

Chapter 37: *Eo* (“go”) and Time/Place Constructions

Chapter 37 covers the following: the formation of the irregular verb *eo* (“go”); and constructions for place and time in Latin. 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 this chapter: (1) The base of *eo* (“go”) is *i-* or *e-*. (2) The ablative case shows “place from which” and “point in time.” (3) The accusative case shows “place to which” and “duration of time.” (4) The locative case shows “place at which” and is used mainly with “points on the map,” that is, cities and small islands.

The irregular Latin verb *eo, ire, ivi* (or *ii*), *itum* means “go.” In many languages, probably most of them, the basic verb that signals motion or “going” is irregular. For instance, the past tense of English “go” is “went,” a form borrowed from a different verb “wend,” which you may have heard in the old phrase “wend your way home,” meaning “take a path,” often a leisurely and circuitous one. So, English “go” and “went” are part of a composite conjugation. Latin *eo* is not. Even though the base varies — it’s mostly *i-* but sometimes *e-* — those are just alternative forms of the same root, not different verbs glued together. What’s at issue in *eo* is that this is another athematic verb. Many of its forms have no thematic vowel which means the base runs directly into the endings and that can cause problems in pronunciation. But actually with *eo*, there aren’t that many problems because the base which is a vowel (*-i/e-*) accords quite nicely with the personal endings and tense markers, most of which begin with consonants. All the same, having no thematic vowel grated on the Roman ear and, when we join Latin during the Classical Age, the Romans were in the process of regularizing *eo* by adding in thematic vowels, to wit, in the third-person plural present form *eunt* (“they go”), the *-u-* (cf. *agunt*) has been added in even though it serves no purpose phonologically or grammatically. It just looked more regular to the Romans that way. Thus, trying to squeeze *eo* into a conjugation is pointless, since conjugations are determined by their thematic vowel. If anything, *eo* shows strong affinities with third and fourth, but some of its forms look first or second. Categorically, it’s a mutt.

But if its formation is messy, its expectation is simple. There isn’t one: no direct or indirect objects with *eo*. You can’t “go” something or for something. Okay, yes, you can in English. You can say “He went crazy or went for it.” But neither “crazy” nor “for it” in those English idioms is an object. The “crazy” in “go crazy” is a predicate adjective, so “go” is a linking verb there. It’s another way of saying “become,” an English idiom. *Eo* doesn’t work that way in Latin, so don’t worry about that. And “for it” in “go for it” isn’t an indirect object but a construction showing motion towards, meaning “head in that direction.” The Romans could say that but not with the dative case. In Latin or any language, what typically follows a verb of motion like “go” is a “motion construction,” something like “place to or from which.” We’ll talk about those in a moment. The gist of all of this here is, if you’re asked for the expectation of a form of *eo*, say “nothing.” Yes, there are things that follow *eo* but they’re not objects as such, nothing that depends on the verb itself the way an accusative direct object depends on a transitive verb. Okay, fine, if it rankles you to say there’s nothing after *eo*, when in fact there is often something after it, and you really want to cite some sort of expectation for this verb, then go ahead and put “plus place to or from which,” but be sure you know that if there happens to be an accusative after *eo*,

it indicates “place to which.” That accusative is not a direct object. You don’t “go the movies” (direct object); you “go to them” (place to which).

Here’s a chart showing the present system of *eo*. In the indicative the *i*- base dominates most of the forms. It shows up in the infinitive *ire*, too, which means the imperfect subjunctive will have an *i*-: *irem*, *ires*, *iret*, and so on. The imperatives *i* and *ite* also use the *i*- base, as does the present participle *iens* — in its nominative singular at least. The base changes to *e*- when it comes in front of any vowel except *-e* — Latin doesn’t like having two *e*’s in a row — thus, *eo* and *eunt* (“I go,” “they go”) in the present indicative. The *e*- appears also in the present subjunctive (*eam*, *eas*, *eat*, etc.), and in the participle after the nominative singular *iens*, where it becomes *euntis*, *eunti*, ... As we just noted, what conjugation to assign *eo* to is unclear. Most of the forms resemble third or fourth more than first or second, except the future — *ibo*, *ibis*, *ibit*, and so on — which looks first or second. In the end, trying to pound this round verb into any square conjugation is a fool’s errand. There are too many irregularities and not enough forms to make a clear pattern, which is good. There isn’t that much to learn, so go learn it! The perfect of *eo* presents no such challenges. It’s all but completely regular. Take the base *i*- or *iv*- and add endings, for instance, *iit* or *ivit* (“he came”) or *ierant* (“they had come”). There’s only with one problem here. When the double *i*’s appear in front of *-s-*, they tend to conflate into one *i*-, producing *isti* (“you went”) and *isse* (“to have gone”). Minor anomaly.

