

Chapter 6 H&Q Unit 6

This unit covers more conceptual information in terms of grammar, but the good news is that these aren't the huge grammatical ideas that will leave you in the dust and seem to have no relation to what you already know. (Don't worry, though, there are still plenty of those coming up.) Rather, these are points that build on what you already know, which can be seen as extending, or even completing in a couple of cases, the material already covered, and which lay the groundwork for upcoming concepts.

So, if you like, you can see this unit as a collection of small stuff. What this means for you: spend twice the time on it you spent on the previous unit, so that you don't fall into the habit now of cheating the small stuff.

You heard me. What did I say all the way back on page 1-5? “Again, *put in the time now*, and everything will be much easier down the road.” It's still true.

Why knowing how to say “of the goat” in Greek tells you more about the word than just knowing how to say “the goat”

Okay, history lesson – how do we learn nouns again? We learn their *lexical entry* – nominative singular, genitive singular, the article, and the definition. And *why* do we do it this way? Because this teaches us the noun's meaning, gender, stem, and declension all at once.

This has, let's be honest, probably seemed pretty dumb while we've been learning first and second declension nouns. “Oh, gee, for the genitive we just take off the nominative ending and put another ending on the same stem, real hard, yeah, glad I spent the hours making sure I did twice the work I needed to do.”

Right, so, welcome to the third declension.

Let's take a random third declension noun that despite its purported randomness (randomity? randomia?) will conveniently demonstrate a grammatical point, explain the development of a modern word, allow me to make a brief excursion into historical linguistics, and overall make me look like I know what I'm talking about (unless you're my wife, in which case you know a lot more than I do about this stuff and are probably pointing and laughing already) – γάλα, γάλακτος, το, which means "milk." Okay, so meaning we've got down, the article το tells us it's neuter, and the stem, that's obvious, it's γάλα, so –

BZZZZZZZZT.

Sorry, you evidently failed to note the second sentence of Unit 6, page 139: "As with first- and second-declension nouns, the stem to which the ends are added is obtained by dropping the ending of the *genitive singular*" (emphasis in the original). Come on, don't you remember that Hansen and Quinn *very clearly* made that point back on...

...back on...

...um...

(rifling through pages)

...right.

Well, okay, on page 21, they say, way at the bottom of the page, right below the chart of first declension endings, "...to decline τέχνη, τέχνης, ἡ, 'art,' take the genitive singular τέχνης, remove the genitive singular ending –ης to get the stem τεχν-, and add the *(and here we have an awkward page turn for important information)* appropriate endings to the stem." They then repeat this rather elliptical way of making an important grammatical point you're supposed to remember 115 pages later at the very bottom of page 24 in discussing the second declension.

Anyway, now you know. In Greek, *the stem of a noun comes from the genitive singular*, and this becomes very important with the third declension. If I had to guess, the reason why this point is made as the last sentence underneath an important-looking chart of case endings in the first chapter without calling any particular attention to it, only to suddenly hammer on it five chapters down the road like it's obvious and well-covered ground, is that, well, teachers like their "Gotcha!" moments.

I know this because, hey, I could have made a big point of it in my notes for Unit 1, but I didn't, since I knew full well this was coming. It's a fun trick you can pull on your students later.

Okay, back to γάλα, γάλακτος, το, which means "milk," we know it's neuter because of το, the genitive singular tells us that the stem is γάλακτ-, and we know that it's a third declension noun specifically because the genitive singular ending is -ος (although there are a couple of sets of third declension nouns that *look* like they have a different genitive singular ending, even though they actually don't – we'll get to those later), and the nominative singular form is a given that is clearly quite separate from the forms of the oblique cases ("oblique" meaning "non-nominative" in the grammar world). In other words, we know it's a third declension noun because it looks weird.

