

Chapter 8 H&Q Unit 8

Participles, put simply, are *verbal adjectives*. This means they are forms of a verb used to *modify* nouns rather than being conjugated finitely to express the main action of the sentence or clause. We don't really think about them much in English, partially because some of what we think of as our finite verb tenses use them, generally those that indicate progressive aspect:

Present tense: I am *going* to the store.

Imperfect tense: I was *writing* the notes.

Future progressive: I will be *taking* a class.

And so on. Along similar lines, passive participles (the *grated* cheese) also get used with “have” to indicate perfect tenses: I have *grated* the cheese. At the same time, the passive participle also can express the aorist tense – I *grated* the cheese.

We also perhaps don't think about participles much in English because when we do use them as verbal adjectives, often we just think of them as plain adjectives, or they express a thought that's parenthetical and therefore not the main point to begin with: I walked across the street carrying my bag, and then got into my car.

Whether we're used to thinking about them in English or not, one of the major constituents of the seeming initial massive overhead required in learning ancient Greek is the participle, and this is the unit in Hansen and Quinn where you have to start getting used to them. Participles are extremely important in ancient Greek; where possible, it seems, it's preferable to a finite verb. As my first Greek teacher liked to say, “In Greek, you don't say ‘take the money and run’; you say, ‘taking the money, run!’”

Ancient Greek participles, like any other adjective, decline and agree in gender, number, and case with what they modify; also, like any other verb, they indicate voice (active, middle,

passive), they show aspect (simple, progressive or repeated, completed), and to the extent that they indicate time, they do so relative to the main (that is, the finite) verb. For these reasons (among others), participles seem complicated compared to English; on the other hand, this level of specificity reduces the ambiguity that can exist in English with participles, a la “I saw the dog running down the street.” Is it “I” or “the dog” which is running down the street in that sentence? In ancient Greek, however, there would be no confusion — the participle would either be in the nominative case, meaning it would agree with the subject “I”, or it would be in the accusative case, meaning it would agree with the direct object of the main verb “saw”, “the dog”. In English, having lost most of our inflection, we depend on word order and proximity, as well as context, to tell us grammatical function, so the only real way to distinguish whether it’s I or the dog running down the street is to change the sentence to “Running down the street, I saw the dog,” which unfortunately seems a little stilted and artificial. “I saw the dog while running down the street” is a little better, but it seems to imply the imperfect periphrastic “while I was running down the street,” which starts to edge away from a pure use of a participle.

In ancient Greek, on the other hand, if you want to say “I saw Peter walking into my house,” you can do this to eliminate any ambiguity about who is doing what:

Εἶδον/Ἔβλεπα τὸν Πέτρον βαίνοντα εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου. Here, the participle βαίνοντα is in the accusative case, making it clear that it’s Peter going to my house. Also, because of the inflection, you can manipulate the word order in all kinds of ways and have it make sense regardless:

Εἶδον/Ἔβλεπα τὸν Πέτρον τὸν βαίνοντα εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου. Literally, “I saw Peter, the one going into my house.”

Εἶδον/Ἐβλεπα τὸν βαίνοντα εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου Πέτρον. Literally, “I saw the going-into-my-house Peter.”

But then you can also do this:

Εἶδον/Ἐβλεπα τὸν Πέτρον βαίνων εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου. Here, the participle βαίνων is in the nominative case, making it clear that it agrees with the unexpressed subject “I” (unexpressed since the -ov/-α ending of the verb already makes it clear that we’re in the first person).

“Walking into my house, I saw Peter.”

So, yes, it looks freakin’ complicated, certainly more complicated than English, and you have eight pages of paradigms to memorize. At the same time, it’s a time investment that bears fruit when you actually start reading Greek texts. All of this is to say — here’s to inflected languages. Pay now or pay later.

The secret to learning Greek participial paradigms

Make flashcards for everything on pp.204-212.

(That noise you heard was the sound of several dozen faces falling at once.)

I know that’s probably a lot of flash cards, so here’s a shortcut to keep from having to do that.

How to keep from making hundreds of flash cards

Don’t bother learning Greek participial paradigms.

Okay, now that we’ve got that out of the way (and hopefully it’s clear I’m not going to recapitulate for you what Gerry and Hardy have laid out perfectly well for you on pp.204-212), there are some things I will try to clarify. (Do make sure you learn the translation paradigms for the different tenses of participles; obviously both aorist and perfect participles can be translated as “having done”, but the simple/completed aspect difference, while subtle, can be important. I’ll point out examples in the exercises where this is the case.)

