Juliette, are you there?  
yes I'm here.   
Yeah, I know. I apologize.   
That's ok  
Are you okay if we do tonight's lesson simply via chat?  
That will work.  
You're a real trooper! Thanks so much. So, let's get started! First of all, how are you tonight?  
Actually, this afternoon for you.  
I'm good. How are you?  
I'm okay. A little anxious, because I'm awaiting word about that teaching job, but other than that, pretty darn good. Did you understudy tonight?  
  
I'm sure you get it. No I left early to study.  
Y'know, I kinda agree with you (about the job). Hey  
:)  
Thanks. That's great you were willing to give up a night of understudying for your studies. What's the role you're understudying?  
We're doing The Liar and I am understudying the part of Geronte.  
Well, the important thing is, I hope you're having fun. I'll tell ya what, let 's get started. Sound good?  
  
Ok that sounds good.  
Now, the quiz covers the present and imperfect subjunctive, right?  
Yes, and the Hortatory, Jussive, and Optative  
Optative  
How about purpose clauses? Is that on tomorrow's quiz, too?  
Yes, thank you for reminding me. Purpose clauses are also on tomorrow's quiz  
Okay. Have you learned already how to form the present subjunctive?  
  
The present subjunctive of the first conjugation changes the -a of the present stem to -e, and then adds the personal endings  
Excellent!! Wow, you know it. Have you learned the other conjugations, too, or just the first?  
We have done all of the conjugations, I think.  
Okay, great. For the second conjugation, what gets changed to what?  
the infinitive -ēre goes to -ea in the subjunctive  
Exactly - (long) e to (long) ea. Good. And the third conjugation, how do you make that subjunctive?  
the infinitive -ere goes to -a  
Good!! Exactly. Now, how about third -io?  
third -io goes from -ere to -ia?  
Excellent! And how about the fourth conjugation?  
from -ire to -ia  
Excellent, Juliette. You've learned this material VERY well. Do you know what a mnemonic is?  
it's a way of remembering things.  
for the subjunctive I think of it as wE fEAr A gIAnt lIAr   
Did you come up with that on your own? I've never heard that one.  
I saw it on a youtube tutorial. I thought it was the easiest for me to remember (since I'm in the play the liar)  
:-)) Good for you. I'm going to remember that one myself. Thanks for sharing it.  
Okay. Well, did you have a chance to do those exercises I sent you?  
:) Absolutely.  
I didn't get a chance to do them, but I looked over them before logging on  
No problem. That's great. We'll do some of them now together.  
Sounds good!  
  
The first one is ardeant- 3rd person plural, present, and subjunctive. The translation is Let them be fervent  
Yeap-present. Okay! I wouldn't go with "should". Think of it as a jussive (since it's independent). How do you translate the jussive? Good! Good! "catch on fire"? Um...not really. Think of it as "Let them be fervent" "Let them show ardor". No, no, no—don't apologize. You're doing great.  
Sorry, my dictionary said ablaze...Um...that's sort of a translation. Ardeo, ardere really means to show ardor, to work diligently, that sort of thing.  
Ok. My vocabulary might be a little off, my book has some different translations...  
The next one is accident- 3rd person plural, future, indicative. Sorry, They will happen  
Present? Be careful. EXCELLENT!!!!!! What mood? No, no, no. What do you know about the subjunctive? Exactly! The subjunctive does not exist in the future.  
Ok thank you. That helps.  
Good. Glad to hear it. Now, how do we translate "accident"?  
Future indicative?!! Accido, accidere = "happen"  
Skip down, Juliette, to #5.  
Excellent so far, Juliette!  
  
Serviatis - present, 2nd plural, sorry. subjunctive - You should serve   
Good. Excellent. Singular? Really? Good! Exactly. Now, how are we going to translate this? Jussive subjunctive occurs in which person?  
  
