

Chapter 19: Perfect Passive Verbs

Chapter 19 covers the following: the perfect passive system of verbs in all conjugations; how to create a verb synopsis; the formation and use of interrogative pronouns and adjectives; and how to distinguish interrogative and relative forms. As usual, at the end of the lesson, we'll review the vocabulary which you should memorize in this chapter.

There are two important rules to remember here: (1) the fourth principal part of the verb — that is, the perfect passive participle — represents past action and is translated “having been whatever-ed,” for example, “having been praised”; (2) the perfect passive participle plus a form of the verb “to be” is the formula for creating a perfect passive finite verb.

Perfect passive verbs. Compared to the present passive, the perfect passive is remarkably straightforward. It involves only two verb elements: the fourth principal part of the verb, plus a form of *esse* (“to be”). The fourth principal part, which finally comes into play after all the chapters you've been memorizing it, is actually the perfect passive participle: “perfect” meaning it carries a time value of -1, and “passive” meaning it imports a sense of passive voice. When it stands alone, it's translated as “having been whatever-the-verb-is” — “praised,” for instance.

The other component of the perfect passive is a form of the verb “to be.” If that form is a finite verb like *sum* or *es*, it makes the perfect passive form a finite verb form. Thus, the form of the verb “to be” imports person and number — if it's *sum*, it's first person singular; if it's *es*, it's second person singular, and so on — also mood — if it's *sum/es/est*, it's indicative; if it's *esse*, it's an infinitive [we'll get to that in a later chapter]. And to some extent, it imports tense as well, because by changing the tense of the verb “to be” you can change the tense of a perfect passive verb within the perfect passive system — that is, make it perfect, pluperfect or future perfect, according to which tense of *sum* you use.

So forming a perfect passive verb is really very simple. You take the perfect passive participle, a form you memorize with every individual verb — that's really the only hard part — and you add a form of the verb “to be”: *sum*, *es*, *est*, and so on. Every perfect passive verb form will always consist of two separate words. With that, you have the perfect passive. So for example, take the fourth principal part of the verb *amo*: *amo*, *amare*, *amavi*, *amatus*. Add a form of the verb “to be” (*sum*) and you have the perfect passive of “love”: *amatus sum*, “I have been loved.” Here's another example: *monitus es*, “you have been warned.” And another example: *ductus est*, “he has been led.”

Let's look for a moment at the perfect passive participle, the first of the two elements in a perfect passive verb, and note two things about it. First of all, its tense value. Because the participle represents past action — that is, its tense value is -1 — it translates “having been whatever-ed,” in the case of *amatus*, “having been loved.” So when a perfect passive participle like *amatus* is added to the present tense of the verb “to be” (*sum*), it means literally: *sum* (“I am”) *amatus* (“having been loved”). In other words, “I exist right now (*sum*) in a state in which I was once the object of someone's affection (*amatus*).” Where Latin puts the past-tense value in the participle “having been loved,” English puts that same past value in the form of the verb “to be”: “I have been.” Thus, “I am having been loved” is the grammatical equivalent of “I have been loved.”

The second thing worth noting about the perfect passive participle is its part of speech. It is, at heart, an adjective — a *verbal* adjective technically. In terms of its components, it's a verb base to which have been added adjective endings. We'll talk about participles more in a later chapter. Because participles are adjectives, they function the way adjectives do. Principally, they modify nouns. When the perfect passive participle is being used to form a perfect passive verb, it always modifies the subject. So if the subject is nominative, so must the perfect passive participle be. Technically, it's a predicate adjective.

Thus, perfect passive participles must agree in number and gender with the subject. So, say the subject is masculine singular. Then the perfect passive participle must also be masculine singular. In the case of the verb *amo*, it would be *amatus sum/es/est*, meaning "I (masc.) have been loved," "you (masc.) have been loved," "he has been loved." But changing the subject to feminine means the participle must change its form also, rendering *amata sum/es/est*, meaning "I (fem.) have been loved," "you (fem.) have been loved," "she has been loved." If the subject is neuter, then that form would become *amatum est*, "it has been loved." And finally, if the subject is plural, then the perfect passive participle must also be plural, rendering masculine forms like *amati sumus/estis/sunt*, feminine forms *amatae sumus/estis/sunt*, and neuter *amata sumus/estis/sunt*.

So here is an example of a Latin verb, *amo*, conjugated in the perfect passive: *amatus, -a, -um sum; amatus, -a, -um es*; and so on. And here is that same verb translated: "I have been loved," "you have been loved," "he/she/it has been loved," and so on. Remember to use *-us, -a, -um* in the singular in accordance with the gender of the subject, or in the plural, *-i, -ae, -a*. The closest translation in English to the Latin perfect passive is "has/have been," although "was/ were" is also a viable translation, in this case, "was/were loved." English also has a continual form, "has been being loved," but we won't use that translation in this class.

