CHAPTER 23

Participles

Despite its disarmingly simple title, this chapter contains a lot of material - some of it simple, some of it potentially perplexing - but all of it overwhelming taken together in one heap.
I'm going to break it down into two sections for you.
Don't try to do them both in one sitting, unless you find the first section so easy that you need more.
The sections are (I) Morphology (formation), and (II) Syntax (use) of the participles.

PART I

BASIC CONCEPTS OF LATIN PARTICIPLES

You already know what a participle is; you've been working with one now for a couple of chapters.
A participle is a verbal adjective.
That is, an adjective derived from a stem of a verb.
The participle you're familiar with is the perfect passive participle - the fourth principal part of the verb - which is used in the formation of the perfect system passive.
So let's look at it again, this time with a finer eye for detail.

We call the fourth principal part of a verb a participle because it's a verbal adjective.
Now, because it's an adjective it must agree with whatever noun it's modifying.
That's what adjectives do : modify and agree with nouns.
So to agree with its noun, a participle must be able to decline in some way to get the different numbers, genders, and cases it may need - just as any adjective must.
The fourth principle part, therefore, has the adjectival endings *"-us, -a, -um"* attached to it, and that tells you it declines in the first and second declensions - like *"magnus, -a, -um"* - to get the endings it needs.
So every participle in a sentence will have number, gender and case because it is an adjective and it must be agreeing with something in the sentence of which it is a part.

But a participle is a verbal adjective, so it's going to get some of its character from its verbal ancestry.
What qualities do verbs have?
They have (1) number, (2) person, (3) tense, (4) mood, and (5) voice.
So which of these six will participles retain?

   (1)   Number
         A participle has number, that's true, but it gets its number - singular or plural - from the noun it's modifying. So a participle will have number, but not because it is a verbal derivative, but because it's an adjective.

   (2)   Person
         A participle does not have person - 1st, 2nd, or 3rd.
         You can't say of a participle, this is in the first person.

   (3)   Tense
         A participle will have tense - after a fashion. It will be either present, future, or perfect. The participle you know is the perfect participle.

   (4)   Mood
         A participle is already a mood of a verb.
         There are the indicative, imperative, subjective, infinitive, and participial moods of verbs.
         So to say "participle" is already to designate a certain mood.

   (5)   Voice
         A participle has voice - either active or passive.
         The participle you know is a passive participle; hence it is the perfect passive participle.

So let's summarize all this. Whenever you see a participle in a sentence, you must be prepared to identify its adjectival and verbal components:

ADJECTIVAL   VERBAL

  number   voice
  gender   tense
  case

FORMATION OF LATIN PARTICIPLES

Now for a pleasant surprise : the Latin participial system is not nearly so complicated as the English system. In English, participles are often compounds of verbal stems and auxiliary verbs: "having been seen", "having looked", etc. In Latin, a participle is a one-word show.

You know that the Latin participles have number, gender, and case, all of which it must have because of its adjectival character.
It gets its number, gender, and case in its adjectival endings.
The participle which you already know - the perfect passive participle - is declined in the first and second declensions. This is important to remember : all participles will have number, gender, and case, and they get them by declining. We'll look at this again.

But what about voice and tense? You know only one participle, and it is passive in voice and perfect in tense.
But there are other participles with other tenses and voices.
In Latin there are participles of the present, future, and perfect tenses, and of the active and passive voices. (Only the future tense has participles of both voices. There is an active, but not passive participle of the present tense; there is a passive, but not active participle in the perfect tense.)
Here are the formulae for their formation.