Good, good, good! You opted not to translate it as a jussive because why?  
um... I don't know. The jussive is used to bid someone to do something.  
Exactly! And "someone" is which person? Second person plural  
No, no, no. Think of the following English sentence: "Someone is coming." The verb "is" indicates that the subject "someone" is which number and person?  
third person singular  
Exactly!!! The jussive subjunctive is used solely with the third person (singular and plural). Which person does the jussive subjunctive's counterpart, the hortatory subjunctive, use?  
  
(In my textbook it says that the present subjunctive can by used in the 2nd or 3rd person singular/plural)  
And it can!! Most certainly. But second person subjunctive will never be a jussive or a hortatory. Hortatory subjunctive is used soley with the first person. That is why you translated "serviatis" completely correctly. You translated it as neither a jussive or a hortatory.  
Oh ok.  
So would the Hortatory be first person plural, let us, or let's  
Yes!! As a matter of fact, as a quick exercise, try the following: Veniamus.  
  
  
1st person pl, present, Hortatory Subjunctive- Let us (let's) come  
Good job. Exactly! no, no, no. Venio, venire, veni, ventus. RIGHT!!!!  
  
Thank you! I get it! :) :)  
:-)) I'm glad.  
  
Okay, let's try the following. Nesciatur. Give that a try.  
  
2nd? Good job!  
  
3rd singular, passive, present, Jussive subjunctive?- Let him not know  
  
Sure! Third person, right? Subjunctive in an independent clause? Meets all the criteria for a jussive subjunctive, right?  
Yes.  
Jussive. How do we translate the jussive? Right!!!!  
  
nescio, nescire = "to not know" (the opposite of scio, scire)  
Not "Let him be unknown" but "Let him (what?)"  
  
Right!!!! Wow, Juliette, you brought your A game tonight!!  
  
Thank you. This really helped.  
Good, I'm glad. Let's try "vertimini"  
  
2nd plural, present, passive, indicative- You are turned (?)  
good, right!, great catch on the indicative! What's the translation?  
  
Good catch! "Fought"? Um...verto, vertere = "turn" Right! think of it as "You are turned" as in "turned to the Dark Side" or something like that.  
Okay! One more. iubear  
okay, 1st singular, passive, Hortatory subjunctive, Let me be commanded.    
Right! Exactly! good catch! iubeo, iubere, iussi, iussus "be bidden" "bid"? Um... Exactly! TERRIFIC translation. And it's hortatory, not jussive, why?  
  
Thank you so much for all your help. It is hortatory because it is the first person.  
  
Exactly! (And it's my pleasure to help, trust me. It's easy to help such a terrific student.)  
:D  
Okay. Now. The imperfect subjunctive. What can you tell me about that?  
I know what it is, I just can't explain it.   
  
Huh?  
Try again.  
Okay. No prob. It's simply in the imperfect because of tense (meaning, the subjunctive occurs in the imperfect because there are sentences in which the imperfect will be needed to express the idea the writer wants to convey). Now, what's the formula for constructing the imperfect subj?  
  
Um...No. Actually, the formula for creating the imperfect subj is actually very simple: the present active infinitive (by definition, the 2nd principal part of every verb) + the personal endings.  
  
So, try the verb audio, audire in the imperfect subj for the 2nd pl active.  
  
audibatis audia  
Be careful. \*imperfect\* subj -- look at your formula above. No--that's the present subjunctive. No- "audibatis" is the imperfect indicative  
What's the 2nd principal part (the present active infinitive) of the verb "audio"?  
audire  
Right!  
Now, simply attach the appropriate personal ending.  
audiretis?  
Exactly!!!! "Audiretis" is completely correct. Good job.  
How are we going to translate it?   
You were listening   
Good! "You were listening" is the indicative, right? No--that's the indicative, right?  
Yes that's the indicative, the Jussive would  
Actually, really, you can't translate the imperfect subjunctive by itself. Which, actually, brings us tidily to one of the items on tomorrow's quiz, namely the optative subjunctive. One of the tenses the optative subj uses is the imperfect.  
  
