Chapter 36: Indirect Command

Chapter 36 covers the following: the formation and use of indirect command, what Wheelock calls "jussive noun clauses;" the formation and use of fearing clauses; and the formation and expectation of the irregular verb *fio*. At the end of the lesson we'll review the vocabulary which you should memorize in this chapter.

There are three important rules to remember in this chapter: (1) The formula for indirect command is a verb of commanding, urging, warning, or the like, plus *ut*/*ne*, plus a subjunctive verb. (2) *Ut* introduces a negative fearing clause; *ne* introduces a positive one. (3) *Fio* ("be made, become") functions as the passive of *facio*. It expects a predicate noun or adjective, or an *ut* clause.

Indirect Command is the third and last of the constructions we'll study which are part of indirect discourse, the restatement of words that were said (indirect statement), asked (indirect question), or now ordered (indirect command). These three constructions reflect the fact that sentences fall into three basic types: statements, questions and commands. The term Wheelock uses, "jussive noun clauses," is not incorrect. A "noun clause" is a clause taking the place of a noun, which is what the clause we're about to study is, and "jussive" means "having to do with a command," so a "jussive noun clause" is a clause that takes the place of the direct object of a verb meaning "command," but "jussive noun clause" seems out of place when we've called both its sister constructions "indirect" something or other. Consistency argues for "indirect command."

As Wheelock points out, indirect command is identical in formation to a purpose clause: *ut* or *ne*, plus a subjunctive verb, but instead of depending on a verb of motion in the main sentence, or something that an explanation of intention can be attached to, indirect commands have verbs of ordering, commanding, urging, persuading, warning, and basically anything where someone's telling someone what to do. And just like purpose clauses, indirect commands follow sequence of tenses.

Here's an example of an indirect command in Latin: *Imperavit ut veniremus*, meaning literally "He commanded that (*ut*) we come (*veniremus*, subjunctive)." Note the English "come" here. It should be "came," shouldn't it? The commanding is, after all, happening in the past. "Come" is, in fact, the fossil footprint of the English subjunctive. I wonder when the flow of time will wash even that faint trace away. Or as the Roman poet Horace said, *Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume* …! Note also that "that" is not natural English. Far more natural and idiomatic would be "He commanded us to come." While the "that" clause is not out of line, the accusative and infinitive is way smoother.

Here's another example of a Latin indirect command: *Hortemur eos ne veniant*, meaning literally "Let us urge them that they not come" or " … not to come." The latter sounds better, don't you think? Here's a third example: *Quis consulem monuit ut fugeret*? "Who warned the consul that he (should) flee?" … or "… to flee" in more English-sounding English. Note the tenses of the subjunctive in these examples. These clauses follow sequence of tenses. In the first example, *hortemur* is present. That's primary sequence. Thus, a subjunctive verb showing contemporaneous action will have to be present as well: *veniant*. In the second example,

monuit's perfect, secondary sequence, so *fugeret* needs to be imperfect to show contemporaneous action.

Here's a catch that really has nothing to do with indirect command itself ─ there are no catches in indirect command, it's totally straightforward! ─ but a catch attached to the verbs that are often used to introduce it, several of which expect objects or phrases you need to be aware of. *Impero* and *persuadeo*, for instance, take dative objects as we studied in the previous chapter. So if you want to say in Latin "I order or persuade you to do something ─ in Latin, the indirect command would read literally "that you do something" ─ you have to remember that "order" and "persuade" are really "give an order (to …)" or "make thoroughly sweet (to …)." The "you" in the example above, the person you're ordering or persuading, will have to be dative in Latin.

Conversely, a verb like *peto* or *quaero* ─ they both mean "seek" ─ calls for a prepositional phrase using *ab* ("from"). Naturally, you seek "from" people that they do something. But most verbs that expect indirect commands, like most verbs in Latin, take accusative direct objects, even when they're deponent. Thus, *hortor* ("urge"), *moneo* ("warn"), *oro* ("beg"), and *rogo* ("ask") ─ that's right! even *rogo* when it adopts the sense "I'm asking you to do it" ─ are often followed by indirect command. The upshot is you have to memorize what each verb introducing indirect command expects after it. It's a matter of Latin idiom.

