

XIX.—The Syntax of the Gerund and the Gerundive

W. H. KIRK

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

The purpose of this paper is to maintain the following propositions: A. A few gerundives have the value of present participles. Other uses of the gerundive are derived from uses of the gerund. B. A noun used as object of an oblique case of the gerund may be shifted to dependence on the word which governed the gerund. The gerund thus comes to stand in a complementary and subordinate relation to the noun; and this subordination is formally shown by assimilation of the endings of the gerund to those of the noun. Thus an adjectival form is created, lacking adjectival function, since it never serves as an attributive adjective. Gerund with object and noun with complementary gerundive are both used in the same signification. C. The nominative of the gerund with forms of *esse* is used regularly, as other verbal nouns are used occasionally, to express necessity. This impersonal expression may take an object in any case employed with the corresponding verb. But for verbs having a direct object the impersonal changes, following the pattern set by the perfect passive, to a personal construction; thus a passive gerundive of necessity comes into existence. D. In late Latin the accusative of the gerund is sometimes used, chiefly with verbs of motion, to express purpose. Evidence, slight but sufficient, exists to suggest that this gerund is originally used with a different class of verbs, those denoting transference. Of these the commonest in early Latin is *dare*; and the oldest combination, expressing a transaction both ancient and frequent, is probably *ulendum dare*, on the pattern of which other combinations arise. The change of gerund to gerundive by assimilation to the noun is here carried through completely, since the noun is from the first dependent on the verb.¹

I

Such combinations as *huiusce habendae* (Phorm. 827), *serviendae servituti* (Mil. 745), *legendis nostris* (Off. 1.2), *ad se colligendos* (Caes. Gall. 3.19.1), were inevitably misunderstood, so long as the gerundive was regarded as used here, like the perfect participle, as an attribute and a passive. That view, opposed at different times, but never in a way to carry complete conviction, was finally disposed of not very many years ago by Professor Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* 309f., who, quietly setting it aside, opened the way to a full understanding of the construction. I touch below on the erroneous interpretation of the ablative of the gerundive as an ablative absolute and on the error of paralleling

¹ In most quotations only the essential words are cited. Names of authors are abbreviated as in *TLL*, except that *Fam.* replaces Cic. *Epist.* In quoting from Plautus, Terence, Cicero, and Virgil only the work is named, not the author.

in urbe expugnanda with *post urbem expugnatam*; but I have not thought it necessary to discuss the renderings by Zumpt, *Latin Grammar*, Engl. transl. (N. Y., 1846) 429 and 431, of *in litteris scribendis* and *consilium epistolae scribendae*, or those by Sommer, *Lateinische Schulgrammatik* (Frankfurt a.M., 1920) 145, of *proelii committendi signum dedit* and *Crasso bellum gerendum dedit*. Putting together Buck's interpretation of the gerundive and Brugmann's remarks, cited below, on a certain shift of construction found also in Sanscrit and Greek, I have been led to agree in principle, though not in detail, with the scholars who have held the gerundive in such combinations as the above to be derived from the gerund.

Here, however, the morphologist may intervene to object that a theory which regards *te defrudandi causa* (*Men.* 687) as primary and *tui videndi copias* (*Truc.* 370) as derivative must be wrong, since the gerundive existed before the gerund, a statement for which he may offer two proofs.

First: The gerund is not found in Oscan and Umbrian and must therefore be a comparatively late and purely Latin formation. As to this, there are different views; I quote the pertinent passages: Leumann, *Lateinische Grammatik* (5th ed. of Stolz) 226: "Das Gerundium is nur lateinisch, das Gerundivum gemeinitalisch"; Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (Heidelberg, 1914) 592: "In den Überresten der andern italischen Dialekte sind zwar Gerundivformen gefunden worden, aber kein Gerundium; dies kann also eine speziell lateinische Schöpfung sein"; Buck *loc. cit.*: "perhaps a purely Latin development, although the absence of examples in Oscan and Umbrian may be accidental"; Hofmann, *Lateinische Syntax* (5th ed. of Schmalz) 593: "Wahrscheinlich sind beide, Gerundium und Gerundivum gemeinitalisch (erstes ist in den Dialekten nicht belegt)." It may be added that the material is scanty and has an official character, and that examples of official Latin from the second century B.C. (Bruns *Fontes Iuris Romani*,⁶ nos. 10, 11, 35, 155) have indeed examples of the gerund, but with a noun only of the gerundive, so that but for Plautus and Terence we might suppose that the gerund with object was a late development.

Secondly: The gerund is the substantivized neuter of the gerundive. To show how the language must be tortured in order to get an active noun out of a passive participle I need only refer to Deecke, *Bursians Jahresbericht* 1893, 294, and Sommer, *Handb. loc.*

cit.; but, even accepting as I do Buck's view of the gerundive as active except when used as a *participium necessitatis*, I still find difficulties. The neuter of the participle ought, like the other genders, to denote that which acts, not the action; the development of the *nomen actionis* into a *nomen rei* is very common; I do not know whether instances of the reverse trend can be cited. Moreover, a gerundive which had a neuter that could become a substantive must at sometime or other have existed also in the other genders as a true adjective. Now only a few such gerundives are found (see below) and none of these forms a gerund; for such gerundial forms as *eundi* and *dicendi* there is no corresponding gerundive. It seems to me necessary to conclude, either that such gerundives as *eundus* and *dicundus* shed gerunds and then perished, or that the gerund is not formed from the gerundive.

