-l": similis, -e; dissimilis, -e; facilis, -e; difficilis, -e; gracilis, -e; humilis, -e.

stem + -limus, -a, -um

ADJECTIVE	STEM	SUPERLATIVE FORM
facilis, -e	facil-	facillimus, -a, -um
similis, -e	simil-	simillimus, -a, -um

Of course, you mustn't forget the adjectives, most of them very common, which form their degrees irregularly.

POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE
bonus, -a, -um	melior, -ius	optimus, -a, -um
magnus, -a, -um	maior, -ius	maximus, -a, -um
malus, -a, -um	peior, -ius	pessimus, -a, -um
multus, -a, -um	-----, plus	plurimus, -a, -um
parvus, -a, -um	minor, minus	minimus, -a, -um
---	prior, -ius	primus, -a, -um
superus, -a, -um	superior, -ius	summus, -a, -um
		supremus, -a, -um

ADVERBS IN THE POSITIVE DEGREE

Now let's have a look at how Latin "adverbized" an adjective. In English, as you know, we can easily turn most adjectives into adverbs simply by added "-ly" to the stem: "quickly", "speedily", "ferociously", et cetera. In Latin, to form an adverb in the positive degree, you start with the stem of the positive degree of the adjective. For adverbs derived from adjectives of the first and second declension, the rule is simple:

stem + -e

For adverbs derived from third declension adjectives:

stem + -iter

For adverbs derived from third declension adjectives whose stem ends in "-nt-":

stem + -er

This is fairly easy, but let's try a few exercises: Form the positive degree of the following adverbs.

ADJECTIVE	STEM	POSITIVE ADVERB
acer, -cris, -re	_____	_____
sapiens, -ntis	_____	_____
fortis, -e	_____	_____
iucundus, -a, -um	_____	_____
liber, -a, -um	_____	_____
clarus, -a, -um	_____	_____
celer, -is, -e	_____	_____

COMPARATIVE DEGREE OF ADVERBS

In English, we compare adverbs by using the word "more" placed in front of the adverb in the positive degree: "more quickly". Latin forms a comparative adverb simply by using the comparative adjective in the neuter accusative singular form.

So to say "more beautifully", or "rather beautifully", or "too beautifully", Romans said "pulchrius". Let's try a few out.

ADJECTIVE	STEM	COMPARATIVE ADVERB
acer, -cris, -re		
sapiens, -ntis		
fortis, -e		
iucundus, -a, -um		
liber, -a, -um		
clarus, -a, -um		
celer, -is, -e		

SUPERLATIVE DEGREE OF ADVERBS

The English superlative adverb is "most" plus the adverb in the positive degree. To form the superlative degree of an adverb, you simply use the stem of the superlative degree of the adjective and add a "-e". To say "most beautifully", or "very beautifully", Romans said "pulcherrime". Let's have a look.

ADJECTIVE	STEM	SUPERLATIVE ADVERB
acer, -cris, -re		
sapiens, -ntis		
fortis, -e		
iucundus, -a, -um		
liber, -a, -um		
clarus, -a, -um		
celer, -is, -e		

DRILLS

Write out the positive, comparative and superlative degree adverbs derived from the following adjectives.

ADJECTIVE	POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE
longus, -a, -um			
miser, -a, -um			
pulcher, -chra, -chrum			
felix, -icis			
potens, -ntis			
facilis, -e			

DEGREES OF ADVERBS FROM IRREGULAR ADJECTIVES

As you know, there are some common adjectives which form their degrees irregularly. We would hope that the adverbs would just use the irregular stems to form their degrees. And sometimes that's what happens. But sometimes other irregularities start to creep in. Let's look at them. Here are some of irregular adjectives in their three degrees. Try to write them out first on your own.

IRREGULAR ADJECTIVES

ADJECTIVE	POSITIVE	COMPARATIVE	SUPERLATIVE
bonus, -a, -um			
malus, -a, -um			
magnus, -a, -um			
multus, -a, -um			
parvus, -a, -um			
(prae, pro)			

1. From bonus, -a, -um

   Starting with "bonus, -a, -um", if we were to follow the rules for deriving the positive degree adverb, we'd get a form like this: "bone". And that's pretty close to the actual form "ben". The comparative degree of the adjective is "melior, -ius", so, following the standard rules, what would be the comparative adverb? The rule says to use the neuter, accusative singular of the comparative adjective for the comparative adverb, so the form would be "melius". And that is in fact the real form. For the superlative, the form of the adverb would be "optime", and that's what the real form is. Now fill in the spaces in the table above with the degree of the adverb derived from "bonus".