I. FUTURE ACTIVE PARTICIPLE

The future active participle of any verb is formed by adding *"-ur-"* and the adjectival endings *"-us, -a, -um"* to the stem of the fourth principal part of the verb.
For example, the future active participle of *"laudo"* is:

     laudat + ur + us, -a, -um = laudaturus, -a, -um

II. FUTURE PASSIVE PARTICIPLE (THE GERUNDIVE)

The future passive participle (also called the gerundive [jeh RUHN div] for reasons you'll see in a minute) of any verb is formed by adding *"nd"* and the adjectival endings *"-us, -a, -um"* to the lengthened stem of the first principal part of the verb.
Hence for the four conjugations:

1.	*lauda*	+	*nd*	+	*us, -a, -um*	=	*laudandus, -a, -um*
2.	*mone*	+	*nd*	+	*us, -a, -um*	=	*monendus, -a, -um*
3.	*age*	+	*nd*	+	*us, -a, -um*	=	*agendus, -a, -um*
3-i.	*capie*	+	*nd*	+	*us, -a, -um*	=	*capiendus, -a, -um*
4.	*audie*	+	*nd*	+	*us, -a, -um*	=	*audiendus, -a, um*

III. PRESENT ACTIVE PARTICIPLE

The present active participle is formed by adding the third declension adjectival ending "*-ns, -ntis"* to the lengthened stem of the first principal part.
This adjectival ending is the same ending you saw in the adjective *"potens, potentis".*
(We'll consider the declension a little later.) So the present active participle of the four conjugations look like this:

1.	*lauda*	+	*ns, -ntis*	=	*laudans, laudantis*
2.	*mone*	+	*ns, -ntis*	=	*monens, monentis*
3.	*age*	+	*ns, -ntis*	=	*agens, agentis*
3-i.	*capie*	+	*ns, -ntis*	=	*capiens, capientis*
4.	*audie*	+	*ns, -ntis*	=	*audiens, audientis*

IV. PERFECT PASSIVE PARTICIPLE

The perfect passive participle is given to you as the fourth principal part of the verb in the dictionary with the adjectival endings *"-us, -a, -um"*.
The only refinement you should make to your knowledge is that the true fourth principal part of a verb is what is left after you drop off the adjectival endings.
The true fourth principal part of *"laudo"*, for example, is *"laudat-"*, not *"laudatus, -a, -um"*.
"Laudatus, -a, -um" is the perfect passive participle; *"laudat-"* is the true stem of the fourth principal part.

So let's go back to the empty table of participles and insert these formulae:

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	4th p.p. + *ur* + *us, a, um*	lst p.p. + *nd* + *us, a, um*
PRESENT	1st p.p. + *ns, -ntis*	---------------
PERFECT	-------------	4th p.p. + *us, a, um*

SOME PRACTICE WITH PARTICIPLE MORPHOLOGY

Write out the complete participial system of the following verbs:

1. *duco, ducere, duxi, ductus -a, -um*

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	_____	_____
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		_____

2. *mitto, mittere, misi, missus -a, -um*

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	_____	_____
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		_____

3. *cupio, cupere, cupivi, cupitus -a, -um*

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	_____	_____
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		_____

4. *amo, amare, amavi, amatus -a, -um*

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	_____	_____
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		_____

5. *lego, legere, legi, lectus -a, -um*

	ACTIVE	PASSIVE
FUTURE	_____	_____
PRESENT	_____	
PERFECT		_____

TRANSLATING THE PARTICIPLES : THE BASICS

Now let's think about the meaning of these participles. We'll first look at their barest, literal translations. They make really awful sounding English and, I hope, you'll soon discard them, but by learning these rudimentary translations first, you'll be certain to understand the grammar the participles involve.

I. THE FUTURE ACTIVE PARTICIPLE

Obviously, the future active participle tells you that the modified noun is about to undertake some action sometime time in the future ("future active").
But this construction has no convenient parallel in English.
To translate this in English we used what is called a "periphrasitic" (peh ri FRAS tik) construction.
The root of this term is "periphrase" and that's precisely what we have to do to translate the future active participle - we have to find a periphrase for it, some way of approximating the meaning it would have had for the Roman ear. We "talk around it". The standard periphrases for the future active participle is "about to 'x'" or "going to 'x'", where "x" is the meaning of the verb.
For example, for the participle *"laudaturus"* we would say "about to (or going to) praise"; for *"facturus"* we would say "about to (or going to) do".

