**Overview of Select Grammatical Terms and Constructions;  Figures of Speech**[1]

1) Anacoluthon
2) Anaphora
3) Anastrophe
4) The Aorist Aspect
5) Aspect
6) Asyndeton
7) Attributive Use of Adjectives
8) Chiasmus
9) Circumstantial Participle
10) Conditional Sentences
11) Consecutive/Result Clauses
12) Dative

13) Final/Purpose Clauses
14) Future Tenses
15) Hendiadys
16) Hypallage / Transferred Epithet
17) Hyperbaton
18) Indirect Questions
19) Jussive Noun Clauses / Indirect Commands
20) Limiting Accusative
21) Metonymy
22) Paraprosdokian

23) Parataxis
24) Predicative Use of Nouns/Adjectives
25) Prolative Infinitive
26) Prolepsis ("Anticipation")
27) *Quom* (*Cum*)
28) Relative Clause of Characteristic
29) Sequence of Tenses
30) Substantive
31) Synecdoche

Sources:

Gildersleeve, B.L., and G. Lodge. *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*. London and New York, 1895. [**G&L**, cited by section]

Greenough, J.B., J.H. Allen, et al. *Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar*. Mineola, 2006. [**A&G**, cited by section]

*Oxford Latin Dictionary*  [OLD]

Woodcock, E.C. *A New Latin Syntax*. London, 1959.  [**Woodcock**, cited by section]


**1)  Anacoluthon  [A&G 640]**

A syntactic interruption or deviation: an abrupt change in a sentence, from one construction to another which is grammatically inconsistent with the first. This can involve a dramatic shift, as a sentence breaks off and adopts a different course, or a change in perspective or the like that leads to a grammatical or logical inconsistency:

"I warned him that if he continues to drink, what will become of him?"


**2)  Anaphora  (A&G 641)**

The repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of successive phrases, clauses or lines:

"We shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills."

(Others apply this term to cover a broader range of repetition.)


**3)  Anastrophe  (A&G 640)**

Figure of speech in which a regular preposition is placed following the noun that it governs: e.g., *quo ab*  for  *ab quo*.

---

[1] The definitions and examples provided here make no pretense to originality and often draw upon standard discussions available on the Internet and elsewhere or (in the case of Latin constructions) discussions in the standard Latin grammars. For a more detailed, exhaustive, and authoritative account, see R.U. Smith, *A Glossary of Terms in Grammar, Rhetoric, and Prosody for Readers of Greek and Latin: A Vade Mecum* (Mundelein, 2011).

(The above represents a very limited application of this figure, which is sometimes employed to indicate a more fundamental dislocation of traditional word order. The latter is more appropriately referred to as *hyperbaton.)

**4)** **The Aorist Aspect**

[see under "Aspect"]

**5)** **Aspect**

The Latin verbal system mingles two distinct elements: <u>tense</u> and <u>aspect</u>:

- strictly speaking, <u>tense</u> indicates only the time at which a specific action is imagined as occurring:

    - at the <u>same time</u> as that at which the sentence is being spoken or written: the **present**

    - at some time <u>prior</u> to that at which the sentence is being spoken or written: the **past**

    - at some <u>future time</u>, yet to occur, relative to that at which the sentence is being spoken or written: the **future**

- <u>aspect</u>, on the other hand, concerns how the action is imagined as occurring:

    - **progressive aspect**:[2] presents the action as <u>on-going</u> or in some way <u>incomplete</u>   [a moving picture: "I am talking to you!"   "I am living the dream!"   "I kept pulling on the handle."]

    - **aoristic/aorist aspect**: presents the action as a <u>bare fact</u> or as <u>occurring in the blink of an eye</u>, with no concern, in the former instance, for the time the action might have taken or its duration   [a snapshot: "I make model airplanes."   "She studied at Oxford."   "He collapsed."]

    - **perfect aspect**: presents an action that was <u>completed at some point in the past but is viewed from the standpoint of the present</u>, often with the sense of some <u>enduring result</u>   ["I have read the book (and can now answer your question)."   "I have drunk too much beer (and cannot drive)."   "I have decided what is to be done."   "You have stepped over the line, buster!"]

In theory, then, there should be nine distinct sets of forms for each Latin verb in the indicative, accounting for every possible combination of tense and aspect. In practice, however, there are not. Instead, some forms are made to do double duty to make up for the loss of the aorist in CL.

The chart below employs active forms of the verb *dormio* to indicate the way the system works in actual practice.

---

[2] Often referred to, rather unfortunately, as the imperfective aspect.