Assuredly certain gerundives used as adjectives, or participles, are ancient, e.g. *secundus*; ancient, too, are no doubt certain gerunds, e.g. *eundi*; and both are formed on a stem in *-ndo-*, which remains unexplained (Hofmann *loc. cit.*, Sommer *Handb.* 615). Except when signifying necessity, which is admittedly a secondary development, the great mass of gerundives are used only in the oblique cases; and the close relation of these adjectival forms to the substantival appears from their coordination, as in Caes. *Gall.* 4.14.2: *neque consilii habendi neque arma capiendi*; from the fact that writers who generally prefer the gerundival construction nevertheless may use the gerund in order to avoid the repetition of *-orum* and *-arum*; and from the exact equivalence, which no theory can prevent us from giving in translation, of *nos lavando operam dederunt* (*Poen.* 223) and *rei tuae quaerendae operam dare* (*Merc.* 551). How this equivalence was effected I have tried below to explain; the partly analogous developments in Sanscrit and Greek seem to me strongly to support the explanation.

II

To four gerundives we may with certainty attribute the value of present participles. Ennius, Lucretius, and Virgil so use *volvendus*, Accius, Trag. 570, *labunda*. Between *secundus* "following," used of wind and water, and *sequens*, modifying words of time, as *annus* and *dies*, there is differentiation; also between *oriundus*, denoting origin, like *ortus*, and *oriens* = *surgens*. *Secundus* is found chiefly in ablative, the others in nominative or

accusative, except *Aen.* 1.269; only *oriundus* occurs as predicate with forms of *esse*. Other gerundives usually listed with these I discuss later.

III

Of the two readings in *Cas.* 809, *hymenaeo cantando* A, *cantando hymenaeum* P, either is acceptable for sense and syntax. This equivalence of gerundive agreeing with noun to gerund governing noun is recognized, but not satisfactorily explained, by Roby *Latin Grammar* II (2nd ed., London, 1875) "Preface" lxif., and Gustafsson, "De gerundiis et gerundivis latinis," *Eranos* 5 (1904) 81ff. The true explanation had been already suggested by Benfey, *Kurze Sanskritische Grammatik* 227; see Delbrück, *KZ* 18 (1869) 104 and *Vergleichende Syntax* 2.471f.; it is further developed by Brugmann, *Grundriss*² 2.3.917ff. under the heading "Abhängigkeitsmachung des dem Infinitiv untergeordneten obliquen Substantivkasus vom regierenden Verbum." In Vedic Sanscrit a substantive which is properly the object of a dependent infinitive may be shifted to dependence on the main verb, and the Vedic infinitive, having different case forms, may be assimilated in case to its former object. In Greek the same shift of construction may take place, of course without assimilation. In Latin the verbal noun affected by the shift is the gerund. Beside *Epid.* 605: *Epidicum operam quaerendo dabo*, we have *Asin.* 250: *argento comparando fingere fallaciam*, the primary sense of which is shown in Hofmann's rendering, *op. cit.* 597: "für das Geld, seine Beschaffung." Change in the position of the two elements, as in *Persa* 5: *quaerundo argento mutuo*, obscures the epexegetic function of the verbal noun (*KZ loc. cit.*); and the use of a feminine, as in *Rud.* 1374: *rei servandae*, or a plural, as in *Stich.* 678: *lectis sternendis*, completes the transformation into an adjective. Thus beside the few gerundives having the value of participles many arise with an altogether different function, of which it can be said (Buck, *loc. cit.*), that the gerundive is used "with retention of its active force, but in agreement with the logical object (or better, both in the same construction)." The "double genitive" (Hofmann, *IF*, 42 [1924] 85), as in *Capt.* 852 and 1008, represents an intermediate stage, in which the construction of the substantive is shifted, but the gerund is not assimilated. The same shift takes place after prepositions: of the two types, *Brut.* 85: *in suum cuique tribuendo*, and *Fin.* 5.67:

in suo c.t., the former, though not found in early Latin and in general rare, represents the original use.²

That in early Latin the gerund is commoner than the gerundive³ is true if gerunds of intransitives and of transitives without object are included. But for these we do not expect to find the gerundive; exceptional for the latter are *Hec.* 391 and 403, the Livian examples cited by Steele, "The Gerund and Gerundive in Livy," *AJPh* 27 (1906) 283f., and Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.34. The proper comparison is between gerundives in agreement and gerunds with object, and in early literature the former predominate:⁴ Plautus 40:15, Terence 20:12, other dramatists 10:3, Cato *Agr.* 13:0, Lucilius 5:0. Their predominance in official language is well known. Of later writers the only one with whom the gerund absolutely predominates is Vitruvius, 40:58; of the 40 gerundives 34 are with prepositions. In the *Naturalis Historia* prepositional phrases abound; apart from these, a rough count suggests that gerundives preponderate, but not greatly; they are largely datives; a dative of the gerund I have noted only in 28.29.