The stem being found in the genitive singular is also an important concept from a linguistics point of view. What English word does γάλα look like? "Gala," maybe, meaning big party? Yeah, that's just a tad misleading – *if* "gala" is an English reflex of a Greek word, *maybe* it comes from γελάω "laugh" or "be amused." *IF*. But look at the genitive singular – what does the stem γάλακτ- look like? "Galaxy," sure – and why is that? What's the name of our galaxy? "The *Milky Way*," right? So what's another English word that looks like it could have come from γάλακτ-? Well, if you drop the first syllable γά, you're left with -λακτ-, which looks a lot like

“lactose” or “lactation” or a bunch of other fancy Latin-derived words in English that are related to milk. Sure enough, go to a decent Latin dictionary and you’ll find that *lac, lactis* “milk” is indeed related to *γάλα, γάλακτος, το*. It seems that in the Indo-European divorce (well, one of them), the first syllable of that word was one of the assets the Greeks got in the settlement. I’m sure the attorney’s fees were incredible.

And wow, over two pages later, I’m finally done talking about this word. For a random third declension noun, I sure managed to milk it for all it was worth, didn’t I?

Allrightallrightallright. Moving on already.

So, the main thing here is, now that the point about where the stem of the noun comes from and why it matters has been beaten into the ground, you have a new set of endings to memorize. Happily, there are fewer endings on the whole to learn, but there are some tricky rules about what endings you do have. Get comfy with the material on pages 139-42; as usual, there’s no real shortcut. The book gives you the rules about accent, the accusative singular, the vocative singular, and the dative plural; give yourself the time to get comfortable with those rules. The drills in the book will help.

I will let the book’s discussion of compensatory lengthening at the top of page 142 go without comment; seems like the kind of thing that one shouldn’t talk about in polite company. I will say that my childhood dog Telemachus had to have a spurious diphthong removed, and he could never sit down again without yelping pitifully.

Relative pronouns, the importance of which is discussed

On the whole, relative clauses and pronouns need not give you any sleepless nights; we use these all the time in English, even if we aren’t necessarily conscious of it. In languages for modern textbooks, you will usually see example sentences like these broken apart to demonstrate

how the relative clause answers a question left hanging by the main clause. “I tell a lot of bad jokes.” *Oh? What do they do?* “The bad jokes make my wife cry.” And then this becomes “I tell a lot of bad jokes, which make my wife cry.”

“I tell a lot of bad jokes.” *Oh? Does anybody ever laugh at them?* “Nobody ever laughs at them.” → “I tell a lot of bad jokes *at which nobody ever laughs.*” (Never dangle your prepositions in public, my friends.)

“Everybody felt sorry for the woman.” *Oh? Why?* “Her husband’s sense of humor drove away puppies.” → “Everybody felt sorry for the woman, *whose husband’s sense of humor drove away puppies.*”

Of course, such touchy-feely, communicative nonsense is below our high-minded textbook (just don’t ask Hansen and Quinn what *πέρδομαι* means), who limit the discussion to explaining how relative clauses are just another way of modifying nouns:

“Homer, *whose epic poetry makes many undergraduate students live in fear,* was really just the prototypical blind bluesman.” Going by the book’s method of analysis, the clause “whose epic poetry makes many undergraduate students live in fear” is simply a way of modifying the proper noun “Homer” and conveying more information about him.

So, when we render such sentences in Greek, what do we need to keep in mind? Well, as with any other noun, pro- or otherwise (are there con-nouns?), relative pronouns decline according to (say it with me) **gender**, **number**, and **case**. In this way, it’s not too far off from English; we have subjective and objective pronouns (*who/whom* for persons, *which* for objects), as well as a genitive pronoun (*whose*) – certainly English reflects this system more than some other modern languages (like Modern Greek, incidentally) where the relative clause is simply introduced by a non-declinable particle. Although, let’s make it clear that English has this as well

in the word *that*; “I saw the people *that* you know” instead of “I saw the people *whom* you know” etc. Some grammarians and stylists would even argue that *that* more properly serves the function of the relative pronoun in contemporary English except under specific conditions. Lest I make you even more confused, I’m not going to argue the point, except to note that this is not universally held. For present pedagogical purposes, let’s assume that we’re not going to translate relative pronouns as *that* but as *who/whom*, *which*, etc.