**Tense and Aspect in the Roman Verbal System**

*Tense*

| Aspect | Present | Future | Past |
|---|---|---|---|
| Progressive | *dormio*<br>"I am sleeping" | *dormiam*<br>"I will be sleeping" | *dormiebam*<br>"I was sleeping" |
| Aorist | [*dormio*]<br>"I sleep" | [*dormiam*]<br>"I will sleep" | [*dormivi*]<br>"I slept" |
| Perfect | *dormivi*<br>"I have slept" | *dormivero*<br>"I will have slept" | *dormiveram*<br>"I had slept" |

Note: forms in square brackets are being employed artificially to present a combination
of tense + aspect for which no distinct form exists in CL

When we refer to "the present tense," "the future tense," or "the perfect tense," we are alluding to forms that are each employed to present two distinct combinations of tense + aspect.

The "present tense" can be used to indicate the present tense of either the progressive or the aorist aspect.

The "future tense" can be used to indicate the future tense of either the progressive or the aorist aspect.

More confusing, the "perfect tense" can be used to indicate either the present tense of the perfect aspect (the "true" perfect), or the past tense of the aorist aspect (its more common function).

On the other hand, the past tense of the progressive and perfect aspects each receive a specific designation of their own: the imperfect and pluperfect tenses. In the same fashion, the future tense of the perfect aspect is also given its own designation: the future perfect tense.

6) **Asyndeton** **[A&G 640; G&L 474 n., 483 n., 492 n.]**

Figure of speech wherein a conjunction is omitted. The omitted conjunction can be copulative, adversative, disjunctive, consecutive (result) or epexegetic (presenting an explanation).

"She eats, sleeps, drinks Latin grammar."

"Hate the sin, love the sinner."

… *dives pauper, clarus obscurus sit* …   ("… whether he be rich or poor, celebrated or unknown …")

*ausculta ergo, scies.*     ("Just listen and you will know.")

*bene hercle facitis, a me initis gratiam.*     ("Excellent work! You have won my thanks.")

7) **Attributive Use of Adjectives** **[A&G 287]**

An attributive adj. presents an attribute of the noun that, from a grammatical point of view, is simply assumed to be true. For example: the statement, "The purple cow ate the grass," merely specifies which cow did the eating, taking it for granted that a cow can be purple. An attributive adj. qualifies its noun directly, without the intervention of a vb. or ptcple. (expressed or implied):

*vir bonus*  a good man          *multae puellae*  many girls

Contrast below regarding the *predicative use of nouns and adjs.

**8) Chiasmus   [A&G 641]**

The structuring of related or parallel words, phrases, or ideas in an ABBA pattern:

   ***desertos**que videre <u>locos</u> <u>litus</u>que **relictum***          [*Aen*. 2.28:  adj.$^1$ — noun$^1$ — noun$^2$ — adj.$^2$]

   ***expletus** <u>dapibus</u> <u>vino</u>que **sepultus***          [*Aen*. 3.630]

   "Who **dotes**, yet <u>doubts</u>; <u>suspects</u>, yet **strongly loves**."


**9) Circumstantial Participle   [A&G 496, Woodcock 88-93, 95-96]**

*Predicative use of a ptcple. to introduce the equivalent of a subordinate clause.

True ptcples. are employed as *attributive adjs. much more rarely in Latin than in Engl. (Woodcock 97-99): e.g., *draco dormiens* would typically be translated, "a dragon that is sleeping/while it is sleeping," <u>not</u> "a sleeping dragon." The main exceptions involve ptcples. that have become common adjs. — *iratus, sapiens*, etc.

Circumstantial ptcples. are commonly translated in a temporal, concessive, or causal sense ("when/while/after," "although," "because/since"); more rarely with conditional or relative force ("if," "who"):

|  |  |
|---|---|
| *haec <u>minatus</u>, abiit*. | <u>After</u> he had made these threats, he departed. |
|  | <u>Although</u> he had made these threats, he departed. |
|  | <u>Because</u> he had made these threats, he departed. |
| *haec <u>dicens</u>, Marcus stultus est*. | <u>If</u> he says this, Marcus is a fool. |
| *servum haec <u>locutum</u> verberaverunt*. | They beat the slave <u>who</u> had said this. |


**10) Conditional Sentences  [A&G 511-25, Woodcock 191-200]**

A conditional sentence presents a hypothesis (the "if" clause) and then considers what results/conclusions would follow if that hypothesis were true (the main clause). In the grammars, the "if" clause or hypothesis is called the <u>protasis</u>, and the main clause (the "then" clause) the <u>apodosis</u>.