2. From malus, -a, -um

   The adverbs derived from "malus" are entirely regular -- once you remember the irregular degrees of the adjective itself. Fill in the next row of blanks.

3. From magnus, -a, -um

   The adverbs in the positive and comparative degrees from "magnus" a very odd: "magnopere" for the positive degree (not "magne") and "magis" for the comparative degree (not "maius"). But the superlative degree follows the rules. Fill them in.

4. From multus, -a, -um

   The adverbs from "multus" are odd, too. Just "multum" for the adverb in the positive degree, "plus" for the comparative degree, and "plurimum" (not the expected "plurime") in the superlative degree.

5. From parvus, -a, -um

   The adverbs from "parvus" follow the rule, except for the positive degree, where we have "parum", instead of "parve".

6. From prior, -ius

   As you might expect, there is no adverb for "before"; Latin instead uses a subordinating conjunction and a subordinate clause for that. The comparative degree of the adverb is regular; the superlative degree is either "primum" or "primo", (not "prime").

7. "For a long (longer) (longest) time"

   Wheelock also shows you degree of an adverbs which means "for a long time", "for rather long time", and "for a very long time". This adverb is not derived from an adjective, but it does show degrees as if it were. Besides, it's a very common adverb, so you need to recognize it:

   diu diutius diutissime

8. Magnopere, magis, maxime

   Wheelock gives you another set of adverbs which are also derived from the adjective "multus, -a, -um". The meanings are straight-foward enough -- "greatly, more, and most" -- but there is a fine distinction is usage of these forms from the other adverbs derived from "multus", "multum, plus, and plurimum". In the comparative, "plus" is used to compare amounts of action undertaken: "Video plus quam tu" (I see more than you). "Magis", however, is used to compare certain adjectives: "Hoc idoneum est quam illud" (This is more suitable than that.) This may seem odd, because you learned in Chapter 26 that comparative adjectives are formed by adding the suffixes "-ior, -ius" to

the stem. This rules holds except for adjectives whose stem ends in "-e-", as "idoneus, -a, -um" does. These adjectives use the comparative adverb "magis" to form their comparative degree. Similiarly, the superlative degree of these adjectives is "maxime" plus the positive degree. (You won't see "magis" or "maxime" much in this book.)

THE IRREGULAR VERB Volo, velle, volui, -----

The verb "to wish" has some irregularities in the present system of tenses, it has no passive voice in either the present or the perfect system. (Hence no fourth principal part.) The perfect system active, however, is entirely regular. Unfortunately, there isn't any way to predict or explain many of these oddities, so you simply must memorize them. Basically "volo" is a third conjugation verb, so you should be noting how it differs from a regular third conjugation verb. That will give you some standard against which to compare it. In the following tables, I'll fill in the irregular forms; you fill in the rest.

I. THE PRESENT SYSTEM

(a) Indicative

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st			
2nd	vis		
3rd	vult		
1st	volumus		
2nd	vultis		
3rd			

(b) Subjunctive

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	velim		vellem
2nd			
3rd			
1st			
2nd			
3rd			

II. PERFECT SYSTEM

(a) Indicative

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st			
2nd			
3rd			
1st			
2nd			
3rd			

(b) Subjunctive

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____

III. INFINITIVES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT	_____	
FUTURE		

IV. PARTICIPLES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		
FUTURE		

V. IMPERATIVES (No imperative forms)

THE RELATED IRREGULAR VERBS Nolo AND Malo

The two irregular verbs "nolo" (not to want) and "malo" (to prefer) are derivatives of "volo". "Nolo" is a kind of contraction of "ne + volo", meaning literally "I don't want", and "malo" comes from "magis + volo", meaning literally "I wish more". Because these verbs are so closely related, therefore, to the irregular verb "volo", Wheelock thinks it right to put them together in the same chapter. Why not? Write out the conjugations of these two verbs. Again, I'll put in the irregular forms; you should be able to produce the forms that aren't irregular on your own.

