Chapter 23: Participles

Chapter 23 covers the following: the formation, translation and use of participles in Latin, and the nature of relative time. At the end of the lesson we'll review the vocabulary which you should memorize in this chapter.

There are four important rules to remember in Chapter 23: (1) Latin has four participles: the present active, the future active; the perfect passive and the future passive. It lacks, however, a present passive participle ("being [verb]-ed") and a perfect active participle ("having [verb]-ed"). (2) The perfect passive, future active and future passive participles belong to first/second declension. The present active participle belongs to third declension. (3) The verb *esse* has only a future active participle (*futurus*). It lacks both the present active and all passive participles. (4) Participles show relative time.

What are participles? At heart, participles are verbs which have been turned into adjectives. Thus, technically participles are "verbal adjectives." The first part of the word (parti-) means "part;" the second part (-cip-) means "take," indicating that participles "partake, share" in the characteristics of both verbs and adjectives.

In other words, the base of a participle is verbal, giving it some of the qualities of a verb, for instance,
- tense: it can indicate when the action is happening (now or then or later; i.e. present, past or future);
- conjugation: what thematic vowel will be used (e.g. *-a-* in first conjugation, *-e-* in second, and so on);
- voice: whether the word it's attached to is acting or being acted upon (i.e. active or passive);

And if it can express voice, then it must also be able to express expectation, in other words, will the participle be followed by a direct object (if so, it must be active) or an agent (if so, it must be passive)? Participles can also be followed by anything the verb naturally expects: indirect objects, complementary infinitives, ablatives of separation, and the like.

That's the base of participles. Their endings are totally different. They're not verbal, but adjectival. That is, they contain the type of information adjectives do: case, number and gender, allowing them to agree with nouns or, as often happens, serve as substantives. But like adjectives, participles cannot stand alone and make sense — well, actually, they can and often do in the works of ancient authors, but in this class we're going to pretend they can't — so participles cannot serve as the basis of full sentences the way finite verbs do. Instead, they create phrases, i.e. dependent forms which must be embedded inside a larger thought that has a full (finite) verb.

Before embarking on the formation and use of Latin participles, let's look at a few examples of participles in English beginning with present-tense participles, for example, "listening," as in, "Listening carefully, students can learn much from their teachers." Here, the first part of the participle "listen-" comes from a verb in its present-tense form—the students are listening and learning at the same time (now)— while the second part of the participle "-ing" ("-ing" is an

English participle ending) turns the verb "listen" into an adjective agreeing with students. In other words, in the same way an adjective like "smart" or "attentive" could have been attached to "students" — "Listening carefully, smart and attentive students can learn much from their teachers."—"listening" modifies "students." It tells you what kind of students they are.

Notice that participles like "listening" convey not only tense (in this instance, present tense) but also voice and expectation, for instance, "Giving Latin their full attention, most students get A's." Here, "giving" is active — the students are doing the giving; they're not being given — and by being active, "giving" naturally expects what most active-voice verb forms take: a direct object, in this instance, "(their full) attention." And because the meaning of the verb "give" expects an indirect object — you give something to someone — the participle has an indirect object, here "Latin," in other words, "(to) Latin."

Besides being active-voice, participles can also be passive-voice, as in "Being instructed by a Latin teacher, students understand English better." As before, "-ing" indicates that the form is a participle, but when it's expressed with "be" plus the "-ed" form of the verb, it becomes passive, which means it expects an agent: "by (a Latin) teacher."

In addition to voice, participles can change tense. An English perfect active participle, such as "Having learned good grammar, students often go on to great success in life," the "-ing" in the verb form "having learned" shows it's a participle and the "hav(e) + -ed" shows it's past-tense. The lack of any form of the verb "to be" is a sign the participle is not passive but active and thus it expects a direct object, here "(good) grammar."

Just like present participles, perfect participles can be passive, as in "Having been guided by the best teachers, students often experience joy and fame." The "-ing" shows it's a participle, "hav(e) + -ed" shows it's past-tense, i.e. perfect, and "been" shows it's passive, which, of course, sets up the expectation of an agent, "by (the best) teachers."