Anyway, back to the gender, number, and case of relative pronouns in Ancient Greek. A relative pronoun gets its gender and number *from the noun it is modifying* – that is, its *referent* or its *antecedent* (you’ll see both words) – and it gets its case *from its grammatical function in its own clause*.

To look at a couple of our sample sentences again:

“I tell a lot of bad jokes, which make my wife cry.” The antecedent of the relative pronoun is the word “jokes”; it is plural, and for our purposes let’s assume it is masculine. So, the relative pronoun is going to masculine and plural. Its function in the relative clause, “which make my wife cry,” is as the *subject* of the verb; therefore, it will be in the *nominative* case. Thus, masculine, plural, and nominative are the gender, number, and case of the relative pronoun we want.

Another example:

“Homer, whose epic poetry makes many undergraduate students live in fear, was really just the prototypical blind bluesman.” The referent (I told you you’d see both words) of the relative pronoun is “Homer”, which is masculine and singular. In the relative clause, “whose epic poetry makes many undergraduate students live in fear,” it needs to show possession, therefore,

it will be in the *genitive* case. So, masculine, singular, and genitive are the gender, number, and case of the required relative pronoun.

Get to know the table of relative pronouns on page 143. Here is where the diacritics can both help you and mess you up. These look basically like free-standing first and second declension case endings, except in the nominative case, where they look just enough like definite articles to kill you on a test if you're not used to it. ***All relative pronouns always have an accent and a rough breathing, and the nominative forms of the masculine and feminine definite articles do not.*** So, yes, the neuter singular nominative relative pronoun *ὅ* looks like it *could* be the *masculine* singular nominative definite article *ὁ*, except that it has an acute accent (or a grave depending on context). Yep, it's just that one little dash of the pen that will make all the difference in the world for comprehension, and it *will* drive you nuts – forget it, Jake, it's Ancient Greek.

Oh yeah, one last little thing that will make you crazy where these things are concerned. There is a set of circumstances where the definite article will look exactly like a relative pronoun, accent and all, and Hardy and Gerry have been good enough to make sure you get hit with it immediately in this unit. There is a phenomenon where a word will add an accent to the last syllable of the word that precedes it; this is called an *enclitic*. This comes up in the vocabulary for this unit as well as the sentences; I'll talk more about it in the context of the appropriate sentence. Just know that this is coming and watch out for it.

The good news about Greek relative pronouns is that once you understand them, then the whole “who/whom” and “who’s/whose” distinction in English will make sense to you, and when you hear somebody talk about “that guy who you know” you can say, “No, sorry, that relative pronoun needs to be *whom*.” Everybody will love you for it, I promise.

Are we to learn independent uses of the subjunctive? Yes, and get used to it.

As has been discussed, the subjunctive and optative moods are the moods of non-factual information, with the optative being a little more non-factual than the subjunctive. As well, so far the subjunctive mood has been discussed in terms of how it functions dependently, as in conditional statements and purpose clauses. There are a handful of uses of the subjunctive that one finds in an independent clause as well; these uses are all very much in keeping with the subjunctive communicating something about the action of a verb in a non-factual way.

The first use the book talks about is called the *hortatory* (your teacher might also use the word “jussive”) subjunctive. This is always in first person plural, present or aorist tense, and it conveys a desire of the speaker, short of the force of a command (which uses the *imperative* mood). It’s an *encouragement*, really; a strong suggestion. “Let us reason together” is a hortatory subjunctive. “Let us pray to the Lord.” “Let us now praise famous men.” And so on. Again, it is non-factual information; it hasn’t happened, it isn’t happening, but the speaker is expressing that he thinks it’s a good idea that it happen at that particular moment. If you have trouble with this one, just remember that “hortatory” is related to “exhortation.” Also, don’t forget that, since this is not the indicative mood, if you need to encourage somebody *not* to do something, you use μή instead of οὐ.

The second independent use of the subjunctive is the *deliberative* subjunctive – deliberative as in *with thought*; the judge deliberating in his chamber, the child deliberately eating the cookie before dinner. It’s in the subjunctive mood because, again, the action of the verb hasn’t happened – the speaker is having to think about what he is doing before he does it, hence *deliberative*. “Am I to think about this action before doing it?” “Are we to use the deliberative subjunctive?” It is always in the first person (either singular or plural), present or

aorist, and again, if you're wondering if you should *not* do something, wonder with μή and not οὐ.