The expanding-a-clause-because-of-everything-you-can-do-with-it attributive participle and the participle, since not being in attributive position, that is circumstantial

This unit details specifically with *attributive* participles (“the going-into-my-house Peter” from the example above) and *circumstantial* participles (“Walking into my house, I saw Peter”). Supplementary participles are another use for them, but we won’t meet those until Unit XIV.

With respect to attributive participles – it’s called that for no more complex reason than *it is in attributive position*. If you see a participle in between a definite article and the noun the article goes with (*or* immediately following the repeat of the definite article, e.g. τὸ *noun* τὸ *adjective*), it’s an attributive participle. What’s a circumstantial participle? Every other participle (factoring out supplementary participles, of course).

Here’s the thing – attributive participles do everything attributive adjectives do, and they also do everything verbs do. This means that participles take objects. Yes, that means they can expand their clauses significantly. Here’s a relatively short example:

ὁ πέμπων τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰς τὴν μάχην στρατήγος – “the sending-the-man-into-battle general”

It also means that attributive participles can be used substantively – from the example above, for instance, simply take out any reference to Peter:

...τὸν βαίνοντα εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου. This is a substantive use of an attributive participle – “the one walking into my house”.

Circumstantial participles also do everything a verb does – take objects, etc. – but not being in attributive position, they have to be understood as describing – wait for it – the *circumstances* surrounding the action expressed by the finite verb. Greek has a set of helpful

words that *can* clarify exactly what kind of circumstances the participle is describing, and these are outlined on page 215, so yep, you guessed it, get ready to go make some more flash cards. The main thing I want to emphasize here is a subtle but important difference, that being the difference between ἄτε/οἷα and ὥς. Both indicate *causal* force, “Because/since”, but ἄτε/οἷα indicate that the speaker is vouching for what is being said as the cause; ὥς is also causal, but it means specifically that the speaker *isn't* vouching for what's said. It's a “so they say”, you might say, or even a way Greeks do the equivalent of “scare quotes”. If you “know” what I “mean”.

Two other points to remember about circumstantial participles for the moment: first, take note of the brief mention made of future participles being used as a substitute for a purpose clause. You won't see this often, but you need to know it when you see it. Also note that when a participle is negated with μή instead of οὐ, it then stands for the protasis of a conditional sentence where the condition being expressed is negative. In general, μή is indicative, shall we say, of a non-indicative use of the verb, and what that means for a circumstantial participle is that the factual *circumstance* becomes the as-yet unfulfilled *condition*.

Finally, while it's going to be tempting to smooth out participial phrases into relative clauses (“the general *who* sends the man into battle” rather than “the general sending the man into battle”), or at least to re-render them into clauses with finite verbs linked by conjunctions (“Take the money and run” rather than “Taking the money, run”), **DON'T**. At least not right now. For right now, unless your teacher tells you otherwise, your teacher is more concerned that you understand how participles work and how they are grammatically different from relative clauses, *not* that you can produce a publishable, easy to read translation. Let your translations be literal and clunky for the time being; as my first teacher liked to say, “It's an English problem, not a Greek problem.” Just learn your participles for now.

Every use of πᾶς is found in this whole section, and it's all good

πᾶς is a three-termination adjective that in predicate position means “all”, accompanying a singular noun with no article means “every”, and in attributive position means “whole”.

That’s seriously all there is to it, in every case. That’s the whole thing.

Shall we do some sentences?

Unit VIII Exercises

I. As always, notes as needed. Greek to English:

1. (After/when/while/since/although) having left behind (simply) the old men, we (a group of women) have come being about to indict the speakers altogether, the ones having stolen, (on a charge of) bribes.

The first participle, λipoῦσαι, is not in attributive position, therefore it is circumstantial. There is no helpful word to tell us anything more about the circumstances; context would help, but failing that, we have to choose one. The participle is aorist, therefore it is translated – for Hansen and Quinn’s purposes – as “having done (simply)”. The ending of the participle is nominative feminine plural, which agrees with the first person plural ending of ἡκομεν, so the speakers are a group of women. κεκλοφότας is an attributive participle being attributed to τοῦς ῥήτορας; since it is in the perfect tense, it is translated as “having done”. γραψόμεναι is a future participle in the middle voice, so it’s functioning as a purpose clause (and don’t forget that γράφω in the middle voice means “indict” and takes a genitive of the charge). Again, a real sentence like this would supply context that would make certain ambiguous things clear, but this is how you take a sentence like this apart and put it back together otherwise.