In CL, conditions are broken down according to their degree of likelihood and their temporal reference:

 Vivid (employing the indicative)

 a. Future Vivid:  "If you (in fact) do this (at some future time), you will (in fact) be a fool."
   *si hoc facies, stultus eris*.
   [Note that where Engl. employs a generalizing pres. indicative in the protasis, CL employs a *fut. indicative.]

 b. Present Vivid: "If you (in fact) are (now) doing this, you are (in fact) a fool."
   *si hoc facis, stultus es*.

 c. Past Vivid: "If you (in fact) did/used to do this (in the past), you were (in fact) a fool."
   *si hoc fecisti/faciebas, stultus fuisti/eras*.

 Less Vivid (employing the subjunctive)

 a. Future Less-vivid (present subjunctive in both protasis and apodosis)
   "If you should ever do this (and there is no certainty that you will), you would be a fool."

*si hoc facias, stultus sis.*

    b.   Present Contrary-to-fact  (imperfect subjunctive in both protasis and apodosis)
        "If you were in fact (now) doing this (and we both know that you are not), you would be a fool."
        *si hoc faceres, stultus esses.*

    c.   Past Contrary-to-fact  (pluperfect subjunctive in both protasis and apodosis)
        "If you had in fact done this (in the past — and we both know that you did not), you would have been
           be a fool."
        *si hoc fecisses, stultus fuisses.*

In CL, this simple scheme admits of all sorts of variation:

    • there are numerous examples of mixed conditions — e.g.:

        "If you had done this, we would now be in trouble."
        [past contrary-to-fact protasis with present contrary-to-fact apodosis]

    • in special contexts, the impf. subjunctive can be employed to present a past contrary-to-fact condition

In Plautus, however, this scheme is going to be employed much more loosely. In particular:

    • the pres. subjunctive will often be employed to express a present contrary-to-fact condition

    • the impf. subjunctive will often be employed to express a past contrary-to-fact condition


**11)**  **Consecutive/Result Clauses**  **[A&G 536-38, Woodcock 160-68]**

A consecutive clause indicates something that follows (*consequor*) or results from the action indicated in the main
    clause:

    "She ran so fast <u>that she fell down</u>."

In Latin, as in Engl., the consecutive clause is regularly signaled by the presence of a demonstrative (correlative)
    adj./adv. in the main clause: *tantus, talis, tam, ita, sic, adeo,* etc. (Note the use of "so" in the Engl. example
    above.)

A positive result is introduced by *ut* + the subjunctive, a negative result by <u>*ut non*</u>.

The latter is a bit remarkable: normally one expects *non* to be employed with the indicative, in clauses that deal in
    the realm of fact, while *ne* is regularly employed with the subjunctive to indicate an action that is possible,
    contingent, urged, wished for, etc.

This points to the oddity of the Latin consecutive clause. Grammatically, such clauses should indicate something
    that is contingent or expected, as in the Engl. "they were foolish enough <u>to do this</u> (i.e., that they <u>would do this</u>)."
    For the most part, however, the Latin consecutive clause deals with an actual, not an expected, result. The use of
    *ut non* reflects this fact.

Thus:

    *tam acriter pugnavit ut occideretur.*  =  "He fought so fiercely that he (actually) was killed,"

<u>*not*</u>

    "He fought so fiercely as to be killed / that you might expect that he would be killed."

Consecutive clauses are also useful in that they reveal how much context, not the particular form of expression, must guide our analysis of the subjunctive.

Contrast

*fecit ut hoc fieret.*  =  "He/She brought it about/saw to it that this was done."

with

*fac ut hoc fiat.*  =  "See to it that this is done."

The former is most readily taken as a consecutive clause: he/she acted in such a way that "this" actually got done. The latter involves a jussive noun clause: it presents a command — i.e., an action that might or might not actually take place.

## 12) <u>Dative</u>  (A&G 360-85, Woodcock 56-68)

Virtually all datives are in effect datives of reference (A&G 376) in some sense, but they can be employed in a variety of specific contexts. A small selection follows below.

Perhaps the best way to conceive of the dative is to regard it as the case that limits the meaning of a sentence by indicating the specific regard in which it is to be taken to be true. Consider the following:

> This is difficult <u>for me</u>.
> She is a good person <u>in my eyes</u>.
> He is a hindrance <u>to me</u>.
> This is a source pride <u>for me</u>.
> They are presenting an award <u>to me</u>.
> They are stealing this <u>from me</u>.
> They are in charge <u>of me</u>.