The last independent use of the subjunctive the book discusses is the *prohibitive subjunctive*. This one's very straightforward; by putting μή with a second person (singular or plural) aorist subjunctive, you're telling somebody not to do something. The prohibitive subjunctive is how Ancient Greek says "don't!". So – do not forget about the prohibitive subjunctive!

Two conceptual notes:

First, as has been pointed out before, outside of the indicative mood, all tense conveys is the *aspect* of the action, and doesn't tell anybody anything about time.

Second, you are perhaps thinking to yourself, "Wow, this is really screwy looking to me." The reason why is, to put it in rather obvious terms, Greek solves these problems in a way that looks nothing like English's solutions. The Ancient Greek verb system is robust enough to be able to communicate a lot of information using only a verb form; in English, we've, let's say (hey, hortatory subjunctive!), outsourced some of that. For example (with apologies to David Bowie), you can say – χορεύσωμεν! With one verb form, you can say what it takes two verb forms and an expressed subject to say – let's (let us) dance! The trick is to make the conceptual links using *meaning* rather than individual words. Don't try (prohibitive subjunctive!) to understand Greek as just "English in code" – you'll rob the language of a lot of beauty that way, *and* it will be a lot harder to understand.

This means that you're going to have to learn grammar and like it, but the bright side is that once you understand Greek grammar, you can be really annoying about correcting people's English grammar. It'll be your new favorite hobby.

These are some of the uses of a partitive genitive

This one's a real no-brainer; you're talking about some part of the whole, with the whole being in the genitive case. It makes perfect sense if you just translate the genitive with its default rendering, "of"; context will make it clear that it's not a possessive. "Almost all *of the Greek students* got the partitive genitive the first time out." "I ate a lot *of the cheese*." "The Athenians drank most *of the ouzo*."

That's all the partitive genitive is, folks.

Within a week of practicing these time and space expressions, you'll understand them

These time and space expressions are not difficult; you just have to read enough of them to make them all clear in your own head. The names of the expressions make them pretty self-explanatory: "genitive of time within which" – so, the time span *within which* something occurs. "Dative of time at which" – the moment in time *at which* something occurs. "Accusative of extent of time" – the *extent of time* it takes for something to happen. "Accusative of extent of space" – similar idea, as the name implies, you're just talking now about physical rather than temporal distance. If the difference between a genitive of time within which and an accusative of extent of time seems a little arbitrary, perhaps this English example will help make it clear: "During the day (*genitive of time within which*), I was writing the Hansen and Quinn notes and answer key, and it took me three hours (*accusative of extent of time*)." The genitive refers to a bigger window of time that encompasses a particular event; the accusative describes the length of that event on its own.

Make sense? OK, then, on to the exercises.

Unit VI exercises.

I. As usual, I will provide notes as I think they are necessary.

1. (He) will station five of the soldiers beside the sea in order that the six messengers may not be hindered by the men in the plain.

Don't get confused by the fact that πέντε is indeclinable, assume that it's nominative because it's the first element of the sentence that could be, and then try to figure out why τάξει looks weird. You aren't going to understand what grammatical function πέντε is serving until you see τάξει, think to yourself, "Hey! Third person singular future indicative active!" and then realize that τῶν στρατιωτῶν πέντε is your direct object, with an unexpressed subject. Also, since τάξει is future, that tells us that the syntax of κωλυθῶσιν is what? Syntax for a verb is tense and reason, mood and reason, so your automatic answer should be, "Aorist to show simple aspect, subjunctive because it's in a purpose clause in primary sequence." If you got that on the first try, pat yourself on the back. If not, go back and review Unit 3. NOW. How about the syntax of the substantive (remember what that means?) τῶν in the purpose clause? Here, it's a noun, so we're looking for case and reason, and the instantaneous, hesitation-free answer should be "Genitive of personal agent." Got that?