II. THE FUTURE PASSIVE PARTICIPLE

This participle, too, has to be brought into English with a periphrase.
Since both future participles make use of periphrastic constructions, the translation for the future active participle is often called the "1st periphrastic"; the future passive participle is called the "2nd periphrastic".
The periphrase of the future passive participle might be something like this "about to be 'x'ed", or "going to be 'x'ed", where "x" is the meaning of the verb.
For example, *"ducendus"* might be translated "about to be (or going to be) led".

But the future passive participle in Latin usually has a special sense attached to it you can't foresee simply by examining the grammar of its constituent parts.
The future passive participle very often implies a sense of obligation or necessity that the action be performed.
We can get a feel for it in our construction "to be 'x'ed" with a conjugated form of the verb "to be".
Like this:
         "This book is <u>to be put on the shelf</u>".
         "This point is not <u>to be ignored</u>".

The underlined portions would be represented in Latin with the future passive participle.
The next chapter will straighten all this out.

For now, just remember that the future passive participle involves a special meaning that has to be treated separately.

III. THE PRESENT ACTIVE PARTICIPLE

The key to the translation is "present and active". This tells you that the noun which the participle is modifying is currently engaged in an action. That is, the noun is the agent of an action, and the action is currently underway. The Latin present active participle can be translated directly into our English present active participle, which is formed from the first principal part of the verb plus the participial suffix "-ing"; egg., "walking", "running", "seeing", etc.

IV. THE PERFECT PASSIVE PARTICIPLE

Once again, with this participle the translation is spelled out in its title.
The perfect passive participle tells you that the noun which the participle is modifying underwent ("passive") an action that is viewed as having been completed ("perfect").
The surest way to get this over into English is with the rather clumsy auxiliary construction "having been" plus the third principal part of the English verb; e.g. "having been seen", "having been taken", "having been helped".

For some good practice identifying and translating the participles, look the Self-Help Tutorials in Wheelock, exercises 1-3.
You really shouldn't go any further in this lesson until you feel comfortable about the morphology and basic translations of the participles.

VERBS WITH DEFECTIVE FOURTH PRINCIPAL PARTS

You have already seen many verbs whose fourth principal part is a little odd looking, or which have no fourth principal part listed in the dictionary at all.
Verbs which do not have a perfect passive participle as its fourth principal part are called "defective" verbs.
But often defective verbs will nevertheless have a future active participle.
Now, this may seem to be an impossibility, because the future active participle is a derivative of the fourth principal part of the verb, right?
For example, you get *"laudaturus"* by using the perfect passive participle *"laudat-"* plus *"-ur"* plus "the adjectival ending *"-us, -a, -um"*.
So if a verb has no fourth principal part, how can you put together a future active participle?
Look again.
The fourth principal part is the perfect passive participle, and there are many verbs which have no possible passive voice.
Verbs which are intransitive cannot be made passive, so, logically, they'll have no perfect passive participle.
But the future active participle is a possible form for intransitive verbs.
In this case, the dictionary will list the future active participle as the fourth principal part :

fugio	fugere	fugi	fugiturus
sum	esse	fui	futurus
careo	carere	carui	cariturus
valeo	valere	valui	valiturus

PART II: THE SYNTAX OF THE PARTICIPLES

Latin is fond of its participles; it uses them much more often and with many more shades of meaning than English. For this reason, it is critically important that you not rush to grab hold of one-to-one equivalent translations from Latin to English. First you must force yourself to understand the "meaning" of the Latin construction, and only then look for an English translation which will faithfully reproduce the "meaning" of the Latin. It's in cases like this where basic language instruction truly approaches the realm of the liberal arts. You must understand the meaning of the Latin before you reproduce it in English.