Nolo, nolle, nolui, -----

I. THE PRESENT SYSTEM

(a) Indicative

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____		
2nd	non vis		_____
3rd	non vult		_____
1st	nolumus		_____

2nd non vultis _____

3rd _____

(b) Subjunctive

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	nolim		nollem
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____

II. PERFECT SYSTEM

(a) Indicative

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____		
2nd	_____		
3rd	_____		
1st	_____		
2nd	_____		
3rd	_____		

(b) Subjunctive

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____

III. INFINITIVES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT	_____	

177

FUTURE

IV. PARTICIPLES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		
FUTURE		

V. IMPERATIVES

SINGULAR noli

PLURAL nolite

Malo, malle, malui, -----

I. THE PRESENT SYSTEM

(a) Indicative

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____		
2nd	mavis	_____	
3rd	mavult	_____	
1st	malumus	_____	
2nd	mavultis	_____	
3rd	_____		

(b) Subjunctive

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	malim		mallem
2nd	_____	_____	
3rd	_____	_____	
1st	_____	_____	
2nd	_____	_____	
3rd	_____	_____	

II. PERFECT SYSTEM

(a) Indicative

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____		

2nd _____

3rd _____

1st _____

2nd _____

3rd _____

(b) Subjunctive

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____

III. INFINITIVES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT	_____	
FUTURE		

IV. PARTICIPLES (No participles)

V. IMPERATIVES (No imperative forms)

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

divitiae, -arum (f)	The noun has no singular forms, and students often confuse this noun with adjective "dives, divitis (ditis)" meaning "wealthy rich".
dives, divitis (ditis)	This is a third declension adjective of one termination, which also has two possible stems: "divit-" or "dit-". You must work hard to keep the form derived from the stem "divit-" and the noun for "riches" ("divitiae, -arum (f)") distinct.
pauper, pauperis	Another third declension adjective of one termination. It is very often used to mean "a poor person", or "the poor".
par, paris	Once again, a third declension adjective of one termination. Don't confuse this with the noun "pars, partis (f)". "Par" means "equal" and takes the dative case: "equal to". (Remember the parisyllabic (equal syllable) rule?)
honor, -oris (m)	It very often means "public office"; a position with the government.
lex, legis (f)	Wheelock reminds you to contrast (c.p.) "lex", which means a written law, with "ius", which means "right, justice" Not all rights become written law, and justice is often not entirely recognized in law. "Leges" attempt to codify "iura", but they don't always succeed.

01/10/93

CHAPTER 33

"Conditions"

To understand conditions and conditional sentences, we need some specialized terminology. There is no easy way to do this, so you're going to have to spend some time up front getting familiar with them. After a basic introduction to conditional sentences, we'll look at conditional sentences in Latin and their formulae.

CONDITIONAL STATEMENTS IN ENGLISH

A conditional sentence has two parts: the subordinate "if" clause, called the "protasis" (PRAH ta sis) of the condition, and the main "then" clause, called the "apodosis" (a PAH da sis) of the condition. The protasis states the condition under which the main clause will be (will not be), is being (is not being), or was (was not), fulfilled:

PROTASIS	APODOSIS
If it is raining outside	then the grass is wet.
If you saw him yesterday	then he must have been here.

There are basically two kinds of conditional sentences, categorized by the expectation the speaker has concerning the possibility of the fulfillment of the condition stated in the protasis:

OPEN OR SIMPLE CONDITIONS

A. The speaker may be making no implication as to whether the condition was (not), is (not) being, or will (not) be, fulfilled. These conditions are called "open" or "simple" conditions.

1. "If x approaches 0, then the value of f(x) approaches infinity."

(Notice that the speaker is not implying that it is doubtful that x is approaching 200, but if it is, then the apodosis holds true.

2. "If you saw him yesterday, then he was here."

(The speaker is not doubting or suggesting that you did not see him yesterday, but if you did, then he was here.)

3. "If you come tomorrow, I will be happy."

(Again, the speaker is not saying that it is unlikely that you will come tomorrow, but if you do, then... When a simple or open condition applies to a future event, it is often called the "future-more-vivid," or the "future real" condition.)