Besides present and past, participles can be future-tense as well, though they're not as simple to form because the normal future tense marker in English ("will") cannot be used with participles. Where we can add "having" to a verb form to create a perfect participle like "having done (it)," we can't do the same with "will." "Will-ing do (it)"? Instead, we have to say "about to do (it)" or "going to do (it)." In the next chapter we'll learn this is called a "periphrastic" construction, meaning it's a long way of saying a simple thing, that is, the construction requires more words than necessary.

Here's an example of a future active participle construction in English: "The students, about to confront some very difficult grammar, resolved to study like never before." The "about to" tense marker indicates that the action of the verb ("confront") will take place in the future, and the lack of a verb "to be" shows that the participle is active and will expect a direct object, here "(some very difficult) grammar."

Future participles can be passive as well. For instance, "The students, about to be confronted by some very difficult grammar, resolved to study like never before." "About to" shows that the

participle is future, and "be" shows that it's passive and, like passive forms, expects an agent: "by (some very difficult) grammar."

Here are all those participles — active/passive, present/perfect/future — in chart form. Note the use of "-ing" in the active forms: "(verb)ing, having (verb)ed, going to (verb)." The passive forms use, instead, a form of "be" + "-ed": "being (verb)-ed, having been (verb)-ed, going to be (verb)-ed."

Now let's talk about Latin participles. Here are the simple formulas for those participles: "(verb)ing," "being (verb)ed," and so on. Of these six participles, the Romans had only four. The present passive and perfect active are missing, which, when you're memorizing these forms is nice — one-third off is a discount most student buyers can't resist — but take my word for it, it's not nice in practice since the absence of these forms forced the Romans into some mighty odd work-arounds, as we'll see in the next few chapters. You'll come to want them, but wanting isn't getting, so tough luck!

The present active participle is formed in Latin by taking the present base of a verb, plus the thematic vowel appropriate to that verb's conjugation and adding the adjectival ending *-ns*, *-ntis*, and so on following third declension. Remember that, even though participles come from verbs, they're adjectives fundamentally. For example, the present active participle of *amo* (1st conj.) is *amans*, *amantis*, … We'll talk about the translation of these forms in a second.

No present passive participle in Latin, or perfect active participle. So, on to the perfect passive participle, which you've already learned! It's the fourth principal part of the verb, in the case of *amo* again: *amatus*, *-a*, *-um*.

Take that same base, add *-ur-* between the perfect passive verb base and the ending, and you have the future active participle. Its distinctive *-urus*, *-a*, *-um* ending follows first/second-declension, rendering forms like *amaturus*, *-a*, *-um*. Funny that a future form uses the perfect passive base but that's the way it is. Don't let that trip you up!

No such problem with the future passive participle. It uses the present verb base + *-nd-* — not *-nt-* ! Be careful! — + first/second-declension endings, producing forms like *amandus*, *-a*, *-um*.

Okay, that's complicated. Let's make it simpler. This is the core of what you need to know: these four markers — "participle signs," you might call them: *-nt-* (present active) = "-ing"; *-t/s-* (perfect passive) = "having been"; *-(t)ur-/-(s)ur-* (future active) = "about/going to"; and, *-nd-* (future passive) = "about/going to be."

Notice that two of the participles (the present active and future passive) use the present active verb base, and two use the perfect passive base (the perfect passive and future active), which means that thematic vowels are significant for the present active participle and the future passive: *-a-* will be used in 1st conjugation, *-e-* in 2nd and 3rd, and *-ie-* in 3rd-*io* and 4th. Notice also that only one of the participles employs third-declension endings (the present active). All the others use 1st/2nd-declension endings.

So what is the dative singular ending for the present active participle of *amo*? The ending is *-i*, so the correct answer is *amanti*.

What about the ablative singular of the same form? Will the ending be *-i* or *-e*? The answer is … both! When a participle like *amans* is used as a noun, the Romans preferred not to apply third-declension *i*-stem rules — *amans* does not fit the qualifications for *i*-stem nouns — and they would write or say *amante*, especially when the participle takes a direct object and conveys a strong sense of "the person doing … whatever." But when it operated as a true adjective and had a noun to modify, they did use *i*-stem rules, creating the variant *amanti* in the ablative singular, and using *-ium* in the genitive plural (*amantium*) and *-ia* in the neuter nominative and accusative plural (*amantia*).