Before leaving indirect command, let's take a moment to review all three indirect discourse constructions: indirect statement, indirect question and indirect command. The different ways that English and Latin form these "indirects" is notable and can help you remember them. Indirect statement in English uses "that" plus a finite verb, as in "I trust that you are excelling." Indirect question in English uses a question word plus a finite verb, as in "I asked why you excelled." English is most comfortable using an accusative and infinitive in indirect command, like "I command you to excel." Now look at the Latin counterparts. Indirect statement in Latin uses an accusative plus an infinitive, for instance, *Credo te praestare*, meaning "I trust you to excel." Indirect question in Latin requires a question word and a finite verb in the subjunctive, as in *Rogavi cur praestares*, "I asked why you excelled." And indirect command has *ut* (or *ne*) plus the subjunctive: *Impero ut praestes*, "I command that you excel."

The differences and similarities are telling. Indirect question in Latin and English is formed essentially the same way ─ question word plus finite verb ─ only Latin uses the subjunctive because it has a subjunctive. Indirect command in English prefers an accusative plus an infinitive ("you order someone to do something"), which is identical to the way Latin forms indirect statement ("you trust someone to do something"), very different from English indirect statement which uses a subordinating conjunction "that" followed by a finite verb, the same way Latin forms indirect command. Get it? Latin and English just reverse that-clauses and accusative-infinitive constructions. In other words, we like to use "that" with indirect statement; the Romans preferred "that" for indirect command. Conversely, we save our accusative-infinitive for indirect command which they deployed with indirect statement. It's just a matter of flip-flopping idioms. We trust *that*; they trust *to*. We order *to*; they order *that*. The details and ramifications of that are a nuisance, but in the big picture it's not much of a difference. If we'd learned indirect command and indirect statement at the same time in the same chapter ─ okay, yes, your head would have exploded ─ but I could also have said, "Just treat indirect statement like indirect command, and

command like statement, and that's all there is to it!" How simple it might have seemed. I guess "simple" is not the right word here, but it is simple. Moving on.

There's another type of subordinate clause, a fearing clause, we need to address before stamping you Latin-grammar proficient. Wheelock doesn't include fearing clauses in the main part of his text ─ they're discussed in the Supplementary Syntax at the back of the book (page 378) ─ but it's a construction you need to know, super-simple: verb (or word) of fearing in the main sentence ─ like "I'm scared" or "the fear" or "so trepidaciously" ─ plus *ne* or *ut*, plus a subjunctive verb. That's it, with one catch. *Ne* introduces a positive fearing clause, such as "I'm afraid that (*ne*) you will come too late." *Ut* begins a negative one, as in "I'm afraid that (*ut*) you will not(!) come on time."

Let's look at a few examples. First, a positive fearing clause: *Timeo ne hostes veniant*, meaning "I fear that the enemy is coming (or will come)." *Ne* means "that." Now, a negative one: *Timui ut exercitus veniret*. "I feared that the army was not coming (or would not come)." *Ut* means "that … not." *Ut* and *ne* are backwards in fearing clauses. That's really the only unexpected thing you'll see here. But do note a minor difference here between English and Latin. Look at how we use "will, would, might, may" in fearing clauses. Nothing equivalent to "will, would" is even possible in Latin which has no future subjunctive as such. When translating fearing clauses, then, you often have to import an English modal ─ something like "will" or "would" ─ whatever seems best to you in that particular context. Note also that fearing clauses in Latin follow sequence of tenses. A present-tense main verb like *timeo* is primary sequence, requiring a present-tense subjunctive like *veniant* to show contemporaneous action. Similarly, a past-tense main verb like *timui*, since it's secondary sequence, calls for an imperfect subjunctive like *veniret* for the same. Exactly zero excitement there.