The pluperfect passive operates much the same way the perfect passive does. But instead of *sum*, it uses the imperfect of the verb "to be," *eram*. In other words, by adding *eram* which has a time value of -1 to the perfect passive participle which also has a time value of -1, the verb takes on a time value of -2, that is, pluperfect. These two Latin verb forms together mean literally "I was having been loved," that is, "I once existed in a state at some point in the past (*eram*) of already by that time having been the object of someone's affection (*amatus*)," which is a very complicated way of saying, "I had been loved." Here is *amo* conjugated in the pluperfect passive: *amatus, -a, -um + eram/eras/erat*, and so on. And here is its translation: "I had been loved, you had been loved," etc.

And finally, here is the future perfect passive, which is constructed of the perfect passive participle plus the future tense of the verb "to be," producing the equivalent in English of "will (future) have (perfect) been (passive)." Here, the perfect passive participle brings a time value of -1, and the future form of the verb "to be" a time value of +1. The result is a time value of +½, the future perfect, a tense describing an event which takes place between the present and the future. If we use *amo* as an example again, the Latin future perfect literally means "I will one day be in a state (*ero*) where by that point in time I have already been the object of someone's affection (*amatus*)." In other words, "I will have been loved."

Here is how the future perfect passive in Latin is formed. The future of the verb “to be,” *ero/eris/erit*, etc., is added to the perfect passive participle, for example, *amatus*, *-a*, *-um*, resulting in *amatus*, *-a*, *-um ero*, *amatus*, *-a*, *-um eris*, and so on. Be careful! The third person plural is *erunt*, not *-erint* as it is in the future perfect active. And here is how the future perfect passive is translated: “I will have been loved,” “you will have been loved,” and so on.

Let’s take a moment to practice a little bit with perfect passive verb forms. So I’ll give you some perfect passive verbs. You translate them.

First: *motum est*. All right fine, that’s complicated. Let’s reason our way through it. For starters, *motum* is a perfect passive participle. It comes from *moveo*, the Latin verb that means “move.” So all by itself, *motum* means “having been moved.” In this verb, it’s attached to a form of the present tense of the verb “to be,” *est*, the third person singular. If a perfect passive participle has a time value of -1, and the present tense of the verb “to be” a time value of +0, the whole verb must have a time value of -1 ($-1 + 0 = -1$), making it perfect in tense, meaning it will translate in English as “have, has,” that is, one step back in the past. That the verb is passive means you must add “been” to your English translation, and finally, look at the gender of the participle, *motum*. It’s neuter. That means that your English translation must use “it” as the subject. Putting it all together: “it has been moved,” or in the simple past, “it was moved.”

Here’s another verb: *iuti eramus*. Pause this presentation for a second, and see if you can figure out the answer by applying the same logic we did to figure out the translation of the previous verb. Okay, what tense is it? It’s pluperfect, because it’s an imperfect form of the verb “to be” (-1), added to the perfect passive participle *iuti* (also -1). And what’s the English tense sign for the pluperfect? Good! “Had.” And what verb does *iutus* come from? That’s right: *iuvo*, “help.” And who’s doing the action? Look at the ending on *eramus*: *-mus*! It’s first-person plural. That means “we.” Therefore, the proper translation is “we had been helped.”

One more practice verb: *missa erunt*. You figure it out. [Take your time, I’ll just sit here and wait for you. It’s not like I’m old and only have a little bit of time left in life. Fine, yes, who’s doing the action? Third plural. Okay, yeah, what’s the gender of the subject? That’s a tricky one here, isn’t it?] Okay, well, the answer is — drumroll please! — “they will have been sent”, and the “they” has to be something neuter.

Now let’s look at another important aspect of perfect passive verbs. When translating verbs, you should always think ahead to what will follow the verb, what the verb expects. In this case, these are all passive verbs; therefore, they expect agents. So let’s look at some examples of how agents might be added onto these particular passive forms.

Say we add *a vobis* to the first verb *motum est*, which we translated as “it has been/was moved.” Here, *a vobis* would mean “by y’all”: “it has been moved by y’all.” Here’s another example of a passive agent: *iuti eramus ab amico*: “we had been helped by a friend.” And finally, *missa erunt a Cicerone*: “they (neut.) will have been sent by Cicero.”

Here is an exercise that will help you memorize Latin verb forms. It's called a synopsis [the plural is synopses]. A synopsis provides an overview of a Latin verb as it changes tense and voice. Later we'll add mood, but in a synopsis you don't change person and number, you use only one of each. This is a very efficient way to practice changing tense and voice, which aids in memorization.