Returning to participles and their declensions, where the present active participle is third, all the other participles are first/second, a distinction that still exists in the forms some Romance languages like Italian inherited from Latin participles.

Now let's look at an example of a Latin verb and its participles, using a third-conjugation verb (because they're always the most difficult) *ago*. Taking the "participle signs" cited above — remember them? I hope so! — and adding them to the base and proper thematic vowel for third conjugation (*-e-*), you get the present active participle of *ago*: *agens*, *agentis*. From the vocabulary, you know the perfect passive participle of *ago*. It's the fourth principal part, *actus*, *-a*, *-um*. You just have to memorize that one. Inserting *-ur-* into that creates the future active participle, *acturus*, *-a*, *-um*, and returning to the present base, add *-nd-* and you have the future passive participle: *agendus*, *-a*, *-um*.

Many Latin participles enter English as derivatives. Some students find it easier to learn these forms when they realize they already know them, for instance, our word "agent" which comes from the present participle of this verb (*agens*, *agentis*). The perfect passive participle *actus* produced "act, action" in English, and the future passive participle *agendus* underlies our word "agenda." Only the future active participle *acturus* has generated no derivatives, unless you count "act your age."

That raises the question of what these forms mean and how to translate them, which at heart is not at all a difficult process. Each of the Latin participles has a simple (if not always idiomatic) English equivalent, which in most instances is enough to render a passable (if not always elegant) English translation. *Amans*, *amantis*, for example, means literally "loving." Remember that Latin *-nt-* (plus third-declension endings) equals English "-ing." As we've already learned, *amatus*, *-a*, *-um* means "having been loved," never an ingredient in a silky-smooth English translation, but "having been whatever-ed" will rarely lead you astray. The same goes for turning *amaturus*, *-a*, *-um* into "about/going to love," the English periphrastic construction which is required — remember that? — in the absence of "willing love." And finally the hardest of all participles to transform into simple English, the future passive "about/going to be loved," which is how we'll render it for now. The next chapter will discuss one of its major uses.

Before leaving the formation of regular participles, let's address their expectation. It's exactly what you'd expect. The active ones, *amans* and *amaturus*, call for direct objects, "loving/going

to love someone," and the passive ones, *amatus* and *amandus*, call for agents, "having been or going to be loved by someone."

Finally, the verb "to be" in Latin (*sum*, *esse*) has only one participle, the future active: *futurus*, -*a*, -*um*, probably one of the easiest forms to remember in Latin ("future"? *futurus*?). Naturally, *sum* has no passive forms ("being be'd"?), but quite unexpectedly it also has no present active participle, the equivalent of English "being." The lack of this basic participle forced Latin into some odd expressions as we'll see later in the course. Actually there was a participle that meant "being" in pre-classical Latin, **sons*, *sontis*, but it survived into the classical age only in a compounded, vowel-gradated form, for example, in *absens*, *absentis* ("absent," that is, "being away") and in *praesens*, *praesentis* ("present," that is, "being right in front, standing before [you]").

Now let's address the use of participles in Latin, which happens considerably more often than in English. Simply put, the Romans used their participles a lot more than we do, both as adjectives and substantives which is to be expected when an adjective's form naturally indicates number and gender. So *dicens* (the present active participle of *dico*) can mean not only "the one speaking" but "the speaker." Likewise, *intellegentes* can mean both "those comprehending" and "smart people," and *moventia*, literally "moving things, things that motivate action," also means "motivations."

Where Latin tends to use participial phrases, English prefers whole clauses, for instance, those beginning with "when, if, although, since, who, which" and so on. To wit, where Latin will have, "The students ignoring their teacher suffered horribly," English prefers "The students who ignored their teacher suffered horribly." Or, where Latin says "The forms having been ignored by the students came back to haunt them," English will say "The forms which had been ignored by the students came back to haunt them."