UNREAL CONDITIONS

B. The speaker may be implying or explicitly stating that the condition stated in the protasis will not be, is not, or was not fulfilled. These category of conditions are sometimes called the "unreal" conditions, and are further broken down into the time to which the conditions are being applied.

1. When the protasis applies to a future event, these conditions are called "future-less-vivid," "future unreal" or "should-would" condition.

"If you should come (or were to come) tomorrow, then I would be happy."

180

(The speaker doubts that you will come, but if you should, then he would be happy.)

2. When an unreal condition pertains to a present condition that is not being fulfilled, it is called the "present contrary-to-fact" condition.

"If you were eight and a half feet tall, you would be a great basketball player."

(But you are not eight feet tall, so you are not a great basketball player. But if you were...)

3. When an unreal condition pertains to a past condition that was not fulfilled, it is called the "past contrary-to-fact" condition.

"If George had been there, we would have won the game."

(But he was not there, so we did not win the game. But if he had been there...)

Let's summarize the basic formulae for English conditional sentences. Notice that it is the change in tense and mood in the protasis which indicates the kind of condition of the sentences.

I. Simple or Open Conditions

PROTASIS	APODOSIS	CONDITION
pres. indic.	fut. indic.	FUTURE MORE VIVID
pres. indic.	pres. indic.	PRESENT SIMPLE
past. indic.	past indic.	PAST SIMPLE

II. Unreal (and Contrary to Fact) Conditions

PROTASIS	APODOSIS	CONDITION
should, were to	would	FUTURE LESS VIVID
imperf. indic.	would	PRESENT CONTRARY TO FACT
plperf. indic.	would have	PAST CONTRARY TO FACT

REVIEW

Classify the following conditional statements: [We often omit the "then" of the apodosis.]

1. I will be most appreciative if you try your best on the exam. _____
2. If Captain Kangaroo said it, it must have been true. _____
3. If the bendix drive is bent, the car will not start. _____
4. If the song were in the key of G flat minor, then you would be singing the right note. _____
5. Had I known that the teacher would be back next term, I would not have written such acidic comments on the course review. _____

CONDITIONAL STATEMENTS IN LATIN

The same classification of conditional sentences which you just learned for English conditions applies to Latin conditions as well. Here is a table of the formulae for standard Latin conditions.

I. OPEN OR SIMPLE CONDITIONS

181

PROTASIS	APODOSIS	CONDITION
future indic.	future indic.	FUTURE MORE VIVID
present indic.	present indic.	PRESENT OPEN
past indic.	past indic.	PAST OPEN

II. UNREAL CONDITIONS

PROTASIS	APODOSIS	CONDITION
present subj.	present subj.	FUTURE LESS VIVID
imperf. subj.	imperf. subj.	PRES. CONTRARY TO FACT
plpf. subj.	plpf. subj.	PAST CONTRARY TO FACT

One feature you should notice about these formulae is that the simple conditions all have the indicative mood in the protasis, whereas all the unreal conditions have the subjunctive mood in the protasis. If you can remember this, you'll be better able to untangle conditional sentences when you're reading.

If the mood of the verb in the protasis is in the indicative, then the condition is one of the simple or open conditions. Further refinement of the condition is then determined by the tense of the verb in the protasis. For example, if the mood of the verb in the protasis is indicative and in the future tense, then the condition is future more vivid. If the mood of the verb in the protasis is in the subjunctive, then the condition is one of the unreal conditions. Again, further classification of the condition is determined by the tense of the verb in the protasis. For example, if the mood of the verb is subjunctive and its tense is present, then the condition is future less vivid. Let's look at some examples.

1. "Si hoc faciet, beatus ero."

   (Because the protasis is the indicative mood, it is a simple condition -- one that does not imply any doubt about the fulfillment of the condition stated in the protasis. Because the tense of the protasis is future, the condition is a "future open" -- a condition which is also called a "future real," or "future-more-vivid." Tr. "If he does this, then I will be happy." Notice that in the Latin future- more-vivid, the protasis is future, whereas the English is present.)

2. "Si hoc facit, beatus sum."

   (Present simple or open. Tr. "If he is doing this, then I am happy.")

3. "Si hoc fecit, beatus eram."

   (Past simple or open. Tr. "If he did this, I was happy.")

4. "Si hoc faciat, beatus sim."