Here's an example of a synopsis: the verb *amo* in the first person singular. Starting in the upper left-hand quadrant of the chart (the present active system), the present active first-person singular is *amo*, the imperfect *amabam*, the future *amabo*. Notice that we're not using any of the other persons and numbers, only the first-person singular.

Moving across the chart to the upper right-hand quadrant, you see the passive: *amor*, *amabar*, *amabor*. In the lower left-hand quadrant is the perfect active: *amavi*, *amaveram*, *amavero*. And finally, in the lower right-hand quadrant is the perfect passive: *amatus sum* [I'm using the masculine form of the participle here because, well, I am masculine] *amatus eram*, *amatus ero*.

These translate as (starting back in the upper left-hand quadrant with the present active): "I love, I was loving, I will love"; and in the present passive: "I am loved," "I was loved," "I will be loved"; the perfect active: "I have loved," "I had loved," "I will have loved"; and finally, the perfect passive: "I have been loved," "I had been loved," "I will have been loved."

Let's pause this presentation again and let you work on a synopsis by yourself. Take the third-conjugation verb *gero* and write a synopsis of it in the third-person plural, including translations. Remember the principal parts of this verb: *gero*, *gerere*, *gessi*, *gestum*. Now try to write that synopsis. When you're done, start the presentation again, and I'll give you the answers.

And here are the answers: *gerunt* [remember in third conjugation the third-person plural present uses *u* as its thematic vowel], *gerebant*, *gerent* [the future tense marker is *e* in third conjugation]. And in the present passive: *geruntur*, *gerebantur*, *gerentur*. In the perfect active: *gesserunt*, *gesserant*, *gesserint*; and in the perfect passive: *gesti*, *gestae*, *gesta* [any gender can be used as long as the participle is plural] *sunt*, *gesti erant*, *gesti erunt*, meaning "they wage," "they were waging," "they will wage"; and in the passive, "they are waged," "they were waged," "they will be waged"; in the perfect active, "they have waged," "they had waged," "they will have waged"; and the perfect passive: "they have been waged," "they had been waged," "they will have been waged."

The final part of the grammar in this lesson addresses the interrogative pronoun and adjective, that is, words that introduce questions. As we noted before, words like "who, what, which" can introduce questions as well as relative clauses, but when "who, what, which" is used in its interrogative sense, it usually begins an independent sentence, a question, whereas when it's used as a relative pronoun, it begins a clause which cannot stand alone.

Let's be clear about that difference. If "who" asks a question, it's interrogative — for example, "Who will help us?" — but if "who" is in a clause that can't stand alone and make sense, it's relative and it doesn't ask a question, for example, "Here is the teacher who will help us." Note that relative pronouns have antecedents; interrogatives just ask you, well, to fill in the blank.

They're essentially fill-in-the-blank questions, like you've seen on many tests. The questioner is asking someone to fill in the blank in some thought. So for example, "Who are you?" is really saying "You are — person that I'm speaking to! — fill in the blank, please?" or "What did he do?" is really saying "He did — fill in the blank, please?" or "Which problem are you taking about?" means "You are talking about — fill in the blank please — problem?," or finally, "Whose book is this?," meaning "This is the book of [meaning "belonging to"] — fill in the blank, please?"

That probably didn't come as any particular surprise to you, but it's an important point to remember because it stresses the fact that interrogative pronouns serve grammatical functions in sentences the way any noun does. In the first sentence, it would be a nominative interrogative pronoun, because in the sentence "You are ____?" the blank is a predicate nominative. In "What did he do?" [meaning "He did what?"], the "what" is the direct object and would therefore be accusative in Latin. In the last example, "Whose book is this?" the "whose" shows possession. That means it would be genitive in Latin. The third example is an adjective, and we'll talk about that in a second.

Latin has only one interrogative pronoun which comes, of course, in many forms because it has many endings depending on its case, number and gender. English, on the other hand, has three interrogative forms — "who, which, what" — with some remnants of case endings like "whose" and "whom."

Here are the singular forms of the interrogative pronoun in Latin, which start *quis, quid*. Except for those nominative forms, there's no need to recite it. It's identical to the masculine and neuter forms of the relative pronoun. Nor is there any need to point to its translation, which is also identical to the relative pronoun. Also like the relative pronoun, there are no mandatory long marks in the singular or plural.

But unlike the relative pronoun, there is no distinction between the masculine and feminine, because when someone asks a question about who is doing something, they often don't know whether it was a man or a woman. Therefore, it's pointless to make a distinction in gender.