The result is a rich array of possibilities for translating Latin participles into English. So, for instance, the Latin sentence "Seeing the errors of their ways, those wretched students begged for mercy" can be turned into English as
  • "Since they saw the errors of their ways …,"
  • "When/After they saw …,"
  • "Those students who saw …,"
  • "Those students if they saw …,"
  • or if we invert the sense entirely, "*Although* they saw the errors of their ways, those wretched students did *not* beg for mercy."

These translations raise another important issue concerning Latin participles, one we'll deal with several times in this class, the concept of relative time. Returning to the same sentence we were just using ("Seeing the errors of their ways, …) which can be rendered in English with a clause like "Since they saw…, " note that the present-tense participle "seeing" is represented by the past-tense finite verb "saw" in the clause. That's not a mistake nor even really a change of tense, because "present" participles are not necessarily always happening in present time. "Present" is a misleading and badly chosen name. "Present" participles should be called *contemporaneous* participles because they represent the same time as the main verb. To put it another way, their

time value is +0, which will be present-tense if the main verb is present-tense. For instance, "He is happy (now), seeing you there." That is, he's seeing you right at this moment and because of that he's happy now. Both the main verb and the participle are present-tense. But make the main verb past and it drags the participle into the past: "He was happy (yesterday), seeing you there." In other words, he saw you in the past and that made him happy back then. [Now, who knows? Maybe he's miserable.] So in this sentence, the "seeing" and the "was happy" are both events that took place in the past, meaning a so-called "present" participle denotes in this context a past-tense action.

The same principle holds true for the purported "perfect" participles. "Having" shows *prior* action, that is, action which took place prior to the time of the main verb ─ its time value is -1 ─, and as long as the main verb is present-tense, then the participle represents action that took place one step back in the past. For example, "He is happy now (i.e. in the present), having seen you there yesterday (in the past)." The main verb is +0, the participle is -1, so the participle's action is actually taking place one step back in time from the present (-1). But make the main verb past-tense, and the participle's real time value changes to the pluperfect because now it's showing action prior to the past, i.e. a -1 participle relative to a -1 main verb becomes -2 in real time. For example, "He was happy (yesterday), having seen you the day before." In other words, "He *was* happy after he *had* seen you." To put it another way, a past-tense main verb pushes the real or absolute time value of any participle back one step in time, and that's because participles show relative (not absolute) time, i.e. time relative to the main verb.

Future-tense main verbs do the same, except they move the participle's real time value forward in time. The result is that the so-called "future" participles, the ones that mean "about/going to," show *subsequent* action ─ that is, they have a +1 time value ─ but this participle doesn't cause the same problems the perfect participle does. With future participles the tense of the main verb doesn't matter, since in the periphrastic construction "is going to" the form "is" is changed, not the future participle which will always stay "going to" as long as you translate it that way, which you can. So make your life easy and do that. Thus, the future participle in its periphrastic construction (the one that uses "to be") acts the same way present participles do, meaning there's nothing new to learn here. Going back to our example, the "going to see" doesn't change whether you say "He is happy (he is) going to see you" or "He was happy (he was) going to see you." Only the "is" or "was" changes along with the main verb. Whew! That's complicated. We'll go over the concept of relative time several times, so if you didn't get it right here, no fear! We'll attack it again, and again, and again.

The key point to understand is that the terminology for naming participles is misleading. If I were King of Universe, it's one of the first things I'd change. "Present" participles should be called *contemporaneous* ─ they have a +0 relative-time value ─ which means they don't always show action that's happening now the way present-tense finite verbs do. They show action that's happening at the same time as the main verb, i.e. contemporaneously. Likewise, "perfect" participles have *prior* time value (-1), but that doesn't mean they're always "perfect." Sometimes they're pluperfect, if the main verb is past-tense. Finally, "future" participles show *subsequent* action and because of the way they're used ─ that annoying periphrastic business ─ they follow the same rules as present participles.

An important thing to remember here is that English and Latin participles operate the same way. They both show relative time. So as long as you can translate a Latin participle with an English one — and for the most part in this chapter you'll be able to do that — there's no need to address the issues pertaining to relative time. Problems arise only when converting a participle or the like into a clause, that is, changing a form which shows relative time to one which shows absolute time, and while that's not "absolutely" necessary here, it's a good investment in your Latin future to start wrapping your mind around how to make this sort of tense shift correctly. So let's practice making that change.