  
What have you learned so far about the opt subj?  
  
  
I was out that day sick, but from what we've done in class, I am going to say that it is hopeful thinking; May Marcus come to the villa  
  
Um...Yes, sort of. "May Marcus come to the villa" (but he's probably not going to)--the part in the parentheses, that's what the optative subjunctive conveys. In a nutshell, the optative subjunctive is used for a future wish capable of fulfillment. It is introduced by the word "utinam" or the word "ut" (in the negative, it's introduced by "utinam ne" or simply "ne").  
  
So. Let's try "Utinam veniat!"   
  
First, though: anything about that above explanation you need me to clarify?  
I'm sorry, what does utinam mean??  
  
The best translation of "utinam" is "Would that...". Oh Ok thank you.  
Sure.  
Would that he come (?)  
That's actually not a bad translation at all. A smoother-English translate might be "Would that he may come."  
Oh ok that makes sense   
"Would that he may come" (the speaker, by using the optative subj, is implying, "But it's not likely that he will").  
ok, sounds good.  
Great. How about "Utinam ne veniat."  
  
Would that he may *not* come  
Exactly! You got it.  
YAY!!!  
Type that again! (I didn't mean to erase it.) That's ok.  
Yay, indeed!  
  
Now, to tie in the imperfect subjunctive. One of the main uses of the imperfect tense in the subjunctive is in the optative, in what is called a "contrary to fact" construction. Contrary to fact wishes use the imperfect subjunctive for present tense. I know that sounds confusing, but it goes back to how the Romans looked at their world. For example:  
      
Utinam veniret! ("Would that he were coming" (but he is not)" (the part in the parentheses is the "contrary to fact" part -- the speaker is basically saying, "I sure wish he would (could, was able to) come, but, alas, he cannot." Understand?  
  
Ok. I sort of get it.   
  
Try translating "Utinam ne iuberemus."  
ok...Would that we were **not** commanding   
Which voice? -mus is which voice?active   
Exactly! "Commanded", though, is which voice? Right!!!!! That translation is almost perfect. One thing's missing. Can you spot it?  
  
What you just wrote in the parentheses is not the translation, but is indeed what the speaker is conveying. What about the word "ne"?  
Juliette, you still there?  
Yes, I added not into the translation.  
  
Oh, okay. We were disconnected for a moment.  
And that's completely correct: "Would that we were not commanding." Now, what in the sentence "Utinam ne iuberemus" justifies your correct translation "were commanding"?  
because iuberemus is the imperative + personal endings  
Exactly!!!!!! Good job.  
  
We've covered the jussive, the hortatory, and the optative. There's another subjunctive on tomorrow's quiz, right?  
:)  
I think so? I'm sorry did we do purpose clauses  
  
Nope. Purpose clauses. Yay!!!!! Purpose clauses. (Cheering in the background, the crowd goes wild.)  
:)))  
Okay. Were you in class for the explanation of purpose clauses?  
No. I wasn't.  
Okay. Purpose clauses really aren't complicated. The hortatory, the jussive, and the optative are three examples of the subjunctive used in \*independent\* clauses (meaning, they stand alone). The subjunctive in purpose clauses occurs in the \*dependent\* clause--in other words, the purpose clause is an example of a \*dependent\* use of the subjunctive.  
  
With me so far?  
  
I think so....I'm still a little bit confused but I'm sure it will straighten out.  
  
Okay. It will. It's perfectly okay to be a little confused.  
  
Um...The purpose clause is one of the most common types of dependent subj clauses. This clause expresses the reason for or the purpose of the action in the independent clause. A purpose clause is introduced by the subordinating conjunction "ut" (remember, conjunctions join two or more clauses in a sentence, and a \*subordinating\* conjunction specifically joins an independent clause and a dependent clause). The conjunction "ne" is used if the clause expresses a negative idea.  
  
Okay. Good so far?  
Good so far.  
  