The alternation of the gerund with various forms of the verbal noun has often been noticed;⁵ I add some examples: Gell. 3.7.12: in expectando sunt, Liv. 7.6.8: in expectatione erat; *Andr.* 771 in pariendo adfuerunt; *Dig.* 25.4.1.10: partui adesse; Lucr. 4.842: utendi causa, Varro *Ling.* 8.30: usus causa; *De orat.* 1.241: agna-

² A theory for which Roby, *op. cit.* lxxiii cites Kühner, *Schulgrammatik* 131, 5, and which is accepted by Persson, *De origine et vi primigenia gerundi et gerundii* (Uppsala 1900) 111, and by Kvičala, "Gerundium und Gerundivum," *WS* 2 (1880) 228, regards the construction of *in urbe expugnanda* as being exactly like that of *post urbem expugnatam*, a participle in each case representing the verbal noun *expugnatio*. This implies that the gerundive is a present passive participle and that it stands to the noun in a true attributive relation, as the perfect participle does; both assumptions are impossible if one accepts, as I do, Buck's views as to the nature of the gerundive and its relation to the noun. See Roby's criticism of the theory, *op. cit.* lxxiii; a strong argument against it is that, while the noun and participle are so used in the nominative, the noun and gerundive are not, except in the very late instances referred to by Hofmann, *op. cit.* 595. This limitation is not easily understood, if both constructions spring from the same root, the preference for concrete expression; it becomes intelligible, if we regard the use of the oblique cases of the gerundive as arising out of the use of the oblique cases of the gerund.

³ Bennett *Syntax of Early Latin* 1.442; some statistics in Gustafsson *op. cit.* 91f. and *Gl* 24 (1936) 102.

⁴ Omitted are *Cist.* 721, *Merc.* 987; *Mil.* 1010, where *conveniundi* may be either form; also passages such as *Eun.* 20f., *Hec.* 254, where the object belongs to both finite verb and gerund. *Cas.* 809 is included among gerunds.

⁵ E.g. Madvig *Lateinische Sprachlehre*³ (Braunschweig, 1857), 385, Nägelsbach *Lateinische Stilistik*⁸ (Müller, Nürnberg, 1888) 153, Riemann *Syntaxe de Tite-Live* 202.

scendo rumpi testamentum, Ulp. *Reg.* 23.2: rumpitur testamentum mutatione . . . item agnatione; *Fin.* 3.34: cum ceteris comparando . . . comparatione cum aliis: *Ecl.* 8.71: cantando rumpitur, *Arch.* 19: cantu flectuntur; Quint. *Inst.* 2.18.1: positae in agendo, *ibid.* 2: in actu consistere. In Arnob. *Nat.* 2.7: pili paulatim adiciendo canescant, the gerund is necessary, since Latin has no adjective corresponding to *paulatim*. The gerundive also is so used, Caes. *Civ.* 3.28.5, *De orat.* 3.56, *Fin.* 5.32; cf. Liv. 7.3.1.: procurandis religionibus, 5.17.1: ad prodigii procurationem ac deos placandos; *Orat.* 74: immolanda Iphigenia, Quint. *Inst.* 2.13.13: in Iphigeniae immolatione.

Cicero's *immolanda* is cited by Sommer *Schulgram.* 146 and *Vergleichende Syntax* (Leipzig, 1921) 101 as an instance of the gerundive as present participle passive in ablative absolute: see for a like interpretation Marx *Rhetorica ad Herennium* "Prolegomena" 170, and for criticism of this interpretation in Livian passages Steele *op. cit.* 299. In truth, all the supposed examples may be regarded as falling under one or another of three heads: gerundive for gerund as equivalent to present participle or *dum* clause, as *Off.* 1.5: nullis praeceptis tradendis (Kühner-Stegmann *Lat. Gram.* 2.1.752, Klotz *Kommentar zum Bellum Hispaniense* (Leipzig, 1927) 64; ablative of means, as *Div.* 2.148: superstitione tollenda (for ablative absolute see *ibid.* 123, *Off.* 3.28); simple ablative for ablative with *in*, as *Orat. loc. cit.*; Vitruvius 1.1.10: legibus scribendis, cf. *Inv.* 1.68; Sall. *Catil.* 61.2: pugnando, reproduced in Flor. *Epit.* 4.12.12 by *in pugnando*.

