XVIII.—Voice of Non-Finite Verb Forms in Latin and English

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

Hittite non-finite verb forms, being essentially nouns or adjectives, are voiceless, but seem to us passive when transitive (unless an object is present), active when intransitive. Latin and English, despite formal voice-distinction, show traces of the same condition. In this connection a new solution is offered for the Latin gerund and gerundive. Their fundamental difference is one not of voice, since both were originally voiceless, but of function—substantive vs. adjective. A gerund accompanying another noun in the same case (a construction with parallels in Hittite and Sanskrit, and remnants in Latin), misinterpreted as an adjective agreeing with the noun, produced the gerundive construction, which has no connection with gerund plus object. The theory accounts for all uses of gerund and gerundive, including all peculiarities.*

I

The linguistic category of voice is by no means universal or even widespread. It is well-established in Indo-European, and those accustomed only to working with this branch of languages, unless they are thoroughly well-trained in linguistic method, are

* It seems unnecessary to cite bibliographical details for the following familiar works: (1) Greek and Latin grammars: Brugmann-Thumb [4]; Bennett (*Syntax of Early Latin*), Gildersleeve-Lodge[3], Hale and Buck, Lane, Leumann-Hofmann (= Stolz-Schmalz [5]), Madvig[3], Roby (all references are to Part II), Sommer (*Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* [3]), Stolz-Schmalz[4]. (2) Comparative grammars of Greek and Latin: Buck, Meillet-Vendryes[2]. (3) Classical periodicals: *AJPh, ALL, BPhW, TAPhA*. (4) Latin and English dictionaries: Ernout-Meillet, Walde [3]; *New English Dictionary* (abbreviated *NED*), Skeat, Webster's *New International Dictionary*[2]. (5) Editions and Loeb Library translations of Latin authors. The following non-classical periodicals are cited: *IF = Indogermanische Forschungen; JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society; KZ = Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung; Lang = Language, MSL = Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris.* Other works referred to are as follows: Theodor Benfey, *Handbuch der Sanskritsprache*, 2 vol., Leipzig, 1852-4; K. Brugmann, *Abrégé de Grammaire Comparée*, transl. into French by J. Bloch, A. Cuny, and A. Ernout, Paris, 1905 (abbreviated *KVG*); Karl Brugmann and Berthold Delbrück, *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen*[2], 5 vol., Strassburg, 1897-1916 (abbreviated *Grund.*); Johannes Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Ḫatti-Reiches in Hethitischer Sprache*, 2 parts, Leipzig, 1926-30; Albrecht Götze, *Ḫattušiliš, Der Bericht über Seine Thronbesteigung nebst den Paralleltexten*, Leipzig, 1925 (abbreviated *Hatt.*); id., *Neue Bruchstücke zum Grossen Text des Ḫattušiliš und den Paralleltexten*, Leipzig, 1930 (abbreviated *NBr.*); E. Adelaide Hahn, *Coordination of Non-Coordinate Elements in Vergil*, Geneva, 1930; Hermann Hirt, Indogermanische Grammatik, 7 vols., Heidelberg, 1921-37; W. H. Kirk, "The Syntax of the Gerund and Gerundive," *TAPhA* 73 (1942) 293-307; W. M. Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, Oxford, 1907; Hermann Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*[2],

likely to seek for it and fancy they find it in languages in which it really does not exist; but such a procedure is methodologically indefensible.   The only safe guide, here as elsewhere, is to look for a formal difference; if this is wholly non-existent, we must conclude that any functional difference is also non-existent.[1]

Thus in the North Caucasic languages [2] the distinction between active and passive does not exist, but on the other hand the distinction between transitive and intransitive, which of course exists but does not seem extremely important in the Indo-European group,[3] is of cardinal significance.   In these the noun representing the agent with an intransitive verb is in the "casus patiens" (corresponding to an Indo-European nominative), but with a transitive verb it is in the "casus agens" (corresponding to an Indo-European instrumental), while the recipient of the action is denoted by a noun in the "casus patiens."   Such a language really has no voice; but from our point of view the intransitive verb is active and the transitive verb is passive.

Evidence is not lacking that at least within limits a somewhat similar state of affairs [4] prevailed in proto-Indo-Hittite.[5]   The Hittite finite verb, to be sure, resembles that of Latin in having two

Halle, 1886; Holger Pedersen, *Hittitisch und die Anderen Indoeuropäischen Sprachen*, Copenhagen, 1938; Ferdinand Sommer, *Die Aḫḫijavā-Urkunden*, Munich, 1932 (abbreviated *AU*); Edgar H. Sturtevant, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Philadelphia, 1933; N. Troubetzkoy, "Langues Caucasiques Septentrionales," in A. Meillet and Marcel Cohen, *Les Langues du Monde*, Paris, 1924; I. Vahlen, "Ad Ciceronis Pisonianam c. 41, 98," in *Festschrift zu Otto Hirschfelds Sechzigstem Geburtstage*, Berlin, 1903; William Dwight Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar²*, Cambridge, 1923; Johannes Wilde, *Die Passivischen und Medialen Ausdrucksweisen Objectiven Geschehens*, Weida, 1913; E. Wölfflin, *Die Gemination im Lateinischen*, Munich, 1882.   Works are cited by the surnames of their authors only, unless ambiguity would result; references are to pages. Citations of Latin passages without names of authors are all from Plautus or Terence. In Hittite and Latin passages only apposite words are quoted, with no indication of omissions.

   [1] Similarly, the attempts of some students of English to find datives and accusatives in English (because Old English, or, even more absurdly, because Latin, had them) are as ill-advised as it would be were Hellenists to seek for ablatives in Greek or Latinists to seek for instrumentals in Latin (because Indo-European had them).

   [2] Troubetzkoy 127–8.   Cf. Speiser's discussion, *JAOS* 59.289–324, especially 319, of Hurrian as a language somewhat of this type; otherwise Goetze *Lang* 16.125–40.

   [3] Cf. Brugmann *KVG* 521, Hirt 7.28.

   [4] Of course such similarity is purely fortuitous, and is not to be interpreted as implying any relationship between Indo-Hittite and North Caucasic.

   [5] I accept the Indo-Hittite hypothesis.   Those who do not may simply substitute early Indo-European for Indo-Hittite wherever the latter occurs in this article.   The question which is correct has no bearing on my present thesis.

voices, active and medio-passive;[6] but when we turn to the non-finite forms, both verbal nouns (gerunds, infinitives, and supines) and verbal adjectives (participles), we find an altogether different state of affairs.   Hittite has a single participle [7] which corresponds in form to the Latin *regens* but in use to both *regens* and *rectus*.[8] And it has a number of verbal nouns, all originally *-r/n* stems in *-war -mar* or in *-tar -sar*,[9] certain case-forms of which have acquired specialized syntactic values, as follows: from nouns in *-war -mar*, a gerund in *-was -mas* (genitive),[10] a supine [11] in *-wan* (suffixless dative [12]), and an infinitive [13] in *-wanzi -manzi* (dative of a *-t-* extension [14]); and from nouns in *-atar*, an infinitive in *-anna -anni* (dative).   All the Hittite scholars with whose work I am familiar assume that the participle is active if intransitive, passive if transitive.[15]   They have not in general committed themselves in regard to the verbal nouns, though Götze has tentatively suggested [16] that the forms in *-wanzi* are active [17] and those in *-anna* medio-

[6] Even here, however, it should be noted that the distinction is by no means clear-cut.   Some verbs (active intransitives) have active forms only, some (deponents) have passive forms only, and some (active transitives) have both; but that the distinction is to a great extent a formal one only is shown by the fact that the medio-passive, though often passive and still oftener middle in force, at times cannot be distinguished in meaning from the active, especially in the case of deponents.   The same state of affairs exists in Greek and Latin; in regard to the latter, cf. fn. 27.

[7] However, cf. fn. 10.

[8] The Hittite participle is not only, as I hope to show, voiceless, but tenseless as well.

[9] For the first set see Sturtevant 152–4, for the second *ib.* 149–52.   The second set, according to Sturtevant (149), "are used chiefly to form verbal nouns from intransitive verbs, especially medio-passives"; but this is a purely formal matter.

[10] This gerund generated a declinable adjectival form with nominative masculine in *-as* comparable to the Latin gerundive (which may be viewed as an additional participle).   Thus *KBo* 5.9.3.2–3 *me-mi-ya-aš ku-iš Ū-UL i-ya-u-wa-aš* may be explained as meaning literally either 'a thing which (is) not of doing' or 'a thing which (is) not to be done'.   See Sturtevant 153, Götze *Hatt.* 140, Friedrich 1.45.

[11] Regularly so called (e.g. Sturtevant 153).   I see no reason why it might not equally well be called an infinitive.

[12] So Sturtevant 153.   Pedersen (150) calls it a suffixless locative, which for Hittite comes to the same thing though it involves a different view of the history of the cases.   I myself think the form may rather be the neuter accusative of the *-t-* extension posited by Sturtevant (154) in connection with the infinitive in *-wanzi*.

[13] Some authorities call this too a supine (cf. fn. 11); but the name is of course of no importance.   Cf. Brugmann *Grund.* 2.3.889–90.

[14] Sturtevant 154.   Cf. fn. 12.

[15] See e.g. Sturtevant 158.

[16] *NBr.* 31.

[17] They do indeed seem to be limited to active verbs (Sturtevant 154), but this once more is a purely formal matter (cf. fn. 9).

passive.   But as a matter of fact I believe that no Hittite non-finite verb forms, whether adjectival or nominal, possess voice, and that our endeavors to find such a distinction in them is simply a forcing of our own speech-habits upon an alien tongue.[18]

The real criterion for Hittite non-finite verb-forms is whether the verb from which each is derived is transitive or intransitive. If the form is intransitive, it is of course "active" from our point of view,[19] since there can be no question of a recipient of the action. If the form is transitive, there must be a recipient of the action, which may be expressed by a noun corresponding, in its relationship to the verbal noun or adjective, (1) to the object of an active verb, or (2) to the subject of a passive verb (in the latter case the agent need not be indicated).

In the first of these two cases, the noun in question is the object of the verbal noun or adjective.   Examples of this sort exist, e.g.: (1) with a participle, *Ann.* 3.12 UDU IGI.ḪI.A-*wa* ᴰUTU-*i ne-an-za* 'a sheep turning its eyes to the sun'; (2) with a gerund, *KUB* 2.1.2.26 ŠU-*an ap-pa-an-na-aš* ᴰKAL-*ri* 'to the god of shaking hands'; [20] (3) with an infinitive, *KBo* 4.4.2.63–4 *ku-e* KARAŠ.ḪI.A *I-NA* KUR ᵁᴿᵁ*Nu-ḫaš-ši* *ḫal-ki*ᴴᴵ·ᴬ-*uš* *ḫar-ni-in-ku-wa-an-zi* *pí-e-ḫu-da-an ḫar-ta* 'the troops which he had led into Nuhassi in order to destroy the crops'.   In all these instances the verbal adjective or noun is from our point of view active.   However, expressions of this sort are extremely rare, for in general the Hittite participle is almost a pure adjective, and the Hittite gerund or infinitive is almost a pure noun, hence both are unlikely to take the

[18] I shall confine myself here to a few illustrative examples.   A detailed attempt to prove my theory, which I presented orally before the American Oriental Society in April 1943, I hope shortly to publish elsewhere.

[19] An intransitive verb cannot really be passive, since there can be no recipient of the action which it denotes.   Impersonals are not genuine passives; perhaps it is a false idea that *pugnatum* and *pugnandum* must be passive which leads us to regard *pugnatum est* 'there has been fighting' and *pugnandum est* 'there is to be fighting' as passive, and even the finite form *pugnatur* may not have been originally a genuine passive; cf. Ennius *Scen.* 241 (Vahlen²) vitam vivitur, and see Zimmer *KZ* 30.286 fn. 1, and Ernout *MSL* 15.332.

[20] Since ZI-*aš arnu-* seems to be the regular phrase for 'grant a wish' (cf. Sommer, *AU* 31, and the references there given), *KUB* 2.1.2.28 ZI-*aš ar-nu-um-ma-aš* ᴰKAL-*ri* 'to the god of wish fulfilling' may be perfectly parallel, with *ar-nu-um-ma-aš* an "active" gerund like *ap-pa-an-na-aš*.   But on the other hand ZI-*aš* and *ar-nu-um-ma-aš* may both depend directly upon ᴰKAL-*ri*, 'the god of desire, of its fulfilment' (cf. fn. 25), in which case the gerund is "passive", and is of the stuff of which gerundives are made (cf. fn. 10).

complements that belong to verbs.   It results that the possibilities
are usually reduced to two: the verbal noun or adjective is intransi-
tive, and seems active; or it is transitive, with the recipient ex-
pressed otherwise than through its object, and therefore seems
passive.

As typical examples with participles, we may note the following:
(1) intransitive, "active," *Hatt.* 1.17 *nu-wa-ra-aš* TI-*an-za* 'he (will
be) alive', *KBo* 5.8.1.37–8 *Ú-UL ku-iš-ki pa-an-za e-eš-ta* 'no one
had gone'; (2) transitive, "passive," *Pap.* 2.29–30 *na-at IŠ-TU*
SÍG *iš-ḫi-ya-an* 'this (is) bound with wool', *KUB* 21.1.3.3–4 *iš-ḫi-
ú-ul ki-iš-ša-an i-ya-an e-eš-du* 'let the treaty be made as follows'.

As typical examples with verbal nouns, we may note the follow-
ing: (1) intransitive, "active," *Hatt.* 1.15 *Ú-UL-wa-ra-aš* TI-*an-
na-aš* 'he (will) not (be) long-lived [literally, of living]',[21] *Pap.* 3.49
nu-za a-da-an-na e-ša-an-da-ri 'they sit down to eat', *KUB* 12.62.2.4
KASKAL-*ši ka-ri-pu-wa-an-zi pa-a-i-mi* 'I am going on the road
to eat'; (2) transitive, "passive," *Tav.* 2.3 INIM *ku-na-na-aš-wa
na-aḫ-ḫu-un* 'I feared the circumstance of being killed', *KUB*
13.5.2.17 UDU DINGIR-*LIM-ni a-da-an-na u-un-na-an-za* 'a
sheep (is) brought to the god to be eaten',[22] *KBo* 4.4.4.24 URU-*an
ša-a-ru-u-wa-an-zi Ú-UL tar-na-aḫ-ḫu-un* 'I did not allow the city
to be plundered'.[23]   A particularly striking passage is *Mad.* § 24,
where we find in rapid succession 2.31 ZAB.MEŠ-*ya MA-ḪAR*
ᴰUTU-*ŠI ú-wa-u-an-zi Ú-UL tar-na-i* 'he does not allow the troops
to come before my Majesty' and 2.32 *MA-ḪAR* ᴰUTU-*ŠI ar-ga-
mu-uš-ša ú-tum-ma-an-zi Ú-UL tar-na-i* 'he does not allow the
tribute to be brought before my Majesty'; *wawanzi* 'to come' (liter-
ally, 'for coming') and *utumanzi* 'to be brought' (literally, 'for

---

[21] The absolute parallelism of the gerund TI-*an-na-aš* here with the participle
TI-*an-za* two lines after it (in the passage cited in my preceding paragraph) makes
very strange the failure of scholars to realize that verbal nouns and adjectives corre-
spond perfectly in voice usage.