TENSE OF THE PARTICIPLES

This feature of the Latin participle may be the most difficult for students to comprehend.
You know that participles have three different "tenses" : the present, the future, and the perfect.
The present participle indicates an action that is on-going; the future, an action that is going to happen; and the perfect an action that has been completed.
But a Latin participle only shows time relative to the tense of the main verb of the sentence.
Participles only indicate whether an action
   (a) is going on at the same time as the action of the main verb - the present participle;
   (b) will occur after the action of the main verb - the future participle;
   (c) was already completed before the action of the main verb - the perfect participle.

To keep things simple, we refer to these temporal relationships as
   (a) time contemporaneous : the present participle
   (b) time subsequent : the future participles
   (c) time prior : the perfect participle

Therefore, the participle *"ductus"* does not mean that the action happened in the absolute past, but that it happened before the action of the main verb.
If the main verb is in the future tense, then the action of *"ductus"* might not have happened yet in absolute time.
Similarly, the participle *"ducens"* does not mean that the action is going on in the real present, but that the action is going on at the same time as the main verb.
Therefore, if the main verb is a past tense, the action of *"ducens"* may have already been complete by the time the sentence is uttered.
And so also for the future participle.
The future participle indicates that, relative to the time of the main verb, the action in the participle has yet to take place.
"Ducturus", therefore, may represent an action that by the time of the real present has already been completed, if the main verb of the sentence was a past tense.
This may be too much to absorb at once, but the tenses of English participles work the same way.
So let's forget the Latin for a moment and look at some English examples.

   1.   The students, about to go home for break, are excited.
   2.   The students, going home for break, are excited.
   3.   The students, having gone home for break, are excited.

The main verb of each of these sentences is "are" - that is, a present tense.
The students "are" now excited - that is, at the time the speaker utters his thought.
Now let's look at the participial constructions.

In sentence #1, the students have not yet gone home, when they are excited.
That is, they are excited now, and then they are going to go home. (There's no doubt it's the prospect of going home that makes them excited.)
The participle is therefore indicating an action that will take place after the time of the main verb.

In sentence #2, the students are excited and are going home at the same time; consequently the present participle is used, because the action it indicates is contemporaneous with that of the main verb.

In sentence #3, the students are now excited - that's the absolute time - but before that they had gone home.
Therefore the perfect participle is used, since it shows time prior to that of the main verb.
They went home and now they are excited.

Now let's shift the whole time frame by using "were" instead of "are" for the main verb of the sentence.
Remember, it is the tense of the main verb that sets the absolute time of the sentence.

1. The students, about to go home for break, were excited.
2. The students, going home for break, were excited.
3. The students, having gone home for break, were excited.

Read each of these sentences carefully.
Even though the main action now has a different meaning for the speaker and his audience - he's talking about an event that was a fact - the temporal relationship of the participles to that event does not change.
The participial construction in sentence #1 is still talking about something that is subsequent to the time of the main verb; the one in sentence #2 is still talking about an action contemporaneous with the time of the main verb; and the one in sentence #3 is talking about an action prior to the time of the main verb.

Now let's see how this looks in Latin. Translate these sentences into literal English.

1. Puellae, cursurae, matrem vident.   _____

2. Puellae, currentes, matrem vident.   _____

3. Puellae, vocatae, matrem vident.   _____

Now translate these into English - notice the change of the tense of the main verb.

1. Puellae, cursurae, matrem viderunt.   _____

2. Puellae, currentes, matrem viderunt.   _____

3. Puellae, vocatae, matrem viderunt.   _____

TRANSLATING LATIN PARTICIPLES AS CLAUSES

In many ways, English is a very precise language, especially when it comes to spelling out the relationship a subordinate clause has to the main clause of a sentence. Consider these complex sentences.

a. When the sailors were seen by Polyphemus, they were frightened.
b. Because the sailors were seen by Polyphemus, they were frightened.
c. Since the sailors were seen by Polyphemus, they were frightened.
d. The sailors who were seen by Polyphemus were frightened.
e. The sailors, who were seen by Polyphemus, were frightened.
f. The sailors, although they were seen by Polyphemus, were frightened.