The view that the gerund is sometimes passive appears in the fourth century (Diomedes in *GLK* 1.343.13ff., Servius on *Ecl.* 8.71); it is accepted by Klotz *loc. cit.* who refers to Vahlen *Festschrift für O. Hirschfeld* (Berlin, 1903) 488. Madvig *loc. cit.* (see note 5) holds that only the appearance of a passive is created, either by the use of a gerund for a substantive, "z. B. *movendi* für *motus*," or by the fact that the subject or agent implied by the gerund is sometimes to be found elsewhere than in the subject of the main verb. In fact, this detachment of the gerund (as also of the gerundive) from the principal subject is not uncommon⁶ and is usually

⁶ Cf. Roby *op. cit.* lxiif., Kühnast *Livianische Syntax* 21f., Munro on Lucret. 1.312. Extreme cases are Nep. *Cim.* 4.4: sic se gerendo minime est mirandum si et vita eius fuit secunda et mors acerba, and Dig. 50.16.67.1: donationis verbum simpliciter loquendo omnem donationem comprehendisse videtur. With this *loquendo* cf. the

unnoticed; only in respect to some ablatives and some accusatives with *ad* (Vahlen treats only of the latter) has the theory of passivity been advanced. In a few cases parallel passages refute it; with *Georg.* 3.225: *urit videndo*, cf. *Hec.* 435: *ambulando rumperet*, *Pis.* 43: *vigilando necaverunt*, which explain also *Liv.* 37.19.4: *exhauriant commeatibus praebendis*; with *Leg.* 1.25: *pecudes ad vescendum procreatas*, cf. *Liv.* 22.52.5: (*argento*) *ad vescendum facto*; with *Fam.* 9.25.2: *ades ad imperandum*, and *Sall. Iug.* 62.2: *ad imperandum vocaretur*, cf. *Font.* 17: *segniore ad imperandum*, like *Merc.* 630: *ad mandata claudus*; see Cobet *Mnemosyne N. S.* 8 (1880) 190. Taking a broader view, we find that the use in such subordinate phrases of active or passive may differ in different languages and vary in the same language. On the Greek infinitive see Kühner-Gerth *Griechische Grammatik* 2.2.15. The following quotations may serve to illustrate English usage. J. S. Fletcher *The Lost Mr. Linthwaite* (N. Y., 1923) 51: "I may as well see what there is to be seen. Is there anything to see?"; Freya Stark *Gates of Southern Arabia* (N. Y., 1936) 3: "All the frankincense is brought to that place to be stored"; 117: "Donkeys were trotting up with water in goat-skins to mix with the earth."; M. G. Kains *Grow Your Own Fruit* (N. Y., 1940) 157: "ripe enough for eating"; 158: "ripe enough to be picked for eating"; 161: "ripe enough to eat." Storrs-Best *Varro on Farming* (London, 1912), translating *Rust.* 1.68: *si non dempseris ad edendum, ad abiciendum descensurum se minitantur*, writes "to be eaten" and "to be thrown away." The first we might render by "for eating"; cf. Kains 158 and *Rust.* 1.60: *esui condi*; that for the second we naturally use a passive shows, not that the Latin gerund may be passive, but that Latin and English idiom may differ, as Greek and English may; cf. *Hom. Il.* 18.508.

Usually the shift from gerund to gerundive takes place only when the gerund, if retained, would take a direct object. One exception is *Cael.* 51: *vel in legatis insidiandis vel in servis sollici-*

gerundives *silendo* and *omittenda* in *Plin. Nat.* 16.171, 18.11: also, in the *New English Dictionary* IX 1, 534, the examples of "speaking" and "to speak." The detachment of the gerund is found also in French and English. For different points of view respecting the French usage see on the one hand Gerault et Bouvier *Grammaire des Grammaires* (Paris, 1886) 2.721, and Brunot et Bruneau *Grammaire historique de la langue française* (Paris, 1933) 527, on the other Haas *Neufranzösische Syntax* (Halle a. S., 1909) 271, and Le Bidois *Syntaxe du français moderne* (Paris and New York, 1935) 1.477. On the English usage see H. W. and F. G. Fowler *The King's English* (Oxford, 1906) 125, and H. W. Fowler *Dictionary of Modern English Usage* (Oxford, 1926) 216.

tandis, made for the sake of the homoeoteleuton; Gellius, 1.11.2, 1.13.9, has not that excuse. Another, an extension of the preference for gerundive after preposition, is Liv. 3.28.7: ad prohibenda circumdari opera; cf. 6.15.9, Plin. *Nat.* 20.147. A third occurs with the verbs *frui*, *fungi*, *potiri*, *uti*.⁷ It is usually said, either that these verbs were originally transitive, or that in this construction they were treated as transitives because in early Latin, and sometimes later, they may take the accusative. But the only early examples of assimilation are *Haut.* 133: ad haec utenda and, by perseveration,⁸ *Lex agraria* (*CIL* 1.200) 85: vectigalibus fruendeis locandeis vendundeis; Langen *ALL* 3 (1886) 329ff. shows that in early Latin *frui* and *uti* almost always take the ablative, as they regularly do later; Delbrück *Vgl. Synt.* 1.248 and 253 and Wackernagel *Vorlesungen über Syntax* (Basel, 1920) 1.68f. conclude from the use of both accusative and instrumental with Sanscrit *bhunkte* and *patyate* that the use of two cases with *fungi* and *potiri* is inherited, which allows us to infer that the Latin accusative belongs rather to a sphere than to a period of the language; finally, such instances as I find of the gerunds of these verbs all have the object in the ablative.⁹ I incline therefore to believe that the fairly frequent gerundives are due simply to the general preference for that form. Roby *op. cit.* lxx holds that an exception occurs with some intransitives in -sc-; having collected further examples, I partly agree with him. That gerundives of such verbs may be used as present participles is clear from Ps.-Lact. *Mort. pers.* 33.9; tabescendorum viscerum; and I prefer so to understand *CIL* 1.317: Florae quae rebus floresentibus praeest, comparing Aug. *Civ.* 4.8: praefererunt florentibus frumentis Floram. But Ven. Fort. *Vita Hil.* 3.6: spem convalescendae infantiae, must mean "hope of the infant's recovery";¹⁰ similar are Chiron 69: luminis nascendi origo, and 191: ratio huius morbi nascendi; and I find it difficult to understand otherwise Gell. 3.10.10: modum summum adolescendi corporis, while remaining in doubt as to Varro *Ling.* 6.11: senescendo-