What’s much more important is how productive *eo* is in creating compounds. Think about it! “Go” naturally attracts directional affixes — “go forth, from, in, out, under, over, toward, closer.” [No, that’s too close! Back! Go back!] Three of these compounds are in the vocabulary — they’re asterisked below — so for example: **abeo*, “go away, depart”; **redeo*, “go back, return” *prodeo*, “go forward, advance” [Take note of the *-d-* that keeps the vowel at the end of *pro-* and *re-* from melting into the *-e-* at the start of *eo* and turning into something incomprehensible like **proeo* or **reo*.] Here’s another compound of *eo*, a very popular one: *adeo*, “go to, approach”; also, *praeo*, “go before, precede...” [— *praeo*’s okay but **proeo* isn’t? Fine. How about...—] *coeo*, “go (or come) together, assemble”; *subeo*, “go under, undergo”; **pereo*, literally, “go thoroughly,” meaning “go all the way, die” — think English “pass on, pass away”; we’ll talk about this more in the vocabulary — and finally, *intereo*, literally, “go between,” that is, “go between life and death, die.” Enough going!

Let’s end the grammar of this chapter by looking at how Latin expresses constructions describing motion or location: “to, at, from” and the like. This may come as a bit of a surprise to you, perhaps even a shock, but there’s a whole case we haven’t talked about yet. Yes, a case! You thought Latin had six. Nope, bad news. There’s seven. Indo-European had, like, ten, so show a little gratitude to Rome here. “Here”! Yeah, that’s the case, the locative. It’s used to show the place of an event, its location. Locative? Location? That shouldn’t be too hard to learn. English prepositions like “in, at” are the closest equivalent to the Latin locative and should be used to translate it. Here’s the good news. You’re not going to have to learn any new case endings here, not even one single one for the locative, not in all five declensions, singular or plural. Locative endings look like other endings. Why? The Romans didn’t use the locative that much, only with special types of nouns, so it couldn’t support a lot of irregularity. In fact, during the classical age they were in the process of getting rid of the locative altogether and constructing new ways of expressing location or place where, using prepositions mostly. So Wheelock’s not playing some

horrible trick on you by holding off a whole case until you're almost done with Latin grammar. He's right not to introduce the locative before now, since it's very predictable and rarely used, almost never with anything but place names, and at that, not all place names, only "points on the map," i.e. towns or villages, not countries or provinces or even districts, just cities and islands, small islands, Capri, for instance — a tiny island off the coast of Naples — not big islands like Sicily. So the locative of Rome is *Romae* ("at Rome"). *Athenis* is the locative of Athens: "in Athens."

Because there are no new endings used to create the locative, you just have to learn which endings certain nouns use to form their locative. If a noun is first- or second-declension singular, its locative will look like its genitive singular, for instance, *Romae* ("at/in Rome") — *Roma* is first-declension — or *Corinthi* ("at/in Corinth") which comes from *Corinthus*, *-i* (second declension). Corinth is a city in central Greece. If a noun it belongs to any other category like third declension or if it's plural, its locative looks like its ablative, for example, *Carthagine* ("in Carthage") from *Carthago*, *Carthaginis* (third-declension), or *Athenis* ("at Athens") from *Athenae*, *Athenarum*, which is first-declension but plural. And because "home" also qualifies as a "point on the map," the Latin word for "house, home" *domus*, a singular noun of the second declension — well, it's second-declension sometimes! Let's talk about that in a moment! — has a locative *domi* ("at home"), a form that looks like the genitive. Learn *domi* ("at home"). You see it a lot in Latin.