[22] Literally, 'a sheep (is) brought to the god for eating'.   In terms of the god
rather than the sheep, the infinitive is "active" not "passive"; but I believe we should
choose the subject of the sentence as the test-word for determining voice in English
terms.   Were we to recast the sentence with 'bring' as a participle and 'eat' as the
main verb, the finite verb replacing the infinitive would be passive: 'a sheep, having
been brought to the god, is eaten'.

[23] Literally, 'I did not allow the city for plundering'.   I feel sure URU-*an* is the
object of the main verb, in accordance with the usual Hittite usage, and not of the
infinitive; were the latter the case, we should have an "active" infinitive, 'I did not
allow (any one) to plunder the city', of the type discussed in fn. 173 for Latin and in
fn. 180 for French.

bringing') are absolutely parallel in form, but the fact that the first is intransitive and the second transitive necessitates the variation from active to passive in the English translation.

It must be noted that since the Hittite verbal noun regularly lacks subject as well as object, both the word denoting the agent (when expressed) and that denoting the recipient are usually combined with the main verb.[24] For instance Hittite says not 'he directed him to gather the troops' but 'he directed him to the troops for gathering', as in *Hatt.* 4.4 *na-an-kán A-NA* ERIŃ.MEŠ *ni-ni-in-ku-u-an-zi ú-e-ri-ya-at.*[25]

This peculiarity becomes more marked when the main verb is passive. Here the construction varies according to whether there is or is not a recipient of the action denoted by the verbal noun, in other words whether the verb with which this noun is connected is intransitive or transitive. We thus have two types.

(1) The infinitive is intransitive. 'I was ordered to appear before the Storm God' is rendered in Hittite *PM* 2.§6.2 *nu-mu-kán a-pí-ya-ya* ᴰIM ᵁᴿᵁ*Ḫa-at-ti* EN-YA *pí-ra-an ti-ya-u-an-zi ḫa-an-da-a-it-ta-at* 'it was ordered for me for appearing', i.e. 'the order was given for me to appear', with the main verb impersonal.

(2) The infinitive is transitive. 'I was ordered to offer an expiatory bull to him' is rendered in Hittite *MS* 1.11–2 *nu-uš-ši* GUD *pu-u-ḫu-ga-ri-iš pí-i-ya-u-wa-an-zi* SI×DI-*at* 'an expiatory bull was ordered to be offered to him', with the main verb personal. We cannot say 'it was ordered for me for offering a bull', since the word for 'bull' is not naturally combined with the verbal noun for 'offering' as its object, but must rather, therefore, be combined with the main verb as its subject. Thus it is the transitive character of the infinitive that perforce renders it from our point of view passive, in contradistinction to the intransitive infinitive of the preceding example, which is from our point of view active.

II

It should be noted once more that in *all* the Hittite passages cited above, the verbal adjective or noun is voiceless and its classi-

[24] Cf. fn. 23.

[25] Cf. the common use of two datives, an ordinary noun and an infinitive, in Sanskrit, as in *RV* 5.2.9 śíśīte śŕṅge rákṣase viníkṣe 'he whets his horns to pierce the monster' (literally, 'for the monster, for piercing'); also the occasional use of similar combinations of other cases (Brugmann *Grund.* 2.3.917–9, Whitney 352, 353). Thus Hittite as well as Sanskrit offers excellent support for Kirk's view (296) that in Plautus *As.* 250 *comparando* was originally a gerund rather than a gerundive. Cf. inf. 281.

fication as "active" or "passive" (i.e. as seemingly active or passive from the view-point of the English-speaking reader) is made only as a matter of convenience, and in preparation for the second and third parts of the paper. In these later parts we shall deal with two languages—Latin and English—which do have formal distinctions of voice for verbal adjectives and nouns even though they do not always make use of them, so that we are, I believe, methodologically justified in testing every such form for voice as far as meaning goes, even if formally it does not show it.[26]

The test that I propose to set up is as follows. A finite verb is tested for voice so far as meaning goes [27] by an examination of its relation with its subject. If the subject indicates the agent, the verb is active; if it indicates the recipient, the verb is passive.[28] A non-finite verb form must similarly be tested by its relation to some substantive which, were the verb form converted to a finite verb, would serve as its subject; it is active if the substantive represents the agent, passive if the substantive represents the recipient,

[26] On the other hand it is doubtful how far we are justified in assigning voice to Latin adjectives. For instance *caecus*, which must originally, to judge by its etymology (v. Walde³ 1.129 and Ernout-Meillet 124), have meant 'unseeing, blind', is also used in the sense of 'unseen, hidden or dark'; in the first sense it is usually called "active" and in the second "passive," but perhaps it is really rather neutral, 'without sight', and it may be only our English translation that forces an active or passive meaning into it. Much the same is true of the adjectives in *-bilis*, which usually seem passive but occasionally active: note especially Lucretius's use of *genitabilis* in 1.11, which the editors (e.g. Munro and Merrill) call "active," but which may convey simply the general notion of generation; and still more Horace's of *dissociabilis* in *Carm.* 1.3.22, on which the editors (e.g. Wickham, Moore, Smith, Shorey and Laing) are divided, some interpreting it as 'estranging' ("active") and some as 'incompatible' ("passive"), whereas really it may convey simply the general notion of separation (cf. 'alien', the translation suggested by Shorey and Laing).

[27] In Latin as in Hittite (cf. fn. 6) there may be a conflict between form and meaning. Thus the deponent *sequor* is passive in form but active in meaning; on the other hand *vapulo* is active in form but passive in meaning (not only from the viewpoint of the alien English-speaker who translates it 'get whipped, be whipped' but from that of the native Latin-speaker, Quintilian; see 9.3.7), and so, too, is *audio* in the idiom *audio male* (e.g. Cicero *De Or.* 2.68.277). Some verbs present very difficult problems: *pereo* and *morior* are often synonyms, yet the active form *pereo*, serving as it does as a substitute for **perdor*, seems more truly passive than the passive form *morior*. In short, to assume that verbs in *-o* and *-or* respectively, i.e. those that we call "active" and "passive," inherently denote acting and receiving action, is as absurd as it would be to assume that nouns modified by *bonus* and *bona* respectively, i.e. those that we call "masculine" and "feminine," inherently denote male and female.

[28] With middle verbs, the subject is both agent and recipient; but these may be ignored in a treatment of Latin, in which they are formally indistinguishable from the passive, and of English, in which they are replaced by reflexives.

with respect to the action denoted by the verb form. The substantive serving as the test must be sought in the same passage, whenever possible in the same clause, as the verb form being tested: if the verb form is a participle, the noun is the one modified by the participle; if the verb form is itself a noun, the substantive is one modified by the verbal noun, or is the subject of the verb which is itself modified, or which has a modifier which is modified, by the verbal noun. As an illustration of the way this method works, may be cited Lucretius 1.312 *anulus in digito subter tenuatur habendo*; since the gerund *habendo* represents an action of which the subject *anulus* is the recipient not the agent, *habendo*, though of a form regularly described as active, must here be viewed as passive in meaning.[29]

We shall first examine Latin participles, and shall find that they by no means conform to the prescribed pattern. The past participle is not always passive,[30] nor the present participle always active. As examples of non-passive past participles may be cited such forms as *cenatus, iuratus*. As examples of non-active present participles may be cited such forms as Vergil's *volventibus annis (Aen.* 1.234) where the active participle differs no whit in meaning from the passive gerundive in the same poet's *volvendis* [31] *mensibus* thirty-five lines later (1.269). Such seeming anomalies are either altogether, or at least mainly, confined to the non-finite forms: *cenatus est* is

[29] For parallels and references, see Munro and Merrill *ad loc.*, Page on Vergil *Ecl.* 8.72, and Vahlen in *Festschr.* 487–9; also cf. further below, fn. 36. For a Hittite parallel cf. *KUB* 13.5.2.17, and the discussion thereof in fn. 22.

[30] In its origin the form in *-to-* is neither "past" nor "passive," nor indeed is it necessarily a verbal adjective at all (cf. Brugmann *KVG* 335–6, Leumann 227 and Hofmann 544–5, Buck 307–8 and 335). The Sanskrit participle in *-ta-*, though called the "passive participle" and really passive when formed from a transitive verb, as *datta-* 'given', *ukta-* 'spoken', is active when formed from an intransitive verb, as *gata-* 'gone', *bhūta-* 'been', *sthita-* 'standing', *patita-* 'fallen' (cf. Whitney 340). The Greek verbal adjective in *-τος* follows the same pattern: contrast γραπτός 'written' and πεπτός 'cooked' with ῥυτός 'flowing' (cf. Brugmann-Thumb 535). Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin all have adjectives in *-to-* from nouns as well as from verbs (Brugmann *KVG* 335–6); and the only example of such an adjective cited by Sturtevant for Hittite (157), *tanatas* 'empty', seems to be of the same variety.—Further evidence that the Latin *-to-* participle is not really passive is perhaps afforded by the fact that the use of the accusative (whether explained as accusative of specification or as object of the middle voice) with the passive is restricted in early Latin to occurrences with the past participle. Probably there is also significance in the fact that in Latin each of the three tenses, present, past, and future, has only a single participle (I do not consider the gerundive a true future passive participle, for *videndus est* does not correspond to *visurus est* as *videbitur* does to *videbit*).

[31] Cf. fn. 46.

not a normal substitute for *cenavit*,[32] and to *volventibus annis* corresponds not *anni volvunt* but *anni volvuntur*.[33] It is probably also significant that the parts of the deponent that do not fit the general pattern—the present and future participles with their active forms, and the gerundive with its passive meaning—are all participles.[34] But even here we must note variety: in Cicero, *Cat.* 1.3.7 id quod multo magis est admirandum, the gerundive is a true passive; but in *Fin.* 3.22.73 ei proficiscendum est, it is to all intents and purposes an active.[35]

The gerundive is of particular interest in this connection because of its relation with the gerund. It is normally assumed without question that the gerund is active and the gerundive is passive, but the gerund is passive by the test set down above in Plautus *As.* 222 bene salutando consuescunt, compellando blanditer, and Vergil *Georg.* 3.215–6 urit videndo femina; [36] and the gerundive is active in Plautus *Ep.* 74 puppis pereunda est, *Trin.* 1159 si illa tibi placet,

---

[32] The form exists, as in *Aul.* 368, but only, according to Hofmann 545, as a direct formation from *cenatus*.

[33] Intransitive use of finite forms, such as we apparently have in Vergil's *prora avertit* (*Aen.* 1.104), is probably due to the analogical extension of the use of the participle, as in his *avertens rosea cervice refulsit* (1.402); cf. Hofmann 378, 544, 547. To trace them to the ellipsis of *se*—the explanation offered by some scholars (e.g. Knapp *Aeneid*[2] 75)—seems to me methodologically dubious; cf. Wölfflin, *ALL* 10.1–10, especially 9.

[34] Perhaps we may note also that the participles of deponents sometimes seem tenseless (cf. fn. 8) as well as voiceless—e.g. Vergil's *invectus* (*Aen.* 1.155) and *solatus* (5.708), which are unquestionably used as presents. Cf. inf. 304.

[35] Cf. sup. fn. 19. The difference is of course due to the fact that *admiror* is transitive and *proficiscor* is intransitive (cf. fnn. 36, 40, 46, and 51). For the possibility that *proficiscendum* (as well as *prodeundum* and *recipiendum* in *BG* 1.48.7, discussed in the next paragraph) should be called a gerund rather than a gerundive, cf. inf. fn. 90.

[36] We encounter difficulties when we meet a gerund whose agent and recipient play no grammatical rôle in the sentence under examination (a type which Kirk, 299, offers as a refutation of the view that the gerund is ever passive). Cases in point are Plautus *Men.* 882 lumbi sedendo dolent, Terence *Phor.* 1034 accusando fieri infectum non potest, Vergil *Ecl.* 8.71 cantando rumpitur anguis. In instances such as these the gerund may be viewed as impersonal; if the impersonal finite forms *accusatur* and *cantatur*, *accusandum est* and *cantandum est* (cf. sup. fn. 19) are passive, so too are *accusando* and *cantando*. Servius on *Ecl.* 8.71 calls *cantando* passive in this passage, in contradistinction to the same form in *Ecl.* 3.25 cantando tu illum, where it is active (cf. *ib.* 21 cantando victus). It is easier, however, to view *accusando* as passive than *cantando*, simply because the former is transitive and the latter intransitive (cf. fn. 35). Strictly speaking, both are voiceless; we could substitute a non-committal abstract noun for either, for *accusando accusatione*, and for *cantando carmine* or *cantu;* note *carminibus* in *Ecl.* 8.70 as a direct parallel for *cantando*, and cf. Lucil. 575–6 (Marx), Ovid *Met.* 7.203 and *Am.* 2.1.25–8. A similar example with the gerundive is Naevius *Com.* 18 (Ribbeck) cui caepe edundod oculus profluit.

placenda dos quoque est, and perhaps *ib.* 265 procul abhibendust atque apstandust.[37] Furthermore, an important bit of evidence that gerund and gerundive are precisely alike so far as voice goes is provided by Caesar, who regularly employs the reflexive object with *recipio* in the sense of 'withdraw, retreat', but omits it three times, twice with the gerund (*BG* 7.52.1 signo recipiendi dato and *BC* 3.46.5 quibus ad recipiendum crates impedimento fuerunt) and once with the gerundive (*BG* 1.48.7 si quo erat longius prodeundum aut celerius recipiendum).[38] The second and third instances are particularly interesting because as it happens they are both in close juxtaposition to a finite form of the same locution with the reflexive pronoun included (respectively *BC* 3.46.6 quietissime se receperunt and *BG* 1.48.6 ad eos se equites recipiebant). Thus we have a demonstration that the gerund as well as the gerundive of the transitive verb *recipio* is for Caesar[39] mediopassive in meaning.[40]

An interesting exception to the usual treatment of the gerund is provided by Roby,[41] who realizes that the gerund was originally voiceless, but acquires active or passive force depending on (1) its own nature (i.e. whether or not it can take an object) and (2) "the sense and grammatical frame of the sentence" (lxiii). Roby's discussion of this point (lxiii–lxvii) is admirable; but the remainder of his treatment of the gerund-gerundive problem, apart from his always excellent collections of illustrative examples, is so tainted with speculation and in general so fantastic methodologically, that it does not merit citation or refutation. None the less, some of his conclusions, though based on bad arguments, may have merit (cf. fn. 54).