Each of these five sentences is doing the same thing syntactically : each is subordinating one thought to another.
The main clause - the main thought - is that the sailors were frightened.
Subordinate to the main thought is the thought that the sailors were seen by Polyphemus - the one-eyed monster.

So syntactically, these sentences are constructed the same way.

But look at the different ways this subordination is realized and look at the different ways the relationship between the two thoughts is being expressed.
In sentence (a), the relationship is strictly temporal - they were seen, then they were frightened.
And it's very possible that they were seen and frightened at the same time for some length of time.
Like this :

```
          they were seen ---------------
          they were frightened -----------
```

In sentence (b), by contrast, the relationship is expressly causal - being seen made them fear.
Hence the subordinating conjunction "because" is used to tell you explicitly that the action in the subordinate clause caused the action in main clause.

Now look at (c).
Does the subordinating conjunction "since" express a chronological or causal relationship?
The truth is, it can be indicating both!
Let's look at the subordinating conjunction "since" more closely.
In these examples, "since" is used temporally.

(1)   Since your children were such monsters at the party, Sticky the Clown is charging double his normal fee.
(2)   Since you called yesterday, I've been busy cleaning the house.

(1) shows "since" in its causal sense; (2) shows it in the chronological sense.
But often you can't tell in which way you ought to understand a "since" in a sentence, and often it has to be taken in both senses at the same time.
In sentence (c) above, clearly, it has to be understood in both senses, because both are accurate descriptions of what happened.
The sailors were seen and then they were frightened (they weren't frightened until after they were seen); but just as well, the sailors were frightened because they were seen. It's maddening, sometimes.
Look at these examples where "since" could expressing a causal, temporal, or both a causal and temporal subordination.

(i)   Since the town of Hootersville had grown so much, no one could book a room at the Shady Rest Hotel.
(ii)   Since you came yesterday, our peaceful home has been reduced to near anarchy.

Now let's have a look at the sentences "d" and "e" from above.
As you can see, the same subordination is present. The main idea is still that the sailors were terrified, and the fact that they were seen by Polyphemus is attached to it.
In these sentences, however, this latter idea is put into a relative clause - "who were seen by Polyphemus". That is, it is presented simply as additional information about something in the main clause, as an adjectival clause.

Do you know the difference in meaning between "d" and "e"?
It's quite subtle but very real. *(Look at the commas !)*
Read the sentences out loud and ask yourself this : "Is the relative clause picking a group of sailors from among other sailors"? That is to say, are there several sailors around, but only those who were seen by Polyphemus were frightened?
Or is no such distinction or restriction implied?

Suppose this is what happened : There's a ship in a narrow bay, surrounded by land on the north, south, and east. There are two hundred men on the deck, one hundred looking north, one hundred looking south. Suddenly Polyphemus appears on a hill to the north. The sailors looking to the north, obviously, see him, and because they are seen by him too, they are frightened. But those looking south do not see him, and they are not frightened. Okay, that's the situation, and you want to sum it up. Only some of the

sailors were seen by him and only they were frightened. You could say this "The sailors who were seen by Polyphemus were frightened", and the meaning of the relative clause is that only those seen by Polyphemus were frightened, but the others, who were not seen, were not frightened. We call this a "restrictive" relative clause, because it "restricts" the main clause to a group defined by the relative clause. In written English, a restrictive relative clause is not marked off with commas.

So what about the "non-restrictive" relative clause, which is marked off with commas?
Just undo what the "restrictive" relative clause does.
The non-restrictive relative clause does not limit the main clause to a group specified by the relative clause. It simply gives you more information about something in the main clause.
Suppose that all the sailors on the ship saw and were seen by Polyphemus and they were all frightened.
You would say, "The sailors - who, by the way, were seen by Polyphemus - were frightened".
Study these examples.
1.   The books which are on the table are not worth reading.
      (I'm talking about only the books on the table to distinguish them from some other books which may be in the room.)
2.   The books, which are on the table, are not worth reading.
      (There may be others which aren't worth reading, but here are some and they're on the table.)