All of the above statements would make sense if you left out the underlined words. In each instance, adding the reference to "me" limits the general statement by indicating the specific regard in which it is to be taken to be true. In each instance, Latin would simply employ the dative case of "me" (*mihi*) where English has a variety of ways of conveying the same meaning.

The dative of reference is fundamentally distinct from the ablative of respect/specification (A&G 418). The expression "lucky <u>in love</u>" employs a noun ("love") to modify the sense of the adj. "lucky," making it more precise. (One could imagine an equivalent compound adj.: "love-lucky.") In Latin, this is the function of the ablative of respect/specification, which can be used to specify the significance of a verb as well. By contrast, the dative of reference provides an external frame of reference in which the statement is to be taken as true.

The dative of reference is also to be distinguished from the *limiting accusative, which has an adverbial force.

<u>Dative of Possession</u>  [A&G 373]

The dat. is often employed, in conjunction with *sum,* to indicate possession:

*est mihi filius.*    ("There exists a son so far as I am concerned" — i.e., "I have a son.")

This construction is more vivid and personal than the more straightforward, *habeo filium.*

<u>Sympathetic Dative</u>  [A&G 377]

In a variation on the dat. of possession, the dat. can indicate ownership even when that is not the main focus of the sentence.

*oculi mihi dolent.* ("My eyes ache.")

In this construction, the dat. colors the entire sentence, rather than *oculi* alone, and, again, is more vivid and personal.

<u>Double Dative (Predicative Dative/Dative of Purpose</u>) [A&G 382, Woodcock 67-68]

The dat. can indicate the end or purpose for which something serves:

*auxilio sum.* ("I am a source of aid.")

The term "predicative dat." highlights the way this dat. states something actively of the subject (as in the Engl. transl. above). As in the example above, it usually involves an abstract noun.

The predicative dat. is often joined with a dat. of reference/advantage to form what is known as the double dat. construction:

*corruptelae est liberis.* ("He is a source of corruption for his children." — "He corrupts his children.")

This construction is relatively easy to spot since it regularly presents: 1) the vb. *sum* (or some other vb. indicating existence); 2) an abstract noun in the dat. (the predicative dat.); 3) a noun or pronoun in the dat. alluding to the person(s) or thing(s) affected. (This last will generally refer to a person or personified obj. — one's homeland, troops, etc.)

**13) Final/Purpose Clauses [A&G 529-33, 538; Woodcock 149-50]**

Final clauses indicate the goal or end (Latin: *finis*) of the action indicated in the main clause:

"We studied for five days <u>in order to pass the exam</u>."

A positive purpose is introduced by *ut* + the subjunctive; negative: *ne*.

Final clauses stand out, in both Engl. and Latin, in that (as in the example above) there is no prompt in the main clause to signal their presence: no equivalent of a vb. of commanding, exhorting, persuading, etc. (as in the jussive noun clause); no demonstrative adj./adv. (*tantus, tam*, etc.) as in a consecutive clause. Nor is there a clear prompt in the final clause itself to indicate its nature: no *si/nisi* (condition); no *cum*. Final clauses are a bit like the Spanish Inquisition: no one expects them.

In both Engl. and Latin, final clauses also stand apart from, e.g., jussive or consecutive clauses in that the subordinate clause can come first without the sentence sounding "Yoda-esque." One would not tend to say:

"To do this, I commanded her." or "That he fell down, he ran so fast."

But one can say, quite naturally:

*ut sapiens fieret, Athenis habitabat.* ("In order to become wise, she lived in Athens.")

The <u>inf. of purpose</u> is rare and poetic, although not unknown to Plautus. (A&G 460c):

*ecquis currit pollinctorem <u>accersere</u>?* ("Is anyone running to fetch an undertaker?")

**14) Future Tenses (A&G 449, 472, 478, 516.2a (with n.) and c (with n.))**

Latin is generally much more precise in its use of tenses than is modern North-American Engl.: in a land where expressions such as "I seen" and "I have went" thrive, students often struggle in dealing with the Romans' use of the perfect, pluperfect, and future perfect tenses.

In subord. clauses involving an ind., CL will freq. employ the fut. and fut. pfct. where Engl. employs a generic present. Thus Engl.

When/If I <u>see</u> them, I will summon the consul.

would be rendered with a fut. ind. in the subord. clause:

*ubi/si eos <u>videbo</u>, consulem vocabo.*

Following a similar logic, Latin will employ the <u>fut. imperative</u> in contexts where there is a distinct reference to fut. time (often emphasized via an adv. or similar expression, or evident from the nature of the command itself). The fut. imperative is also used in legal statutes, wills, and general precepts: in P., it is often employed to establish a comically lofty tone.