All in all, this means there's a new piece of grammar I can ask you. I can underline a locative form and ask "What case and why?" If so, answer "Locative, place where." There's no other answer for "locative." But, of course, being in a place is not the only way to describe your location. You can go to or from it. What case do you think Latin uses to show motion toward? What case regularly receives action, like the action of any verb? The accusative, of course, and that's exactly how Latin shows "place to which," that is, the destination where someone's going. And just like with the locative, if that place is a "point on the map," no preposition is necessary, for instance, *Romam* ("to Rome") or *Athenas* ("to Athens"). If it's a country you're going to, however, use *ad* or *in*, as in *ad Italiam* ("to Italy"), *in Asiam* ("into Asia"). Conversely, if someone's going away from somewhere, what case do you think Latin will use? That's right! The ablative, and again with no preposition if the "place from which" is a point on the map, *Romā*, for instance, ("from Rome") or *Athenis* ("from Athens"). But, same as before, if the place is bigger than a point on the map, use a preposition like *ab*, *ex* or *de*, as in *ex Italiā* ("out of Italy"), *ab Asiā* ("away from Asia"). These same rules also apply to the noun *domus* ("home"): *domum* means "[to] home" — note that English can leave the "to" out, too: "I went home" means "I went to home" — or *domo* ("from home"), neither "to" nor "from" requiring a preposition in Latin. So, a Roman went *domum* ("[to] home"), stayed a few hours *domi* ("at home") and later departed *domo* ("from home").

The final nugget of grammar in this chapter concerns time constructions, that is, how to say when or for how long something happened. You'll remember from *ubi*, which means both "when" and "where," that the Romans conflated time and place more easily and more often than we do. After all, if you want to meet people somewhere, you need to know both the place and the time they'll be there. So it's only natural that "*Ubi est convivium?*" should mean "Both where and when is the party?" Thus, time and place constructions were really part and parcel of one

larger construct in the Roman mind. It will come as no surprise either, then, that the grammatical constructions look a lot like each other in Latin. Much as the locative does in space, the ablative shows “point in time.” Remember that quite a few locative forms are identical with their ablative counterparts. So, just as the locative shows the place where you are, the ablative shows where you are chronologically. I hope this isn’t news. We studied the ablative of time way back in Chapter 15, where you learned that the English prepositions which best convey the same sense as the ablative of time are “in, within, on, at.” So, for instance, *tempore illo* means “at that time.” Conversely — and in some respects its opposite — the accusative shows “duration of time,” to which the closest preposition equivalents in English are “for, during,” for example, *horam unam*, “for/during one hour.” And that’s it! We’re done with the grammar in this chapter.

Now let’s explore the vocabulary, the first word of which is *Athenae, Athenarum*, f., meaning “Athens (the city in Greece).” It’s a first-declension plural noun. That’s right! It’s plural. No one can ever stop at just one “Athen.” We today have many examples of cities with plural names. Can you think of any? How about Fairbanks? Grand Rapids? Twin Falls? And if you translate names from Spanish (a language I prefer to call “Modern Latin”) Los Angeles (“The Angels”)? Buenos Aires (“Good Airs”)? There are many more examples. The next word is important. It’s used a lot.

Domus, domūs (or *domi*), f., meaning “house, home.” It’s fourth- (or occasionally second-) declension feminine. When a noun jumps back and forth between two different declensional systems, it’s called “heteroclite,” meaning “declining (-clite) in two different ways (hetero-),” in this case, fourth and second declension, both of which begin with a nominative singular ending -*us*, so it’s easy to see how a word can slip back and forth between them. But that doesn’t mean the forms are evenly divided. *Domus* is way more fourth than second, and because of that there are a number of mandatory long marks, indeed three *domūs*’s as one would expect to see in fourth declension: the genitive singular, the nominative plural and the accusative plural. Second declension’s contribution is limited to three alternative forms: both the genitives (*domi, domorum*) and the ablative singular (*domo*). The two remaining forms — the nominative singular (*domus*) and the accusative singular (*domum*) — can be categorized as either fourth or second. So if it weren’t for the three second-declension forms, *domus* could be classified as entirely, happily fourth. Problem is: the locative (“at home”) is always *domi*, never *domūs*, and the ablative of place from which (“from home”) is always *domo*, never *domu*. *Domu* and *domūs* are employed with other ablative and genitive usages. So it’s really the place constructions that are keeping the second-declension forms of *domus* alive. Get rid of them and you get rid of “heteroclite,” which is exactly what later Italians did. Good for them. In Indo-European languages the base underlying this word can show up as *dem-*, *dom-* or just *dm-*. It’s given us, for instance, Latin-based derivatives like “dome, domicile, domestic, dominate,” all having to do with house or forcing the wilderness out of something so it’s safe to keep it in your house. That “forcing” sense shows up strong in the Greek word *despotēs* (“master [-*potēs*] of the house [*des-*]”) from which we get our word “despot.” But what happened to Indo-European /*d*/ as it evolved in English? Remember Grimm’s Law? It changed to /*t*/. Thus, in our world, **dm* became **tm*, giving us words like ...think about animals. Add a vowel. If animals live in your house and don’t bite you, they’re ... tame. And what about wood? What if you bring wood inside your house? What is it then? Try a different vowel: **tum-*, **tem-*, **tim-*, ... **Tim-*! Try **tim*! Tim ...ber! Timber’s literally “house-wood.” It’s a wild tree that’s been “tamed” and taken inside a house.