Let me tell you something before we continue: this is \*not\* easy Latin--this is some pretty advanced stuff, so be proud of yourself that you're getting into a advanced stage of your study of the language.  
  
Thank you so much. I am very proud. I couldn't do it without your help. Thank you again.   
  
Thanks. my pleasure. I just wanted you to know that.  
  
Okay: Imperator adest ut fabulam audiat. Which mood is "adest"?  
  
adest is subjunctive?  
  
Subjunctive? What makes you think subj? (I'm not saying you're wrong. I am asking you to justify your answer.)  
the -e in adest   
  
Take the prefix "ad" off and you have which verb?  
est; sum es est summus estis sunt  
And "est" is? Exactly! Which mood is that?  
So it's imperative (not imperative! you meant to type \_\_indicative\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_) Good!  
  
Exactly! So that's the independent clause, right?  
  
Yes  
  
Now, you have the word "ut" which is the subordinating conjunction that announces a what?  
a subjunctive?   
  
"Subjunctive" is a mood. Look at what I wrote above: "A \_\_\_purpose clause \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is introduced by the subordinating conjunction "ut".  
  
Right!! So, what's being announced is the purpose clause. So: "ut fabulam audiat" Tell me the five characteristics of hte verb "audiat"  
1) 3rd person  
2) singular  
3) subjunctive  
4)active  
5)present  
  
Great job on #2!  
  
Person, number, tense, mood, voice  
  
Great. Okay. Now, in a purpose clause, you can translate it a number of ways: "so that he could hear the story" ("fabulam" is singular, accusative, feminine, direct object of the word for "story" or "fable", right?)  
Yes  
  
Good. (Impromptu vocab review.) Another translation: "for the purpose of hearing the story". Another (maybe, the smoothest-English one): "in order to hear the story"  
  
So, put the whole thing together in a smooth translation "Imperator adest ut fabulam audiat" (adsum, adesse, adfui, adfuturus = to be present, to stand before)  
  
The leader stands before in order to hear the story  
Sure! Either one of those is great. Good for erasing that second one--that wasn't right. "The general is present in order to hear the story." "The general is here for the purpose of hearing the story." Any of these is just fine.  
  
It's 6:04pm. Are you up for a little bit more?  
  
:) I realized as soon as I was typing it. Ok.  
Absolutely, if you're ok with that.   
  
Sure!! It's my pleasure.   
  
You wrote above, "I realized". Realized what?  
  
  
I realized that the second sentence I typed was wrong. I asked it the sentence would work if the order was switcher; In order to hear the story, the leader stands beforeI realized it as soon as I typed it. That's what I was talking about. Yes I understand that. I see how it can be either. Thank you for clearing that up.  
  
Oh. Actually, the translation, "In order to hear the story, the leader stand before (the crowd--understood)" is just fine. As you know, word order in Latin means nothing.   
  
No prob. Questions are always good. Never hesitate to ask them.  
  
Let's try this one: "Arborem ascendit ne inveniatur." Give that one a shot.  
  
arborem  
1) 1st   
2)singular  
3)feminine   
4)accusative  
What's the number, gender and case for "arborem"?  
  
  
I'll help you out: "arbor, arboris" is feminine.  
  
Right! And why do we put a word in the accusative typically?   
  
No, no. That's how it's in the accusative. Why (typically) are words put in the accusative? (Think: function in the sentence.)  
I don't remember...  
  
That's okay. Let's do a fast review:  
    Nominative = ? subject  
Genitive = ?possession  
Great job!  
Dative = ?Indirect-object  
Right!!!!  
Accusative = ? Direct object!  
Exactly  
And ablative equals everything else.  
  
So! "Arborem" is the what in the above independent clause?  
The direct object.  
  
Good job!!!!!  
"Arborem ascendit ne inveniatur."  
  