In contrast, those asking questions most often do know whether it was a person or a thing, so the distinction between animate (that is, masculine/feminine) and neuter gender is significant. If the question is about the person and the gender is known, as we'll soon see, the interrogative adjective is used. And the question is posed as "which man, what woman?". Since it's often known whether the answer to a question is plural or not, the interrogative pronoun must be able to distinguish between singular and plural. Here is the plural of the interrogative pronoun. No need to recite the forms or translation here; they're identical to the masculine and neuter forms of the relative pronoun.

As we've noted just above, interrogative forms can appear as adjectives as well as nouns. If so, their form is identical to the relative pronoun. Here it is. Where there was only a little to memorize with the interrogative pronoun, there is nothing to memorize here with the interrogative adjective, assuming, of course, you memorized the relative pronoun back in

Chapter 17. If not, fortune is giving you a second chance, and it doesn't hand out many. Take advantage of it!

Remember that like all adjectives, interrogative adjectives must modify a noun and thus agree in number, gender and case with it. So that if a Roman wanted to ask "what man?," he or she would say "*qui vir?*," meaning "what/which man?" To ask "for what woman?," a Roman would say "*cui feminae?*" To ask "at what time?," a Roman would say "*quā horā?*" Or to ask "what/which gifts?" as the subject or direct object, a Latin speaker would say "*quae dona?*"

And that completes the grammar for Chapter 19. Now let's look at the vocabulary.

The first word is *senex, senis*, m., meaning "old man." It's a third-declension masculine noun. It also functions as an adjective meaning "old, aged" in which case it is still third declension, but it's not *i*-stem. It's one of the few exceptions to the rule that third-declension adjectives are *i*-stem. So what would be the genitive plural of this word? Good: *senum* (no *-i*).

The next word is *studium, studii*, n., meaning "eagerness, zeal, pursuit, study." It's a second-declension neuter noun. What type of people are eager? Think of an English derivative. No, not studs! Students! For knowledge, of course. Often this word appears as an ablative of manner, *cum studio*, meaning "with zeal," that is, "eagerly." Remember that, if an adjective is attached to an ablative of manner, the *cum* is optional. So, for instance, it can be *magno cum studio* or just *magno studio*, in either case meaning "with great zeal." What would be the genitive plural of this word? Excellent! *Studiorum*.

The next words, *quis, quid* (the interrogative pronoun), and *qui, quae, quod* (the interrogative adjective), both meaning "who, what, which," we have belabored at length above. No need to go on about them again.

So let's move to the next word, *certus, -a, -um*, meaning "definite, sure, certain, reliable." It's a first/second-declension adjective. It comes from the same base as the verb *cernere*, "to separate, distinguish." In other words, if you know something for certain, you can separate it from other things.

The next word is another adjective, *novus, -a, -um*, meaning "new, strange." It's a first/second-declension adjective. Unlike to us today, to the Romans new things were scary, and thus their phrase *res novae*, meaning literally "new things," meant "a revolution" and usually not for the good.

The next word is *at*, meaning "but." It's a conjunction, and it's slightly stronger in its adversative sense than *sed*, which also means "but." "Adversative" is a grammatical term for a word that turns the logic in a sentence, as in "I went to the store, but I didn't buy bread." It's important to distinguish *at* from *atque*, meaning "and," which is not adversative at all.

The next word, *libero*, a first-conjugation verb, means "free, liberate." Often this verb is followed by an ablative of separation, meaning "to free from something."

The next word, *paro*, another first-conjugation verb, means “prepare, get, obtain.” This word has produced many English derivatives like “prepare, separate, repair, apparatus.” This Latin verb should help you remember that the word “separate” is spelled s-e-P-A-R-a-t-e, getting its middle three letters from *paro*.

And finally the last word in this vocabulary list is *iudicium, iudicii*, n., meaning “judgment, decision, opinion.” It’s a second-declension neuter noun. It literally means “saying (*dic-*) the law (*ius*),” in other words, rendering a legal judgment. What’s the accusative plural of this word? Yes! *Iudicia*.

And that’s it, that’s the end of the presentation for Chapter 19. Do the rules that were cited at the beginning of this chapter now make sense to you? If not, please review this presentation. If so, please proceed to the next slide.

For the next two class meetings, please bring in a copy of the two worksheets attached to Chapter 19 on the class website. Here is a link to both of those worksheets.

Valete, O discipuli! [Spell separate, come on, spell separate: s-e-p- ... that’s right! -A-R-A-T-e. When I learned how to spell this word in fourth grade, I was taught that there’s “a rat” in “separate”! And if that works for you, great, but I think it’s better to learn it the real way, by knowing the Latin vocabulary, don’t you? Because, Latin ... well, it’s always better. *Valete!*]