2. Let us harm the unjust women on the one hand, let us send goats and silver to the just women on the other hand.

Nothing tremendously tricky here; the verbs are clearly both independent subjunctives and first person plurals, and the sentence is not a question, so they've got to be hortatory. τὰς ἀδίκους is a substantive use of the adjective; ἄδικος ἄδικον is a two-termination adjective with the feminine accusative plural article τὰς, hence "the unjust women". Not a terribly gentlemanly sentiment, but there we are.

3. Homer, whose eyes were not guarded by the gods, taught young men and old men the craft of words.

No questions here? Good.

4. Are goats being sacrificed to the gods by slaves, at least?

There's that question particle ἄρα I warned you about...

5. If y'all send the old men with guards five stades from the land, they will not be harmed by the bad strangers who were ordered to destroy the peace.

Let's walk through this one a bit. First thing we notice is the presence of ἐάν and a subjunctive, and then a future indicative. So, we've got a future more vivid conditional sentence, translated "does/will do". Then, πέντε στάδια has to be an accusative of extent of space, and οἱ is a masculine nominative plural relative pronoun, with an antecedent of τῶν κακῶν ξένων and which is the subject of ἐκελεύσθησαν.

6. The grace, at least, of good men is not in body but in soul.
7. After the victory, at least, the guards, on the one hand, were dancing; the enemies, on the other hand, whom we harmed, were being guarded by the old men in the marketplace.

8. If the country were being governed well, we would be ruling even the islands.

Don't forget that ἄρχω takes a genitive as its object.

9. If, you know, the wise men should be ruling the country, during the day on the one hand y'all would be doing the things of the council and the assembly, during the night on the other hand y'all would be dancing.

Now that's a sales pitch. By the way, if "doing the things of the council and the assembly" sounds a little pedestrian, that's because it is intentionally so for pedagogical purposes. A more idiomatic translation of πράττοιτε τὰ πράγματα τὰ τῆς τε βουλῆς καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας might be something like "conducting the affairs" or "taking care of the business of the council and the assembly".

10. The hope of victory is not, let me tell you, a sufficient thing in battle, at least.

Nothing like full body armor and a rocket launcher, that's for sure. Do make sure you translate ἰκανὸν as a substantive, "a sufficient thing", rather than just saying "The hope of victory is not sufficient". The grammatical reason is that since ἰκανὸν is neuter and ἡ ἐλπίς is feminine, ἰκανὸν strictly speaking does not modify ἡ ἐλπίς. Now, in a real translation that you'd publish, would you be that pedantic? No, probably not, but while you're trying to demonstrate to your instructor that you know what you're doing, do it this way.

11. In fact, let us destroy the democracy. For terrible things have been done by the people.

Let me guess – you translated the second sentence as "For terrible things have been done to the people", right? Yeah. Thought so. Since πέπρακται is perfect, this is that weird case where dative without a preposition indicates agency, not indirect object. This little bugaboo shows up a few times in the exercises for this unit. Go back and double-check your work now.

12. If six of the dancers had danced well on the first night, animals would have been sacrificed to the goddess by the wise citizens. For the dances are friends to the gods.

Six, of course, being historically significant, meaning “arbitrary number that serves no purpose except to be inserted in order to demonstrate the partitive genitive.”

13. The young men, because books concerning the freedom of the ancients were written by Homer for them, were stationed in battle within five days for the sake of the people.

Here γε is being used causally, since it appears with a relative pronoun (as shown on page 152). I admit this is a rather awkward rendering in English. With respect to the last part of the sentence, this is something else that H&Q includes in the vocabulary list and touches on only at the very end of the vocabulary notes, but don't forget that χάριν + genitive means “for the sake of”.

14. The wisdom of the unjust is a terrible thing, you know, old man.

As with sentence #10, translate δεινόν as a substantive.

15. The ancients on the one hand were being ruled by good men, the men of now on the other hand are slaves to men unworthy of ruling.

A rather common sentiment, regardless of era...

16. The strangers on the one hand were sacrificing a horse before the start of battle, the Greeks on the other hand (were) not.