2. Let us conduct a sacrifice to the gods having saved (simply) Athenians in that battle in order that all the gods now might want to guard/to be guarding the democracy.

The only thing really necessary to note here is that σώσασιν initially looks like a third person plural finite verb, except that it's a dative plural participle.

3. If only the first men (according to me), because (of) having destroyed the peace at least, would send messengers.

Independent use of optative, no ἂν, therefore πέμψειαν optative of wish; ὅτε, therefore λύσαντες is a causal participle, with the cause vouched for by the speaker.

4. Those evil men, the ones leading the good and wise teacher to death, will be harmed, you know, by the gods, because (of) doing (according to me) shameful things.

Not a lot to point out here, except that οἱ κακοὶ οἱ τὸν ἀγαθὸν τε καὶ σοφὸν διδάσκαλον εἰς θάνατον ἀγαγόντες is an example of an attributive participle with a long-ish(though by no means the longest you might see in Greek) list of things being attributed. Get used to it.

5. Did the man stealing the things of others and at the same time persuading the young men all together to be doing evil things, even if he wasn't sacrificing to the gods, harm the entire country or not?

This is a really unwieldy sentence to render into English without re-thinking the syntax, but again, English problem vs. Greek problem. ὁ...κλέπτων...πείθων is a pair of attributive participles (τε...καὶ shows that the two are intended to be taken as a pair) being used substantively; plus, μὴ...θύων is a participle being used conditionally, that is, standing in for the protasis of a conditional sentence. (It could also indicate a generic substantive – “the one, whoever it was, not sacrificing to the gods” – and I've got a note in the textbook from 13 November 2006 that this in fact was my first teacher's preferred parsing, along with another note that he referred to ὁ...θύων as a “huge attributive sandwich that's the whole subject of the verb – that's pretty friggin' cool”; in any event, looking at it myself, I could see an argument for

θύων being attributive or circumstantial, and I'm open to being convinced one way or the other. Look at pp. 214 and 216 and judge for yourself.) That being the case, the imperfect tense of the finite verb ought to be taken as the apodosis of that sentence, and an imperfect indicative is found in the apodosis of a past general conditional sentence – “did/did” – so it is translated as “did he harm” rather than “was he harming”. The result is really clunky in English, but it's accurate; let your teacher tell you about how to polish it up if in fact that's what is desired.

6. Let us (women), because (of) having been saved (according to me), sacrifice.

Perfect passive participle with causal force being vouched for by the speaker, and also the subject of the verb. Not too much else to say here.

7. Since the enemies destroyed the unguarded bridge, quite all of the hoplites left behind the weapons in the plain because (of) (so they claim) now being about to keep peace, at least/in order that they might now keep the peace, at least.

There are a couple of ways to take ὥς...ἄξοντες – the future participle could be taken as showing causal force not vouched for by the speaker, or it could be taken as a purpose clause. Context would make this clear.

8. In the well-guarded country, the army did not, let me tell you, rule the people, but if, at least, the citizens were harmed by the enemies, quite all of the ones leaving the old men in the houses were appointed by the generals in order that they might guard against the men having come to the land.

Here again ὥς...φυλαξόμενοι could be taken two different ways, except that the context of the generals appointing people means that taking it as a purpose clause makes the most sense. Remember that φυλάττω in middle voice means “guard against”, “guard for one's own benefit”.

9. The books being written by good poets will teach, in fact, whatever women are not slaves.

Μή negating an attributive participle; therefore the participial phrase is indicating a generic class. Not much else to say about this one.

10. The general, although having (simply) stationed the soldiers next to the sea, nonetheless refused to lead those men six stades into battle.

Here are our first examples of concessive participles, clearly marked with καίπερ and ὅμως.

11. We have left gifts, of course, for that poet, at least, the one having written concerning virtue. For he has taught (the women) all together to be doing good things.

12. (Since) having left money for those evil orators, therefore I led the army into the country of the Greeks not being guarded by the soldiers.

ἥγαγον could be 1st person singular or 3rd person plural, but the nominative participle λιπών is singular, therefore it must be 1st person singular. ἔπειτα provides the context for λιπών to be understood as causal.