Take the following sentence which contains a participle, "Seeing you, he always smiles," and convert the participial phrase "seeing you" into subordinate clause starting with "when," without changing the meaning of the sentence or the time values of the verbs. How would you say it? Well, since both the main verb ("smiles") and the participle ("seeing") are present-tense, there's no relative-versus-absolute time issue here: "When he sees you, he always smiles." But what if the main verb were past-tense: "Seeing you, he always smil*ed*"? What's the correct when-clause equivalent for the participle now? That's right! "When he *saw* you, he always smiled." The participle "seeing" has a time value of +0 and the main verb ("smiled") a time value of -1, making the true or absolute time of the participle -1, so in a when-clause which requires a finite verb it has to be "saw."

Now, what if the *participle* is perfect but the main verb is present: "Having seen you, he always smiles"? Turn the participial phrase "having seen you" into a when-clause. Good! "When(ever) he has seen you, he always smiles (is always smiling?)." The participle "having seen" is -1 which, when combined with "smiles" (+0), equals -1, "has seen."

So what if both the participle and the main verb are past-tense: "Having seen you, he always smiled"? Think about it for a second. When did he do the seeing relative to the smiling? Did the seeing come before the smiling? Yes, so what tense should the verb be in a when-clause that's equivalent to this participle? Good, pluperfect: "When(ever) he *had* seen you, he always smiled (was always smiling)." "Having seen" (-1) + "was smiling" (-1) = "had seen" (-2).

Future-tense main verbs operate the same way with participles that present-tense main verbs do, for instance, with a present participle, "Seeing you, he will always smile" is the equivalent of "When(ever) he *will* see you, he will always smile." [0 + 1 = +1] Or with a past-tense participle, "Having seen you, he will always smile" equals "When(ever) he has seen you, he will always smile/be smiling." [-1 + 1 = +½ ; in Latin grammar math!]

Future participles with any tense of main verb create no issues and can be translated literally. For instance, "(Whenever he is/was) about to see you, he is/was always smiling." Unlike when a perfect participle is attached to a past-tense main verb and becomes pluperfect in absolute time, future + future causes no problems: "(Whenever he is) going to see you, he will always be smiling." In other words, there is no "plu-future"! Thank goodness.

In the end, when the main verb is either present- or future-tense, you don't have to worry about changing the (relative) tense of the participle if you convert it into a clause with a finite verb that shows absolute time, because present- and future-tense main verbs don't change the basic time

frame of a sentence. Participles stay in their proper tense and don't change time value. But past-tense main verbs do cause problems in moving between relative and absolute time. Their -1 time value shifts everything back one step into the past. With a past-tense main verb, present participles happen in the past (-1). Perfect participles happen in the pluperfect (-2).

One more time, let's practice shifting verb forms between relative and absolute time. If you've mastered this change, you can skip ahead in this presentation to the vocabulary. Let's start with this sentence: "Students, (when) studying hard, invariably do well on their tests." Let's convert the relative-time participial phrase "studying hard" into a when-clause with a finite, absolute-time verb. Look at the time value of the participle. It's +0 because "studying" is a present participle. The main verb is present, too, so in this case there's no need to change the tense of the participle when converting it into a finite verb. "When students *study* hard, they invariably do well on their tests."

Next sentence: "Finding the enemy, the soldier went running to the general." Make "Finding the enemy" a when-clause. Here, the main verb is taking place in the past so the participle will have to change tense and become past, too. "When he *found* the enemy, the soldier went running to the general."

Here's another sentence with a participle: "Having been betrayed by them, he will never again trust the Greeks." Turn the participial phrase "Having been betrayed by them" into a since-clause, and be careful not to change the voice please! Ask yourself: future-tense main verb, plus perfect participle, equals … what time value? That's right! Past (-1)! "Since he *was* betrayed by them, he will never again trust the Greeks."