[37] Cf. the passages cited from Varro and late Latin by Roby lxx and Kirk 300–1.

[38] Wölfflin notes Caesar's omission of the reflexive with the gerund and gerundive of *recipere* (*ALL* 10.2), as well as its common omission with present participles (*ib.* 9; similarly Lane 250); but his explanations of these phenomena (*loc. cit.* 3 and 9) show no realization of the fact that they imply a distinction as to voice between finite and non-finite forms. We have a close parallel in the Hittite use of the transitive verb *warapmi* 'wash', the finite forms of which (unless passive) require the reflexive *-za*, whereas the non-finite forms do not; note in particular *KUB* 29.8.2.12–3 *nu* EN SISKUR.SISKUR *wa-ar-pu-an-zi pa-iz-zi nu-za wa-ar-ap-zi* 'the sacrificer goes to wash and washes himself'.

[39] However, contrast Cicero *Fam.* 10.23.3 ad colligendum se.

[40] Also, incidentally, that on the other hand the gerundive of the intransitive verb *prodeo*, used in the third passage as a parallel for that of *recipio*, must be viewed as active in meaning (cf. fnn. 19 and 35).

[41] Cf. too Vahlen 488 (cited in fn. 29).

A still more interesting exception to the usual treatment of the gerundive is provided by the Latin grammar of Hale and Buck, which recognizes (1) a future passive participle used to denote necessity, propriety, or intention (323) as in *Carthago delenda est;* [42] (2) a special variety of the foregoing, used to denote the leading idea in the phrase, which receives a new name, the gerundive (328, 329), and which is active,[43] as in *spes Carthaginis delendae*. This discussion, though significant, has several unsatisfactory features: (1) the recognition of two sharply differentiated categories on the basis of meaning, not form; (2) the test of voice by English translation; [44] (3) the assumption as a starting-point for the construction of a use which was a later development.[45] Buck himself, in his subsequent *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, gives a vastly improved version: here he traces the gerundive to an active or middle participle, such as *oriundus* or *volvendus*,[46] and expressly states that the use of the "future passive participle" or "participle of necessity" is a secondary one (309–10). However, he still keeps to his original notion, erroneous in my opinion, that we are to recognize a dichotomy in the development: passive use in *bellum gerendum est;* active use in *cupiditas belli gerendi*.[47] The latter he explains as meaning originally 'desire of war, of the carrying on',[48] which is precisely like Hofmann's explanation (597) of *argento comparando* in *As.* 250 argento comparando fingere fallaciam, as meaning 'für das Geld, seine Beschaffung'. But, while Hofmann realizes that

---

[42] The treatment of *delenda* here as passive takes no account of the construction of *pereunda* and *placenda* just cited (277–8); but of course notice of this early and exceptional use would be out of place in a grammar that, according to its Preface (iii), "aims to be a working text-book, primarily adapted to the needs of high school students" (though as a matter of fact it is much more than that).

[43] See especially 329 fn. 3.

[44] Note again 329 fn. 3 (cited in fn. 43).

[45] Cf. Hofmann 594.

[46] Actually both are really voiceless, but *oriundus* 'rising' seems active because it is connected with an intransitive verb, whereas *volvendus* 'rolling' seems middle or passive because it is connected with a transitive verb (if the entity performing the act of rolling is not provided with an object to show that it actually rolls something, the implication must be that it either rolls itself or is rolled by some external agent). Cf. fn. 35. However, *secundus* does not follow the usual pattern, since it is active though from a transitive verb. As a matter of fact, these forms may not be true participles at all, but simply adjectives like those in *-bilis* (discussed in fn. 26), which they distinctly resemble in use; see fn. 54.

[47] Caesar *BG* 1.41.1 conversae sunt omnium mentes, summaque alacritas et cupiditas belli gerendi innata est.

[48] Cf. the similar treatment of the genitive in a Hittite passage, sup. fn. 20.

such a view forces us to regard *comparando* as originally a gerund,[49] Buck calls *gerendi* a gerundive.[50] Certainly it later became such almost exclusively, as is proved by the fact that classical Latin normally says *cupiditas pacis faciendae* and *pecuniae comparandae fingere fallaciam;* but it is precisely the ambiguity of the phrases where the substantive is masculine or neuter rather than feminine (which presumably account for a majority of the instances) that veils the original character of the construction. If *belli* and *gerendi* are really, as Buck states (with correctness I am sure), "both in the same construction," *gerendi* is a noun and not an adjective, in other words a gerund and not a gerundive. For therein, I am convinced, lies the sole difference between the two categories, and not at all in the matter of their voice, since both were originally voiceless.[51]

As to the question of priority, I agree with Kirk in his recently published view [52] that the gerundive developed from the gerund, and not, as most scholars believe,[53] the gerund from the gerundive.[54]

---

[49] He uses the term specifically with relation to the phrase *copia lucis tuendi* (597), but adds that what applies to the genitive probably applies also to the dative *argento comparando*. Of course this gerund use is merely the starting-point of the construction, which, once it had generated the gerundive, must have spread to situations where the foregoing explanation would hardly apply, as in *Per.* 5 fio miser quaerendo argento.

[50] He does not seem to realize that it fits completely his definition, given just below (310), of the gerund as a case form of the gerundive "in its earlier active value" used as a verbal noun. His mistake lies, I think, in the fact that he, in common with most scholars, assumes that the gerund is a development of the gerundive.

[51] By the test for voice that has been set up above, *gerendi* as a gerund in the particular sentence in which it occurs, since the agent is not expressed, is of the quasi-passive impersonal type illustrated in fn. 36; had Caesar written instead *cupiditate belli gerendi permoti sunt*, it would be active. By the same test, *comparando* in *As.* 250, although it would be passive in meaning if taken closely with *argento*, is active in meaning if I am right in combining it rather with the verb *fingere fallaciam* (cf. fn. 22). But once *gerendi* and *comparando* have developed into participial adjectives, they must be interpreted in terms of the nouns with which they agree, *belli* and *argento*, and since these represent the recipient of the actions involved, the gerundives must be viewed as passive—a circumstance that results automatically from their being transitive, whereas the active force of *placenda* with *dos* results automatically from its being intransitive (cf. fn. 35). The circumstance that *gerendi* and *comparando* are translated by English actives is, despite Hale and Buck, completely irrelevant.

[52] *TAPhA* 73.293–307 (1942)—an article which seems to me, despite my frequent dissent from it, of considerable importance.

[53] Cf. fn. 50.

[54] Still another view is to be found in Meillet-Vendryes (335), namely, that the two are of independent origin. Such independence may be posited for a verbal noun and adjective even though they resemble each other in formation; for instance, there is presumably no direct connection between verbal abstracts like *natura, cultura, pictura,* etc., and the future active participle (cf. Buck 307, 339). The entire development, so far as we know it, of the gerund and the gerundive has involved so close a relation

As I have already said,[55] parallels for the interpretation of locutions of the type of *argento comparando* in *As.* 250 as originally gerunds rather than gerundives are provided not only by Sanskrit,[56] as Kirk notes (296), e.g. *RV* 5.2.9, but also, most strikingly, by Hittite, e.g. *Hatt.* 4.4. But I do *not* agree with Kirk that such passages as these indicate a "shift"[57] of construction undergone by the substantive "which is properly the object of a dependent infinitive" or gerund but which "may be shifted to dependence on the main verb."[58] On the contrary, I believe that surely in Hittite,[59] and presumably also in Sanskrit and Latin, this attachment of the substantive in question to the main verb[60] rather than to the infinitive or gerund represents the original state of affairs[61] when the verbal noun was much more of a noun and less of a verb than it became in later periods, and therefore rarely (earlier still, in all probability, never) took an object. For the same reason I do not believe in speaking of attraction as do Delbrück (*KZ* 18.104) and Whitney

that a distinct origin seems most unlikely; but on the other hand it is quite possible that the early use of adjectival forms in *-nd-* (on which cf. sup. fn. 46 and inf. fn. 101) may really, as Roby suggests (lxxxi), have been quite distinct from that of the verbal noun in *-nd-*, though it may well have contributed to the conversion of the latter into an adjective. Indeed these original adjectival forms may not have been true participles at all, but merely adjectives like the formations in *-tos* and *-bilis* (cf. fnn. 30 and 46); note that *rotundus*, like many *-tos* adjectives, is derived from a noun not a verb (Buck 309; otherwise Ernout-Meillet 832), and its primitive meaning may be 'round' rather than 'rolling'.

[55] 274 and fn. 25.

[56] The discovery of the parallelism between Sanskrit and Latin goes back to Benfey. (see his *Handbuch der Sansk.* 1.432). Delbrück, though he at first disputed it (*KZ* 18.104–5), later accepted it (*Grund.* 4.471), as did also Brugmann (*ib.* 2.3.918, 922–3). But these writers erred, as it seems to me, in comparing with the Sanskrit infinitive not the Latin verbal noun, the gerund, but the Latin verbal adjective, the gerundive. Thus the Sanskrit form corresponds not to *decemviros legibus scribendis creavimus*, as Brugmann says (*op. cit.* 918), but to **decemviros legibus scribendo creavimus*. Hofmann (597) and Kirk (296) correctly speak of a gerund in this connection (cf. fn. 49).

[57] He uses this word repeatedly; see 293, 296, 299.

[58] I also disagree with his insistence on voice. To him the gerund is definitely and exclusively active (298–9; cf. sup. fn. 36), and the gerundive, in accordance with Buck's view, is definitely active when it does not express obligation and definitely passive when it does (293, 295; cf. sup. 279). This last tenet renders him impotent when confronted with *Ep.* 74 and *Trin.* 1159 (cf. sup. 277–8), for which he says he "can think of or find no quite satisfying explanation" (303).

[59] Cf. sup. 274.

[60] So long as this was the case, in our typical example *As.* 250 *comparando* was active in meaning; when it began to be more closely connected with *argento*, it became passive (cf. fn. 51). This situation is just the reverse of that noted in fn. 23.

[61] Hofmann realizes this (597), but I think without seeing all the implications which are made clear by a comparison with Hittite.

(352), or of anticipation as does Brugmann (*Grund.* 2.3.917, 920), or of apposition as does Hofmann (597).[62]   The examples of pairs of datives in quasi-apposition cited by the last-named in *IF* 42.84–5 [63] are extremely interesting, but as a parallel for *As.* 250 I should prefer the ordinary double dative construction, still common in classical Latin, seen e.g. in *Am.* 492–3 nemo id probro ducet Alcumenae, *Truc.* 646 ut bubus glandem prandio depromerem.[64]

Because most infinitives are datives, it is easier to find parallels in other languages for the dative of the Latin gerund than for any other case; and therefore it is convenient to start with the dative in tracing the development of the gerundive from the gerund.   But examples of the genitive are really more illuminating, because here we can actually find striking testimony within the Latin language itself as to the genesis of the construction in question.[65]   I can cite no instances of the dative gerund in combination with a feminine or plural substantive, but for the genitive we have incontestable evidence in (a) Plautus *Cap.* 1008 lucis [66] tuendi copiam and Ennius *Scen.* 248 (Vahlen²) navis inchoandi exordium, (b) Plautus *Truc.* 370 tui videndi copia and Terence *Hec.* 372 eius videndi cupidus (both *tui* and *eius* refer to a woman), (c) Plautus *Cap.* 852 nominandi istorum copia and Terence *Haut.* 29 novarum spectandi copiam. Though *solis* or *luminis tuendi copiam* would have sounded perfectly natural,[67] *lucis tuendi copiam* presumably did not; and the proportion *solis visi : solis tuendi = lucis visae : x* would have produced *lucis tuendae*, which seems to have driven out the earlier type.   On the other hand *Truc.* 370 *tui* videndi copia, even though addressed to

[62] Morris, who speaks of parataxis (on the double genitive in *Cap.* 852), seems to me more nearly on the right track.

[63] As also of similar pairs of accusatives, ablatives, and nominatives (*op. cit.* 82–4, 85).   He expressly suggests a connection between such locutions and the type of expression seen in *Cap.* 1008 (85 fn. 2).

[64] Hofmann in his grammar (418) specifically distinguishes this type from the quasi-appositional one.

[65] I agree with Hofmann (597), who treats the double-genitive type as the starting-point, and disagree with Kirk (296), who calls it "an intermediate stage" (cf. sup. fn. 57).

[66] There can, I think, be no doubt that *lucis* is feminine here; *luci* in *Aul.* 748 and *Ad.* 841 (on which, respectively, see Wagner and Ashmore *ad loc.*) is an indeclinable neuter and furnishes no argument for a masculine *lux* (otherwise Ernout-Meillet 541).