   (Now the mood of the protasis is subjunctive, so you have one of the unreal conditions. Since the tense is present, the condition is a future less vivid, and is represented in English with "should-would." Tr. "If he should do this [I doubt he will], I would be happy.)

5. "Si hoc faceret, beatus essem."

   (The mood isk subjunctive and the tense is imperfect, so this is a present contrary to fact condition. Tr. "If he were doing this [but he is not], I would be happy [but I'm not].")

6. "Si hoc fecisset, beatus fuissem."

   (Pluperfect subjunctive in the protasis, so this is a past contrary to fact condition. Tr. "If he had done this [but he did not, I would have been happy [but I wasn't]."

REVIEW

To establish the kind condition in a Latin conditional sentence, follow these simple steps:

1. Find the protasis.
2. Establish whether the mood is subjunctive or indicative.
   a. If the mood of the verb in the protasis is indicative, then you have one of the simple or open conditions; find

the tense.
   i. If it is future, the condition is future-more- vivid (also called the future real).
   ii. If it is present tense, the condition is present simple or open.
   iii. If it is a past tense, the condition is the past simple or open.

b. If it is subjunctive, find the tense.
   i. If the tense is present, the condition is future- less-vivid (also called "should-would" or future unreal).
   ii. If the tense is imperfect, the condition is present contrary-to-fact.
   iii. If the tense is pluperfect, the condition is past contrary-to-fact.

I strongly suggest that you go to Wheelock's self-help tutorial on pages 315-316 and work through the list of conditional sentences. The only way to internalize these rules is to practice applying them constantly. Ask yourself what kind of condition the sentence is before you translate a single word. Also, practice writing out the basic formulae for the Latin conditional sentences until you have them thoroughly memorized.

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

quis, quid

When the indefinite pronoun "aliquis, aliquid" is preceded in the sentence by "si," "nisi," "num," or "ne," then the "ali-" drops off, leaving just the inflected endings "quis, quid." Consequently, "si quis" means "if someone," "nisi quid" means "unless something," etc. The way I remembered the rule was this little jingle:

"After si, nisi, num, and ne
Then the ali- falls away."

01/10/93

183

CHAPTER 34

"Deponent Verbs; Ablative with Special Deponents"

DEPONENT VERBS

There are many verbs in Latin which have almost no active forms but which nevertheless must be translated as if they were active. These verbs are called deponent, from "de + pono," because they have "set aside" their active forms. In short, a deponent verb is a verb which is passive in form but passive in meaning.

There is a tendency for beginning students of Latin to assume that a deponent verb is so thoroughly exceptional that nothing they have learned about Latin verbs applies. This is a mistake. Deponent verbs are unusual only in this respect: they drop most of their active forms, and its passive forms must be translated as if they were active. Aside from this, deponent verbs follow the rules of inflection and conjugation to the letter.

Imagine that the verb "laudo" had only passive forms. What would the dictionary entry look like? The first dictionary entry of any verb is always the first person singular, present indicative. If "laudo" had no active forms, then the first entry would be passive instead of active: "laudor" instead of "laudo."

The second entry of any verb is the present infinitive from which you deduce the conjugation of the verb by dropping the infinitive ending. If "laudo" had no active forms, the present infinitive would be passive: "laudari" instead of "laudare." Although you're working only with passive forms, by dropping the ending infinitive ending "-ri," you could still tell that verb belongs to the first conjugation.

The third entry of any verb is the third principal part, from which is derived the perfect system active. But because we're imagining that "laudo" has only passive forms, there would be no third principal part listed. The third principal part is used to produce the perfect system active, and there is no active voice for "laudor."

The fourth entry of any verb is the fourth principal part, the perfect passive participle, which is used with the verb "sum" to form the perfect system passive. Hence the fourth entry of the "laudo," if it had no active forms, would still be "laudatus."

Taken together, then, the dictionary entry of "laudo" with its active forms removed would look like this:

laudor, laudari, -----, laudatus

Write out the dictionary entries for the paradigm verbs of the other conjugation without their active forms.

2. moneo _____

3. duco _____

3i. capio _____

4. audio _____

In each of these cases, you can still see to which conjugations each of these verbs belong even if they had no active forms.

