Was There a Nominative Gerund?
(Iterum de gerundio et gerundivo)

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

The title of this paper has been couched in the form of a question, in deference to the great extent of doubt and disagreement on the subject that has existed, and still exists, among scholars.[1]

[1] Bibliographical data are to be interpreted as follows. **Aalto**=Pentti Aalto, *Untersuchungen über das lateinische Gerundium und Gerundivum* (Helsinki 1949). **Benfey**= Theodor Benfey, *Handbuch der Sanskritsprache*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1852–54). **Bennett**= Charles E. Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*, 2 vols. (Boston 1910–14); all references are to vol. 1. **Bennett, Lat. Gram.**=Charles E. Bennett, *New Latin Grammar*, 3rd ed. (Boston 1918). **Brugmann**=Karl Brugmann and Berthold Delbrück, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 2nd ed., 5 vols. (Strassburg 1893– 1916). **Buck, GL**=Carl Darling Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, 4th impression (Chicago 1948). **Buck, OU**=Carl Darling Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston 1904). **Cong.**=*Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*, ed. by Horace G. Lunt (The Hague 1964). **Delbrück**: see Brugmann. **Ernout-Thomas**=Alfred Ernout and François Thomas, *Syntaxe latine* (Paris 1951). **Gilder-sleeve-Lodge**=B. L. Gildersleeve and Gonzalez Lodge, *Gildersleeve's Latin Grammar*, 3rd ed. (Boston 1894). **Götze, Hatt.**=Albrecht Götze, *Hattusilis* (Leipzig 1925). **Götze, Madd.**=Albrecht Götze, *Madduwattas* (Leipzig 1928). **Hale**=William Gardner Hale and Carl Darling Buck, *A Latin Grammar* (Boston 1903). **Hofmann**= Manu Leumann and Joh. Bapt. Hofmann, *Stolz-Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik*, 5th ed. (Munich 1928). **JCS**=*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*. **Jordan**=*M. Catonis praeter Librum de Re Rustica Quae Extant*, ed. by Henricus Iordan (Leipzig 1860). **Lane**= George M. Lane, *A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges*, rev. ed. (New York 1898). **Pedersen**=Holger Pedersen, *Hittitisch und die anderen indoeuropäischen Sprachen* (Copenhagen 1938). **Poultney**=James Wilson Poultney, *The Bronze Tables of Iguvium* (Baltimore 1959). **Ribbeck, Com.**=*Comicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, ed. by Otto Ribbeck, 3rd ed. (Leipzig 1898). **Ribbeck, Trag.**=*Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, ed. by Otto Ribbeck, 3rd ed. (Leipzig 1897). **Roby**=Henry John Roby, *A Grammar of the Latin Language*, 2 parts, new ed. (London 1896); all references are to part 2. **Schwyzer**=Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, 2 vols., vol. 2 compl. and ed. by Albert Debrunner (Munich 1939–50). **Sturtevant**=*A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*: **HG¹**=1st ed. (Philadelphia 1933), **HG²**=rev. ed. (New Haven 1951). **Szantyr**=J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, rev. by Anton Szantyr (Munich 1965). **Vahlen**=*Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*, ed. by Iohannes Vahlen, 2nd ed. (Leipzig 1903). **Warmington**=*Remains of Old Latin*, ed. and transl. by E. H. Warmington, 4 vols. (Cambridge 1935–40). **Whitney**=William Dwight Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, 2nd ed. 5th issue (Cambridge 1923). References are to pages. Quotations are not necessarily complete. In the transcription of Hittite and of Oscan and Umbrian, I omit diacritics; and in the transcription of Oscan and Umbrian, I do not distinguish between the native and the Latin alphabets.

My own answer would be an unhesitating and unequivocal *yes*.[2]

This answer I gave, though only incidentally, as long ago as 1943 in the course of an article entitled "Voice of Non-Finite Verb Forms in Latin and English."[3] I repeated it, again only incidentally, in the course of an article entitled "Verbal Nouns and Adjectives in Some Ancient Languages."[4] But I believe that a specific and detailed defense of my position is called for, in which of course I not merely will reiterate my former arguments but will reinforce them with fresh discussion and fuller details. I am to a considerable extent impelled to this decision as the result of a recent statement on the subject that I cannot but interpret as a challenge.[5] This was made by the late Joshua Whatmough,[6] and runs as follows. "Another favorite *pons asinorum* is the gerund and gerundive, a fascinating problem. But any grammarian who cannot make up his mind to distinguish clearly between the two (e.g., in *currendum est* we have the neuter nominative of the gerundive—the gerund has no nominative— used impersonally, exactly like *curritur*, with or without a possessive dative, *mihi, tibi, nobis, uobis*) has no foundation to his grammatical doctrine."[7] At the cost of laying myself open to this serious charge, I must state unequivocally and unblushingly not only that I believe, as affirmed just above, in the existence of a nomina-

---

[2] My effort to arrive at this answer will take me so far afield that I may seem to have forgotten all about my ultimate goal. However, I assure my putative readers that I will finally come back to the main course; but lest my title seem misleading, I have added a sub-title to suggest the wider scope of subject-matter demanded by my chain of reasoning.

