

XIV.—The Syntax of the Gerund and the Gerundive, II

W. H. KIRK

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

This paper continues, and on some points corrects, that published under the same title in *TAPhA* 73. — I. I give examples of second periphrastic = present infinitive passive, for which I accept Klotz's explanation; then of the much rarer gerund = infinitive active, the origin of which I find in a rare use of gerund as direct object. For this view I find support in the use with *curare* and occasionally with a few other verbs of gerundive instead of infinitive, which I regard as arising out of a gerund of direct object having itself an object; an approach to this is seen in *Vitr.* 7.11.1. Similar is the use of nominative of gerundive instead of infinitive, of which I find a single instance in the classical period, *Colum.* 7.10; this implies gerund instead of infinitive as subject, of which pre-literary use I find a unique survival in *Andr.* 728. — II. Discarding my former suggestion that the final gerundive may not be always passive, I cite *Caes. Civ.* 3.31.4 and 3.80.7 as showing variation of voice. Having here to consider the contrary view of Hahn (*TAPhA* 74.294), I notice and criticize briefly her theory respecting the passive use of gerund and gerundive, and discuss particular passages with a view to maintaining my own theory that the gerund may always be regarded as active. — III. Examining some new suggestions for the use of gerundive as present participle passive, I conclude anew that this use is not to be accepted for Cicero and Livy, but cite some late instances of it in Augustine and imperial constitutions.¹

I

Hofmann (*Synt.* 599 III *Zusatz*) remarks on the use in late Latin of the second periphrastic for the present infinitive passive. Actually, the earliest example occurs in an unclassical work of the classical period: *Bell. Hisp.* 33.3: *cenam adferri optimam imperavit, item optimis insternendum vestimentis*. A like coordina-

¹ In most quotations only the essential words are cited. Names of authors and works are abbreviated as in *TLL*, except that *Fam.* replaces *Cic. Epist.* In quoting from Plautus, Terence, Cicero, and Virgil only the work is named, not the author. Having to refer often to my former article, I cite it as *SG*.

tion of infinitive and gerundive stood in the text of Liv. 22.14.14, until Madvig restored the correct subjunctives. Otherwise I know only of the gerundive, oftener without than with *esse*, first in Call. *Dig.* 48.10.15 pr.: *praecepit adiciendum legi*, then Garg. Mart. *Med.* 9: *praecepit dandos* (blitos). Examples with *praecipere* and *iubere* in Palladius are given by Schmalz *Gl* 6 (1915) 173 f.; with *iubere* in Caelius Aurelianus by Helmreich *ALL* 12 (1902) 182; with *imperare* in *TLL* 7.585.76 ff.; with all three verbs by Thielmann *ALL* 3 (1886) 206. Add for *iubere* Filastr. 67.2, *Cod. Theod.* 1.12.1, 5.14.26, 11.39.7, Oros. *Hist.* 4.3.5; an imperial *velle* = *iubere* in *Cod. Iust.* 1.11.8. Helmreich says, without giving examples, that Aurelian uses also *praecipere*, *imperare*, *poscere*, and *cavere*. For *poscere* with final gerundive see Liv. 36.17.9, 22.28.9, Tac. *Hist.* 4.40; for *cavere* in the jurists *TLL* 3.639.6 ff. *Oportet* only in the *Gromatici*: 312.30 Lachm. signa requirenda o. (312.22: s. inveniri o.), 313.10, 317.8, 322.23; that in 332.14 and 365.29 *requirendum* is gerundive, not gerund like Lucifer's *placendum* cited below, appears from 283.10: o. exquiri. On *Bell. Hisp.* 33.3 A. Klotz, *Kommentar zum Bellum Hispaniense* (Leipzig 1927), says (*ad loc.*): "Gerundiv verstärkt den Begriff des Befehlens durch Ausdruck der Notwendigkeit": a probable explanation in view of the use by Palladius of *debere* beside the gerundive and of the imperative character of most of the governing verbs; exceptions are *desiderare*, *TLL* 5.708.38, *petere* Veg. *Mul.* 3, *praef.*