[67] Cf. in particular Accius 275–6 (Ribbeck) luminis conspiciendi insolentia.   There are numerous ambiguous phrases of this type.   Cf. Plautus *Am.* 638 and *Truc.* 293, Terence *And.* 541 and *Haut.* 218, Ennius *Ann.* 319–20 (Vahlen²), Pacuvius 220 (Ribbeck), Cato *Agr.* 139, 140, and 141.3; also the examples listed in fn. 68.

a woman, must have sounded natural,[68] and therefore the type persisted regardless of the gender or number of *tui* or *sui;* this I believe to be the true explanation for *BG* 7.43.2 legatos sui purgandi gratia mittunt and its numerous parallels, not that commonly given,[69] that *sui* is really a neuter singular adjective used substantively.   There was not the same reason for the survival of the *nominandi istorum* type, but this was probably preserved because of the unpopularity of the cacophonous *-orum -orum* or *-arum -arum*,[70] so that we find sporadic examples throughout the classical period, as Lucretius 5.1225 poenarum solvendi tempus and Cicero *Inv.* 2.2.5 exemplorum eligendi potestas.[71]   Here again the genesis

[68] Probably *eius videndi,* where there is no similarity of terminations, less so. The numerous examples of masculine *eius* or *illius* in combination with a form in *-ndi* (as *Bac.* 487, *Cap.* 748, *Mer.* 850, *Eun.* 620, *Phor.* 176) doubtless induced the shift to *eius videndae.*

[69] E.g. by Madvig on Cicero *Fin.* 1.18.60, Gildersleeve-Lodge 280, Hale and Buck 332.   Lane (405) attributes the seeming anomaly to the similarity of form, but that alone would hardly have led to the introduction into the standard language of a usage that must have seemed glaringly incorrect from the point of view of logic.   Hofmann (598) comes nearest what I believe to be the correct explanation, since he links the locution up with *lucis tuendi;* but he erroneously views *purgandi* as a gerundive (598), though he realizes that *tuendi* is a gerund (597; cf. sup. fn. 49).

[70] Particularly significant are passages in which a locution of this sort is paired with a genuine gerundive phrase, as Cicero *Phil.* 5.3.6 facultas opprimendae rei publicae, caedis faciendae, urbis, agrorum condonandi, Gellius 5.10.5 eloquentiae discendae causarumque orandi cupiens (the ambiguous passage Gellius 16.8.3 Aelius sui magis admonendi quam aliorum docendi gratia might be another instance of the same sort of collocation, but probably *admonendi* like *docendi* is a gerund).   Similarly, we find another substitute for the objectionable *-orum -orum* group, the gerund with accusative, paired with the gerundive in Caesar *BG* 4.14.2 neque consili habendi neque arma capiendi spatio dato, and with the double genitive construction *ib.* 5.38.2 sui [= *Nerviorum*] liberandi atque ulciscendi Romanos occasionem.   But exceptions do occur, as in *Cap.* 889 liberorum quaerundorum caussa (contrast with this the use of the earlier genitive plural form in Ennius *Scen.* 120 [Vahlen²] liberum quaesendum caussa, *id. ib.* 129 liberorum quaesendum gratia, and *Rud.* 1145 spes vostrum cognoscendum), and particularly often in Cicero: e.g. *Or.* 20.68 licentiam faciendorum iungendorumque verborum, *Cat.* 1.3.7 non tam sui [= *principum*] conservandi quam tuorum consiliorum reprimendorum causa (where the presence of the gerund *sui conservandi* might have induced *tuorum consiliorum reprimendi,* just as in Gellius 16.8.3 *sui admonendi* may have induced *aliorum docendi*), and above all *Leg. Agr.* 2.14.37 audaciae xvirali corrumpendarum tabularum publicarum fingendorumque senatus consultorum.   It may well be that in the last two passages the cacophony was introduced intentionally by the orator to heighten the effect of indignant disgust, as Winston Churchill does whenever he utters the word *Nazi.*   (The Roman aversion to the jingle provided by the repetition of *pairs* of syllables is also shown by the rarity with which dissyllabic pronominal forms are reduplicated, *quorumcumque* and *quibuscumque* being preferred to *quorumquorum* and *quibusquibus;* see Wölfflin *A LL* 9.450 and *Gem.* 449, 463.)

[71] For other examples see Roby lxviii, Hofmann 597, Wagner on *Haut.* 29, Munro on Lucretius 5.1225.

of the construction is often not understood,[72] and it is attributed to contamination,[73] or (more often) accounted for as involving the dependence of one genitive upon the other.[74]

For the origin of the accusative and ablative gerundive no examples comparable to *lucis tuendi* can be cited. These may have existed; or perhaps it was the analogy of *lucis tuendae* which produced *ad lucem tuendam* (as *Phor.* 266 ad defendendam causam) and *(de) luce tuenda* (as *Poen.* 224 aggerunda aqua defessi and *Bac.* 223 de amittenda Bacchide), since once the type was established in the genitive and the dative, its spread to other cases [75] would be simple enough.

We might expect the shift of the neuter gerund into the fully declined adjective to go one step further and produce what would seem to be an adjective used substantively. Such a development might be facilitated by the very widespread tendency in Latin to use adjectives in this way: i.e. to employ *bonus*, *bona*, and *bonum* in the sense of *bonus vir*, *bona mulier*, and *bona res*, respectively; and to extend this usage throughout the paradigm wherever this

[72] Practically alone among the grammarians, Lane (405) and Schmalz[4] (444), whom Bennett follows (1.448), reveal what seems to me genuine insight into the nature of the locution, by explaining both genitives as independently dependent on the same governing substantive. Hofmann's revision of Schmalz seems to me far from an improvement; I have already voiced my disapproval (sup. 282) of his notion of "apposition" (597). For the preferable explanation by Morris, v. sup. fn. 62.

[73] E.g. by Paul 134; similarly Madvig on Cicero *Fin.* 1.18.60.

[74] E.g. by Gildersleeve-Lodge 280, Hale and Buck 332. The latter strangely (in view of Buck's explanation elsewhere of the gerundive) compare *exemplorum eligendi* with *electio verborum* (Cicero *Or.* 20.68). Similarly, Elmer on *Cap.* 852. But if this explanation is correct, it seems odd that we find no instances of a genitive depending on other cases of the gerund (so, rightly, Roby lxix). Furthermore, Madvig's objection (on Cicero *Fin.* 1.18.60) that this manner of accounting for the construction may apply to some instances but cannot to all, also seems well-taken. Thus Cicero *Phil.* 5.3.6, cited by Gildersleeve-Lodge presumably as a typical example, seems to me a particularly poor one, as becomes manifest if we examine not merely the excerpt quoted by them, but the whole passage, which runs as follows: agitur utrum M. Antonio facultas detur opprimendae rei publicae, caedis faciendae bonorum, urbis, agrorum suis latronibus condonandi, populum Romanum servitute opprimendi. Madvig's point, that *facultas condonandi* does not constitute a single idea on which *agrorum* depends, could have been strengthened had he added that if it did, we might well inquire why we do not similarly have *facultas opprimendi* modified by *rei publicae*, *facultas faciendi* modified by *caedis*, and *facultas opprimendi* modified by *populi Romani*. Still another objection to the Gildersleeve-Lodge explanation is that if *condonandi* is so essentially a noun that it governs a genitive *agrorum* rather than a direct object *agros*, it would hardly govern an indirect object *suis latronibus*.

[75] At all events to the accusative with a preposition and to the ablative. The nominative and the accusative not with a preposition present slightly different problems and will be taken up later.

could be done without ambiguity. It is possible that there exist some unrecognized instances of this type, e.g. *Phor*. 49–50 omne hoc mater auferet: puer causa erit mittundi. Most persons would call *mittundi* a gerund with unexpressed object, and would translate 'the mother will get all this; the baby will be the pretext for sending (it)'; but it is quite possible that *mittundi* is really a gerundive, either in agreement with a substantive to be supplied from the preceding clause or itself used as a substantive, the meaning being 'the mother will get all this; the baby will be the pretext for (it) being sent'. The usage is facilitated by the proximity of *omne hoc*, which readily supplies the implied *huius*.[76]

Since the proportion *de eo bono : de ea bona* or *de viro bono : de muliere bona = de bono : de bona* is firmly established, it might well follow that from the second proportion *de eo redducendo : de ea redducenda* or *de viro redducendo : de muliere redducenda* (gerundives) = *de redducendo* (gerund) : *x* would be produced the anomalous *de redducenda* 'about taking her back', which we actually find in *Hec*. 391 and 403. But such a locution seems unnatural, and it did not prove productive. Kirk (297) classes with the two *Hecyra* examples a number of instances from Livy cited by Steele (*AJPh* 27.283–4), of which 10.9.3–4 [77] is typical, and also Quintilian 4.1.34,[78] but these are hardly parallel; in the Livy instances some form of an immediately preceding substantive, as Steele himself says (283), is easily to be supplied with the gerundives,[79] which is certainly not the case at least in the second *Hecyra* passage; [80] and in the

[76] Thus in this passage the neuter form is not ambiguous. But the danger of such ambiguity usually necessitates the presence of the substantive *res* (as in *Mer*. 987 rei agendae isti operam dare and *Hec*. 821 his rebus anulus fuit initium inveniundis), which prevents the use of any such telescoped construction as the one here under consideration. Of course this does not apply to the nominative-accusative, an instance of which is found in Cato (cf. inf. 293).

[77] M. Valerius consul de provocatione legem tulit diligentius sanctam. Tertio ea tum post reges exactos lata est, semper a familia eadem. Causam renovandae saepius haud aliam fuisse reor quam quod plus paucorum opes quam libertas plebis poterat.

[78] Sunt et illa excitandis ad audiendum non inutilia.

[79] The usage in these passages may have been facilitated by another Livian idiom in which the place of the noun with which the gerundive agrees is taken by a substantive relative clause as in 3.43.6, 4.6.7 (cf. Steele *loc. cit.* 283). In any case it seems natural enough, and doubtless would not be hard to duplicate in other authors; for instance, a clear example with the nominative of the gerundive is provided by Quintilian 4.5.20 convertenda ad ipsos oratio, hortandi ut sinant.

[80] Much more like the Livy passages are *Phor*. 49–50 just cited, and *Mil*. 803–4 discussed below, 294.

Quintilian passage *excitandis* is probably a genuine adjective used as a substantive,[81] 'for those who are to be stirred up', whereas *de redducenda* in Terence is not 'about a woman who is to be taken back' (which is perfectly normal Latin [82]), but 'about taking her back'.

Consideration of the gerund and gerundive in the nominative and in the accusative without a preposition [83] has been postponed up to this point,[84] since these two uses, closely allied with each other, are generally viewed as very different from the rest.   And so they are to some extent, since they regularly involve a notion of necessity, obligation, or suitability not usually inherent in the other forms, and presumably somehow derived from their close connection with a verb, as subject, object, or predicate.   Yet I believe their development may be traced by much the same method as has been employed up to this point for the other cases.

Once again I would begin with the verbal noun, the gerund. Verbal nouns in early Latin very often have overtones of obligation, and there is frequently a close parallelism between those in *-tio* and those in *-ndum*.[85]   Thus we may compare *cautio est* (as in *Bac.* 597–8 mihi cautiost ne excussit [86]) and *cavendum est* (as in *Pseud.* 474 cavendumst mihi aps te) in the sense 'there is (need for) caution', or *curatio est* (as in *Poen.* 354 istaec meast [87] curatio) and *curandum est* (as in *Bac.* 691 hoc tibi curandumst) in the sense 'there is (need

[81] Otherwise Butler (Loeb Library translation), apparently; but his renderings are too free to serve as a sure guide for his views on the structure of the original.

[82] Cf. Horace *Serm.* 1.3.114 dividit fugienda petendis; and see further below, 293–4, on Cato *Agr.* 5.3.

[83] There are two main varieties of this: (1) the representatives of the nominative gerundive in indirect discourse, as in *Cap.* 767, *Cas.* 411, *Men.* 345, *Mil.* 359, *Rud.* 182, *Eun.* 883, *Phor.* 457; (2) predicative gerundives with transitive verbs such as *do, loco, curo,* etc. (on which see below).

[84] Cf. fn. 75.

[85] Roby 166 (who as usual has a good list), Hofmann 594.   Despite this comparison, Hofmann (*loc. cit.*) none the less, in common with almost all the grammarians, calls *cavendum* a gerundive; Roby, more consistently, regards it as a gerund (lxii).

[86] The use of a *ne* clause to represent the thing guarded against, met in comedy with *cautio est* (cf. *Poen.* 445–6, *Pseud.* 170, *And.* 400, *Ad.* 421), does not seem to be found there in combination with the gerund *cavendum* (*Cas.* 411, *Men.* 345, *Mos.* 1142, *Pseud.* 474); but this is apparently mere chance, for *caveo* does take *ne* in both Plautus (*Cap.* 255, *Pseud.* 478) and Terence (*Haut.* 235, *Hec.* 470).

[87] The use of the adjective *mea* (on which cf. fn. 89) seems to stress the nominal rather than the verbal side of *curatio*.   But we have the dative pronoun with *curatio* in *Am.* 519 and *Mos.* 34, which from another point of view are not such good parallels for *Bac.* 691 (in which I assume *hoc* is nominative) since in them *curatio* governs the accusative (cf. inf. 297).

for) care'.[88]   Thus I view the nominative form as at least in origin
a gerund,[89] though the seeming parallelism of the perfect *cautum*

[88] To these phrases with nouns in *-tio* I think we may add one with a noun in *-tus*
(on which cf. inf., 297, 298), namely *usus est*, for which I would offer the corresponding
translation 'there is (need for) use', i.e. simply 'there is need'.   *Mos.* 250 speculo ei
usus est 'she needs a mirror' might easily be recast as *speculo ei utendum est*, though
the phrase *utendum est* does not occur in Plautus; cf. Cicero *Verr.* 2.4.6.11 quid igitur
nobis faciendum est? num argumentis utendum?