[3] *TAPA* 74 (1943) 269–306. See especially 287–90.

[4] To appear in *Language* 42.2 (June 1966).

[5] I regret sincerely that it is no longer possible to address my reservations in regard to this statement directly to its author; but I do not believe that this is a reason for withholding them.

[6] *CP* 59 (1964) 112 in the course of a review of a fascicle of Szantyr.

[7] Professor Whatmough had made similar statements earlier, but in a more temperate manner. In *CW* 43 (1949) 20: "In such an expression as *nihil faciendum*, we have the gerundive, not the gerund, which has no nominative case." In *CP* 47 (1952) 182, in a review of Aalto: "Aalto speaks of a passive gerund, I maintain that the gerund is always active; Aalto that it has a nominative, I that what he calls the 'nominative' of the gerund is the neuter of the gerundive used multipersonally." It seems to me circular reasoning to cite a nominative neuter form such as *faciendum* which some take as a gerund, and to base the statement that it is a gerundive at least in part on another statement that there is no such gerund.

tive gerund,[8] but also that there are a number of instances in which I am not able unquestioningly to distinguish between the gerund and the gerundive.

Any one who asserts categorically either that there is or that there is not[9] a nominative gerund must be prepared to submit particulars in support of this assertion.[10]   My arguments rest in part on six fundamental postulates.

1. I believe that verbal nouns and adjectives were originally nouns and adjectives far more than they were verbs.   This is true to an even greater extent of nouns than of adjectives.   Hittite, Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin all had numerous nouns of action formed from verb roots with various suffixes, some of which became attached to the verb paradigms while others did not.[11]   Adjectives did not show quite such a diversity of forms, but there were certainly some in -to- and in -no- which tended eventually to develop into participles,[12] and there was one participial formation, in -nt-, which was so widely distributed in the derivative languages that it may certainly be assigned to the Ursprache.

---

[8] The reason for its ultimate rarity is clear.   See note 23.

[9] For one of my reasons for questioning Whatmough's method of arguing, see note 7.

[10] The vast majority of scholars deny the existence of a nominative gerund, and, as a corollary, of an accusative gerund except with prepositions.   Notable exceptions are Roby, especially lxii and lxxi–iii; Kirk, TAPA 73 (1942) 293–307, well summarized there on 293, and 76 (1945) 166–76; and Aalto, 92–98.   Roby's conclusions concerning the gerund and the gerundive, documented by remarkably full lists of examples, seem to me in general well-taken, but often based on distorted reasoning and fanciful explanations, as well as on impossible etymologies; at times his complicated discussion (especially in the matter of voice) strikes me as subtle but futile.   Kirk is stimulating; his first paper in TAPA prompted mine, in part in agreement and in part in rebuttal, and mine similarly prompted his second paper, similarly in part in agreement and in part in rebuttal.   Aalto's monograph seems to me an admirable piece of work, thoughtful and thorough, and I heartily concur with much of it (though not with all).

[11] See for Hittite Sturtevant, HG² 68–77; for Sanskrit Whitney 203 and 347–55, especially 349; and for Greek and Latin Buck, GL, passim in his excellent treatment of derivation of nouns and adjectives, 311–48, especially his summary of verbal abstracts, 347.   For convenience I apply the term "action noun" rather than "verbal noun" to those nouns which did not become part of the verb system.

[12] We find neither type in Hittite.   Both types provide Sanskrit participles, those in -to- (Sanskrit -ta-) being much the commoner.   The -no- type gives no participles in either Greek or Latin, but is very productive of adjectives in both languages.   The -to- type is not specially common in Greek, apparently being limited to the so-called "verbals"; but in Latin it is highly productive, furnishing adjectives from both verb and noun stems as well as true participles.   Germanic used both types as participles, with a new sort of specialization, the -no- type being associated with strong verbs and the -to- type with weak verbs.