The only thing really exciting in all of this is the history lying behind fearing clauses, in particular, why *ut* and *ne* are reversed. Here's the reason. Originally, the main sentence and the fearing clause were two separate statements, each with their own independent grammar. The first, what will become the main sentence in a fearing clause, expressed fear, such as "I'm afraid." Period. What would later become the actual fearing clause was originally a full sentence of its own, explaining the reason for the fear: "Let him come!" In other words, "I want him to come! [I'm really scared!] How much I hope that he will come!" *Ut* can mean "that" in that way, especially in early Latin where it was often paired with a jussive subjunctive: literally, "How (*Ut*) let him come!," meaning "How I wish that he would come!" Grammarians call these two different ways of expressing a thought (1) parataxis (literally, "side-by-side arrangement") where an idea is stated as two independent sentences, and (2) syntax (or syntaxis, literally "arrangement together, coordinated arrangement"), the same idea but one thought is the main sentence and the other's a subordinate clause. It's the same difference as direct and indirect statement: "I said, "I am here" (parataxis, two separate sentences with separate grammar) versus "I said that I am here" (syntaxis, a sentence with a clause inside it). As a rule, parataxis usually predates syntaxis, the simpler preceding the more complex.

So originally in Latin before syntaxis had fully developed, a positive fearing clause would have been paratactic: *Timeo. Ne veniat!* literally, "I'm afraid. Don't let him come." That is, my fear is that he's going to come and do whatever terrible things I'm afraid he'll do. But as Latin

developed, it combined the two constructions and began expressing them syntactically: *Timeo ne veniat,* which still meant the same thing: "I'm afraid that he's going to come." But this left *ne,* meaning somewhat illogically "that," not "that … not."

Negative fearing clauses in Latin suffered the same when syntaxis dawned, only the opposite. Paratactically, early Latin said, "*Timeo. Ut veniat!*" that is, "I'm afraid. Let him come!" In other words, "How (I hope) that he might come." His absence, not his presence, is what scares me. But later, as the Romans embraced syntax, that became "*Timeo ut veniat*," still meaning the same thing: "I'm afraid that he will not come." So much for linguistics, and fearing clauses. Please be aware that Wheelock's not going to include this construction in his sentences so this is pretty much all the introduction and practice you'll have before you see fearing clauses on tests. Some exercises I provide will include them, but you're not going to get as much of a workout with fearing clauses as you usually do with new syntax. So be sure you read Wheelock's discussion of fearing clauses on page 378. Remember: nothing here is complicated. The only real challenge is the *ut-ne* inversion. You have nothing to fear but "that" … *ne*.

The final part of the grammar in this chapter centers on another irregular verb, *fio,* which functions as the passive of *facio* in its present tenses. A verb that ends in *-o* but is passive in sense? What? *-o* is an active ending; *-or* is its passive counterpart. What's up with this? Some sort of reverse deponent? Wow, that's annoying. Fortunately, however you choose to describe *fio*, it's the only verb of its kind in all of Latin. We can count that as a minor mercy, I suppose. *Fio*'s major purpose is to serve as the passive of *facio* in the present system, but only the present system, and only *facio*! No other verb, not even any of the many compounds *facio* forms, like *conficio,* which is also some welcome news. So, if *fio*'s the passive of *facio*, it must mean "be made, be done." *Fit,* for instance, its present third-person singular, must mean "it is made, it is done." Besides that passive sense, *fit* also connoted to Romans "it becomes, it happens," which only makes sense. If a thing is done, it's happened. It's come into being.

And as we noted above, *fio* exists only in the present system. That is, it has only present, imperfect and future forms: "is done, was (being) done, will be done." Beyond the present system, there is no *fio*. *Factus* takes over in the perfect passive and *factus* (*sum, es, est*, …) is used to convey its perfect senses: "having been made or done." This includes the future passive participle (the gerundive) *faciendus* meaning "to be made or done." And I know you're all wondering so I'll answer your question right now. It's true, *fio* and *facio* look a lot alike but they're not related linguistically, making the whole *fio-facio* verb-wreck a composite conjugation like *fero* or *volo*.

Here's a chart with all the present-system forms of *fio* you need to know. The present indicative is *fio, fis, fit*; *fimus, fitis, fiunt*, meaning "I am made/become, you are made, he is made," and so on. Put a star next to *fit*. It's used a lot in Latin, in the sense "it happens." The imperfect is all but completely predictable: *fiebam, fiebas, fiebat*; *fiebamus, fiebatis, fiebant* ("I was becoming, you were becoming, etc.). Note the *-ie-* thematic vowel, as if *fio* were third-*io* or fourth, and if you assume that, the future *is* completely predictable: *fiam, fies, fiet*; *fiemus, fietis, fient*. I'm pretty sure I don't need to translate these for you. Let's move on.