Next word: *frater, fratris*, m., meaning “brother.” It’s a third-declension masculine noun. Note that the base contracts (*fratr-*), and it’s not *i*-stem. So what’s the genitive plural? Yes, *fratrum*. *Manus fratrum*, “a band of brothers.”

The next word is *Roma, Romae*, f., meaning ... guess! It’s first-declension feminine.

Following that is an adjective, *gratus, -a, -um*, meaning “pleasing, agreeable, grateful.” It’s first/second-declension. From its meaning it expects a dative after it, “pleasing (to ...),” a “dative with certain adjectives.”

The next word is an adverb, *deinde*, meaning “thereupon, next, then.” It never changes form. Isn’t that lovely?

And here’s a word you already know, *ut*, but being used in a new sense, “when, since, as.” It takes on that sense when the verb inside its clause is indicative. Yep, that’s right. *Ut* can take the indicative, not just the subjunctive. That’s not so lovely, huh? This point of syntax really shouldn’t be sequestered in the vocabulary. It’s a major element of Latin grammar and is seen not infrequently. So if I underline an indicative verb inside an *ut*-clause and ask you what mood and why, you should say “indicative, in an *ut* clause meaning ‘when, since, as’.” For instance, *Vēnit ut me videbat*, meaning “He came when he saw me,” the implication being that he did actually see me. It’s a fact, as least as far as the speaker is concerned, so the indicative is the appropriate mood to use. Conversely, *Vēnit ut me videret* is a purpose clause meaning “He came in order to see me.” The subjunctive here reflects the uncertainty lurking behind any purpose clause, since it’s always possible the intention expressed in the purpose clause was not fulfilled. “He came in order to see me” doesn’t mean he did see me, only that he wanted to. In sum, with the subjunctive I’m not saying what I’m saying is a fact. With the indicative, I am! That’s why *ut* can have these two very different senses.

Now let’s go on to “go,” *eo, ire, ii (ivi), itum*. Latin attests two perfect active bases, *i-* and *iv-*, which appear to have been interchangeable. And as we noted above, *eo*’s an irregular verb, a blend of athematic, third- (or fourth-) and first/second-conjugation forms, which in the end you just have to memorize. You’ll find the same is true of the verb for “go” in almost every language, certainly all the ones I’m familiar with. Remember the reason for this is that the more often a word is used, the more likely it is to be irregular and, take my word for it, “go” is used a lot. The perfect passive participle *itum* is supplied here mainly to show you how to form the future active participle *iturum* which Latin needs when it says “will, would” in indirect statement. Sentences like “I said I would go” are common expressions in Latin or any language. There is, of course, no true passive of *eo*. Let us “be go-ed”? Count me out.

Next on this vocabulary list is a compound of *eo*: *abeo, abire, abii, abitum*, meaning “go away, depart.” It’s *ab-* (“from”) plus *eo* (“go”), so memorizing this one shouldn’t pose any problems. Note Latin doesn’t use *eo*’s alternative perfect active form *ivi* with this compound. *Abeo*’s perfect is always *abii*.

And after “departure” naturally comes “death”: *pereo, perire, perii* (or *perivi* — this one does use both alternative perfect forms), *peritum*, meaning “pass away, be destroyed, perish, die.” The *per-* prefix here means “thoroughly,” so “to go thoroughly” connoted to the Romans to die,” in much the same way we say “pass on, pass away.”

And here’s another compound of *eo*: *redeo, redire, redii* (or *redivi* — this one also uses both alternatives in the perfect), *reditum*, meaning “go back, return.”

The next word is another verb, *interficio, interficere, interfeci, interfectum*, meaning “kill, murder.” It’s third-*io*. Literally, it means “make (*-ficio*) between (*inter-*),” with the sense “create a division,” in this case, between life and death. So to *interficere* someone was to separate that person from the living, in which case he *intereo*’d.