Okay. So: "The tree" (direct object) "ascendit"  
  
Oh, yeah—we have gotten pretty far away from the sentence, haven't we? Look at the material we're covering.  
  
ascendo, ascendere = ?  
up? ascend?  
"Ascend" is a fine translation. To ascend a tree is to \_\_climb up\_\_\_\_\_\_ the tree.  
  
"to climb up"  
  
Exactly! So, "ascendit" = person, number, tense, mood, voice  
  
  
1) 3  
2)singular  
3)active  
4)present  
5)indicative  
  
Perfect tense?  
  
Actually, Juliette, good catch: "ascendit" is the spelling of both the 3rd person \*present\* tense \*and\* the 3rd person \*perfect\* tense -- that doesn't happen too often in Latin; this just happens to be be one of those times. In this particular sentence, it's the present tense (we know that from the tense of the verb in the dependent clause--via a concept called "the sequence of tenses").  
  
Oh OK.  
  
  
He does not climb up the tree?  
  
"Should"? You correctly indicated that "ascendit" is in the indicative mood.  
  
Look at the explanation I typed above. "Ne" is a subordinating conjunction, right? Subordinating conjunctions announce what?  
  
purpose clause?  
  
Exactly! Specifically, a purpose clause that expresses a negative idea.  
  
So, the "ne" doesn't go with the independent clause ("arborem ascendit"), but rather with the dependent clause, right? "ne inveniatur"  
Right.  
  
He   
So far, so good.  
  
Remember which clause the "ne" functions in.  
  
I don't know. Can you help me through it? Sorry.  
Sure!!  
  
You almost had it above. If "ne" actually functions in the dependent clause, then "arborem ascendit" translates as, not, "He does not climb up the tree" but actually as  
\_He climbs up the tree\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_?  
  
  
Right!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!  
 Great job!  
  
Okay. Now, what about "ne inveniatur"?  
  
Remember, you've already correctly recognized this as a purpose clause.  
  
I do not find  
Close! invenio, invenire, inveni, inventus = find, discover (in this sentence, go with find)  
  
  
inveniatur: person, number, tense, mood, voice  
  
3rd person  
singular  
present  
passive  
subjunctive!!!!  
  
great catch on the passive!  
  
"jussive" isn't one of the moods. "inve  
  
  
Okay! Now, just put the whole thing together: "Arborem ascendit ne inveniatur."  
Let him not climb up the tree  
  
Do not let him climb up the tree  
  
  
Which number is "arborem"? singular  
  
"Arborem ascendit" -- you correctly translated it just a few lines above.He climbs up the tree  
  
Right!!!! Now, the dependent, purpose clause: "ne inveniatur"  
He does not find?  
  
How did we translate the purpose clause above? We did so a number of ways.  
  
I'm sorry I can't find it.   
  
No prob. "for the purpose of \_\_\_\_\_" "in order to \_\_\_\_\_\_" "so that he could \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_" -- all of those are variations of perfectly legitimate translations  
Let him not be found  
  
Yes!! Yes!! You're on the right track. "Let him not be found" would be an independent, jussive clause. This is a purpose clause.   
  
Let him not be found for the purpose of climbing up a tree?  
???  
"Arborem ascendit" -- is that the independent clause or the dependent clause?  
  
  
independent?  
  
Right!!!! "ne inveniatur" independent or dependent?  
  
Hi kerry, it's Marianne  
  
Bonsoir, Marianne!  
  
Forgive me I have to take Juliette away to dinner... A table!  
  
Y  
  
I know. We really got into the lesson tonight. Juliette has been terrific this afternoon!!! She KNOWS this stuff!!  
  
great. You must be exhausted as well.  
thank you so much for fitiing her in  
  
i will let you know how she did on the test/quizz  
  
and schedule next session this week end.  
  
good night!  
  
Absolutely my pleasure. It's always terrific to teach such a great student.  
  
Okay. Sounds great.  
  
Juliette, real quick: "Arborem ascendit ne inveniatur" = "He climbs the tree in order not to be found."  
  
Good night!!!!