### 15) <u>Hendiadys</u>  (A&G 640)

Use of two words connected by a conjunction to express a single complex idea:

*minis animisque* — angry threats

*donum decusque* — glorious gift

### 16) <u>Hypallage / Transferred Epithet</u>  (A&G 640)

A poetic device: use of an adj. with a noun to which it does not properly belong. Transforms a prosaic expression into one that has greater texture, nuance, or vividness:

"She tossed her angry locks."  vs.  "In her anger, she tossed her locks." / "She tossed her locks angrily."

### 17) <u>Hyperbaton</u>  (A&G 641)

Deviation from normal or logical word order for rhetorical or poetic effect.

### 18) <u>Indirect Questions</u>  (A&G 573-76, Woodcock 177-83)

Consider the following two statements:

"I know the man <u>who killed Caesar</u>."

"She asks <u>who killed Caesar</u>."

The first of these involves a straightforward relative clause, and would be translated:

*novi virum qui Caesarem necavit.*

The second is quite different: there the object of the vb. "asks" is in fact the question, "Who killed Caesar?", introduced by an interrogative pronoun. This is known as an indirect question, and would be translated:

*rogat quis Caesarem <u>necaverit</u>.*

In this second instance, CL employs the subjunctive to indicate a form of indirect discourse. (Cf. the use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses in reported speech: A&G 583, Woodcock 272-89.)

The tense of the subjunctive is determined by the rules of *sequence of tenses: see the discussion of that topic below, which employs indirect questions to illustrate the relevant principles.


### 19)  Jussive Noun Clauses / Indirect Commands  [A&G 563, Woodcock 139]

In Latin, commands are generally conveyed via the imperative mood, or through the use of the jussive subjunctive. Sentences such as, "I order/forbid you to do this," are known as indirect commands, since in such sentences the actual command has come to be subordinated to the main vb.

A few vbs., such as *iubeo* and *veto,* convey an indirect command with an acc. + inf., as does Engl.:

*iubeo / veto te hoc facere.*        ("I order/forbid you to do this.")

More commonly, however, Latin employs *ut*/*ne* + subjunctive in what is known as a jussive noun clause. The main vb. in such sentences can cover a wide range of volition: commanding, forbidding, admonishing, requesting, permitting, persuading, urging, etc.

Typically, the recipient of the command, etc. is presented as the obj. of the main vb., independently of the subordinate clause (*prolepsis):

*impero tibi ut hoc facias.*     ("I order you to do this.")

*nos hortati sunt ut hoc faceremus.*        ("They urged us to do this.")

In Plautus, as opposed to CL, one will often find a prohibition expressed via *ne* + the imperative:

*ne formida.*     ("Don't be uneasy.")


### 20)  Limiting Accusative  [A&G 390, Woodcock 13-14]

Often referred to as an "internal object," this is a dir. object that melds with the vb. to modify its meaning: i.e., it generally has an adverbial force.

Consider the Engl. "I teach you Latin."  In this sentence, "you" represents a regular direct object; the limiting acc. "Latin," however, melds with the vb. "teach" to form a more nuanced verbal notion (to "Latinize"). Thus, we can generate a passive equivalent of this statement ("you are taught Latin"), where the limiting acc. is retained.

Consider:

| | |
|---|---|
| *si quid te volam* | if I shall want you for anything / at all |
| *videtis viginti minae quid pollent?* | Do you see what twenty minae can do  /  how powerful they are? |

In some contexts this construction is identified as an acc. of respect. In any case, you should note how often this acc. consists of a generic neut. adj./pronoun and how readily it can be translated with an adv. force.

In a related construction, the noun in the acc. is derived from the same root as its vb. (the cognate accusative):

*aliquam fraudem frausus est.*        He has committed some deception.


### 21)  Metonymy  (A&G 641)

Figure of speech in which the name of one object or concept is substituted for that of another to which it is related: "the Crown" for "the government," "the bottle" for "alcohol," "sweat of one's brow" for "labor" —

"The <u>pen</u> is mightier than the <u>sword</u>."

To be distinguished from *synecdoche.


## 22) **Paraprosdokian**

Figure of speech in which a phrase or sentence takes an unexpected (generally humorous) turn:

"He was at his best when the going was good."

"I want to die peacefully in my sleep, like my grandfather, not screaming and yelling like the passengers in his car."