13. The thing saving the whole country is virtue, let me tell you, old man.

*This is a little tricky. The attributive participle τὸ...σῶζον is being used substantively, with ἀρετή as the predicate. Because it's an attributive participle, it can't be translated as "saving the whole country is (a) virtue" – that would be expressed as an articular infinitive, τὸ σῶζειν. Therefore, it's "**the thing** saving the whole country..."*

14. Are not the things having been done for the gods, at least, all just?

15. He led the soldiers to the field in order that he might begin the battle, of course.

16. If you should do good things, brother, I would send during the night those animals having been sacrificed (simply) by the old man.

17. That shameful orator, although having sent bribes to all the unjust men and at the same time having persuaded the people to destroy the peace, nonetheless wanted to be saved by quite all the free men instead of being justly harmed.

18. Since (according to me) (the women) doing badly, (female) friends, neither should we keep the peace nor be slaves to evil men.

19. The Athenians, for the sake of the (their) friends, having been persuaded by evil orators, wanted to command all the islands, at least, and therefore the women were sending money on the one hand, on the other hand if they were not persuaded they were harmed.

χάριν plus a genitive means "for the sake of". One of those details from Unit VI.

20. (Although) guarding the freedom of all that night, Greeks, now, of course, although being stationed in battle, will you neither obey the generals wanting to save quite everybody nor (will you) save the country?

Don't be confused here by ἐθέλουσιν looking like it's third person plural present indicative active; it's not. It's a present dative masculine plural attributive participle agreeing with τοῖς στρατηγοῖς.

21. You were sent to the marketplace, shameful orator, by the people, to be indicted (on a charge of) theft.

Future participle being used as a stand-in for a purpose clause.

22. (After/when/while/since/although) having left behind (simply) good books for (his) friends) for his own benefit, the poet was buried by the young men having been taught well and beautifully.

*As usual, context would make some of the nuances of this clear. λείπω in the middle voice can mean “leave behind for posterity”, but you wouldn’t know that without looking it up someplace other than Hansen and Quinn’s glossary. Probably, in context, the circumstantial participle λιπόμενος is not indicating concessive force (“although”); it’s more likely to be causal. The sense in cleaned-up English is probably going to be something like “**Because** the poet had left behind good books as a monument for his friends, he was buried by the young men who had been well and skillfully taught (by him).” If it were concessive, the sense would be ironic, perhaps: “Although he had left to his friends good books for posterity’s sake, he was (nonetheless) buried (euphemism for “killed”, maybe) by the young men who had been well and thoroughly taught.”*

23. (After/when/while/since/although) having indicted (simply) (on a charge) of theft the (women) having stolen wine, good (women), we will guard the houses, at least.

24. Now, you know, we ought to send gifts, at least, to the good men having appointed the army in battle. For without virtue the generals will destroy the democracy, harming the just and doing unjust and shameful things.

25. They had come to the island, you know, in order to stop the war, but they wanted to steal the she-goats and the wine, the gifts which we had been sent by the goddess, at least.

ἤκόν is imperfect but because ἤκω already has a perfect meaning, that means the imperfect tense shows a pluperfect meaning. Once again, a future participle is being used to show purpose. We also have an instance the rarely-seen-in-the-wild dative of personal agent being used with a pluperfect passive verb (ἐπεπόμφεμεν τῇ θεῷ). Watch out for the people who want to steal your she-goats and your wine, as I always say.

26. Are we to hinder, in fact, that old man from teaching the young men because (according to me) (of) having stolen the wine from the house?

Or, to clean up the translation a bit – “Are we to hinder, in fact, that old man from teaching the young men because, as I say, they’ve (the young men) stolen the wine from the house?” I’m going to guess that you started translating this as “Let us hinder...” until you got to the end, saw the semicolon, and realized it was a question. Then you probably had to go back and remind yourself that there is such a thing as a deliberative subjunctive. It happens. Don’t make the mistake of too-quickly assuming that κλέψαντα is an attributive participle; οἷα means that it isn’t, that it’s a circumstantial participle showing causal force vouched for by the speaker. Also don’t forget that κωλύω takes an infinitive of the action being hindered.

27. Will you come for five days into that country in order to teach the citizens rhetoric? But you (after/when/while/since/although) being guarded by the old men, at least, might not be teaching them.

Do note that our nominative participles are feminine, so the speaker is addressing women in this case.

28. Having been left behind on the island and (according to me) having destroyed the democracy, then nonetheless having stolen silver, they were harming all of the men having been well-civilized.