On Aurel. *Chron.* 1.4.78: *iubentes ei² a lavacro abstinendum atque sine vino et carnis usu perseverare*, Helmreich says: "Der Wechsel von Gerundiv und Infinitiv kommt öfters vor." Perhaps *abstinendum* coordinated with *perseverare* may be regarded as a gerund, that form being sometimes used in late Latin for infinite active (Hofmann *Synt. sup. cit.* and 582 *Zusatz B*): Chiron 779: *dicendum satis habeo*; Lucif. *Non Placend.* 35 (583 Hartel): *quid censes oportuisse tunc facere cultores dei? deo oportuerat an Antiocho placendum?*; Fredegar³ *Chron.* 3.23: *iube Gundebaudent tributum tibi solvendum*; 4 *praef.*: *incipias scribendum*; 4.81: *tributa Sarracenis emplendum refutat*. Here the gerund has lost its proper character and is employed thoughtlessly as a mere substitute for the infinitive. Two earlier passages, Ulp. *Dig.* 3.3.35.3: *nisi agendum recusaverit*,

² So Helmreich for manuscript *et*.

³ Not being able to consult the text of Fredegar, I take my quotations from Odelstierna *De vi futurali ac finali gerundii et gerundivi observationes* (Uppsala 1926).

and Vitr. 7.11.1: *caerulei temperationes primum Alexandriae sunt inventae, postea item Vestorius Puteolis instituit faciendum*, seem at first sight to exhibit the same use. But it seems possible to take them as showing the origin of the use, to hold that in Latin, as in English, a gerund as direct object might alternate, and yet not be felt as identical, with an infinitive, and to regard the literal translations "declined proceeding" and "commenced making" as representing the conception of the writers. Support for this view I find in the case of verbs which exhibit alternation of gerundive with infinitive. The only common one is *curare*, as to which I withdraw what was said in *SG* 304. Other instances are few and scattered. I cite first Liv. 3.45.3: *puellam sistendam promittat*. This gerundive cannot be final, as suggested by Weissenborn-Mueller's note on Liv. 22.28.9; for the action denoted by that gerundive is always to be performed by the taker, never by the actual or prospective giver.⁴ It cannot be a future passive participle, as was at first hesitatingly suggested by Weissenborn *ad loc.*; for it is not credible that the form should have been so used once by Livy and afterwards not again till the middle of the second century; the earliest example I find cited is *CIL* 6.10234.14 (*a.* 153). Nor can it be a *participium necessitatis*. There remains only the function which the gerundive has in its association with an accusative after a preposition and with other oblique cases. This I have treated, *SG* 296, as involving a substitution in form, but with no change of meaning, of gerundive for gerund; and I regard the examples here discussed as coming under the same head. A gerund of direct object having itself an object is indeed not found; there is an approach to it in Vitr. 7.11.1, where *temperationes* is implied as object of *faciendum*; a writer less addicted than Vitruvius to the use of the gerund (*SG* 297) would have written *faciendas*. With Liv. *l.c.* belongs *Rep.* 2.36: *aedem vovisse faciendam*; of *vovere* with infinitive I can indeed cite no instance; with *promittere* the jurists regularly use *sistere* or *sisti*; see Lewis and Short under *sisto*. The few remaining examples are:

⁴ In the original use, as seen in comedy, there is always a transfer, a giver and taker. Later there may be only a taker: Hirt. *Gall.* 8.37.3: *partem oppidi sumit ad obsidendum*. In Liv. 36.17.11: *muris urbis obsidendum sese incluserit*, the gerundive stands for an ordinary clause of purpose, as in the late instances which alone I before noticed, *SG* 306 (where for *nutriendos* read *servandos*). This explains Suet. *Dom.* 11: *more maiorum puniendi condemnarentur*; see in *TLL* the normal use of *ut* clause with *damnare* and *condemnare*.