[89] I am strongly influenced by the parallel use of the infinitive as an imperative;
for other examples of the equivalence of gerund and infinitive, cf. such pairs as *est
mihi dicendum* and *est mihi dicere* (Roby lxxii, Hoffman 583; see also inf. fn. 105), and
est tempus abeundi and *est tempus abire* (Madvig 384–5).   We have a particularly
interesting illustration of the coördination of a gerund and an infinitive in Varro *RR*
3.9.8 in cubilibus, cum parturient, acus substernendum; cum pepererunt, tollere sub-
stramen et recens aliud subicere (I believe *substernendum* is a gerund with object—
a very common construction in Varro—rather than a gerundive because thus it con-
stitutes a better parallel for the infinitives with their objects).   Here Madvig (on
Cicero *Fin.* 2.31.103), followed by Roby (lxxi fn. 1), accounts for the infinitives by
supplying an *oportet* implied in the preceding gerund.   He applies similar treatment to
the infinitives in three Cicero passages, *Lael.* 20.74, *Inv.* 2.44.130, *Fin.* 2.31.103, also in
Quintilian 4.5.20.   In regard to the first and second Cicero passages, he must be right
unless we assume that *oportet* or some such form has dropped out of the text, an expla-
nation which he specifically rejects in the case of the second (where indeed we may
note that *inducere* with no governing indicative corresponds to the preceding *erit
dicendum* in 129 just as *quaerere* with no governing indicative in 133 corresponds to
the preceding *oportet recitare* in 131).   In regard to the third, he may be right, though
one might explain the anacoluthon here as due to an anticipation of *inquies* used
parenthetically in the next sentence.   In regard to the Quintilian passage, quaedam
interim nos invitis litigatoribus simulandum est dicere, nonnumquam quasi inter-
pellemur ab iis subsistere; saepe convertenda ad ipsos oratio, hortandi ut sinant nos uti
nostro consilio, he is probably wrong, for stopping as if the litigants were interrupting
is quite as much a pretense as speaking against the litigants' will (note that if Madvig
were right, Quintilian would hardly have reverted to the gerundive in the immediately
following *convertenda oratio* and *hortandi*, but would have written *convertere orationem*
and *hortari*).   But whatever we think about the passages from Cicero and Quintilian,
in our Varro passage *tollere* and *subicere* as independent infinitives can certainly be
justified by the precise parallel just below (3.9.10), with no preceding gerund or ge-
rundive, si ova gallinis pavonina subicias, cum iam decem dies fovere coepit, tum
denique gallinacia subicere, ut una excudat.   Probably Varro, to avoid monotony in
his series of precepts, deliberately sought variety of expression, which accounts not
only for his free alternation of gerunds and gerundives—noted by Kirk, 303—but also
for his frequent use of *oportet*, sometimes with an infinitive and sometimes with a sub-
junctive, and likewise for his occasional use of an independent infinitive.   Brugmann
(*Grund.* 2.3.939) explains this use of the infinitive as due to an ellipsis, and offers as
an explanation of its origin in Latin (*ib.* 942) Varro *RR* 1.31.1, where a succession of
infinitives follow *haec fieri debent;* but these active infinitives, though they may be in
a sort of rough apposition with *haec*, can hardly depend, as he seems to believe they do,
upon the *debent* in this passage, which has *haec*, not an impersonal 'they', as its sub-
ject; and even if they could, their use here would not justify the assumption of a
parallel origin for infinitives in passages where no such possible governing verb appears
at all.   I would far rather view the "imperative infinitive" with Hofmann (591) as
constituting a nominal sentence; and thus in our Varro passage (3.9.8) it forms an

est or *curatum est* may have induced a feeling that it was a gerundive.[90]   In either case the meaning is active when the verb is intransitive,[91] as in *Pseud.* 474 just cited, *Cur.* 486 linguae moderandum est mihi [92] 'there must be moderation for my tongue', *Phor.* 457 deliberandum censeo 'I think there is need of deliberation', *Mos.* 701 et cenandum et cubandumst ei male 'he has a bad dinner and a bad night before him', *Mil.* 180 vae mihi misero quoi pereundumst 'woe is me for whom death is in store', *Pseud.* 331 mi currendumst 'I've got to run'.   In Accius 541 (Ribbeck) contra est eundum cautim et captandum mihi we seem to have a combination of active intransitive and passive transitive, but the fragmentary condition of the line precludes certainty.   In *Mil.* 170–1 hau multos homines, si optandum foret, nunc videre quam te mavellem, the verb may be intransitive, 'were wishing in order, if there were any wishing to be done'; but it is also possible to believe that the indication of the goal of wishing with *mavellem* implies one for *optandum* as well, in which case the verb is transitive and passive, 'if the sight of some one were to be wished for'.   The same verb in different passages may vary between active and passive meaning according

excellent parallel for the gerund if a similar origin is to be posited for the latter, as I believe it is.   It seems highly likely that *cavendum*, used, like its German synonym *Achtung*, without a copula, antedated *cavendum est;* at all events Varro regularly uses the gerund, and its substitute the gerundive phrase, without a copula (there are nineteen examples in our chapter, 9, alone).   As other instances of gerund and infinitive in nominal sentences, note Eng. *no smoking*, Germ. *nicht hinauslehnen*.   This use of verbal nouns in a modal sense seems particularly common in the negative, as in the last two examples (for *no* instead of *not* in *no smoking*, compare *nulla* instead of *non* in *Hec.* 650, which corresponds to the use of *mea* instead of *mihi* in *Cas.* 261 and *Poen.* 354; on this cf. fn. 87).   Other examples are Shakespeare's "there is no tarrying here" (*Julius Caesar* 5.5.30, cited by Roby xciv) to express necessity, and modern English 'there's no pleasing him' to express possibility.   These negative expressiions are particularly pertinent if we accept Sommer's view (*Handb.* 616) that the idea of necessity arose in the negative.   That the negative does not correspond absolutely with the affirmative is not important, as shades of meaning often shift with a change to the negative; thus 'he must know this' serves as affirmative for three different negatives, 'he must not know this', 'he need not know this', and 'he cannot know this'.

[90] It is classed as a gerundive e.g. by Hofmann 594 (cf. sup. fn. 85) and Gildersleeve-Lodge 166.   Hale and Buck, though they do not call it a gerundive, also treat it as an adjective, terming it the future passive particle (324; cf. sup. 279).   Following the usual practice, I have in citing the "impersonal" -nd- form when met in classical Latin called it a gerundive (cf. fn. 35); but it might be preferable always to call it a gerund.

[91] Cf. fn. 35.

[92] With this contrast Horace *Carm.* 1.24.1 quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus; *modus* is not a verbal noun like *moderatio*, and the notion of obligation is conveyed not by it but by the mood of the verb.

to whether it is used intransitively or transitively: thus in *Rud.* 719 tecum ago.   atqui mecum agendumst 'I'm dealing with you.—But your dealing has to be with me', *agendum*, like the preceding *ago*, is intransitive; in the very similar *Poen.* 1243 nil tecum ago.   atque mecum agendum est 'I have nothing to do with you.—But you must have to do with me', *agendum* probably still is intransitive, though now the preceding *ago* has an inner object *nil;* and in *Poen.* 567 hoc cito est agendum 'this is to be done quickly', *agendum* is clearly transitive, with *hoc* as recipient of the action involved, hence passive.   To be sure, it may be suggested that *hoc* is object rather than subject of *agendum*, in which case the form is still transitive but active;[93] however, in the closely parallel passage *Am.* 891 faciundum est mi illud fieri quod illaec postulat, *illud* is presumably in the same relation to *faciundum* as *quod* is to *fieri*, in other words *faciundum* is in the same voice as *fieri*.   In these passages it is still possible to view *agendum* and *faciundum* as gerunds,[94] though once more the influence of the perfects *hoc est*

---

[93] In other words the form is ambiguous, like *acus substernendum* in Varro 3.9.8 discussed sup. fn. 89.   Obviously every passage involving a neuter singular substantive and a gerund or a gerundive will present the same difficulty (cf. fn. 94, and, for a slightly different type of ambiguity, fn. 129).   On the nominative gerund with a direct object, cf. inf. 297.

[94] Proof that they are such could be furnished only if the type **haec res agendum est mihi* (corresponding to *lucis tuendi copia*) could be cited.   The meaning would be 'this matter, its doing, is (a job) for me'.   Whether such a form ever actually existed is purely a speculative matter, but certainly several characteristics of the Latin language would have militated against its survival.   In the first place, though consistency would demand our regarding both nominatives as subjects of *est*, just as in *lucis tuendi copia* both genitives are modifiers of *copia*, a verb can hardly take two independent subjects in the way a noun can two independent genitive modifiers, and so almost inevitably *res* would come to be felt as subject and *agendum* as predicate noun; and the tendency to force them into agreement would be even stronger than in the corresponding genitive construction (cf. the attraction in *Cas.* 261 me sinas curare ancillas, quae mea est curatio).   In the second place, the use of a nominative verbal noun in the predicate is frequent enough when the subject is a singular neuter pronoun (cf. the common use of *quid* with *-tio* nouns, e.g. in the examples cited by Roby, 166); but otherwise we tend to have a predicative dative ("purpose") instead. Contrast *As.* 192 nobis lucro fuisti with *Mer.* 553 id lucrumst; and *Cur.* 501 usui estis, *Men.* 358 qui est usui, *Cis.* 691 quae (feminine singular) usui esse potest, and *Mer.* 32 quae (neuter plural) sunt usui, with *Rud.* 1083 hoc usust, *Truc.* 721 si quid usust, and *Mer.* 854 quod usust.   Cicero *Att.* 10.2.2 haec nostra erit cura represents a rare turn of expression; much more typical are *Men.* 761 haec res mihi curaest and *Ad.* 894 quoi dominus curaest.   If Latin did not naturally say *homo* (or *res*) *mihi usus est* or *cura est*, it would hardly say *homo* (or *res*) *mihi utendum est* or *curandum est*.   (That even after the gerundive developed a preference for the neuter persisted is perhaps suggested by *Cap.* 227–8 tanta incepta res est: hau somniculose hoc agendum est, where after *res* we might have expected *haec agenda est* rather than *hoc agendum est*.)   If the form

actum, factum est illud would be potent in inducing the view that they are gerundives; and the next step in the development is illustrated by *Rud.* 1298 adeundus mihi illic est homo, where indubitably we have a gerundive.[95]   A particularly interesting example is *Phor.* 248–50 meditata mihi sunt omnia mea incommoda: molendum usque in pistrino, vapulandum, habendae compedes, opus ruri faciundum, for several reasons: (1) *molendum, vapulandum,* and *opus faciundum* are in form either gerunds or gerundives, but *habendae compedes* is clearly a gerundive; (2) *molendum* and *vapulandum* are intransitive and therefore active,[96] while *habendae* and *faciendum* are transitive and therefore passive; (3) all four members may be treated not as finite verbs with the auxiliary *sum* not expressed,[97] but as simple nominatives in apposition with *incommoda,* in which case *molendum* 'grinding' and *vapulandum* 'getting beaten' are clearly nouns, and *habendae compedes* and *opus faciundum* are phrases in which we may stress either the participles ('the wearing of fetters' and 'the doing of work') or the nouns ('fetters to be worn' and 'work to be done').   In the former case we have examples of the *ab urbe condita*—or rather *ab urbe condenda* [98]—type which is supposed to be little developed, and in the nominative quite unexampled, in early Latin (Hofmann 608).   In the latter, we have an example of the way in which the idea of obligation spread from the gerundive used predicatively in periphrasis with the copula, to the same form used as simple adjective in attributive relation with a noun.   Thus the gerundive as seen in *And.* 156 animum advortenda [99] iniuriast certainly generated Buck's "future passive par-

haec res agendum est never existed, but *hoc agendum est* (with *agendum* a gerund) did, that would be enough to generate the gerundive construction *haec res agenda est;* if even *hoc est agendum* (with *hoc* a nominative) did not exist, the gerundive could still have been created by the analogy of examples in the oblique cases, as *ad hoc agendum.* Conceivably, a misunderstanding of *hoc agendum est* as a parallel for *hanc rem agendum est* might have assisted in creating *haec res agenda est,* though it would have been far less likely as a starting-point because of the shift in voice which it would have necessitated (cf. fn. 124).

[95] Thus no shift in voice, such as is posited by Kirk 301–2, is involved.   Cf. fn. 94, end.

[96] Though *vapulandum* in all its forms, active though they are, has a passive meaning (cf. fn. 27).

[97] Some MSS insert *est,* and some even *esse* (which the case of *habendae compedes* renders out of the question); but the best reading is certainly without any verb, in common with the usual practice (cf. the note on Varro's usage in fn. 89).

[98] Cf. Livy *Praef.* 6.

[99] I follow Tyrrell's Oxford text, but should prefer to write *animadvortenda,* since *animum* is clearly fused with the verb.   *Mer.* 15 represents the earlier state of affairs.

ticiple" in *And.* 767 o facinus animum advortendum; the possibility of saying *caedundus es* undoubtedly helped produce *Cas.* 528 caedundus [100] tu homo es; such a phrase as *Bac.* 409 minus mirandumst is the basis of *Rud.* 345 hau miranda facta dicis. In these passages the gerundive is little more than a simple adjective; it is actually paired with a simple adjective in *Phor.* 1008 facinus miserandum et malum. Finally the adjective construction reacted on the verb, for *expetenda* is to all intents and purposes a mere adjective such as *eximia* not only in *Per.* 521 forma expetenda virginem but also in *Phor.* 1024 mea forma atque aetas magis nunc expetendast.[101]

The idea of obligation or the closely related one of purpose seems more unfailingly retained by the predicative gerundives than by the attributive ones.[102] These are used in the accusative in periphrasis with transitive verbs such as *habeo, do, curo, loco*,[103] etc., precisely as the gerundives in such examples as *Am.* 891 faciundum est mi illud are used in the nominative in periphrasis with *sum*.[104] Particularly interesting are the instances with *habeo*, as *Phor.* 364–5 agrum de nostro patre colendum habebat, because of the common

[100] Here *caedundus* means 'deserving to be killed'. It has the slightly different meaning 'fit to be killed', i.e. 'tender', in its use of a lamb, *Cap.* 819 locant caedundos agnos and *Aul.* 567 caedundum conduxi ego illum. In the latter case there is a sort of play on words in the answer, 567–8, tum tu idem optumumst loces ecferendum; Megadorus uses *caedundum* as scarcely more than an attributive adjective, 'I bought him (as fit) to be killed, i.e. as fit for eating'; but Euclio understands the gerundive as strictly predicative, 'I bought him to be killed', and responds in kind, 'then you'd better also contract for him to be buried'.

[101] On the other hand the similar forms which were early used as adjectives, such as *oriendus, volvendus, secundus*, etc., have no notion of necessity or obligation (cf. Hofmann 594, Buck 309, Kirk 295–6); *secundus*, for instance, is much closer in meaning to *sequens* than to *sequendus*. Cf. fnn. 46 and 54.

[102] Yet here once more it is not the -nd- formation that exclusively provides the result. Just as non-gerundial nouns like *cautio* can possess the same modal value as *cavendum*, so can a non-gerundival adjective like *proprium*, for which cf. *Trin.* 1130–31 beneficium, homini proprium quod datur, prosum perit; quod datum utendumst, id repetundi copiast quando velit, where *proprium* in the first *quod* clause balances *utendum* in the second (*proprium quod datur* = 'is given', *quod datum utendumst* = 'has been lent').

[103] Cf. *Aul.* 568 and *Cap.* 819, quoted in fn. 100.