The present subjunctive is *fiam, fias,* and so on. And if the infinitive is *fieri*, then the imperfect subjunctive will be *fierem, fieres,* and the like. The imperatives are *fi*! and *fite*! They are attested in Latin, but seriously I can't remember the last time I saw either. You should learn them, but you should also know you won't ever see them from me. And finally the participles *factus* and *faciendus* are both borrowed from *facio*, making *fio* technically part of a composite conjugation. As a matter of record, there is no present participle. In other words, no Roman author says **fiens* or whatever it would be. The less the merrier, huh?

Let's end the grammar introduced in this chapter by looking at the expectation of *fio*. It apparently grated on the Roman ear to have active endings like *-o, -s, -t* take a passive agent like *ab* plus the ablative, in the same way, I guess, it rubs us the wrong way to hear something like "it becomes by you." Whatever the reason, only rarely do we find passive agents with *fio*, at least not in the present system. *Fio*'s perfect forms, like *factum est* which is really *facio*'s perfect passive, can indeed take an agent but only when it means "it was made or done," not when it means "it became" or "it happened." Those last two meanings call for different constructions as we'll see in a second. So, for instance, in *arbitrati sumus ab istis factum esse*, meaning "We thought it had been done by them," *ab istis* ("by them") is a passive agent with the perfect infinitive of *fio*. If, however, you decide to make your life easy and call *factum esse* the perfect passive infinitive of *facio*, I will not slap your hand. Consider that future "more vivid."

Instead of an agent, *fio* ─ and this is also true of *factus* sometimes ─ has two different expectations depending on its sense in a sentence. When it means "become," it acts as a linking verb and thus naturally expects a predicate, for example, *divitiores fimus*, meaning "we are becoming richer," or in the perfect, *divites facti sumus*, "we have become rich." "Rich, richer" are nominative here because they're predicates, predicated by *fio* in its linking sense. When a Roman used *fio* in its other major meaning "happen," it was usually followed by *ut* plus the subjunctive and had the sense "it happens or happened that …" as in, *fiebat ut veniret*, meaning "it happened that he came," or in the perfect *factum est ut veniret* (which has the same meaning). Like most *ut* clauses that take the subjunctive, this one follows sequence of tenses. And that's it! The end of the grammar for this chapter.

Now let's look at the vocabulary. First word, *timor, timoris*, m., meaning "fear." It's a third-declension, masculine noun (not *i*-stem! not even close!). How would Latin say "with fear"? [What kind of ablative is this? What does it show? How something happened. It's adverbial. Which use of the ablative is adverbial? The ablative of manner. Does the ablative of manner use a preposition? Yes, *cum*, when its object doesn't have an adjective. So?] *Cum timore*.

The next word is *levis, leve*, meaning "light, slight, easy, trivial," a third-declension adjective so it has to be *i*-stem. If it's *i*-stem, what's its genitive plural? Good for you, *levium*.

Next up, *accedo, accedere, accessi, accessum*, meaning "come, come to, approach," a third-conjugation verb. It's a compound verb. The prefix *ad-* ("to") has been added to *cedo* ("go"). The object of this verb is really the object of the prefix *ad-* ─ *cedo* in its "go" sense can't take an object ─ so what case will the object of *ad* be? That's right. Dative, a dative with a compound verb. Or you can repeat the *ad* in a prepositional phrase which will have an accusative object, of course. How would Latin say, "We are commanding (use *impero*) them (use *is, ea, id*) to

approach us"? "… them to approach us"? What's that construction? It's introduced by the verb "command" so it must be … an indirect command. How is indirect command formed in Latin? *Ut* or *ne* plus the subjunctive. And don't forget what case *impero* takes as its object. It's one of those ten special verbs that expects … the dative. So what's the answer? *Eis imperamus ut nobis* ─ dative with a compound verb, or you can repeat the *ad* and say: *ad nos* ─ *accedant*.