Poor horse!

17. The fate for the body is death, but immortal is the soul, at least.

18. The guard who was sent to the island during the day prevented the slaves from harming the free men for five nights.

19. The things of the sea are terrible things to the wise men, at least.

τοῖς σοφοῖς is in this case a dative of reference, so it could also be translated as “in the eyes of the wise men” or something to that effect.

20. Brother, the bribes for which you are persuading free Greeks to be slaves to bad foreigners are in fact bad.

Context makes it pretty clear that δῶρα in this case means specifically “bribes” and not “gifts”.

21. Since the war stopped, at least, the fear of the people was destroyed.

22. The poet, because books have been written by him concerning small things is bad, you know.

Another instance of the dative of personal agent and the causal γε.

23. Friend, do not persuade good men to do unjust and bad things by means of big words/long speeches.

Ah, politics...

24. If just men at least govern, the unjust men, by whom the people are being harmed, are sent from the land.

25. Are we to write a book concerning goats if the citizens send money?

As long as they're paying in cash, I'll do it if you guys don't want to.

26. If you were taught by poets, (namely) good men, you did well at least.

27. In fact, (the) wisdom is not a small gift.

28. The wise men are bad according to the opinion of the old man, at least.

29. The words/speeches against the Greeks are unjust. And yet, you were writing long speeches during the night against Greeks.

II. And now English to Greek:

1. διδασκώμεθα/παιδευόμεθα τῆς γε ἡμέρας ἵνα χορεύωμεν τῆς νυκτός.

You have two possibilities of words for “taught”; your teacher may have a preference. Here’s the quick-and-dirty way we break this down in terms of going from meaning to meaning:

“Let us be taught during the day at least in order that we may dance during the night.”

This can be broken up into basically six components:

- *“Let us be taught” – First person plural passive hortatory subjunctive verb*
- *“during the day” – genitive of time within which*
- *“at least” – emphatic expression*
- *“in order that” – indication of a purpose clause*
- *“we may dance” – first person plural active subjunctive verb in primary sequence*
- *“during the night” – genitive of time within which*

Now, having analyzed the sentence in this way, it’s a reasonably easy step to render each of those components as its own Greek expression, each one being a type with which you’re sufficiently familiar at this stage of the game. Does that make sense?

2. ὧ νεανία, εἰ ἄρχοις/ἄρξαις τῆς γῆς πέντε ἡμέρας,

βλαπτοίμεθα/βλαβεῖμεν/βλαβεῖημεν/βλαφθεῖμεν/βλαφθεῖημεν ὑπὸ τῶν πολέμων (ἡμῶν) ἄν;

I’ve included the present and aorist forms of “rule” and “harm”, since either are possible depending on what you want to emphasize. I’ve also included all four possible forms for the first person plural aorist optative of “harm”. Isn’t this fun?

Also, Hardy and Gerry modify the word “enemies” with the possessive pronoun “our”; I don’t know why they’ve done this since you don’t know those yet, but I’ve included it in parentheses. You’ll learn those later.

3. ὦ φίλε, μὴ θάψῃς τοὺς ἀδικοὺς ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ. ἱερὸν τῆς θεοῦ ἢ ἡ γῆ πεφύλακται τοι τὸ πεδίον.

And one last appearance of the dative of personal agent. I swear, you will never see it appear so many times in a two-page span outside of this book.

4. ἐὰν βλάβῃτε τοὺς ἵππους οὓς ἐπέμφθησαν παρὰ τοὺς στρατιώτας, ὁ πόλεμος παυθήσεται ἐξ ἡμέρας.
5. Οἱ νεανία ὑπὸ ὧν οἱ αἴγες τε καὶ οἱ ἵπποι πεμφθήσονται εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰ οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν παιδεύεσθαι/παιδευθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ σοφοῦ ποιητοῦ.

Understand all of that?

Coming up in Unit 7: the middle voice (uh, the *what?*), the second aorist, demonstrative pronouns, and other things guaranteed to be more fun than getting hit over the head with a ventriloquist’s dummy!