29. In wine, you know, even that wise man used to do/was doing shameful things; for having left behind the (his) brothers he was dancing around the house.

You gotta be careful when wise men drink. They get pretty crazy.

30. Having been saved (simply) (according to me) in that battle, (the women) could make for their own benefit/you (women) could make for your own benefit a sacrifice to the goddesses having guarded the earth/land.

Here, I am 99% certain that we have a typo in Hansen and Quinn. ἄγοιτο is a third person singular optative, but looking at the rest of the sentence, it seems clear to me that σωθεῖσαι is intended to be a participle that agrees with the unexpressed subject of the verb, and it is plural. It could be a dative, agreeing with τῇ μάχῃ, in which case it would be “He/she could make a sacrifice in that battle having been saved to the goddesses having guarded the land”, but I’m having a hard time making sense of the idea of a battle being saved in this context. Far better, I think, to take σωθεῖσαι as a plural nominative and to read the verb as ἄγοιντο. Mistakes happen. Another possibility is that the form is ἄγοιντε, as the elision just means the word has to end in a short vowel, ο or ε, which would make it second person plural present tense, then agreeing with the participle as the implied subject (y’all, apparently female). While it is certainly a possible solution, if we were dealing with a real text, I’d be hesitant to go with this because I’d expect such an idea to be expressed as an imperative rather than an optative; there’s also the principle of lectio difficilior (basically, because errors happen, if faced with two possibilities, go with the more difficult reading). But this is definitely an alternative possibility.

31. The orators, at least, were persuading the general, although having appointed well the hoplites, neither to be leading the other army to the sea nor to be guarding the land.

Orators don’t really seem to be good guys in these sentences, do they?

32. Being taught by the good men, brothers, you will indict (on a charge) of bribes whatever orators are not obeying the good men.

Here, again, is an attributive participle being negated by μή which means it is indicating a generic class. Don't forget that πείθω in the middle means "obey" with dative of the entity being obeyed (or not, as here).

33. Having begun the battle, we might harm for our own benefit/cause to be harmed the enemies since (according to me) having destroyed the peace.

34. If, at least, you steal all the wine, young man, you will be harmed because (according to me) (of) having done unjust things.

That's telling him!

35. Having harmed the enemies, at least, then, we will sacrifice to the goddess because (according to me) (of) guarding both the bodies and the money and the souls of all the citizens.

Do note that the nominative participle is feminine plural. Hansen and Quinn are giving you a lot of feminine subjects in this unit, I believe, to get you used to distinguishing between feminine plural participles and infinitives.

36. If you had obeyed the orator writing speeches concerning war, Greeks, you would have been well on guard against the men having left behind the (their) weapons in the battle.

But you didn't. So there. Now what are you gonna do, smart guys?

II. English to Greek:

1. καίπερ βλαπτόμενοι ὑπὸ τῶν νεανίων, οἱ πολῖται οὐκ ἠθέλησαν λῦσαι τὴν δημοκρατίαν, καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς ἤγαγε τοὺς στρατιώτας εἰς τὴν χώρα ὡς ἄρξων τῆς νήσου OR ἵνα/ὡς/ὅπως ἄρξαι/ἄρξειεν τῆς νήσου.

It asks that you show purpose two different ways; you can do this with either a future participle or with a purpose clause. The tense of the main verb is aorist, which means we're in secondary sequence, so the purpose clause uses the optative mood.

2. βλαπτόμενος ἐν μάχῃ OR ἐὰν βλαφθῇ/βλαβῇ ἐν μάχῃ, ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἐθελήσει παῦσαι τὸν πόλεμον.

Two ways to write a protasis: with a participle and with an if statement.

3. λίποντες OR εἰ ἐλίπομεν τοι τὸν στρατήγον καὶ πάντας τοὺς ὀπλίτους ἐκεῖ, μὴ ἐπαύσαμεν τὴν μάχην ἂν.

4. ἄγωμεν τὸν αἵγα τὸν κλαπέντα εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τῶν στρατιώτων οἳ ἐπέμφθησαν εἰς τὴν μάχην OR τῶν πεμφθέντων εἰς τὴν μάχην στρατιώτων.

You can express the subordinate clause as either an attributive participle or as a relative clause.

Okay – any questions? Coming up next – the verb system gets even a little more complicated, demonstrative pronouns get demonstrated, and we start to get into some of the finer points of syntax. Good luck.