Next is another third-conjugation verb, *cogo, cogere, coegi, coactum*, meaning "drive together, bring together, force, compel," a compound of *con-* (here, *co-*; "together") and *ago* ("drive"). And note the perfect forms of the compound (*coegi, coactum*) follow the pattern of its base verb: (*ago, agere,*) *egi, actum*. Sometimes *cogo* has an accusative noun and a complementary infinitive after it. When it does, it takes on the sense "force," as in "force someone (accusative) to act (complementary infinitive)." Other times it's followed by an *ut* clause with a subjunctive verb, in this case, meaning literally "force (someone, accusative) that (*ut*) they act (subjunctively)." The accusative "someone" is not necessarily always stated, but it is always understood. How would Latin say "we will be forced"? [What conjugation? Third. And how is the future formed in third? With an *-e-*. So?] Yes, *cogemur*.

Next is another verb, *curo* (1), meaning "care for, attend to, take care." Take care! This verb does not mean "cure." Remember its close comrade *cura, curae*, the noun meaning "care." We learned that back in, what, Chapter 4. What's the Latin word for "cure"? We studied that one in Chapter 26! It's *remedium*. More *cura* from you means more *remedium* for me! *Curo* often is followed by an indirect command, and if so, it assumes the sense "take care," so how would Latin say, "Take care (singular) not to become too evil!"? [How is indirect command formed in Latin? *Ut* or *ne* plus the subjunctive. Will you use *ut* or *ne* here? *Ne*. It's a negative indirect command. And how do you add the sense "too" to an adjective in Latin? Make it comparative. The comparative of what word here? *Malus*. What's the comparative of *malus*? *Peior*. So the answer is … *Cura ne peior fias*! [Listen! Latin's trying to tell you something.]

Next up is another verb. This one is deponent, *fateor, fateri, fassus* (*sum*), meaning "confess, admit." It's second-conjugation. As a "verb of the head," it naturally kicks off indirect statement or indirect question, as in "confess that, confess why …" And the *fa-* base, meaning "speak," underlying this verb you should recognize from other words we've learned that employ the same root: *fatum* and *fama*.

Next is *fio, fieri, factus* (*sum*), the verb we just discussed above. It means "be made, be done, become, come about, happen, take place." The majority of its forms suggests Romans thought of it as third-*io* or fourth conjugation ─ *fio, fiebam, fiam* and *fies* (the future) ─ but its infinitive *fieri* hints they were thinking second, a minor anomaly compared to *fio*'s real oddities: its reverse-deponent quality (active acting as passive) and its composite-conjugation nature seen in its perfect participle *factus* and its gerundive *faciendus*. All in all, this is a verb you just have to memorize.

And here's another verb, *hortor, hortari, hortatus* (*sum*), meaning "encourage, urge." It's a first-conjugation deponent. Look for indirect command after *hortor*. "Urge" and "that" are a natural fit. What do you think the English derivative of this word "to exhort" means? That's right: "to

urge." And what about "hortatory"? It means … "urging, encouraging." "Jussive" from *iubeo* as virtually the same sense.

And the last word on this vocabulary list is *oro* (1), meaning "speak, plead, beg, beseech, entreat," a word with a fascinating history. During the classical age *oro* began to fall out of fashion, despite the fact its abstract noun *oratio* ("speech, oration") was still being widely used. But the Romans of the first century BCE preferred *peto* or *rogo* or *precor* when they wanted to say "seek, beg, plead." In later antiquity, however, *oro* started being used again by Christians in the sense "pray," because the other Latin words for "pray" like *precor* reeked of pagan religion, something Christianity very much opposed. So, needing a different word for what they did when they got down on their knees before God, the Christians revived the dying *oro* and gave it new life as their word for "pray." To them, its "begging" sense was a good way to describe the posture their new belief system demanded of worshippers. So in that light, how would Latin say "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and in the hour of our death!" [Use *pro* plus the ablative for "for."] "*Sancta Maria, Mater Dei, ora pro nobis peccatoribus nunc et in horā mortis nostrae*!" Wow, I love Church Latin. It's so straightforward.

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 class meeting, please bring in a copy of the P&R sentences for Chapter 36 on pages 174-175 of Wheelock's text.

And for a different view of time and death in Latin, and some somewhat more sumptuous syntax, here's the first four lines of an ode by Horace: *Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume, labuntur anni; nec pietas moram rugis et instanti senectae afferet, indomitaeque morti.* "Alas, the passing years go by, Postumus, Postumus, my friend; nor will faith put the brakes on wrinkles and age pressing down, or on death, death the unvanquished."