## 23) **Parataxis  [A&G 268 *ad fin.*, Woodcock 130]**

The juxtaposition of two independent clauses to convey a single complex thought, without the use of a subordinating conjunction:

| | |
|---|---|
| *faxo erunt* | I will see that they are |
| *facito afferas* | see that you bring |
| *volo amet* | I want him to love |
| *sine astet* | let him stand |
| *cave supplicassis* | see that you <u>don't</u> beg  (A&G 450 and n. 2) |

This type of <u>paratactic construction</u> will be most familiar from the typical fear clause, where the commonly employed *ne/ut* are not in fact subordinating conjunctions: A&G 564.

Contrast *<u>asyndeton</u>, which commonly joins two <u>coordinate clauses</u> rather than a main and subordinate clause.


## 24) **Predicative Use of Nouns/Adjectives  [A&G 285.2, 392-96]**

The use of a noun or adj. to state something actively of another noun and thus modify the clause as a whole rather than only the noun with which it is associated. To be distinguished from the *attributive (descriptive/specifying) use of the adj. (above).

*tua ista culpa est, quae discipulum <u>semidoctum</u> aps te amoves.*
"That's your fault, since you're dismissing your student (<u>while he is/despite his being) only half-taught</u>."

*quid illuc quod <u>exanimatus</u> currit huc Leonida?*
"How is it that Leonida comes running here <u>all out of breath</u>?"

In reality, these expressions represent a hidden use of the *circumstantial ptcple. (see separate entry, above): in each instance, the pres. ptcple. of *sum* ("while being") is to be understood with the underlined adj. (The pres. ptcple. of *sum* is not employed in CL.)

Thus, one would <u>not</u> translate lines 6-7 of the argument of Plautus' *Asinaria* as:

*rivalis <u>amens</u> ob <u>praereptam</u> mulierem rem omnem nuntiat*

"his <u>distraught rival</u> reports the whole matter on account of <u>the snatched woman</u>" (attrib.)

but:

"his <u>rival, distraught</u> on account of <u>the woman who was snatched away</u>, reports …"

10

"his <u>rival, in his distress</u> over <u>the snatching away of the woman</u>, reports …"

A more straightforward and limited version of this construction is known as <u>apposition</u>: the renaming of a noun — "Arthur, king of Britain."

Predicative adjs. are freq. employed where Engl. would use an adv.:

*laetus abiit*.     ("He departed (while being) happy" — i.e., "He departed happily.")

Related constructions:

<u>Circumstantial Participles</u>:  see separate entry, above

<u>Predicative nom./acc</u>. after a <u>factitive vb</u>. (of making, etc.):  e.g., "I was elected <u>king</u>," "he makes me <u>happy</u>"

<u>Proleptic/pregnant acc</u>.: "I shot him <u>dead</u>."  (see below, s.v. "Prolepsis.")


### 25) <u>Prolative Infinitive</u>  [Woodcock 22-24]

Often referred to as the complementary infinitive: this inf. is used in combination with a finite vb. to "carry on" or "complete" the sense of the finite vb. by specifying the domain in which it applies. Thus the prolative inf. serves to limit or define the area in which the finite vb. holds true:

*possum currere* — I am able <u>to run</u>

*volo currere* — I want <u>to run</u>

This usage reflects the origin of the Latin inf. as a verbal noun in the locative or dat. (in the first example: "I am able <u>when it comes to running</u>"). This original function was forgotten over time as the inf. came to be taken as, in effect, a dir. object of the finite vb. or, with the addition of an acc. subject, as an acc.-inf. "noun clause" (e.g., *volo <u>te currere</u>*).


### 26) <u>Prolepsis ("Anticipation")</u>  [A&G 576, 640]

The anticipation of the subject of a subordinate clause as an object of the main vb. (the "I know <u>you</u>, who you are" construction).

*faciam <u>te</u> ut scias*. [consecutive clause]    ("I will let you know."  /  "I will fill you in.")

Cf. the regular construction in indirect commands:  *impero <u>tibi</u> ut abeas*.

Modern discussions of prolepsis sometimes conflate two distinct phenomena: the syntactical figure, where something that properly belongs in a subordinate clause is anticipated in the main clause (as above) vs. the "pregnant" use of the predicative acc. ("she shot him <u>dead</u>" [A&G 392]), which is merely a vivid figure of speech involving a form of compression.


### 27) <u>*Quom* (*Cum*)</u>  [A&G 544-49;  Woodcock 231-39]

The conjunction *quom* (= CL *cum*) can be employed with temporal ("when," "after"), causal ("since," "given that"), or concessive ("although") force. In CL, it typically takes a subjunctive except in certain contexts where the clause has a temporal force: in such contexts, it regularly takes an indicative —

1) when the temporal clause refers to the pres. or the fut.