Liv. 1.20.7; iusta funebria placandosque manes edoceret; Ps. Vict. *Orig.* 8.1: sacra administranda edoceret; Scrib. Larg. *Comp.* 53: non suadeo tollendum (dentem): Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.37: Catoni petendos honores suadeamus; Suet. *Tib.* 32: praesidibus onerandas tributo provincias suadentibus;⁵ *Cod. Inst.* 1.16: eliciendum aliquod rescriptum tentaverit; perhaps Bened. *Reg. prol.*: quidquid agendum inchoas. Of course a verbal noun other than the gerund may be used for the gerundive, as *Orig.* 8.5: administrationem sacrorum edoceret, or for the infinitive, as in Sen. *Benef.* 7.22.

In *SG* ftn. 2, I made the mistake of slighting Hofmann's reference to a like use of the nominative in late Latin; now I offer an example of this from the classical period, Colum. 7.10: deinde (pecudibus), sicut hominibus, aqua calida potanda permittitur. *Potanda* is not to be classed, as I before thought, *SG* 303, with the final gerundives in Liv. 42.49.3, Plin. *Epist.* 1.10.11, where *permittere* = *committere*, or Liv. 29.10.3, where it may be rendered by "leave (to the discretion of)", as in 24.14.5; here the proper comparison is with Plin. *Epist.* 10.79.3: illis magistratum gerere permissum est, and we may paraphrase by *aquam potare permittitur*. The affinity between gerundive and infinitive appears clearly in Bened. *Reg.* 47: nuntianda hora sit cura abbatis, aut ipse nuntiare aut tali sollicito fratri iniungat hanc curam; the sense of the gerundive is continued by the appositional infinitive, as if the writer had begun his sentence with *nuntiare horam*.⁶

For "I must beware" Plautus and Terence put *mihi cavendum est*⁷ with ablative, *mihi cautio est* with a *ne* clause. It seems obvious that *cavendum* is, like *cautio*, a nominative, and that in both phrases the primary sense is "for me there is bewaring," which the situation causes to be understood as "there is need to beware"; cf. Engl. "no fear" = "no need to fear"; and see Hahn *TAPhA* 74, 286 and 288. It seems possible, therefore, to conclude that the nominative of the gerund, which regularly expresses necessity, was once used to express simply action, a function performed in the language as we know it by the infinitive. Of this original use I am inclined to think that there remains in classical Latin a single example, *Andr.* 728; si opus sit iurandum mihi "if for me swearing should be neces-

⁵ Different is *Arch.* 14, where the gerundive expresses obligation.

⁶ Or *nuntiari h.*: see *TLL* 4.1456.38.

⁷ To the examples cited by Hahn (*TAPhA* 74, 286 ftn. 86) add *Eun.* 883.

sary.”⁸ And, in accordance with my general theory, I think that such a nominative as *nuntianda hora* arose out of a *nuntiandum horam* = *nuntiare h.*

II

Wrongly I spoke, *SG* 306, of *aedificatus* in Varro *Ling.* 5.147 as a participle; it stands for *aedificatus est*. The late recognition of this fact does away with my (otherwise also unjustifiable) doubt as to the passivity of the final gerundive. It does not affect my belief that that gerundive arises out of a gerundial accusative of purpose, of which rare construction I here offer another example, Cass. Fel. 39 *fn.*: simul omnia decoques in posca et dabis gargarizandum, aestate frigidum hiberno tepidum.⁹ But it leads me to conclude that there is variation of voice in Caes. *Civ.* 3.31.4: diripiendas his civitates dedit, and 3.80.7: oppidum ad diripiendum militibus concessit.

Here, however, I come up against the theories, very different from mine, of Hahn, “Voice of Non-Finite Verb Forms in Latin and English,” *TAPhA* 74.269–306. She would regard *diripiendum* as passive because (ftn. 22, cf. ftn. 23) it does not refer to the subject of the sentence and because (294) it is a transitive gerund having no object either present or (ftn. 122) easily to be supplied. On what reasoning these modes of determining the voice are based is not clear to me. She designates also as passive apparently (ftn. 36) intransitive gerunds, certainly (ftn. 51) gerundives, which do not refer to the subject. She says nothing of passages in which the gerund refers to a noun in an oblique case (e.g. *Hec.* 233 f., *Off.* 2.2, Suet. *Tib.* 61), nor does she mention in this connection the transitive gerund with object, on which my view as to the relation between gerund and gerundive is based. That she takes the gerundive in *Aen.* 1.269: volvendis mensibus, as passive arises from the fact that she thinks (ftn. 28) that middle verbs are to be ignored in Latin; on this and on her remark (ftn. 27) that “*sequor* is passive in form” it would be interesting to know why she dissents from the conclusions reached in Clafin’s weighty article, “The Nature of the Latin