A deponent verb is a verb which in fact lacks most of its active forms, so the dictionary entry for it will have to rely only on its passive forms. Here is the dictionary entry for the deponent verb "to urge."

"hortor, -ari, hortatus sum"

From the first entry you can tell the verb is deponent because the dictionary is giving you the passive first person singular instead of the active. The verb has no active voice. Looking at the second entry, you can tell that the verb belongs to the first conjugation, because "-ari" is what the passive infinitive of a first conjugation looks like. Therefore, the stem from which you'll build the present system of tenses is "horta-."

The third entry is the perfect passive participle with a conjugated form of the verb "sum." Instead of listing a blank where the perfect active is normally listed in a non-deponent verb, the entry for a deponent verb skips over it and goes directly to the participal and adds "sum" to show that this is the perfect system. But the participle "hortatus" is entirely predictable, since first conjugation verbs form their perfect passive participle by adding "-tus" to the stem of the first principal part -- in this case "horta-."

There are deponent verbs belonging to all four conjugations. Examine this list of deponent verbs and write down their conjugation.

1. egredior, -i, egressus sum _____

184

2. sequor, -i, secutus sum _____

3. patior, -i, passus sum _____

4. experior, -iri, expertus sum _____

5. fateor, -eri, fassus sum _____

6. loquor, -i, locutus sum _____

7. utor, -i, usus sum _____

8. nascor, -i, natus sum _____

9. morior, -i, mortuus sum _____

10. proficiscor, -i, profectus sum _____

11. conor, -ari, conatus sum _____

12. arbitror, -ari, arbitratus sum _____

It is important not to forget that deponent verbs conjugate in ways that are entirely consistent with other verbs of their conjugation. The only difference is that deponent verbs have "set aside" their active finite forms and the remaining passive forms are translated as it they are active. Just to give you more confidence about this, let's spend some time conjugating deponent verbs.

I. FIRST CONJUGATION DEPONENT VERB:

arbitror, -ari abritratus sum (to think)

A. PRESENT SYSTEM INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	aribtraris	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	aribtrabimur	_____
2nd	_____	_____	arbitrabamini
3rd	_____	_____	_____

B. PRESENT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	arbitrer		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		arbitaretur
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____

C. PERFECT SYSTEM INDICATIVE PASSIVE

185

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	arbitratus eris	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	arbitrati sumus	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	arbitrati erant

D. PERFECT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	arbitrati simus		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		arbitrati essent

E. PARTICIPLES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		_____
FUTURE	_____	_____

F. INFINITIVES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT		_____
PERFECT		_____
FUTURE	_____	

G. IMPERATIVES

SING. _____

PLUR. _____

II. SECOND CONJUGATION DEPONENT VERB:

fateor, -eri, fassus sum (to confess)

A. PRESENT SYSTEM INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	fateris	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	fatebimur	_____
2nd	_____	_____	fatebamini
3rd	_____	_____	_____

B. PRESENT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	fatear		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		fateretur
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____

C. PERFECT SYSTEM INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	fassus eris	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	fassi sumus	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	fassi erant

D. PERFECT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	fassi simus		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		fassi essent

E. PARTICIPLES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		_____
FUTURE	_____	_____

F. INFINITIVES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT		_____
PERFECT		_____
FUTURE	_____	

G. IMPERATIVES

SING. _____

PLUR. _____

III. THIRD CONJUGATION DEPONENT VERB:

utor, uti, usus sum (to use)

A. PRESENT SYSTEM INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	uteris	uteris	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	utemur	_____
2nd	utimini	_____	utebamini
3rd	_____	_____	_____

B. PRESENT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	utar		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		uteretur
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____

3rd _____ _____

C. PERFECT SYSTEM INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	usus eris	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	usi sumus	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	usi erant

D. PERFECT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	usi simus		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		usi essent

E. PARTICIPLES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		_____
FUTURE	_____	_____

F. INFINITIVES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT		_____
PERFECT		_____
FUTURE	_____	

G. IMPERATIVES

SING. _____

PLUR. _____

IIIi. THIRD CONJUGATION I-STEM DEPONENT VERB:

patior, pati, passus sum (to endure, permit)

A. PRESENT SYSTEM INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	pateris	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	patiemur	_____
2nd	_____	_____	patiebamini
3rd	_____	_____	_____