⁷ For *vesci* a possible example is Vitruvius 2.1.1; but in view of his general preference for the gerund, I incline here to recognize that form; cf. 1.2.8.

⁸ Oertel "Über grammatische Perseverationserscheinungen" *IF* 31 (1912) 49ff., Havers *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax* (Heidelberg, 1931) 69ff.

⁹ *Fin.* 5.20, Vitruvius 1.2.8, 5.4.4, 7.3.10, 8.3.28, *Liv.* 21.59.5, 33.21.2, 34.47.6, 41.8.9, Sen. *Benef.* 2.34.4, Plin. *Nat.* 7.18, 19.108, 35.165.

¹⁰ Cf. *Att.* 7.3.12: Tironis reficiendi spes. As to *infantiae* for *infantis* see Löfstedt *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (Uppsala, 1911) 111ff.

rum hominum, Gell. 3.10.7: ad homines nascendos, and Aug. *Civ.* 22.28: in hominibus renascendis.

IV

Sommer *Handb.* 371 and *Vgl. Synt.* 101 suggests that the gerundive, having become a present participle passive, may have acquired the sense of necessity from association with the negative; his citation of *invictus* may indicate that he, like Kvičala, *op. cit.* (note 2) 231, held the development to be from possibility to necessity; cf. Persson *op. cit.* (note 2) 106. Kvičala, however, *loc. cit.* gives up this theory for that of Corssen, who (*Kritische Beiträge* 133) compares *Trin.* 869: agitandumst vigiliis, with *Amph.* 519: quid tibi hanc curatior rem; similar is *Curc.* 486: linguae moderandumst mihi, beside *Rud.* 502: quid mihi tibi erat auscultatio, and *Ad Q. fr.* 1.1.43: est tibi his utendum,¹¹ beside *Asin.* 89: viginti usust filio minis. The sense of necessity appears occasionally in various verbal nouns. For Greek cf. Dem. 1.3. δέος, 1.14 ἐλπίς. For Latin Hofmann *Lat. Synt.* 594 cites *consultatio*, *Hec.* 650, *descensus*, Sall. *Catil.* 57.2; add *iter*, *Phorm.* 66; familiar is *cautio est ne* in Plautus (who uses *cavendum est* only with ablative) and Terence. Comparing Liv. 22.53.7: non consultandum ait esse, with *Hec.* 650: Nulla tibi hic consultatior, we see a correspondence between *consultandum* and *consultatio* such as was noted above between *expectando* and *expectatione*, and may conclude with Roby *op. cit.* lxxi and Schömann *Die Lehre von den Redetheilen nach den Alten dargestellt und beurtheilt* (Berlin, 1862) 57 that the gerund had a nominative which, employed perhaps at first more freely (Persson *op. cit.* 127), was finally confined to the expression of necessity. In this view a direct object is as natural with *agitandum* as with *agitandi*, both forms being active. The oblique cases remained active; the nominative became personal and passive through the influence of the perfect, just as, according to Ernout "Recherches sur l'emploi du passif latin" *MSL* 15 (1908-1909) 332, an impersonal *librum legitur* became *liber legitur* to accord with *liber lectus est*. Perhaps the change took place first in the neuter, the likeness in form of *id faciendum est* to *id factum est* leading to the conclusion that the function of the pronoun was the same in both; then, such a form as *monendum est te* (Catull. 39.9) being felt as incongruous with *monitus es* and with the new conception of the neuter, conjuga-

¹¹ I do not find *utendum est* in early Latin.

tional symmetry was effected by the change to *monendus es* (*Pseud.* 915).¹² Thus out of an active substantive denoting necessity arose a passive adjective having the same sense.