2) when *cum* is employed, like *ubi* or *ut,* to indicate a purely temporal relationship betw two actions in the past

3) in "inverse *cum*-clauses," where the temporal clause, while subordinate grammatically, is the focus of the sentence (otherwise known as burying the lead). (E.g., "I was making a peanut-butter sandwich when the atomic bomb went off.") Generally speaking, this use is merely a particular application of 2) above.

4) when the temporal clause refers to a habitual action in the past ("whenever")

In Plautus, the indicative is regularly employed with *quom*. The principal exceptions can be explained via attraction to a subj. in the main clause (A&G 593) or are found in expressions involving an indef. 2ᵃᵗ pers. sg. (Cf., e.g., *Asinaria* 442, where the *quom*-clause is a subordinate clause in indirect discourse: in such instances the subj. is regular.)

### 28) <u>Relative Clause of Characteristic</u>   [A&G 534-35, Woodcock 148, 155-59]

A relative clause with a potential subjunctive can perform many of the same functions as a subordinate clause introduced by *cum, ut,* or *ne.*

In its purest form, such a clause describes, not a particular person or object, but a class:

> *nihil est <u>quod</u> facere <u>malim</u>.*                   There is nothing (of any sort whatsoever) that I would prefer to do.

Quite often, such clauses will imply intention or purpose (esp., but not exclusively, after a vb. of motion):

> *cupio argentum <u>quod det</u> amicae suae*.     I desire money which he might give / for him to give to his mistress.

But they can also have a concessive, explanatory, or consecutive force:

> *tune verberes, <u>qui</u> pro cibo <u>habeas</u> te verberari*?  *You* beat (*me*), although you consider / given that you consider your being beaten to be like mother's milk?

> *cum is me dignum <u>cui concrederet</u> haberet*       since he considered me worthy to confide in

### 29) <u>Sequence of Tenses</u> (A&G 482-85, Woodcock 140, 162-63, 180, 217)

For the sake of this discussion, sequence of tenses concerns the tense of verbs in the subjunctive in subordinate clauses. Consider the following sentences in English:

> He <u>does</u> this in order that he <u>may</u> be happy.

> He <u>did</u> this in order that he <u>might</u> be happy.

Each of these sentences involves a statement of purpose. In the first, where the verb of the principal clause ("does") is in the present tense, English prefers to indicate purpose by using the modal verb "may" in the subordinate clause; in the second sentence, where the main verb is in the past tense ("did"), English prefers the modal verb "might." Thus, the tense of the main clause influences the tense of the modal verb "may/might" in the subordinate clause.

In the same way, Latin will employ different tenses of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses according to the tense of the verb in the main clause. Thus the two sentences above would be translated into Latin as follows:

> *hoc <u>facit</u> ut beatus <u>sit</u>.*

> *hoc <u>fecit</u> ut beatus <u>esset</u>.*

The matter is a bit more complex, however. One must consider not only the tense of the main verb, but the temporal relationship between the principal clause and the action presented in the subordinate clause. (Thus "relative tenses" might be a better term than sequence of tenses.) Consider the following:

She <u>asks</u> why we <u>are doing</u> this.

She <u>asks</u> why we <u>did</u> this.

She <u>asked</u> why we <u>were doing</u> this.

She <u>asked</u> why we <u>had done</u> this.

In the first and third sentences, the person is asking why something is being done at the very moment she asks the question; in the second and fourth sentences, the person is asking why something was done prior to the moment she asks the question. Notice how the tense of the verb in the subordinate clause ("are doing," "did," "were doing," "had done") shifts according to: 1) the tense of the main verb and 2) the temporal relationship between the time the question is being asked and that at which "we" performed the action being discussed.

In Latin, indirect questions (a type of subordinate clause) require the use of the subjunctive. The Latin equivalent of the above sentences would be:

*<u>quaerit</u> cur hoc <u>faciamus</u>.*

*<u>quaerit</u> cur hoc <u>fecerimus</u>.*

*<u>quaesivit</u> cur hoc <u>faceremus</u>.*

*<u>quaesivit</u> cur hoc <u>fecissemus</u>.*

Notice how the form of the subjunctive changes according to each scenario, along lines similar to the vb. "do" in the Engl.

To describe what is happening here, grammarians make a distinction between primary and secondary sequence:

• **Primary sequence** is introduced when (as in the first and second sentences above) the main clause refers to the present or the future. The verb in such a clause is said to be a **primary tense**. In Latin, the primary tenses are: the present, the future, the "true" perfect (e.g., "I <u>have read</u> the book."), and the future perfect.