Here’s another verb, *licet, licere, licuit*, meaning “it is permitted, one may.” It’s second-conjugation. This is an important verb of a type we haven’t dealt with much but which is a big part of Latin. *Licet* is an impersonal verb, meaning its subject is always “it” so it’s always third-person singular and active. But while it remains constant in person, number and voice, it can and often does change tense and mood. And please be aware that it has infinitives and participle forms too. So what does *licebit* mean? “It will be permitted.” [Don’t try putting “one may” in the future. When changing tenses with this verb, stick to “be permitted.”] And what does *licens, licentis* mean? [That’s the present participle, isn’t it? Latin *-nt-* equals what in English? “-ing”! So how do you translate *licens*?] “(Being) permitted,” that is, “free” as in “Being permitted (or Free) to leave, he fled the country.” The base underlying *licet* also produced our Latin derivative “licence,” which is just another word for “freedom, nothing left to lose.” *Licet* expects two constructions after it. One, a dative plus an infinitive, for instance, *licet ei redire*, meaning “it is permitted for him to return,” or “he may return.” The other is a subjunctive verb. It can have an *ut* preceding it but it doesn’t have to, e.g. *licet (ut) redeat*. The meaning is the same whether you use a subjunctive or a dative plus infinitive, but there is a difference worth noting in the grammar of the subjunctive clauses. Without the *ut*, the construction is essentially paratactic, literally “It is permitted. Let him return.” With the *ut*, it’s syntactic, creating a clause that, you should note, follows sequence of tenses.

The next word is another verb, *soleo, solere, solitus (sum)*, meaning “be accustomed.” It’s a second-conjugation semi-deponent verb, meaning in the present-tense system it’s regular, but its perfect forms are deponent. Like *audeo, audere, ausus (sum)*, it has no true passive in any tense. So it has half the forms of a regular verb if that’s any consolation. Its meaning “be accustomed” naturally expects a complementary infinitive — you’re “accustomed to do something” — but translating it that way can prove cumbersome. The Romans used this verb where we are more accustomed to saying “usually,” so “usually” can be another way of translating *soleo* if you’re careful always to make the Latin complementary infinitive an English finite form. So, for example, *hīc venire solebat*, meaning literally “he was accustomed to come here,” can also be rendered “he usually came here.”

And the last word on this vocabulary list is *Syracusae, Syracusarum, f.*, meaning “Syracuse,” a major port city in southeastern Sicily. It’s a first-declension feminine noun, that’s always plural, another of those plural place names like White Sands or Los Alamos.

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 37 on page 180 of Wheelock's text.

To end this lesson let's review motion constructions by taking a short tour of the Roman Empire, starting in Rome, of course. How does Latin say "in Rome"? [Remember the rule for the locative. If a word is first- or second-declension and singular, the locative looks like what case? The genitive. So what's the genitive (and thus locative also) of *Roma*?] *Romae*.

Now let's head out of Rome? How does Latin say "from Rome"? [What case is used to show motion away from? The ablative. And does *Roma* use a preposition to show "place from which"? No, this is a city, a "point on the map," so no preposition. What's the ablative of *Roma*?] *Romā*.

And now that we've left Rome, let's go to Athens. How would Latin say "to Athens"? [What case is used to show motion towards? The accusative. And will Latin use a preposition here? No, not with a "point on the map." Remember: it's plural! So?] *Athenas*.

And now we're "in Athens." What's that in Latin? [*Athenae* is plural so the locative looks like what case? The ablative. And what's the ablative of *Athenae*?] *Athenis*.

But it's time to go. Departing "from Athens," how does Latin say that? [Preposition? No. So?] *Athenis*. It looks exactly like the locative. Context will tell whether "at" or "from" makes better sense.

Heading now "to Syracuse," what would that be in Latin? [Another plural name, isn't it?] *Syracusas*.

"In Syracuse"? [Plural, so the locative will look like ... the genitive or the ablative. Which one? The ablative. So?] *Syracusis*.

"From Syracuse"? That will be *Syracusis*, too.

"To Carthage" then? [*Carthago*, *Carthaginiis*, so it's third-declension. What case indicates "toward"? The accusative. What's the accusative singular ending in third? *-em*. So?] *Carthaginem*.

"In Carthage"? [Is the locative equal to the genitive or the ablative here? The ablative. *Carthago* is not first- or second-declension. So what's its ablative singular?] *Carthagine*.

"From Carthage"? [You figure it out.] That's right. *Carthagine* again, just like the locative in form. Again, context will clarify which is meant.

And back "to Rome — Rome, sweet home!" [Go ahead. Get yourself back there on your own.] Yes, *Romam*, *dulcem domum!*"

And now that we're back "in Italy," how does Latin say that? "In Italy"? [Can you use the locative with big places, not "points on the map." No. So "in Italy" you'll have to use a preposition. So?] *In Italiā*.

And that's the end of our tour.

Mihi placet ut domum salvi redieritis, O Romani!