[104] We may note further the corresponding use of these adjectives in the nominative with verbs of the type of *loco* in the passive, as Cato *Agr.* 145.1 facienda locata erunt; or with an intransitive verb as in *Mil.* 891 venit vobis faciundum utrumque, which might be paraphrased 'est, ut evenit, vobis faciendum utrumque', and *Ad.* 337 hoc proferendum tibi videtur. The nominative use of this type of predicative gerundive, except with *sum*, seems much less frequent than the accusative; that accounts for the detail commented⋅on by Kirk (304) that "the governing verb is rarely intransitive."

parallelism of *habeo* and *sum* as auxiliaries [105] (*agrum colendum habet* is a close parallel for *ager colendus ei est*, especially if we consider *ei* as dative of the possessor [106]).   However, we can hardly offer the use of *habeo* as the starting-point for the construction, since other auxiliaries are both earlier and commoner, especially *do*, as in *Bac.* 338 *homini aurum servandum dedit*.[107]   Of particularly frequent occurrence is the phrase *utendum do* [108] 'lend', as is also the corresponding *utendum rogo* (or occasionally *peto*) 'borrow'.[109]   I suggest that originally *argentum utendum rogo* and *argentum utendum do* meant, respectively, 'I ask for money, (its) using' and 'I grant money, (its) using', with *utendum* as a gerund precisely like *comparando* in *As.* 250.[110]   This gerund is of course essentially voiceless, though in the first instance, where it has the same agent as the main verb, we may look upon it as active, and in the second as a quasi-impersonal passive.[111]   As *utendum* came to be connected more closely with *argentum*, 'money to be used', it became a passive adjective; [112] and thus was generated the personal passive use of

[105] Just so, Caesar *BG* 1.15.1 *equitatum quem coactum habebat* = *equitatum qui coactus erat*.   And note the tendency of many languages, from Hittite to English, to use 'have' as an auxiliary for active transitive verbs, and 'be' as an auxiliary for active intransitive and for passive verbs.   Cf. the interesting discussion by Thielmann, *ALL* 2.379–80, of the parallelism of *est mihi dicere* and *habeo dicere* in the double sense of 'I can say' (cf. *ib.* 50–64) and 'I must say' (cf. *ib.* 64–89); also of the comparable use of *est mihi dicendum* and the later *habeo dicendum*.   (The correspondence of *dicere* and *dicendum* forms fresh proof that *dicendum* in *est mihi dicendum* was originally an active verbal noun, i.e. a gerund; cf. fn. 89.)   In English we normally use *have* rather than *be* to express obligation, as 'I have to say' (or the synonymous 'I've got to say'), but *be* to express suitability, at least in the negative (cf. fn. 89, end), as 'it's not for me to say'.

[106] So Lane 207, 400, though most authorities—e.g. Hofmann 417—call it dative of agent and trace it back to the dative of reference or advantage.   Certainly it sometimes comes very close to the dative of possessor, as in Caesar *BG* 2.20.1 *Caesari omnia uno tempore erant agenda*, which seems to mean 'Caesar had everything to do at once' rather than 'Caesar had to do everything at once'.

[107] Bennett 1.444 lists 38 examples.

[108] That it is a set phrase, on the way to becoming a single word like *animum advorto* (cf. fn. 99), is perhaps suggested by the placing of the copula at its close in *Trin.* 1131 *quod datum utendumst* not *quod utendum datumst* or *quod datumst utendum*.   However, this is not conclusive evidence; cf. *Ad.* 729 *ducenda indotatast*.

[109] They are paired in *Aul.* 311 and Cato *Agr.* 5.3 (cf. *As.* 778).   For *utendum do* twelve other examples can be cited from early Latin; for *utendum rogo*, two (with the corresponding passive expression found in *Trin.* 1131), and *utendum peto*, one.   See Langen *ALL* 3.330–1 and Bennett 1.444.

[110] V. sup. 279–80.

[111] Like the gerunds cited in fn. 36.

[112] Kirk's explanation (305) that "*utendum dare* contains a gerundial accusative of purpose, which became a gerundive by assimilation to the noun," is not wholly dissimilar (though I would not call the accusative gerund *utendum* an expression of pur-

the gerundive of an intransitive verb.[113]   It is significant that other forms of *utor* became neither transitive in use [114] nor passive in meaning; [115] that these peculiarities are inherent in the gerundive alone [116] certainly seems to justify the setting up of an explanation which is pertinent to the gerundive alone.

The *utendum do* construction provides us with an example of the substitution for the gerund of a substantival gerundive form already noted in a phrase consisting of *de* + ablative.[117]   This is Cato *Agr.* 5.3 duas aut tres familias habeat, unde utenda roget et quibus det 'let him have two or three households whom he can borrow from and lend to'.   Here the construction seems less peculiar than in

pose, which I think demands either an accusative with *ad* or a dative); but it seems to me to be marred by his usual treatment of voice as something that works mechanically in fixed categories.   Thus because *utor* is not transitive, he refuses to view *utendum* as passive, this despite the existence of such a passage as Varro *RR* 1.62 propterea quod sunt tuenda, aut quod utenda, aut quod vendunda, which he himself cites (303); he calls this a case of perseveration, as it very likely is, but he does not realize that no perseveration could induce a locution that was contrary to the potentialities of a given form, e.g. **quod utuntur* to balance *quod venduntur*, the explanation being that *utuntur* cannot have a passive meaning but *utenda* can.   Since, following Buck, he views the gerundive in *Am.* 669 ad aquam praebendam as active, he classes with it (306) *Per.* 127–8 filiam utendam mihi da, a type which he has already, 304, character-ized as an example of the "final" gerundive; yet the final gerundive is of course a special variety of Buck's "participle of necessity" (cf. Hale and Buck 327), which Kirk himself has already agreed is passive (295).   Actually were he consistent, Kirk ought to see a greater difference between *Per.* 127–8 and *Am.* 669 than I do!   He does point out one difference: that in the former "there was no shift of construction for the noun, which was from the first the object of the main verb" (306); what he does not realize is that it is precisely in this hypothetical "shift" that the whole question of voice is involved.

   [113] It must be noted that *utor* differs from the other deponents with which it is usually associated, *fruor, fungor, potior,* and *vescor,* in that in early Latin all of them freely take the accusative (and *fungor* indeed never takes anything else), whereas *utor* in Plautus does not take the accusative except in a few dubious instances (and these if genuine may be a sort of back-formation from the passive use of the gerundive) and with neuter pronouns, always freely used with verbs not ordinarily transitive other-wise.   See Langen *ALL* 3.330–5, Bennett 2.211, 215, 216–7, Hofmann 435–6.

   [114] Not even the gerund; cf. Kirk 300 and fn. 9.

   [115] Cf. sup. 277, also fn. 112.

   [116] It is probably a reflex from the situation with *utor* that in the classical period, when its four fellow deponents (for which cf. fn. 113) were like itself definitely re-stricted to the use with the ablative, their gerundives continued to be used like those of transitive verbs (cf. Gildersleeve-Lodge 279).   For *fruor* cf. Cicero *Fin.* 1.1.3 non paranda nobis solum ea, sed fruenda etiam est (on the "perseveration" cf. fn. 112); for *potior,* Caesar *BG* 2.7.2 spes potiendi oppidi and 3.6.2 in spem potiendorum cas-trorum, and Ovid *Met.* 10.569 sum potiunda.

   [117] *De redducenda;* cf. sup. 285–6.

de redducenda, for *utenda* means simply 'things to be used',[118] i.e.
res utendas,[119] whereas, as already pointed out, *de redducenda* does
not mean 'de muliere (quacumque) redducenda' but 'de illa red-
ducenda'. Had Cato used the phrase *utendum do* or *rogo* without
an accusative substantive to serve as object of *do* or *rogo*, greater
uncertainty might have been occasioned, for in that case it might
have been doubtful whether *utendum* was to be regarded as a
gerund or a gerundive.[120]

Another possible example of the same construction occurs in
Mil. 803–4 non potuit reperire, si ipsi Soli quaerendas dares, lepi-
diores duas. Here, however, *lepidiores duas* may be taken ἀπὸ
κοινοῦ with *reperire* and *quaerendas dares*.[121]

I have now completed a rapid survey of what I believe to be the
facts as to the development of the gerundive and the gerund.
Throughout my discussion has been implicit my thesis, although I
have not constantly paused to harp on it, that the gerund when
transitive and yet used without an object tends to be passive,[122]
and thus is easily converted into an adjective which, because it
agrees with the noun that denotes the recipient of the action indi-
cated by the gerund or gerundive, is of necessity both transitive
and passive. As for the gerund with an object, which is both

[118] I cannot follow Kirk at all in his statement (305 fn. 20) that "the plural *utenda*
is due to the attraction of *utendum* into the number of *quibus*."

[119] Cf. fnn. 76 and 82.

[120] Precisely as is the case with *mittundi* in *Phor.* 49–50, discussed above, 285.
We do possibly have something of the sort in a late passage cited by Kirk (305),
Dig. 13.6.1.1 inter commodatum et utendum datum tantum interesse, but here again
I think we had better recognize a gerundive (used much as in *Trin.* 1131 quod datum
utendumst) and paraphrase *inter commodatum et utendum datum* by *inter rem com-
modatam et rem utendam datam*, both phrases being of the "*ab urbe condita*" type.
Kirk's interpretation of them (305 fn. 19) as abstracts, in accordance with Monro's
translation, 'between making a loan and giving a thing to be used', seems strange in
view of his belief, offered as an argument against the derivation of the gerund from the
gerundive (295), that a *nomen actionis* cannot be derived from a *nomen rei*.

[121] Cf. *Cis.* 647–8, *Cur.* 601–3, *Mil.* 347, *Per.* 127–8, in all of which an immediately
preceding noun or pronoun probably supplies a substantive for the gerundive to agree
with, as in the Livy passage cited in fn. 77. If the genitive in *Phor.* 50 (on which cf.
fn. 120) really is a gerundive, it is a precise parallel for these accusatives.

[122] An exception occurs when the object is readily to be supplied, as in *Ad.* 869
contrivi in quaerundo vitam atque aetatem meam. *Phor.* 50 is a parallel for this if
mittundi is a gerund (contrast fn. 121). If the substantive to be supplied with *quae-
rundo* is the immediately preceding clause *ut quam plurimum facerem*, we once again
have the alternative of viewing *quaerundo* as an adjective in agreement with it, in
other words a gerundive; but that seems less likely. The context rather suggests the
supplying of some indefinite object conveying the general notion of 'a living' or 'a
fortune'.

active and transitive, I do not believe it plays any part in the picture. From an early stage, *copia lucem tuendi* must have existed (as Hofmann says, 597) side-by-side with *copia lucis tuendi*,[123] but it could never, in my opinion, have generated *copia lucis tuendae*, since for this we need some sort of connecting-link involving both form and meaning.[124] Both (a) the old form *lucis tuendi* and (b) its product and successor, *lucis tuendae*, were to all intents and purposes synonymous with each other and with (c) the alternative *lucem tuendi*, as is proved by the freedom with which they are coördinated with one another.[125] (Small wonder that the scribes sometimes confused them, as in *Cas.* 809.[126]) Such a passage as *Fin.* 5.23.67 in suo cuique tribuendo, represents both the early (a) and the later (b), and has no connection with the type met in *Brut.* 21.85 in suum cuique tribuendo, which represents (c); hence the difficulty that Kirk evidently feels (297) in treating (c) as the original, though it is "not found in early Latin and in general rare," is completely obviated.

However, I am not sure that he is right in calling the (c) type rare, unless it is the presence of a preposition with the ablative

[123] Just as in Hittite *ḫal-ki*[ḤI.A]*-uš ḫar-ni-in-ku-wa-an-zi* 'to destroy the crops' exists side-by-side with *A-NA* ERÍN.MEŠ *ni-ni-in-ku-u-an-zi* 'to the troops for gathering' i.e. 'to gather the troops' (on these passages v. sup. 272 and 274 respectively).

[124] Cf. the way in which the Hittite genitive gerund in *-as* generated a nominative masculine adjective in *-aš*. In the case of the Latin gerund with an object, the only ambiguous cases would be those in which a nominative gerund has a neuter singular object, or an accusative gerund has a masculine or a neuter singular object. These instances are of necessity rare in proportion to the total number; but where they do occur, they may have reinforced the tendency, already produced by the quite different *lucis tuendi* type, to make the *-ndum* form agree with the noun. This would be especially true of the first type, *hoc agendum est*, which is doubly ambiguous since *hoc* may be either subject or object; thus it would be likely to convert either *haec res agendum est*, if this form of expression ever really existed, or *hanc rem agendum est*, into *haec res agenda est* (cf. fn. 94). Examples of the sort are fairly common, e.g. *Am.* 891, *Cap.* 227–8, *Cis.* 657, *Poen.* 567, in all of which I am inclined to view the construction as already that of the gerundive agreeing with its subject (cf. sup. 289–90); on the other hand in Varro *RR* 3.9.8 I believe we have the gerund with an object (v. fn. 89 beginning). As for the second type, this probably had less influence, for examples seem to have been very few in early Latin; I find only six possible ones among the examples listed by Bennett (1.444–5) of the accusative gerundive with a preposition (cf. fn. 129).

[125] For various combinations, cf. the passages quoted in fn. 70, namely: a + b, Cicero *Cat.* 1.3.7 (*sui* [= *principum*] *conservandi* and gerundive) and Gellius 5.10.5 (*causarum orandi* and gerundive); a + c, Caesar *BG* 5.38.2 (*sui* [= *Nerviorum*] *liberandi* and gerund with object); b + c, *ib.* 4.14.2. The combination of b + c is particularly common in Varro (cf. fn. 89 and Kirk 303) and Livy (cf. Gildersleeve-Lodge 279). An especially striking passage is Cicero *Phil.* 5.3.6 (quoted in fn. 74), in which we find all three varieties, a, b, and c.

[126] Cf. fn. 129.

gerund that is troubling him. Certainly there seems to have been
no serious objection in early Latin [127] to the use of an object with
a verbal noun. We can cite examples for all the usages discussed
above: with genitive, *Cas.* 190 ius optinendi optio, *Men.* 687 te
defrudandi caussa; [128] with dative, *Ep.* 605 Epidicum operam quae-
rendo dabo, *Poen.* 223 nos lavando operam dederunt; with accusa-
tive, perhaps *Poen.* 599 ad hanc rem agundum; [129] with ablative,

---

[127] That is, at the earliest stage available to us. Whether still earlier there existed
a situation more like that which prevails in Hittite, we of course cannot know; but it
seems probable that even in Indo-European verbal nouns had attained quite enough
verbal force to acquire subjects and (when transitive) objects with ease, even though
not yet differentiated as to voice.