⁸ This leaves untouched the anacoluthon which Fairclough (*TAPhA* 30, 13) removed by proposing *iurandumst*. Sturtevant in his edition of the *Andria* adopts this reading, but not Fairclough’s interpretation; his own seems to me to postulate a doubtful position for the volitive clause.

⁹ The adjectives, belonging syntactically to *omnia*, are attracted (perseveration of number) into agreement with the gerund.

Passive," *AJPh* 48 (1927) 157-175. It is to be observed that her definition of a form as passive has nothing to do with the mode of translation, which (ftn. 51) she considers irrelevant, or with the question whether the subject of a passive is (as I take it to be) always a *patiens*; for in treating Virgil's *volvendis* and the gerund *recipiendi* in *Caes. Gall.* 7.52.1 as passive she does not, I suppose, mean to say that the months are propelled by some external force, or that the signal was given, not for the soldiers to withdraw, but for them to be withdrawn.

While we disagree on these and some other points, we have also points of agreement. But I cannot accept one suggested by Hahn (280). When she says that "the gerundive developed out of the gerund," she means this in a morphological sense. My theory, that all *uses* of the gerundive, except the rare use as attributive (*SG* 295, 300), developed out of uses of the gerund, falls under syntax; and my explanation that this development arose through a shift in construction she does not accept. Her own view (ftn. 56 and pages 281-2) is that, of such a phrase as *lectis sternendis studuimus* (*Stich.* 678), the original form was *lectis sternendo*; and she says (294): "As for the gerund with an object, which is both active and transitive, I do not believe it plays any part in the picture." The natural inference would seem to be that it is a later, and at bottom unnecessary, development.

I proceed to discuss passages cited by Hahn with a view to showing that gerunds regarded by her as passive may with better reason be regarded as active. I begin with three of which she says (ftn. 36): "We encounter difficulties when we meet a gerund whose agent and recipient play no grammatical rôle in the sentence."

Men. 882 f.: *lumbi sedendo, oculi spectando dolent, manendo medicum* (of this Hahn cites only the three words *lumbi sedendo dolent*). The situation makes it clear that the loins and eyes are the speaker's, that it is he who sits and looks, and that Sauppe, *Philol.* 19 (1863) 255, rightly explained the detached gerund¹⁰ *manendo* by *dum maneo*. The verse does not permit the insertion of an easily understood *mei*, in which the agent, or subject, of the gerund could be found. Cf. Ferd. Brunot, *La Pensée et la Langue* (Paris 1920) 233: "Quand on dit: Mon cœur battait en montant l'escalier, le gérondif se rapporte à l'idée de *moi* contenue dans *mon*

¹⁰ On detached gerunds see *SG* 298 with ftm. 6.

coeur, mais non à ce sujet lui-même"; *Phorm.* 422 f.: tua praeterierat ad ducendum aetas; *Att.* 4.6.3: ne βαβύρης mea, quae in agendo apparuit, in scribendo sit obscurior.

Phorm. 1033 ff.: merito hoc meo videtur factum? — minime gentium: verum iam quando accusando fieri infectum non potest, ignosce. *orat.* Since a recipient (object) for *accusando* is as readily to be supplied as a subject for *orat*, I assume that the difficulty lies in the fact that the gerund, whether active or passive, cannot refer to the subject *hoc*. There are, however, other examples of this: *Ad.* 880: id fit dando; *Lucr.* 1.902 f.: terendo quae cum confluxere (to be explained from 898 f.: not the *semina* but the *cacumina* rub against each other: cf. *Vitr.* 2.1.1); *Liv.* 9.5.11: hora advenit omnia tristiora experiundo factura; *Plin. Nat.* 33.162: ex caeruleo fit quod vocatur lomentum; id perficitur lavando terendoque (the gerunds cannot refer to *id*; for the *lomentum* is the result of these processes, not the material on which they are performed).