The explanation of final *-r* as the sign of the impersonal (Ernout *op. cit.* 289, Meillet *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*⁸ [Paris, 1937] 234) explains Pallad. 8.4.1: indiget hoc genere, and impersonal *caletur* beside personal *calet* in Plautus. To regard this impersonal with its middle suffix *-tu-* (Ernout *loc. cit.*) as a passive in its rare appearances with a direct object (Wackernagel *Vorl.* 1.146, Löfstedt *Komm.* 292) seems unwarrantable; passivity is a matter of function, not of form, as Quintilian felt, *Inst.* 9.3.7, and as Wackernagel, *Vorl.* 137ff. sets forth with respect to the Greek aorist and future. These appearances are rare survivals of an ancient usage, which faded out of the literary language¹³ because of the incongruity with the common use of transitives with the nominative, as also because the intransitives had come, in accordance with the transitives, to be felt as passive; that this latter development was gradual may be inferred from their comparatively late association with the ablative of agent (Wackernagel *Vorl.* 1.148).

That the change from impersonal to personal for the form in *-ndum* was much later than that for the form in *-tur* is made probable by the more vigorous survival in this case of the older construction. For examples from classical and juristic Latin see Roby *op. cit.* lxiii f., for some from ecclesiastical writers Linderbauer *Benedicti Regula* (Benediktinerstift, Metten, 1922) page 233. The ten examples in Lucretius¹⁴ may be due not only to his archaizing

¹² Cf. Paul *Principien der Sprachgeschichte*⁶ (Halle a. S., 1937) 227: "Jede Sprache ist unaufhörlich damit beschäftigt alle unnützen Ungleichmässigkeiten zu beseitigen, für das funktionell Gleiche auch den gleichen lautlichen Ausdruck zu schaffen."

¹³ That it remained in popular speech down to the fourth century seems to me proved by *fil orationem*, Aether. *Peregr.* 25. Löfstedt takes this as an instance of passive with direct object; for other explanations see Heraeus *ALL* 15 (1908) 552. To me it seems that here, as in 39: *ingressus est discipulis*, on which see Löfstedt's note, the writer fell into error by trying to be correct; for the historically correct *facitur* she substituted the normal *fit*. Schmalz *BPhW* 30 (1910) 703 cites Sall. *Hist.* 4.10 M.: *castra introitum*; that this is an accusative of place to which seems evident from *Capt.* 469: *ilicet malam crucem* (cf. *Most.* 359), and Apul. *Met.* 2.2: *me forum intuli*. Of the ablatives of perfect participles with accusative cited by Schmalz the earliest is from the end of the fourth century, and nothing analogous appears at an earlier period; if we accept them with Schmalz's interpretation, it can only be as evidencing the decadence of the language. For another interpretation see Havers *Gl* 13 (1924) 183ff.

¹⁴ In *Lucr.* 3.626 *esse* is not to be understood; cf. *Dig.* 1.9.12.1: *Senatores accipiendum est eos*.

tendency but also to metrical convenience. The two in Cicero¹⁵ are interesting; in *Cato* 6 he has the transitive deponent *ingrediundum* (*Trin.* 963 *adgrediundus*); in *De orat.* 2.341 he achieves concinnity and brevity by letting *scribendum* follow on the common *utendum*. In Varro I find 45 instances (42 from the *De Re Rustica*), along with many of the gerundive. He seems to use the two constructions indifferently; cf. *Rust.* 1.11.2: *villam aedificandum* . . . *cisternae faciendae*, *ib.* 1.17.5: *plures parandos esse* . . . *praefectos alacriores faciendum*. In only one passage is a neuter noun clearly an object, *ib.* 1.47: *pecus ab prato ablegandum et omne iumentum, etiam hominem*.

Of verbs regularly taking the ablative the only gerundives of necessity that I find in prose are *Rhet. Her.* 2.17.26: *visa est supersedenda*, due to the constantly personal use of *visus sum* (see *CPh* 33 [1938] 187), and *Fin.* 1.3: *non paranda solum sed fruenda etiam est*, Varro *Rust.* 1.62: *quod sunt tuenda aut quod utenda aut quod vendunda*, both cases of perseveration (see note 8). In Catull. 5.6 and Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.23 we have gerundives from intransitives, the accusative of duration being treated like the accusative of the object and turned into a subject; so, I think, *expectandus*, *Prov.* 17, *Off.* 2.75, Cels. 3.4, page 82, 5D.¹⁶ The irregularity, here veiled by the confusion of accusatives, is evident in *Epid.* 74: *puppis pereundast*, and *Trin.* 1159: *placenda dos est*, a license which may be Plautine only or have belonged to popular speech, and for which I can think of or find no quite satisfying explanation.

V

Except for *fruendus*, *utendus*, *vescendus*, and the intransitive *immorandam* Cass. Fel. 30, the final gerundive is always that of a verb regularly taking a direct object. The gerund with *ad* is a fairly common substitute; others are only occasional, except when "to drink" is to be expressed. For this we find in early Latin and Chiron *bibere* or *bibat*, the former also in *Tusc.* 1.65, Liv. 40.47.5, Veg. *Mulom.* 2.12, page 300 ed. Bip., the subjunctive in Plautus also with a relative, see *TLL* 2.1961, 59; *bibendus*, 18 times in Plin. *Nat.*, seems to occur first in Val. Max. 2.4.5, *potandus* only in Colum. 6.14, page 159 ed. Bip., 7.10, page 314; Celsus and Cassius Felix use

¹⁵ *Scaur.* 7, 13 is, of course, not an example: see Müller's text.