B. PRESENT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	patiar		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		pateretur
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____

C. PERFECT SYSTEM INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	passus eris	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	passi sumus	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	passi erant

D. PERFECT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	passi simus		_____
2nd	_____		_____

3rd	_____	passi essent

E. PARTICIPLES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		_____
FUTURE	_____	_____

F. INFINITIVES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT		_____
PERFECT		_____
FUTURE	_____	

G. IMPERATIVES

SING.	_____
PLUR.	_____

IV. FOURTH CONJUGATION DEPONENT VERB:

experior, -iri, expertus (to try)

A. PRESENT SYSTEM INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	experiris	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	_____	experiemur	_____
2nd	_____	_____	experiebamini
3rd	_____	_____	_____

B. PRESENT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PRESENT	FUTURE	IMPERFECT
1st	experiar		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		experiretur
1st	_____		_____

2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____

C. PERFECT SYSTEM INDICATIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____	_____	_____
2nd	_____	expertus eris	_____
3rd	_____	_____	_____
1st	experti sumus	_____	_____
2nd	_____	_____	_____
3rd	_____	_____	experti erant

D. PERFECT SYSTEM SUBJUNCTIVE PASSIVE

	PERFECT	FUTURE PERFECT	PLUPERFECT
1st	_____		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		_____
1st	experti simus		_____
2nd	_____		_____
3rd	_____		experti essent

E. PARTICIPLES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		_____
FUTURE	_____	_____

F. INFINITIVES

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
PRESENT		_____
PERFECT		_____
FUTURE	_____	

G. IMPERATIVES

SING. _____

PLUR. _____

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

utor, uti, usus sum	The verb takes the ablative case to complete its meaning. "Usus sum multis libris" (I used many books.) Wheelocks remark that the ablative is really an ablative of means is pure speculation.
audeo, -ere, ausus sum	A handful of verbs are regular in the present system, but become deponent in perfect system. As you can see by this dictionary entry, the verb "audeo" skips over the perfect system active entirely and goes directly to the participle "ausus." This is telling you that in the perfect system this verb is deponent, hence "ausus sum" means "I dared." These verb are called semi-deponent.

DRILLS

Try a few easy drills before you turn to Wheelock's self-help tutorial. Translate the following.

1. loquitur _____
2. sequemini _____
3. secuti eramus _____
4. usus ero _____
5. naturus _____
6. conabimini _____
7. patitur _____
8. secuturum esse _____
9. morieris _____
10. moreris _____

01/10/93

193

CHAPTER 35

"Dative With Special Verbs; Dative With Compounds"

There is nothing conceptually challenging in this chapter, but that doesn't make it any easier. Chapter involves a lot of very precise memorization, and a little advice. There's not much help I can give you.

DATIVE WITH SPECIAL VERBS

You see before that Latin sometimes conceives actions differently from the way we with English as native language might expect. For example, remember the verb "careo, -ere, carui, cariturus"? For us it means "to lack", and when we use the verb "to lack" in English, it is followed by the direct object case. We might be tempted to assume, therefore, that the Latin verb "careo" will also take the accusative case. But it doesn't. "Careo" is construed with the ablative case in Latin. Similarly, our verb "to use" is followed by a direct object, but the Latin equivalent, "utor, uti, usus sum", takes the ablative case, obviously because Latin simply doesn't conceive of the action of using something in quite the same way we do in English. So the point of all this is that you got to be careful not to rely to heavily on your English instincts as you try to feel your way through Latin constructions. But you've known that for some time now.

In this chapter, you're presented with several very common verbs which take the dative case instead of the accusative case, as we might expect simply by examining their English translations. There is no connection between the kinds of actions represented in these verbs and the fact that they take the dative case. There is no rule we can concoct in advance that will tip you off whether a certain verb in Latin will take the dative case. You simply must memorize, as you've been doing before, the case the verb takes when you learn the verb itself. The only helpful advice is that you memorize the verbs with a definition which will make the dative case object obvious. Here's the list:

credo	(3)	credidi	creditus	"to believe in" (not "to trust)
ignosco	(3)	ignovi	ignotus	"to grant pardon to" (not "to forgive")
impero	(1)	-avi	-atus	"to give order to" (not "to order")
noceo	(2)	nocui	nocitus	"to do harm to" (not "to harm"
parco	(3)	peperci	parsurus	"to be lenient to (not "to spare")
pareo	(2)	parui	--------	"to be obedient to (not "to obey"
persuadeo	(2)	-suasi	-suasus	"to be persuasive to (not "to persuade")
placeo	(2)	placui	placitus	"to be pleasing to (not "to please")
servio	(4)	-ivi	-itus	"to be a slave to (not "to serve")
studeo	(2)	studui	-------	"to be eager for" (not "to study")