Ecl. 8.71: cantando rumpitur anguis. Hahn hesitates to say with Servius that *cantando* is passive and suggests paraphrasing it by "a non-committal abstract . . . *carmine* or *cantu*." *Carmen* is concrete; the *-tu-* noun may become concrete, but is primarily abstract, as is also the gerund; both express action; cf. *Arch.* 19: bestiae cantu flectuntur; *Off.* 1.107: velocitate ad cursum, viribus ad luctandum valere: *Catull.* 64.340: certamine cursus, beside *Rhet. Her.* 4.60: certamine currendi. For an explanation of the active gerund here, I quote again from Brunot *sup. cit.*: "fort souvent le gérondif n'a pas de sujet déterminé: L'appétit vient en mangeant (quand on mange)"; see also Diez, *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*⁵ (Paris 1882) 961. For such Latin gerunds with *in* see *Off.* 1.10: cum praeterire aliquid maximum vitium in dividendo sit (= *ubi dividas*; cf. *Fin.* 2.26); *Off.* 1.89: prohibenda est ira in puniendo; simple ablative *Rhet. Her.* 3.21: recreatur vox spiritu et arteriae reticendo conquiescunt (= *cum reticeas* or *eo quod reticeas*); *Cels.* 3.27.4: ne luctando aut currendo aut alia ratione sanescentia ulcera exasperentur; with object *Vitr.* 3.1.3: circumagendo rotundationem digiti linea tangentur (= *si circumagas*); *Vitr.* 6 pr. 5: ingenuus color movetur pudore petendo rem suspiciosam (= *ubi petas* or *si quis petit*). In like manner *cantando* = *si cantes*; and the same paraphrase may be used for *As.* 222 *salutando*, *appellando*, *osculando*; *Lucil.* 30.132 *Muell.*, *Lucr.* 1.312, *Georg.* 2.250 *habendo*;

Lucr. 4.1068 *alendo*; Georg. 2.239 *arando*; *ibid.* 3.454 *tegendo*. Of course, a general statement may be expressed by the indicative passive in the third person as well as by the subjunctive active in the ideal second person; cf. the two together in Sall. *Iug.* 10.4, the two along with gerunds, *id. Catil.* 52.29; but, equally of course, the gerund represents the active clause, not the passive.

Beside *As.* 222 with its intransitive, and Lucr. 1.312 with its passive main verb, Hahn puts Georg. 3.215: *urit videndo*; but this with its transitive and active verb belongs with Lucr. 4.1102: *nec satiare queunt spectando corpora*. No doubt we could render these gerunds by English passives; not, however, in two otherwise exactly similar sentences, *Hec.* 435: *ut me ambulando rumperet*, *Pis.* 43: *quem Karthaginienses vigilando necaverunt*. In their detachment from the subject and reference to the object these two gerunds are comparable to the substantives in Val. M. 9.2 Ext. 1: *Regulum vigilantia necaverunt*, and Suet. *Tib.* 47: *plerosque modestia et pudore deterruit*. For other examples of such substantives referring to an oblique case see Knapp *CR* 21 (1907) 45; the especial peculiarity of the four ablatives just cited is that they denote the means of doing the thing, but a means not employed by the doer, so that they ought logically to be nominatives with an active or ablatives with a passive; e.g. in Suet. *l.c.* either *plerosque pudor deterruit* or *plerique pudore deterriti sunt*; cf. *Off.* 3.100: *vigilando necabatur*, which could be turned into an active *vigilantia necabat*. This manner of phrasing is odd, but in these four cases unquestionable; and the exact similarity in the form of the sentences seems to justify putting *videndo* and (with Munro) *spectando* under the same head.

The ablative of the gerund with a passive verb may denote action by indefinite, but real, persons; e.g. Liv. 5.8.2: *neglectum Anxuri praesidium vacationibus militum et Volscos mercatores volgo receptando*; 23.37.4: *promovendo adiunctam muro turrem*; Vitruv. 7.13.3: *sanies in mortariis terendo comparatur*. The fact that *promovendo* and *terendo* can be paraphrased by *dum promovetur* and *dum teritur* has to my thinking less force than the parallelism with *receptando*; and I conclude that the active gerund contains in itself the notion of the indefinite as well as the ideal agent.