¹⁶ *Expectare* being used absolutely = "wait"; to the examples in Lewis and Short add *Fam.* 10.18.2, Sen. *Benef.* 1.10.3, 5.6.5, 5.12.1, 5.20.6, 6.40.2, Mart. 1.15.7.

only *potui*. I note also *manducare* Chiron 401, 454, *edit* Cato Agr. 157.9, *esui* Varro Rust. 1.60, Cels. 4.16.

The governing verb is rarely intransitive.¹⁷ Of the nine transitives (54 instances) *dare* (32) is far the commonest; later, by "the construction of opposites" (Fay *CQ* 5 [1911] 186), the gerundive is used in Sen. *Epist.* 118.3, Lucan 4.804 with *negare* "refuse," in Colum. 1.3, page 31, with *eripere*. In some instances of *dare* in early Latin (e.g. *Mil.* 803), and always with *locare* and *conducere* (cf. e.g. Cato Agr. 14.1, *Dig.* 19.2, 19.7) the real object seems to us to lie in the gerundive; accordingly Bennett *op. cit.* (see note 3) 444 does not regard the gerundive here as final. But in the case of other verbs we often must, or find it convenient to, depart from the Latin idiom in translation: cf. e.g. Liv. 5.22.4, Lucan *loc. cit.*, Tac. *Hist.* 1.25. Note, too, the use with *locare* of substantive alone with the gerundive to be understood, as in *CIL* 1.206, 36, Frontin. *Aq.* 6, Liv. 27.10.13, 34.53.3, 40.44.10, and similarly in Greek Dem. 18.122, as also the fact that in Greek ἐκδιδόναι with infinitive is equivalent to *locare* with gerundive (Liddell and Scott *sub voce* I 3). Bennett also will not regard the gerundive with *curare* as final, nor will Odelstierna *De vi futurali ac finali gerundii et gerundivi observationes* (Uppsala, 1926) 14, who takes the gerundive with *curare* as equivalent to an abstract noun. I doubt the possibility of such an interpretation, since I know of no example of the gerund being used as *direct object* of a transitive verb and therefore rather hold that the Roman here also admitted a conception not according with ours.

Livy's use of final gerundive after *in* and once after *circa* (Steele *op. cit.* 284) seems a natural extension of the use after verbs (a different view in *TLL* 7.765, 77 and 79); whether he so used it also after *ad* (Weissenborn on 36.16.3, 39.21.2) is not clear, though I am inclined to admit the possibility in view of Vit. 10.13.1, where *ad* seems to stand for *apud*, and of Liv. 9.25.2, if the *inquirendos* of most manuscripts may be accepted; however, both Weissenborn and Walters and Conway prefer the *inquirendo* of the Medicean. The view of Baehrens, *Ph Supplement* 12 (1912) 342ff., that Livy used gerundive and substantive without *ad* in the same final sense

¹⁷ *Mil.* 891 *venire*, Caes. *Gall.* 7.81.6 *obvenire*, Liv. 8.22.9, 35.20.7 *evenire*, 42.3.7 *patere*, Colum. 11.3, page 450, Sen. *Epist.* 90.36 *iacere*. The examples of *venire* in its literal sense, cited by Smith on Tibull. 1.2.76, do not belong with *Mil.* 891, where *venire* = *evenire*.

as with *ad*, has not found acceptance¹⁸; see Hofmann *Lat. Synt.* 599, Klotz *op. cit.* 41, who, however, do not question this use in late Latin, regarding which see Baehrens *loc. cit.* and *Mnemosyne* 38 (1910) 402ff., and especially Löfstedt *Spätlateinische Studien* (Uppsala, 1908) 86ff. and Odelstierna *op. cit.* 26ff.; Stangl's *Pseudasconiana* I have not seen. Of the gerund, also so used, the earliest example is Chiron 133: *ambulandum ducere*. Oder's note reads: "ad ambulandum?"; looking at 115 and 261, we might supply *in*; but one is tempted to ask for *inambulandum* in both passages and so get two more instances of the simple gerund. The frequent use of the construction with a verb of motion, at least in what may be regarded as sure examples, seems to confirm the view of Hofmann, *Lat. Synt.* 599, *Gn* 18 (1928) 698, that the gerund was substituted for the obsolescent supine; cf. *Dig.* 7.1.12.1: *navis usufructu legato navigandum mittendam puto*, perhaps a sixth century copyist's use of the current form in place of Ulpian's *navigatum*.