And one more sentence: "Having been betrayed by them, he never again trusted the Greeks." Now we have a past-tense main verb with a perfect participle attached. -1 + -1 = … -2! Pluperfect. "Since he *had* been betrayed by them, he never again trusted the Greeks."

As we noted before, we'll always translate Latin participles with English participles … for the moment. Why? Because we can, but that won't always be true, as we'll soon see. So you're eventually going to have to learn how to jump quickly and correctly between relative- and absolute-time verb forms. If you can master this now, you'll make your life much easier in the future.

Now let's look at the vocabulary in this chapter.

The first word is *aliquis*, *aliquid*, meaning "someone, somebody, something," a pronoun. It's a combination of the base *ali-* ("some/other") and the interrogative pronoun *-quis* ("who"). Adding the first part (*ali-*) changes the pronoun from interrogative to indefinite, from "who?" to "someone," literally "other-who." What would be the genitive singular of this pronoun? That's right: *alicuius*. Remember that *cuius* is the genitive singular of *quis*. And the dative singular? Good for you! *Alicui*. Please make a note, too, that the neuter nominative/accusative plural is *aliqua*, not *aliquae*, because the plural uses the interrogative adjective, not pronoun.

The next word is *iucundus*, *-a*, *-um*, meaning "pleasant, delightful, agreeable, pleasing." It's a 1st/2nd-declension adjective. Oh, that evil Mr. Wheelock! What a word to choose for this vocabulary list! While *iucundus* looks like a future passive participle because it ends *-ndus*, it's not! It's just an adjective, though the *-nd-* affix inside *iucundus* points to the linguistic origin of the future passive participle, a form unique to Latin. This *-nd-* affix originally just created adjectives, as it does in *iucundus* — it didn't carry any tense or voice value — but the Romans at some point decided to assign it a future passive value and thus used it to create their future passive participle. Note also please that *iucundus* expects a dative after it, that is, "pleasing to someone." This is called a "dative with *iucundus* (or with a special adjective)."

The next word is another adjective, *liber*, *libera*, *liberum*, meaning "free." It's first/second declension, and notice that it does not contract. The base is *liber-*.

The next word is *umquam*, meaning "ever," an adverb. As we've noted before, it's the correlative of *numquam*, "never."

Next is *audio*, *-ire*, *-ivi*, *-itum*, meaning "hear, listen to." It's a 4th-conjugation verb.Be careful not to confuse this verb with *audeo*, *-ere*, which means "dare." The "hear" verb is 4th-conjugation; the "dare" verb is 2nd.

The next word is another verb, *cupio*, *-ere*, *-ivi*, *-itum*, meaning "desire, wish, long for." It belongs to the 3rd-*io* conjugation. This verb expects a complementary infinitive, "desire to do something."

And here's another verb: *ostendo*, *-ere*, *ostendi*, *ostentum*, meaning "exhibit, show, display." It's 3rd-conjugation. It's a compound of the prefix *ob*(*s*)- ("out toward"), plus the verb *tendo* ("stretch"). If you "stretch (something) out toward (someone)," you're showing or displaying it. Thus, this verb takes both an accusative DO ("something") and a dative IO ("[to] someone"). Another thing to note about this verb is that the present and perfect bases are the same, which in certain forms can cause confusion. To wit, translate *ostendit*. It's either "he displays" or "he (has) displayed." The same holds true for *ostendimus*: "we display" or "we (have) displayed." Now, translate please *ostendi*. If you take the *ostend-* base here as perfect, it means "I showed, I have shown." But if you interpret it as the present base, *ostendi* translates as "to be shown" (the present passive infinitive).

And next comes another verb: *peto*, *-ere*, *-ivi*, *-itum*, meaning "seek, aim at, beg, beseech"; also, 3rd-conjugation. But note that the third principal part *petivi* is formed as if this verb were 4th, not 3rd. Its sense anticipates both an accusative direct object and a prepositional phrase (*ab*/*ex*/*de* + ablative): you "seek something (acc. DO) from someone (prep. phrase)."How would Latin say "they are seeking"? [That's just the present active 3rd-person plural, so what's the thematic vowel used in that form in third conjugation?] That's right! *-u-*: *petunt*. Now take the "are" out of the English. How would Latin say "(they) seeking"? [That's the present active participle, isn't it, what we just studied in this chapter? What's the marker for the present active participle in Latin? In other words, English "-ing" equals what in Latin? Yes, *-nt-* plus third-declension endings. And "they" connotes nominative plural (let's assume masculine), which means the correct ending is … *-es*. And this verb is 3rd-conjugation. What's the proper thematic vowel? We just studied this.