The active character of some gerundial ablatives seems to me demonstrable by comparison with other verbal nouns which cannot be passive. *Fando accipere* = *fama a.*; Eun. 893: *in cognoscendo*,

921: de cognitione; *Georg.* 3.206: ante domandum, Colum. 6.2.1: in domitura; *Verr.* 4.190; ad portandum, and Liv. 34.34.6: ad comportandum, Vitruv. 2.9.16: adportationibus; *Aen.* 12.46: aegrescit medendo, cf. in *TLL* 1.951.3 the citation from Ennodius: curatione aegrescitis.

III

After the publication of my former article I received a letter containing a courteous inquiry as to how I would fit into my scheme "certain passages in Cicero and Livy where the gerundive seems to be used as a precise parallel to a perfect passive participle." The passages in question are: *Leg.* 3.11: donum ne capiunto neve danto neve petenda neve gerunda neve gesta potestate; *Phil.* 6.17: partis honoribus eosdem in foro gessi labores quos petendis; Liv. *praef.* 6: ante conditam condendamve urbem; 22.25.4: non praesentem modo dictatorem obstitisse rei bene gerendae sed etiam gestae obstare. Certainly three of these four exhibit a contrast between two kinds of time which is not found in another sentence, where also gerundive and past participle are associated, *Fam.* 2.12.3: non erat minor laus ex contemnenda quam ex conservata provincia.¹¹ Nor, I think, is it found in Liv. 22.25.4. Taking *gerendae* as a participle, we must translate: "not only opposed action which was being" (or "when it was being") "successfully carried on, but also opposes action which has been" (or "now that it has been") "carried on." But the second phrase, *gestae obstare*, which in no way represents the sense of the sentence in *dictator . . . diceret*, is purely rhetorical, a merely verbal contrast to *gerendae obstitisse*; and the first is contrary to the facts: Minucius had criticized Fabius for inaction, not for blocking successful action. Rhetorical, too, is the placing of *bene* with *gerendae*; according to the facts as reported by Minucius it belongs with *gestae*. I conclude, therefore, that the gerundive is here employed as it usually is, as it is, e.g., in a sentence which is a counterpart to this, *Rep.* 5.5 studuerit legibus cognoscendis.

The gerund and gerundive denote continuous, and therefore sometimes contemporaneous action; accordingly either may be used (e.g. *Tusc.* 1.96, *Off.* 1.5) in the ablative of manner as the equivalent of a present participle. It is not so generally recognized that Latin writers sometimes make up for the lack of a perfect active parti-

¹¹ Both actions lie in the past. I assume that Cicero preferred *contemnenda* to *contempta* because the quadrisyllable balances better with *conservata*.

ciple by using the ablative of the passive participle. On this see Woelfflin *ALL* 13 (1904) 274: "Einen Ersatz für *νικήσας* gewinnt man mit: Caesar victo Pompeio Aegyptum adiit, weil der Leser zwischen den Zeilen versteht dass Caesar der Sieger war. Dies unterstützt Caesar gern durch Zwischenstellung des Subjektes, *Gall.* 2.12.2 *hac re statim Caesar per speculatores cognita.*" See also Methner *Gl* 6 (1915) 53: "weil der Lateiner kein Partizip des Aktivs hat, das die vollendete Handlung bezeichnet, bedient er sich einer passiven Wendung": *ibid.* 54, on *Mur.* 3: *me et consulem et legis latorem et severe gesto consulatu*: "auch der Römer fühlte das *consulatu gesto* gewissermassen als ein part. perf. oder aor. activi." That such a feeling existed seems to me to be confirmed by the following passages, in which the ablative absolute evidently refers to a noun in an oblique case and expresses action on the part of the man or animal designated by the noun: *Lucr.* 1.135: *morte obita quorum tellus amplectitur ossa*; 4.760 f.: *quem relicta vita terra potitast*; *Caes. Gall.* 6.38.4: *relinquit animus Sextium multis acceptis vulneribus*, cf. *Sest.* 85; *Hor. Sat.* 1.2.16 f.: *nomina sectatur modo sumpta veste virili tironum*; *Ov. Rem.* 633: *non facile est taurum visa retinere iuvenca*; *Plin. Nat.* 2.155: *(terra) serpentem homine percusso amplius non recipit*. Further, Woelfflin (*ALL* 9 [1896] 88) cites, from a second-century translation of a Greek document, *relicta domo* as a rendering of *οἶκον καταλιπών*; and an earlier instance of such a rendering occurs in *Aen.* 11.811, where *occiso pastore* represents the *κτείνας βουκόλον* of *Hom. Il.* 15.587. I conclude that in the two passages cited Cicero used *gesta* and *partis* as Virgil used *occiso*, and that, to effect the coordination with these participles, he substituted gerundival ablatives of manner for nominatives of present participles.