We translate the final gerundive sometimes by a passive, oftener by an active. Greek uses in such phrases the infinitive active (Kühner-Gerth *Griech. Gram.* 2, 2.16); that Latin also may, is shown by *dare bibere*. This infinitive may or may not be associated with a noun (*TLL* 2.1960, 31ff.); of the gerundial form without noun I have noted only two instances, *Dig.* 13.6.1.1: *inter commodatum et utendum datum tantum interesse*,¹⁹ and *Cato Agr.* 5.3: *duas aut tres familias habeat, unde utenda roget et quibus det, praeterea nemini*.²⁰ That *utendum* and *utenda* are not passives, I infer from the fact that only once, and that in a special connection, is the impersonal *utendum est* changed to a gerundive; see page 303. Hence I conclude that *utendum dare* contains a gerundial accusative of purpose, which became a gerundive by assimilation to the noun,

¹⁸ The most pertinent example Baehrens does not cite, *Liv.* 29.28.10: *speculatum ad mare turbandosque egredientes ex navibus missi*. Neither the reference in Weissenborn's third edition to passages where a supine is coordinated with a gerundive introduced by *ad*, nor the attempt in the sixth edition (Müller) to make *ad* serve for both *mare* and *turbandos*, is satisfactory. Whether a second *ad* may be inserted before *turbandos* I must leave to others to say.

¹⁹ *Commodatum* and *datum* are here used in an abstract sense; cf. the rendering by Monro in his translation of the *Digest*, Vol. 2, edited by Buckland (Cambridge, 1909): "between making a loan and giving a thing to be used"; also Girard, *Manuel Élémentaire de droit romain* (Paris, 1911) 529: "Le prêt à usage (*commodatum*, anciennement *utendum datum*).". For the two meanings of *commodatum* see *TLL* 3.1921, 34ff.

²⁰ The plural *utenda* is due to the attraction of *utendum* into the number of *quibus*, just as *nemini*, for which we expect *neminem* sc. *habeat*, is due to attraction into the case of *quibus*.

and that the gerundives in *Persa* 127: *filiam utendam mihi da*, and *Amph.* 669: *ad aquam praebendam*, both find their explanation in the remark of Buck cited on page 296. I think further that the combination *utendum dare*, an ancient phrase expressing an ancient and familiar transaction, set the pattern for the use of other gerunds and gerundives first with *dare*, then with a constantly increasing number of other verbs. The thorough carrying through of the assimilation in the case of the final gerundive is due to the fact that here there was no shift of construction for the noun, which was from the first the object of the main verb. That in some connections popular speech may have retained the gerund, is suggested by the use of the gerund with *ad*, which may be an urban equivalent, and by one late phrase, Fredegar *Chron.* 2.57, cited by Odelstierna *op. cit.* 36: *bistiis (sic) tradatur devorandum*. In Capitol. *Aur.* 6.4 *formandus*, in Pallad. 4.9.14 *nutriendos*, in Cass. Fel. 30 *conglutinandam*, all in a different setting from that in which the final gerundive arose, are clearly passive; whether earlier and in the usual connection the gerundive came to be so felt, I have not tried to determine. The interpretation of *aedificare* in TLL 1.925, 78 carries with it the necessity of understanding *aedificanda* in Liv. 1.35.10 as passive; I feel doubtful, but, because of Varro *Ling.* 5.147, cannot discuss the point without entering upon a discussion of the use of the perfect participle.

VI

The assumption that, alike in *Fam.* 5.21.5: *cupidus mei videndi*, and in *Fam.* 10.32.5: *epistolam legendam tibi misi*, the gerundive is an adjective only in form, not in function, involves the further assumption that both turns of phrase are irrational, the product not of thought but of thoughtlessness. In this there is nothing new or surprising; it is a platitude to say that in the use and development of language logic does not always rule and error plays a part. In English the incorrect substitution of a verbal adjective for a verbal noun appears on the one hand in the familiar "the house is building" instead of "a-building," and on the other hand in a usage which, to judge from the examples in Mätzner, *English Grammar*, Eng. transl. (London, 1874) 3.66, arises in the second half of the eighteenth century, is sharply censured by H. W. Fowler, *op. cit.* (note 6) under the heading "Fused Participle," and is still prevalent; the latest example I have noted is in *New Statesmen and Nation*, Mch. 8,

1941, page 238: "The Runcimans had many predecessors. The aim of this little story is to prevent them having successors." The *quod esset consilium eorum* of Hirt. *Gall.* 8.7.3 is grammatically and logically correct; the *quid sui consilii sit* of Caes. *Gall.* 1.21.3 is perhaps the most flagrant example of a widespread misuse of the genitive. Cicero says, *Leg. agr.* 1.5: *quemadmodum Pompeium oppugnarent a me indicati sunt*; cf. *Font.* 39, *Att.* 7.17.4. In Quint. *Inst.* 5.12.12 we find: *quae non debent deesse orationi et, si desunt, multum nocent*; cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Nouveaux Lundis*, 3.129: "En temps ordinaire toutes ces circonstances auraient eu moins d'importance, car toutes n'auraient pas donné à la fois; l'une, en manquant, aurait corrigé et compensé l'autre"; the logical subjects of *nocent* and *aurait* are contained in *si desunt* and *en manquant*. For a conspectus of errors due to assimilation in different languages, some occasional, others creating a usage, see Wackernagel, *op. cit.* 51–59; instructive also is the discussion of *attractio inversa* by Löfstedt, *Komm.* 222ff.