2. As a result of point 1, verbal nouns and adjectives of course had distinctions of case, and equally of course lacked distinctions of voice and tense.[13] This in my opinion is still completely the state of affairs in Hittite, which provides us with the earliest documentary evidence[14] that we have as to what must have been conditions in the Ursprache, call it Indo-Hittite or early Indo-European as one prefers. Hittite scholars are in general agreed in regarding verbal nouns and adjectives as tenseless; in attributing voice to them, I think they are usually placing undue emphasis on translations into the vernacular. Hittite verbal nouns, which have been variously named gerunds, infinitives, supines, and simply verbal substantives,[15] probably can all be classed in one of two categories, both neuter -r/n- stems,[16] those in -war (-mar)

[13] Whether if we could go back far enough we would find these distinctions lacking in finite verbs too is open to question.   The derived languages certainly give evidence of a dichotomy between present-future and past (no separate future), and between active and medio-passive (no separate passive).   The distinction between present-future on the one hand, and past on the other, which is the only tense-distinction known to Hittite, seems universal in the Indo-European languages, although the contrast of the primary and secondary endings (-mi -si -ti vs. -m -s -t) that is so particularly marked in Sanskrit and Greek may suggest that the primary endings simply consist of the secondary endings plus an added suffix (perhaps originally just a separable adverbial element like the added prefix of Sanskrit and Greek secondary tenses that became the augment).   Certainly at an early period aspect must have been a more important feature of the verb than tense; to a considerable extent this always continued true of the Greek verb except in the indicative.   As for voice, even as early as Hittite we find a separate medio-passive conjugation (marked by an -r- element as are those of Latin, Celtic, and Tocharian); but it has seemed to me that this is just a special kind of conjugation not corresponding to any difference of meaning or use; perhaps the question of deponents enters into the problem.

[14] The Vedas may antedate the Hittite remains in date of composition, but not in time of being committed to writing.

[15] Hittite nomenclature in this respect is lamentably lacking in consistency and uniformity.   The explanation is in the history of the discipline: Hittitologists, especially the great German trio, Sommer, Friedrich, and Götze (of whom our own country is fortunate enough now to be able to claim the last-named), made remarkable discoveries of these piecemeal, and consequently named them piecemeal.

[16] This was an exceedingly widespread and productive formation in Hittite. Greek and Latin have preserved only scanty and sporadic vestiges of it, not always easy to recognize, among which we may mention Greek hêpar and outhar beside Latin iecur and uber; Greek hydôr (beside Umbrian utur and Gothic wato); Latin femur (with variation between the n and the r in feminis femoris) and iter (with blending of the n and the r in itineris).   Probably these seemingly anomalous manifestations of a noun stem varying between two consonants tended to disappear in such neat languages as both Greek and Latin, especially the latter, which repeatedly ironed out variations of the sort through the workings of analogy.   It is the operation of analogy that helps make Latin so seemingly orderly, and the lack of it that helps make Irish so seemingly disorderly.   Professor Sturtevant used to say that the regular working of phonetic

and those in -*atar*. According to Götze, the first set tends to be
associated with the active conjugation and the second set with the
medio-passive conjugation,[17] but this in my opinion does not
justify us in calling the first set active in force and the second set
medio-passive in force; they seem to me absolutely parallel so far
as use goes, just as are e.g. the infinitives of active and deponent
verbs in Greek and Latin. As for Hittite verbal adjectives, the
language possesses only one, a formation in -*nt*-; from the point
of view of form, this has its counterpart in Latin (as well as in
numerous other languages) in the present active participle, but
so far as use goes, it corresponds not only to its cognate but to the
so-called past passive participle as well.[18] The explanation
usually given by Hittitologists for this seeming ambivalence is
that the -*nt*- participle is active when it comes from an intransitive
verb, and passive when it comes from a transitive verb;[19] what

law leads to apparent irregularity, and its irregular working to apparent regularity.

[17] *Madd.* 93–95, cf. *JCS* 2 (1948) 151–55.