[128] In some instances there may be a special reason for the employment of the
gerund: balance in *Cur.* 706 and *Phor.* 701, avoidance of possible (though unlikely)
ambiguity in Trin. 1131 (cf. fn. 76), avoidance of cacophony in *Phor.* 885 (cf. fn. 70).
But none of these explanations applies to the examples cited in the text.

[129] There is MS authority for this reading, which, to be sure, may be due to a
scribe's slip induced by the following *Philippum* (as the surely wrong lection *adglu-*
tinandum in *Cis.* 648 was probably induced by the preceding *ad me*), but which on
the other hand there is no cogent reason to reject. The editors (e.g. Goetz and Schoell
for the Teubner text and Lindsay for the Oxford) change *agundum* to *agundam*, and in
agreement Bennett (1.450) and Hofmann (596) deny the existence of the accusative
gerund with a direct object in early Latin, Hofmann believing it started with Varro,
some of whose examples are indubitable (as *LL* 9.42 ad discernendum figuras, *RR* 1.23.6
alia ad serendum). But this seems to me circular reasoning. The gerund with an
object is commoner in early Latin than later, but the chances of recognizing an accusa-
tive gerund with singular object are only one in three; six ambiguous instances (*Men.*
16, *Mer.* 15, *Mil.* 79, *Trin.* 646, Pacuvius 51, Cato *Agr.* 134.4) are all arbitrarily classed
by Bennett (1.444–5) as gerundives, and a clear-cut gerund in the passage here under
discussion is emended into a gerundive, whereas in my opinion it might well be retained
as the *lectio difficilior*. Cf. the fate of *pacem petendum* in Vergil *Aen.* 11.230, where the
bulk of the MS evidence favors *petendam* but *petendum* has been restored on the
authority of Servius. On the other hand in *Cas.* 809, where there really is MS authority
for *hymenaeo cantando*, the selfsame editors accept the reading *cantando hymenaeum*
presumably because unquestionable examples of the ablative gerund with direct
object exist. Yet the evidence (as provided by Bennett 1.450) is far from impressive,
especially in proportion to the frequency with which the ablative gerund is used:
three instances (*Haut.* 114 and 711, *Hec.* 254) with neuter pronoun objects, which might
have been ambiguous had the gerundive been employed (note that the same reason
for choosing the gerund rather than the gerundive does not exist in the accusative);
one instance (*Eun.* 1008 te ridendo) which may be a gerundive (and which therefore
according to Bennett's practice in regard to accusatives ought to be classified as such);
and only six clear-cut cases (*Men.* 883, *Trin.* 1048, *Eun.* 7 and 68, Pacuvius 315,
Lucilius 49). The preservation of six instances of the ablative gerund with an object
out of a total of 138 occurrences of this case of the gerund, as against 60 of the ablative
gerundive, but only one instance (our *Poenulus* passage) of the accusative gerund with
an object out of a total of 33 occurrences of this case of the gerund, as against 18 of
the accusative gerundive, not only may be a matter of chance, but actually fits reason-
ably well with the general proportion of ablative gerunds and gerundives to accusatives,
4 + : 1 and 3 + : 1 respectively. (In totaling the accusative gerundives, I am exclud-

Men. 883 manendo medicum, *Trin.* 1048 fidem servando; [130] with nominative, *Trin.* 869 agitandumst vigilias, probably Afranius 99 (Ribbeck) optandum uxorem; [131] with verbal nouns in -*tio*,[132] *Am.* 519 quid tibi hanc curatio est rem,[133] *Truc.* 622–3 quid tibi huc ventio est? quid tibi hanc aditio est? quid tibi hanc notio est, inquam, amicam meam?; [134] with the not dissimilar verbal noun in -*tus*, *usus*,[135] *Pseud.* 385 usust hominem astutum. It is true that the gerundives predominate over the gerunds with objects,[136] but not, I am sure, to the same degree as in the classical period. The eventual preponderance of the gerundive may be due [137] to the strong tendency of Latin in a phrase containing a substantive and a verb form to let the verb rather than the substantive carry the main idea,[138] so that in the classical period we find the gerund with an object retained in oblique cases mainly as a means of avoiding

ing from the count our own example and the six ambiguous ones listed above; and I am of course disregarding instances of the predicative use of the accusative with verbs like *do*, for which a corresponding gerund usage cannot be cited.)

[130] Once more (cf. fn. 128) some of the passages of this type might be ambiguous were the gerundive used, as already pointed out in another connection in fn. 129: this is definitely true, for instance, of *Haut.* 114 and *Hec.* 254; on the other hand of such an instance as *Haut.* 711 it might be urged that the ambiguity would be purely formal, since the context would make the sense obvious. In *Eun.* 7–8 bene vortendo et easdem scribendo male ex Graecis bonis Latinas fecit non bonas, there may be a very special reason for the preference for the gerund over the gerundive: the structure would be less neat and effective were we to substitute the gerundive phrase *bene vortendis et eisdem scribendis male*, which would tend to be combined closely with *ex Graecis bonis*, and thus, by making the sentence topheavy, destroy the balance of this phrase with *Latinas non bonas*.

[131] The usage seems to me fresh proof that the nominative -*ndum* form used predicatively with *est* is a gerund and not a gerundive (cf. sup., fnn. 85 and 90). Once this is admitted, the use of an accusative with this noun form should present no more difficulties than its use with any other case of the gerund.

[132] For a full list see Bennett 2.252.

[133] On this and the similar passage *Mos.* 34 cf. fn. 87.

[134] Note too the adverbial modifier of the intransitive verbal nouns here and in *Rud.* 503, as well as of the transitive verbal noun in *As.* 920.

[135] Cf. fn. 88.

[136] Kirk is right in counting only these (297); the statements by Bennett (1.442) and Hofmann (594) that gerunds are more frequent than gerundives in early Latin is statistically misleading, since they apparently include intransitive gerunds that could not have been replaced by gerundives.

[137] It is certainly *not* due to any such conscious quest of linguistic perfection as is envisaged in Roby's speculations.

[138] Cf. Gildersleeve-Lodge 279 and Hofmann 608–9; we have already (290) noted a passage from Terence (*Phor.* 249–50) which facilitates, or possibly even constitutes, the introduction of this type of locution long before it is supposed to have originated. The same tendency holds true of a verb in relation to its object; cf. the difference in idiom between Latin *hoc orat* and English *he makes this plea*, etc.

cacophony [139] or ambiguity,[140] or of obtaining balance,[141] and other-wise the gerundive given the preference wherever possible. As for the object with the nominative [142] gerund, it seems to be already an archaism when we meet it in Varro, Lucretius, Catullus, and Cicero; [143] while the object with a verbal noun has disappeared as early as Terence.[144]

The result of this tendency, whatever be its cause, to employ the gerundive construction rather than the gerund wherever it is possible to do so, in other words wherever the gerund has an object, is that the use of the active form, the gerund, is mainly restricted to intransitive verbs, whereas with transitive verbs, though we occasionally meet the combination of active form and object, the overwhelming preponderance is with the passive form, the gerundive. Thus the normal pattern of classical Latin, *ad moriendum* (intransitive and active) but *ad eum interficiendum* (transitive, certainly to be interpreted as passive), conforms to that which I believe prevailed in Indo-European.

The supines in *-um* and *-u* constitute a pair similar to the gerund and gerundive in that they too stem from a single ancestor which must have been voiceless,[145] but have developed along different lines, so that when we meet them in Latin one tends definitely to be active and the other passive. The common ancestor is a verbal noun in *-tu-* [146] the case-forms of which, like those of the *-r/n* nouns in Hittite,[147] came to play a part in the conjugation of the verb. At least one such noun is used in its nominative much like the gerund, namely, *usus* in the locution *usus est* 'there is need of'; [148] and its dative *usui* is common in the type of purpose expression [149]

[139] Cf. fnn. 70 and 128.

[140] Cf. fnn. 128 and 130.

[141] However, cf. fn. 125.

[142] Or with the accusative in indirect discourse, as in Vergil *Aen.* 11.230.

[143] The fullest list that I know of is in Roby lxxii–iii. See also, for references and examples, Munro and W. A. Merrill on Lucretius 1.111, Ellis and E. T. Merrill on Catullus 39.9, Reid on Cicero *Cat. M.* 2.6. It is interesting to note that Roby, Munro, and Ellis call the form in *-ndum* a gerund, E. T. Merrill and Reid a gerundive; W. A. Merrill does not commit himself. Cf. sup. fn. 131.

[144] He uses the genitive; see *Eun.* 671, *Phor.* 293.

[145] Cf. Hofmann 544.

[146] The suffix seen with an *-ro-*, *-ra-* extension in feminine action nouns and future active participles. Cf. sup. fn. 54.

[147] Cf. sup. 271.

[148] Cf. sup. fn. 88.

[149] Bennett records ten examples (2.177). He also includes in his total list of datives of purpose or tendency (2.171–7) one or more examples from each of the follow-

which gave rise to infinitives in a number of languages. Two
datives, found in *Bac.* 62 lepida sunt memoratui and Cato *Agr.* 5.3
satui semen dederit nemini, are classed as genuine supines.[150] But
the common supines are the forms in *-tum* and *-tu*, regularly viewed
as accusative and ablative respectively, though the dative as well
as the ablative may have contributed to the development of the
second.[151]

The supines like other verbal nouns must. originally have been
voiceless; often they fluctuate, so that in the just cited passage
from Cato for instance, we can call *satui* active if we attach it
closely to *nemini*, passive if (as seems preferable) we attach it
closely to *semen*. But in general the force depends on the type of
the verb from which the supine is formed. Supines in *-tum* are
formed freely in early Latin both from intransitive and from transi-
tive verbs; later they become less common (for instance in Cicero,
according to Hofmann 600, the use with *eo* is restricted to three
verbs *cubitum, sessum, salutatum*). The supines from intransitive
verbs are of course all active; and as the use of an accusative object
with the supine in *-tum* not only is common in early Latin [152] but
continues freely in the classical and later periods as well,[153] the
supines from these verbs too are active.   On the other hand supines
in *-tu* are mostly verbs of saying and perceiving and doing (Hof-
mann 601), in other words, transitive; [154] and as the supine in *-tu*
never takes an object,[155] it results that it is normally passive.[156]

ing: *cultu, depeculatui, despicatui, frustratui, granatui, ludificatui, neglectu, perditui,
praedatui, quaestui, sumptui*. Roby has instances from 35 different words in his list
(xli–lvi), which covers every period.

[150] Leumann 237, Hofmann 601.

[151] Hofmann 601, Buck 306; otherwise Leumann 237.

[152] Indeed, in all probability the subject of the infinitive in *-tum iri* was originally
the object of the *-tum* part of the periphrasis (Hofmann 601), precisely as in the
parallel finite form in *-tum itur* (cf. Cato *Or.* frag. 54 quae [= contumelia] mihi factum
itur).   The corresponding active form is seen in *Aul.* 736 perditum ires liberos, *Truc.*
559 perditum se it.

[153] Contrast the use with the gerund (sup. 298).   However, in certain cases the
gerundive is substituted for the supine with object as it is for the gerund with object
(Hofmann 601).

[154] Bennett (1.456–7) cites a list of sixteen supines in use in early Latin, of which
only two are intransitive.

[155] Hofmann (601) attributes this to the more substantival nature of the *-u* supine
as compared with the *-um* supine.   As other evidence of this he cites its coördination
with a noun (e.g. Seneca *Epist.* 90.30 dignum inventu, perpetuo usu).

[156] Similarly, the thirty-five datives in *-tui* in Roby's list already referred to (fn.
149), are viewed by him as mainly passive; he thinks only four are active, while five

Proof that the supine in *-tum* is felt as active is the fact that in the future passive infinitive the passive force is provided purely by the auxiliary *iri;* a corresponding active form is provided by the construction *-tum ire*,[157] as in Sallust *Jug.* 68.1 ultum ire iniurias festinat.[158]   Proof that the supine in *-tu* is felt as passive is the common substitution for it in poetry of the passive infinitive.[159]

The Latin infinitives, like the supines, are unquestionably case forms of nouns, and they too must have been originally voiceless.[160] No differentiation of voice is involved in their origin: the infinitives in *-se*, from which were developed those in *-re*, were originally locatives; and the infinitives in *-i*, from which were developed those in *-ri* (through the influence of the forms in *-re*), were originally datives.[161]   The old Latin *-ier* probably is somehow connected with the *-r* of the passive,[162] but it has already been pointed out that this element may not have originally indicated passivity; [163] at all events in *Rud.* 1242–3 mihi istaec videtur praeda praedatum irier, ut cum maiore dote abeat quam advenerit, which I interpret as meaning 'it seems to me that this booty is going to acquire more booty, so that it will leave with a larger portion than it came with',[164] *irier* must, I think, be synonymous not with the passive *iri* but with the active *ire*.[165]

Eventually, Latin definitely specialized its locative infinitives

"can hardly be referred to either category" (xxxv).   As a matter of fact, probably this last description really fits all thirty-five (cf. the similar comment on adjectives in fn. 26).

[157] For *-tum irier* (*Rud.* 1242) see the next paragraph.

[158] See Thielmann *ALL* 2.169–70; Hofmann 557, 600–1.

[159] Hofmann 579.

[160] The ancestors of all infinitives must have been voiceless not only in Indo-Hittite, as testified to by the voicelessness of the Hittite infinitives (cf. sup. 272), but also in Indo-European, as testified to by the voicelessness of the infinitives of all the Indo-European languages except Greek and Latin, in both of which voice in infinitives was an independent creation (cf. Brugmann *KVG* 371, Hofmann 544).

[161] See Leumann 328.

[162] Leumann 328.

[163] V. fn. 19.

[164] I think the meaning is that the *praeda* which Gripus thought he was securing has really turned out to be bait which caught *him* instead (on the principle of "the biter bitten").   Nixon's translation in the Loeb Library Plautus, "loot such as that, methinks, is on the road to being looted, and to leaving with a larger dowry than it brought," does not seem to me to make sense; if the *praeda* goes away *cum maiore dote*, it must be because it has itself been getting spoils (active) and not been getting despoiled (passive).   But the passage is difficult.