Now what about translating the Latin participle?
As I said a the beginning of this section, English likes to nail down the precise logical and temporal relationships between subordinate and main clauses in its sentences. It accomplishes this with a wide array of subordinating conjugations.
Latin, however, isn't so fussy about stating these relationships precisely.
All the sentences "a" through "e" could be represented by one Latin sentence :

> *Nautae, visi ab Polyphemo, territi sunt.*

The participial phrase "*visi ab Polyphemo*" could be translated into English different ways.

The sailors	having been seen by Polyphemus	were terrified.
	who were seen by Polyphemus	
	because they were seen by Polyphemus	
	since they were seen by Polyphemus	
	after they were seen by Polyphemus	
	when they were seen by Polyphemus	
	although they were seen by Polyphemus	

This is the moral : a way to bring a Latin participle is into English is to "promote" it from a single word to a full subordinate clause, one that mixes well with the context.
Try your hand at some of the examples in Wheelock's Self-Help Tutorials, and use a variety of subordinating English constructions.
Watch the tenses of the main verb and the "relative tense" of the participles.

THE PARTICIPLE AS A NOUN

There isn't really anything shocking about this. You've seen adjectives used as nouns before. You simply noted the number and the gender, and then plugged an appropriate pronoun.
The participle, since it's an adjective, can do the same thing. The trick is to find a good way to bring the verbal part of the participle out.
A simple solution, for starters, is to "promote" it to a relative clause which captures the meaning, tense, and voice of the verbal root of the participle.

opprimens   "he/she/it who oppresses" or "the oppressor"
opprimentes   "they who oppress" or "the oppressors"
oppressus   "he who was oppressed"

oppressi	"they who were oppressed" or "the oppressed"
oppressuri	"those who are going to oppress"

THE ACTIVE PARTICIPLE TAKING OBJECTS

We mustn't ever forget that the participle is a verbal adjective, and it always retains its verbal character. The verb *"laudo"* takes a direct object to complete its sense when it's being used in the active voice.

> *"Romani duces bonos laudaverunt"*. (The Romans praised the good leaders.)

Similarly, when the participle derived from it is in the active voice, it also can take a direct object.

> *"Romani duces bonos laudantes virtutem amaverunt"*.
> (The Romans, who praised good leaders, loved virtue.)

Study the following examples of participles taking objects. A very common word-order for participles taking direct objects is to put the direct object between the noun and the participle which agrees with it. Watch for that arrangement. Wheelock (page 306) has a number of excellent little exercises on translating participles.

VOCABULARY PUZZLES

Aliquis, aliquid   This pronoun means "somebody", something", "some people", some things".
It has two parts : the *"ali-"* and the *"quis, quid"* part.
It is very easy to decline this pronoun because it follows the pattern set by the interrogative pronoun *"quis, quid"*. The one difference is the nominative and accusative plurals, which are *"aliqua"* and not the expected "aliquae".

aliquis	*aliquid*
alicuius	*alicuius*
alicui	*alicui*
aliquem	*aliquid*
aliquo	*aliquo*

aliqui	*aliquae*	*aliqua*
aliquorum	*aliquarum*	*aliquorum*
aliquibus	*aliquibus*	*aliquibus*
aliquos	*aliquas*	*aliqua*
aliquibus	*aliquibus*	*aliquibus*

Chapter 23

1. The girls, about to run, see their mother.

2. The girls, running, see their mother.

3. The girls, having been called, see their mother.

1. The girls, about to run, saw their mother.

2. The girls, running, saw their mother.

3. The girls, having been called, saw their mother.

01/08/93