Correct: *-e-*. So, how does Latin say "(they) seeking"?] *Petentes*. This could also be translated as a substantive, "the seekers."

And here's yet another 3rd-conjugation verb: *premo, -ere, pressi, pressum*, meaning "press (hard)." Note how in the perfect base the *-m-* at the end of the present base *prem-* changes to *-s-* when it runs into the *-s(i)* perfect affix, producing the perfect base *press-*.

The next word, *opprimo, -ere, -pressi, -pressum* is a compound of *premo*, meaning "suppress, overwhelm, overpower, check." Like *premo*, it's a 3rd-conjugation verb. The *ob-* prefix in *opprimo* has a somewhat different sense from the way it's used in *ostendo*. Here, it means "up against," i.e. "press up against." And note the vowel gradation in which the slightly more colorful *premo* becomes the totally lackluster *opprimo*. How would Latin say "you will suppress"? [What conjugation is this verb? That's right: third. And how does third conjugation form its future? Good! With *-e-*. So the answer is …] *opprimes*.

And here comes another verb, in this verbal parade ─ no surprise, I suppose, in a chapter about participles. *Verto, -ere, verti, versum* means "turn, change," yet one more 3rd-conjugation verb. Like *ostendo*, too, its base is the same in the present and the perfect, meaning it's sometimes hard to tell what tense it is. For instance, *vertit*. How is this verb translated? Either "he changes" or "he (has) changed." Early Latin distinguished these forms by reduplicating the perfect, *veverti, but the reduplication was lost by the classical age. The *vert-* base shows up in English as the suffix "-ward," as in "toward" or "homeward," meaning literally "turned to" or "turned in the direction of home."

The last verb in the vocabulary list is *averto, -ere, -verti, -versum*, meaning "turn away, avert." It's a 3rd-conjugation verb. Memorizing this verb should be no problem. It's a combination of *a(b)-* ("away [from]") + *verto* ("turn").

The final three items in this vocabulary are all nouns. The first is *donum, -i*, n., meaning "gift, present." It's 2nd-declension neuter. It uses the same base as the verb *do, dare*, to which has been added an *-n-* affix and 2nd-declension endings. The *-n-* affix is used in Latin to form nouns and adjectives. It means "the result of" and can also be seen in *magnus* ("great"), literally "the result of (-n-) being more (mag-)," or *regnum* ("kingdom"), literally "the result of (-n-) ruling (reg-)." What's the accusative plural of *donum*? Yes, *dona*.

The next-to-last word is *orator, -oris*, m., meaning "orator, speaker." It's a 3rd-declension masculine noun. Remember that any Latin noun which goes *-or, -oris* is 3rd-declension masculine. Literally, it means "begger, pleader." It shares a base with the verb *oro* (1), "beg, plead." What's the genitive plural of *orator*? Good for you! *Oratorum*. It's 3rd-declension but it's not *i*-stem.

The last word is *signum, -i*, n., meaning "sign, signal, indication, seal." It's a 2nd-declension neuter noun. In Roman texts it often refers to a "legionary standard," a piece of military equipment used to keep soldiers in their proper formation before and during battle. Thus, for a Roman army "to raise its standards" meant that it was lining up into maniples, cohorts and legions in preparation for battle.

Wow, that was quite a chapter, wasn't it? Know this. Chapter 23 is one of the longest and most difficult lessons in Wheelock. As the class proceeds, we'll review over and over the concepts and forms introduced here. But for the moment do the rules that were cited at the beginning of this chapter now cast some vague shadow of sense over you? If not, please review this presentation. If so, please proceed to the next slide.

For the next class meeting, please bring in a copy of the worksheet for Chapter 23. Here's a link to that worksheet.

Studete valeteque, O discipuli cari!