[165] So Hofmann 601.   For *-tum ire* cf. sup. fn. 158.

as active and its dative ones as passive.[166] Of the periphrastic
forms, those composed of a participle, past passive or future active,[167]
+ a part of *sum* followed the voice of the participle; those composed
of a supine + a part of *eo* followed the voice of the auxiliary.[168]
All these distributions were already well established at the beginning
of the literary period.   Active and passive infinitives are in strong
contrast with each other in *Poen.* 337 quas spectare ego et me
spectari volo and *Ad.* 32–3 aut te amare cogitat aut tete amari; a
passive infinitive is contrasted with an active finite verb in *Phor.* 528
and in *Hec.* 73, and an active infinitive parallels an active finite
verb and is contrasted with a passive gerundive in *Pseud.* 915 and
in *Eun.* 903–4.[169]   On the other hand, such sharp contrasts are far
from common in early Latin [170] or even later; as examples of the
lack of differentiation still in existence in the classical period, we
may note several passages from Vergil, in which active and passive
infinitives are made parallel indiscriminately.[171]   These fall into
three groups: (1) Subjects for the active infinitives are provided
by the context, as in *Aen.* 3.60–1 omnibus idem animus, scelerata
excedere terra, linqui pollutum hospitium et dare classibus Austros,
perhaps [172] 10.55–7 quid pestem evadere belli iuvit et Argolicos
medium fugisse per ignis totque maris vastaeque exhausta pericula
terrae.   (2) The active infinitive is without a specific subject, being
indefinite, so that we have a collocation of two equivalent forms of
expression, the impersonal active and the passive (as in *dicunt* 'on dit'
and *dicitur* 'it is said'),[173] as in *Ecl.* 6.85–6 cogere donec ovis stabulis

---

[166] Bartholomae *IF* 2.284 and Wackernagel *KZ* 33.61 account for the passive
development of the forms in -*i* as due to the influence of the Indo-European medio-
passive endings in -*ai*.

[167] The form in -*turum* was certainly interpreted as a participle by the Romans
even if in origin it was really itself an infinitive, as may be suggested by the common
omission of the auxiliary, and still more by the original invariability of the form as
to gender and number (Hofmann 577).

[168] Cf. sup. 300.

[169] Most of these examples are cited either by Wilde 64 or by Hofmann *BPhW*
36.945.

[170] See Hofmann 543 and Lindsay 53, and note especially *Mos.* 959–61 (cited by
the latter), hic esse et bibi, scorta duci, pergraecari, fidicinas, tibicinas ducere.

[171] See the discussion in Hahn 19–21.

[172] If *exhausta* is an infinitive (= *exhausta esse*).   But it may be a participle, in
which case the inconcinnity is even greater (v. Hahn 100).

[173] Thus the active and the passive approach each other in meaning, and there is
really a sharper contrast between the two active infinitives (the first with a specific
subject and the second impersonal) in *Georg.* 3.295–8 edico herbam carpere ovis et
multa duram stipula filicumque maniplis sternere subter humum and 329–35 greges
iubebo potare undam; tum tenuis dare rursus aquas et pascere rursus.

numerumque referri iussit, *Aen.* 5.772–3 tris Eryci vitulos et Tempestatibus agnam caedere deinde iubet solvique ex ordine funem, 7.468–9 iubet arma parari, tutari Italiam, detrudere finibus hostem.[174]   (3) The active infinitive has its own subject expressed just as has the passive one, as in *Aen.* 11.83–4 indutosque iubet truncos hostilibus armis ipsos ferre duces inimicaque nomina figi.   In some of these passages, the choice of voice may have been a matter of metrical convenience, but in a number of instances (e.g. *parari* and *detrudere* in *Aen.* 7.468–9) this cannot have been a factor, since the active and passive were equally possible.   This has led some copyists and some editors to remove the inconcinnity by emending (e.g. changing *referri* in *Ecl.* 6.85 to *referre*); but this seems quite uncalled-for in view of the indubitable parallels.

III

We now turn to a rapid survey of conditions applying to non-finite verb forms in present-day English.   Since English can vary its forms from active to passive to denote a difference in meaning, even though it does not always do so, we are certainly justified in assuming the existence of voice in the language even in non-finite forms.   In cases where the distinction in meaning is not denoted by a distinction in form, we shall apply the same test as that outlined at the beginning of Part II.

In English as in other languages, the verbal noun *per se* is voiceless: 'they are ready for slaughter' may mean either 'they are ready to slaughter' or 'they are ready to be slaughtered' according to the situation or context.   Just so the verbal noun which is part of a verb is also fundamentally voiceless: its meaning is active in 'the apples are ready to fall' (because the apples fall), passive in 'the apples are ready to gather' (because the apples are gathered), ambiguous in 'the apples are ready to roll' (because the apples either roll or are rolled).   But when special precision is desired, we may substitute for the ambiguous form a form that is unquestionably passive—as when instead of saying 'the apples are ready to gather' we choose to say 'the apples are ready to be gathered'. Similarly there is no difference in meaning between 'this is made to use' and 'this is made to be used'.   In 'eyes were made to see', *to*

---

[174] Here the deponent infinitive *tutari* perhaps effects a transition from the passive infinitive *parari*, which it resembles in form, to the active one *detrudere*, which it resembles in meaning.

see is active; but in 'colors were made to see', *to see* is passive, as also in 'a maiden fair to see'.   In 'it is easy to say that', *to say* is active, like the Latin infinitive *dicere;* but in 'that is easy to say', *to say* is passive, like the Latin supine *dictu.*

The gerund may vary in meaning as does the infinitive: thus for 'eyes were made to see', 'colors were made to see', we may substitute 'eyes were made for seeing',[175] 'colors were made for seeing'. *Building* is active in 'building a house is interesting', but passive in the once normal 'the house is building'.   At times, however, the gerund and the infinitive differ in their voice usage: we use the active form of the gerund in 'her hair needs cutting', but the passive form of the infinitive in 'her hair needs to be cut'.

Other factors also may have a bearing on voice usage—for instance, whether a complement is present or not.   Thus we use the active infinitive in 'he gave them something to eat and drink'; but if *something* is omitted, we can hardly say 'he gave them to eat and drink';[176] we must substitute 'he gave them food and drink',[177] where the substantives really imply 'something to be eaten and drunk'.   French and German do not make this distinction: French can say, indiscriminately, 'il leur a donné à boire' or 'il leur a donné quelque chose à boire'.   Another point of variance between French and English usage is met in causative expressions: French uses the active, as in 'j'ai fait bâtir une maison', English the passive, as in 'I had a house built',[178] though a few English substantives correspond to the French usage, as *hearsay, makebelieve.* The active infinitive is possible in English if the subject is expressed, as in 'I had the men build a house';[179] this type on the other hand is not met in French, which would have to use a phrase with *à* to denote the agent of the action which the infinitive represents, saying 'j'ai fait bâtir une maison aux hommes'.[180]

[175] Which Emerson actually wrote, *The Rhodora* 11.

[176] This once was perfectly possible, as in *Matthew* 14.16 "give ye them to eat." But cf. fn. 177.

[177] As in *Matthew* 25.35 "for I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink."

[178] Vergil combines the two types of expression in the three passages (*Ecl.* 6.85–6, *Aen.* 5.772–3, *ib.* 7.468–9) quoted above (301–2) as examples of the collocation of active impersonal infinitives with passive ones.   See further fn. 179.

[179] Vergil provides further examples of variety (cf. fn. 178) by combining this type now with an active infinitive without subject (as in *Georg.* 3.295–8 and 329–35, cited in fn. 173), and now with a passive infinitive (as in *Aen.* 11.83–4, cited 302).

[180] This is because *faire bâtir* constitutes a single unit: *bâtir* alone, like the Hittite infinitive, takes neither a subject nor an object, *une maison* being the direct object

English participles as well as infinitives may at times seem to lack clearcut distinctions of voice. So far as I know, the present participle is always active, though the gerund which has come to share its form is not; [181] but the past participle is by no means always passive: cf. such forms as *faded, learnéd,*[182] *deceased, dead.*[183] Nor, for that matter, is it always past either; and, since tense and voice seem closely allied in the use of participles, it may be not irrelevant to consider this detail. Such forms as *loved, beloved* (the latter perhaps not quite a true participle, since it cannot be combined with the auxiliary *have*) are clearly present. Often there is no distinction whatever as to time between the present and the past participle—'including the Scandinavian' and 'the Scandinavian included' mean just the same thing, and *providing* is used by many as a substitute for *provided* in the sense of 'on condition that'. We find especially interesting shifts in time when the participle is combined with an auxiliary. Thus in the causative idiom already referred to, 'I had a house built', *built* is present, though it is past in 'I had built a house' (which, incidentally, may also involve a causative idea, though it need not [184]). Here the word order affects the sense. Elsewhere the sole criterion may be whether the notion is particular or general. Thus *closed* is past in 'the door is closed', but present in 'the door is closed every day at six' or 'the door is easily closed'. The very real distinction here is recognized by most languages: German varies its auxiliary—'die Tür ist geschlossen' vs. 'die Tür wird geschlossen'; French refuses to use the past participle at all in a present sense—'la porte est fermée' vs. 'la porte se ferme'; while for Latin, which, unlike the modern languages, possesses a true passive, the problem does not exist at all—'porta clausa est' vs. 'porta clauditur'. Even English does make

---

of the composite *faire bâtir*, just as *aux hommes* is its indirect object. That *maison* is not the object of *bâtir* alone is proved by the position of its pronominal substitute in 'je la leur ai fait bâtir'.

[181] Cf. sup. 303.

[182] Here a distinction in form has grown up corresponding to a distinction in use. Cf. inf. 305.

[183] *Dead* is a participle from an old verb meaning 'die'. See *NED* 3.57 and 335, Skeat 156, Webster 673.

[184] The possibility of suggesting causation without the use of an auxiliary such as *have* seems to be a peculiarity of the verb *build*. Thus we have a sharper contrast in meaning between 'I had a house painted' and 'I had painted a house'; but the shift from present to past participle still holds true. In this case still a third variety of word order is possible, 'I had a painted house'; here the participle, this time closer to a mere adjective, is still past.

the distinction when the auxiliary is *have* not *be*: for 'the door is closed' we may substitute 'the door has closed', but for 'the door is closed at six' or 'the door is closed easily' we substitute not 'the door *has* closed' but 'the door *closes*'.

So far as there is any difference between 'the door has closed' and 'the door is closed', it involves the notion of process, with *have*, vs. result, with *be*. With some verbs, this distinction is more marked: contrast 'he has gone' with 'he is gone'. Sometimes this shift is intensified by a change in pronunciation of the participle— 'he has learned' vs. 'he is learnéd', 'he has aged' vs. 'he is agéd', or the still greater difference that has arisen in 'he has died' vs. 'he is dead'; [185] the second form in each case is to be looked upon as an adjective rather than a participle.[186]

But usually the change produced by the use of the auxiliary *have* vs. *be* is of a completely different sort: it marks a change of voice—'he has seen' vs. 'he is seen', 'he has killed' vs. 'he is killed', 'he has predeceased his brother' vs. 'he is predeceased by his brother'.

Why do *go, die, decease* behave so differently from *see, kill, predecease?* The answer is that the first set of verbs, with active participles, are intransitive; the second, with passive participles, are transitive.[187]   In the same way the infinitive and gerund of an

[185] Cf. fn. 183.

[186] Cf. the still further development away from participial use, already referred to, of *belovéd*, from the obsolete verb *belove*.

[187] To be sure, the use of *have* as an auxiliary has grown up in the great majority of English intransitive verbs; and the same tendency is to be noted in French, and, probably to a lesser extent, in German. Thus English *dance*, French *danser*, usually German *tanzen*, take 'have' as auxiliary; so too English *run*, French *courir*, but rarely German *laufen*. Yet the general distinction of transitive-intransitive seems on the whole a more satisfactory criterion than any based on meaning. For instance, the rule is often set up for both German and French that verbs of motion, other than particular types of motion, are conjugated with 'be'; this will account for the use of *être* or *sein* with verbs meaning 'come', 'go', 'fall', etc., as opposed to others such as those for 'dance' just noted, German *hüpfen* 'hop', French *marcher* 'walk', etc. But it will not account for 'follow' as opposed to 'go' and 'come'; English *follow* and French *suivre* I think take *have* and *avoir* primarily because they are transitive, and it is interesting to note in this connection that German *folgen*, which is intransitive, normally takes *sein* (though it does occasionally take *haben*), while the auxiliary used with the transitive *verfolgen* is *haben*.   The same is true of verbs of change of state: the intransitive verb *decease* alters its habits completely when it becomes transitive through the addition of the prefix *pre-*, so that, while the intransitive 'he is deceased' means 'he has deceased', i.e. 'he has died, he is dead', the transitive 'he is predeceased' does not mean 'he has predeceased, he has died before (some one else)' but 'some one else has predeceased him, some one else has died before him'.

intransitive verb tend to be active, of a transitive verb to be passive. Contrast 'the apples are ready to fall'—intransitive, active—with 'the apples are ready to gather'—transitive, passive.   'The apples are ready to roll' is ambiguous simply because the verb *roll* may be either intransitive or transitive.   In other words, the distinction we found to be of real significance in Indo-Hittite and Indo-European in forms that did not yet possess voice is still operative to a considerable extent in languages which have completely developed categories of "active" and "passive."

ADDENDUM.

It has occurred to me (some time after the completion of the above article) that my rejection (in fn. 112) of Kirk's suggestion that *utendum* in the phrase *utendum do* is an expression of purpose may be wrong, inasmuch as we have a parallel in the use of the accusative supine to express purpose, e. g. in *Aul.* 27 quo illam facilius nuptum daret. If the accusative of the gerund could be similarly employed, then *argentum do* may have meant originally not ' I grant money, (its) using' as I assumed above (292), but ' I grant money for using'; in the same way *Bac.* 338 homini aurum servandum dedit may have meant 'he gave the man gold for keeping'; etc.   Since *do* is one of the small group of verbs used with the accusative in this way (cf. Leumann 237, Hofmann 386), its notable frequency with the predicative gerundive, already commented on (292 and fn. 107), would be of some relevance.   This possible alternative explanation does not in any way affect the validity of my general thesis, that the gerundive in the predicate as elsewhere developed from a misinterpreted gerund.