• **Secondary sequence** is introduced when (as in the third and fourth sentences above) the main clause refers to the past. The verb in such a clause is said to be a **secondary tense**. In Latin, the secondary tenses are: the perfect (when used as a simple past tense), the imperfect, the pluperfect, the historic infinitive, and (sometimes) the historic present.

In **primary sequence**, Latin employs the <u>present subjunctive</u> to indicate (as in the first sentence above) that the action in the subordinate clause is thought of as occurring at <u>the same time as the action in the main clause or in some (usually indefinite) future time</u>. (For an example of the latter, see the first of the purpose clauses at the beginning of this discussion.) The <u>perfect subjunctive</u> will be used (as in the second sentence above) to indicate that the action in the subordinate clause is thought of as occurring <u>prior to the action in the main clause</u>.

In **secondary sequence**, Latin employs the <u>imperfect subjunctive</u> to indicate (as in the third sentence above) that the action in the subordinate clause is thought of as occurring at <u>the same time as the action in the main clause or in some (usually indefinite) future time</u>. (For an example of the latter, see the second of the purpose clauses at the beginning of this discussion.) The <u>pluperfect subjunctive</u> will be used (as in the fourth sentence above) to indicate that the action in the subordinate clause is thought of as occurring <u>prior to the action in the main clause</u>.

Finally, consider the following sentences:

She <u>asks</u> what we <u>will do</u>.

She <u>asked</u> what we <u>would do</u>.

Here the verbs in the subordinate clauses are emphatic futures (as opposed to the more indefinite futures implied, e.g., in the usual purpose clause or clause of fearing): the person asking the question uses the future tense. To reflect this fact, Latin will employ what we might call an *ad hoc* "future subjunctive" (found mainly in clauses involving indirect discourse: i.e., indirect questions and subordinate clauses in indirect discourse). In Latin, the two sentences above would be expressed as follows:

*quaerit* quid *facturi simus*.

*quaesivit* quid *facturi essemus*.

Here the subjunctive of the verb *sum* is joined with future active participle to create a periphrastic future tense involving the subjunctive. Notice, however, that the tense of the subjunctive of *sum* in each sentence does in fact observe the rules regarding sequence of tenses as set out above (literally: "She asks what we are (now) on the point of doing" vs. "She asked what we were (back then) on the point of doing").

| Tense of verb in main clause | *Vb. in subord. clause alludes to an action that is presented as occurring at the same time as that indicated by the vb. in the main clause, or at some indef. future time* | *Vb. in subord. clause alludes to an action that is presented as occurring at some time prior to that indicated by the vb. in the main clause* |
|---|---|---|
| *Primary Tense* | **Present Subjunctive** | **Perfect Subjunctive** |
| *Secondary Tense* | **Imperfect Subjunctive** | **Pluperfect Subjunctive** |

As the above chart suggests, most constructions involving the subjunctive in a subordinate clause will fall into the first column: generally speaking (but not invariably), clauses of command, purpose, result, and fear deal with something that has yet to happen, or that is viewed as happening at that very moment. (Exceptions generally involve the perfect tense: e.g., "I fear that they *have betrayed* us.")

Constructions involving the second column tend to be:
   • *cum*-clauses
       • clauses introduced by *quamvis* or the like (similar to a *cum*-clause)
   • subordinate clauses in indirect discourse (since speakers can employ any tense in a subordinate clause)
       • indirect questions (same rationale)
   • relative clauses of characteristic

As we have seen, the so-called "future subjunctive" (future active participle + subjunctive of *sum*) is employed mainly to represent an original future indicative in indirect discourse. In such constructions, the tense of *sum* falls under column one (since the speaker is viewed as affirming that someone or something *is (right now)* on the point of acting, or *was (back then)* on the point of acting).

NOTE: the above rules do not apply to conditional sentences or to independent uses of the subjunctive (sentences where the subjunctive is the main verb).

For the most part, P. will observe these same rules, with some allowances for the more concise and vivid forms of expression demanded by comic verse.

## 30) **Substantive**  [A&G 288-89]

A word or group of words that functions as a noun. Includes:

- nouns

- adjs. and ptcples. when used as nouns ("the rich," "the damned")

- substantival phrases and clauses of various sorts ("<u>to go outside in this weather without a hat</u> is foolish," "<u>that John should even think of running for office</u> is ridiculous").

## 31) Synecdoche  (A&G 641)

Figure of speech in which the speaker refers to something by the name of one of its parts, a prominent feature, the substance of which it is made, etc.:  "set of wheels" (car), "long-hairs" (hippies), "plastic" (credit card), "lead" (bullets).

To be distinguished from *metonymy.