COMMENTS:

1. Now obviously, the translations Wheelock offers (e.g. "to be eager for) are only to aid memorization of the case structures these verbs take. They're only crutches, which should be discarded when you're actually finishing off a translation. You wouldn't translate "Adulescentes litteris Graecis studebant" as "The youths were eager for Greek literature." But if in your mind you think "studebant -- they were eager for" as you're reading the sentence, you'll know immediately what case "litteris Graecis is in and why. Then you can smooth out the English: "The youths used to study Greek literature."
2. This is quite a list of verbs, but as you can see, almost all have clear English derivatives, which gives you some insight into their meanings. "Pareo" and "ignosco are going to be a little tricky, especially "ignosco", since it looks like it ought to be "not to recognize" (from a negative prefix + "nosco"). Actually, this can be used to your advantage, if you think of it this way: "forgive and forget (i.e. "to put out of mind").
3. Another aid to memorizing these verbs might be to cluster them together into groups of actions and their opposites, or into groups of related ideas. Something like this:

```
I.    command, obey, serve
II.   harm, forgive, spare
III.  persuade, trust, please

      (because you trust in and are persuaded by what you
```

find pleasing)

4. Wheelock omits an important detail about these verbs: none of these verbs can be used in the passive voice. Only verbs which are truly transitive (i.e. take an accusative object) can be used both in the active and in the passive voices. To say "he is trusted" in Latin, consquently, it would be wrong to say "Creditur." Instead, Latin uses the verb impersonally: "Trust is shown to him," which would be "Ei creditur." Similarly for all these verbs. Here are some examples:

Nobis non parebitur.	We will not be obeyed (lit. Obedience will not given to us).
Eis ignotum est.	They were forgiven.
Militibus imperatum est...	The soldiers were ordered...

DATIVE WITH COMPOUND VERBS

The point of this section is simple: sometimes root verbs alter their configuration of objects when prefixes are added. And that's all really that can be said. You've seen already that root verbs can pick up prefixes which slightly change the meaning of the verb. Most of these changes have been trivial:

capio: recipio (take back); accipio (accept)

Sometimes, however, the addition of a prefix will substantially change the way a verbal root has to be understood. Look at some English examples of this phenomenon:

refer, defer, prefer, differ, infer
revoke, invoke, prevoke

And we could go on like this for days. Latin is similiarly able to change the meaning of a root verb with its differing prefixes; furthermore, sometimes the change of meaning also involves a change in contruction. The verb "sum", as you know, means "to be", and is instranstive. But add the preposition "prae" to it, and it means "to be in command of" and it takes the dative case. For example, "Dumnorix equitatui praeerat" means "Dumnorix was in charge of the cavalry." Further, add the preposition "ad", and "sum" means "to support" and takes the dative case (not, as we might expect from the English equivalent, the accusative case): "Caesar amicis aderat" means "Caesar supported his freinds.

Wheelock gives you a list of examples on page 170 where you can see the change of meaning and change of object prefixes often create in verbs. You should look them over, but it will not be necessary for you to memorize them. As you gather more experience reading Latin, you'll begin to recognize compound verbs like this which take the dative case. For your purposes now, you should simply think about this. If you're reading a sentence which seems to lack a needed direct object for a verb, check to see whether the verb you're considering is compound (made up of a root and a prefix). If it is, then look for a dative case, since this may be one of those occasions where the meaning of the verb has been altered by the prefix and now calls for a dative case.

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

antepono (3), -posui, -positus	Obviously this is a compound of the verb you already know "pono" and the preposition "ante": "to place before", hence to prefer. The meaning is completed with an accusative direct object and the dative: "Antepono veritatem pecuniae" (I place truth before money = I prefer truth to money).