The temporal prepositions in use with gerund and gerundive are *in* and *inter*: these accord with the notion of continuity inherent in the form. That notion is dropped in *Fam.* 2.12.3 (*sup. cit.*) with *ex*, and there remains only the fact, which the Roman, of course, realized as clearly as we, that the combination of either adjective with a noun may have the value of noun + dependent noun. On the other hand, in *Liv. praef.* 6, where the two follow the same preposition and agree with the same noun, their association brings out the temporal contrast; therefore, while the relation of each to the noun remains the same as in other cases, we cannot paraphrase by

nouns, because we cannot in that way exhibit their temporal character. We can, however, translate them by English gerunds dependent on the kind of noun which each implies: "before the completion, or before the process, of founding the city." Livy inserts the gerundive in order to show that the scepticism he has expressed about certain earlier matters does not extend to the incidents contained in the story of the founding. And no more here than in *Fam.* 2.12.3 is there any reason to suppose that the writer thought he was using a present participle; the coordination with the perfect participle is a coordination of meanings, not of forms.

It seems, indeed, improbable that such a use, which is not claimed for early or Silver Latin, should have come into being and died out in the Golden Age. I find, however, some indications of its existence in the fifth and sixth centuries. It seems unquestionable for Aug. *Civ.* 1.12: in corpore sensus est occidendo; nullus sensus est in corpore occiso. But I cannot venture to decide whether *erudiendos*, *Civ.* 1.9, and *lacerandam*, 2.11, are appositional present participles or represent an extension of the final gerundive, such as I assumed, *SG* 304, for the *fruendum eriperemus* of Colum. 1.3. Further, looking over the first book of Justinian's *Code*, I find that an enactment is not infrequently followed by an ablative absolute, which takes four forms: gerundive (commonest of all), perfect participle, present or future participle. That the jurists of the fifth century regarded this gerundive as a future is suggested by its association with the future participle in *Cod.* 1.5.5 (*a.* 428): Manichaeis expellendis cunctisque legibus quae contra eos latae sunt valituris; 1.14.2 (*a.* 425): notam infamiae subituro eo et iudice condemnatione plectendo. That in the sixth century it might be felt as a present seems to appear from a like association with the present participle in *Cod.* 1.4.27 (*a.* 530): creatione celebranda, ipso autem curatore sacramentum praestante; 1.17.1.5 (*a.* 530): omnibus auctoribus iuris aequa dignitate pollentibus et nemini quadam praerogativa servanda. I must leave it to others to say whether more examples of such uses occur elsewhere in late Latin.¹²

¹² This paper was ready for printing when, being enabled to consult Joh. Praun's *Syntax des Vitruv* (Bamberg 1885), I found that he (page 57) supplies *caeruleum* with *faciundum* in Vitr. 7.11.1; if this is right, *faciundum* must be taken as a gerundive. Praun there cites also Vitr. 9, *praef.* 9: coronam in foro constituisset ponendam; this may perhaps be classed with Liv. 3.45.3 and like passages, since the notion of necessity, apparent in Caes. *Gall.* 7.36.1: agendum constituit, and 7.78.2: constituit utendum, seems to be here inapplicable.