[18] In this connection Aalto makes the following comment (166): "Im Hethitischen
hat eine ähnliche Entwicklung [the acquisition by an "active" form of a "passive"
meaning] zu einem überraschenden Resultat geführt: das ursprüngliche ie. Präsens-
partizip des Aktivs auf -*nt* hat das Verbaladjektiv auf -*to* gänzlich verdrängt und die
Funktion desselben als passives Perfektpartizip übernommen." He documents this
statement by a reference to Pedersen 148 and to Sturtevant §§170 and 435, i.e. pp.
157–58 and 267 (this is of course *HG¹*; *HG²* was not yet in existence when Aalto wrote
his monograph). But the two should not be cited in the same breath. Sturtevant
believed that in Indo-Hittite, the parent according to him of both Indo-European and
Hittite, or rather, as he later put it, of both Indo-European and Anatolian, the group
to which Hittite belonged, the -*to*- participle did not exist (he recognized "a few
traces" in Hittite of the -*tos* suffix in *HG¹* 157, none at all in *HG²*). He did in *HG¹*
(158) accept the common view that the -*nt*- participle was active if formed from an
intransitive verb and passive if formed from a transitive verb, but this view under the
force of my arguments he modified in *HG²* (78). Pedersen on the other hand wrote
his book in great part to disprove Sturtevant's "Indo-Hittite hypothesis," as he makes
clear by his very title, *Hittitisch und die ANDEREN* (capitals mine) *indoeuropäischen
Sprachen*, and as he expressly states in his "Einleitung" (12–13); he repeatedly sees
innovations in Hittite where Sturtevant (and I) would see archaisms. Thus the
implications of the -*nt*- participle mean very different things to Pedersen and to
Sturtevant. This error on Aalto's part is the result of a dilemma which (as I know all
too well from personal experience) confronts the student of historical and comparative
grammar who specializes in syntax far more than the one who specializes in phonology
or morphology: it is well-nigh impossible to acquire genuine control of all the different
languages and the problems they involve which he needs to deal with on the basis of
first-hand knowledge. This is not said in denigration of Aalto's monograph, my
opinion of which I have already given in note 10.

[19] A similar explanation is widely offered for the -*to*- participle in other languages,
such as Sanskrit, Old Persian, and Gothic, as well as the Greek verbal in -*to*-. It still
seems true to a considerable extent even in modern English; see my discussion in *TAPA*
74 (1943) 302–6.

I believe to be the true explanation will be given below, under point 4. Perhaps in part under the influence of the finite verb, verbal nouns and adjectives did eventually acquire tense and voice at least to a certain extent. Verbal adjectives in Sanskrit and Greek went the furthest in this direction: in these languages each tense-system of the verb developed an active and a middle participle, with the passive participle sometimes resembling the middle and sometimes acquiring a special form of its own. Latin did not go so far: it developed only one participle for each tense realm,[20] active in the present and the future,[21] normally passive in the past. Concerning the last-mentioned, it should be noted that it retains traces of its original, purely adjectival, not participial, use in its occasional deviation from the norm of passivity; not only do the past participles of deponent verbs go along with the finite forms in conforming to the general "rule" of "passive form, active meaning," but we have sporadic examples from non-deponents that are used in an active sense, notably *cenatus, pransus, potus,* and *iuratus* (two of these, *potus* and *iuratus,* are also used in a passive sense, and quite possibly the other two could be so used likewise).

As for verbal nouns, they in general did not develop either voice or tense. The sole exceptions known to me are the infinitives of Greek and Latin. These like the Greek (and Sanskrit) participles, and to a far greater extent than the Latin participles, acquired forms to correspond to the various tense-realms of the finite verbs: in each case a full set, both active and medio-passive. These were evidently not original possessions of the infinitives, which like other verbal nouns seem to have been at the start simply case-forms of nouns, apparently either datives or locatives; but to a great extent infinitives in both languages lost all case distinctions as they acquired distinctions of voice, the tendency seeming to have been to specialize locatives as actives and datives as passives.[22] Thanks to the increasing development of the

---

[20] I do not think the gerundive, which denotes necessity or possibility rather than futurity, should be classed as a future passive participle any more than the Greek "verbal."

[21] A fundamental difference between participles and finite forms of the verb so far as voice goes is indicated by the fact that these participles are the only active forms of deponent verbs.

[22] This would certainly appear to be true of Latin: the ending *-re* (originally *-se*) was a locative, and the ending *-i*, including *-ri* (originally *-si*), was a dative. The

Greek definite article, the Greek infinitive never lost its ability to function as the case-form of a noun, but the Latin infinitive became restricted to a very great extent to use as a nominative or accusative.[23]

3. Since verbal nouns and adjectives were in origin nouns and adjectives, not verbs, they doubtless could not originally govern objects. They were only just beginning to acquire this ability in Hittite. For this language I cited in *TAPA* 74 (1943) 272 one example of an object with an infinitive (*KBo.* 4.4.2.63–64), one with the genitive of a gerund (*KUB* 2.1.2.26), one with a participle (*Ann.* 3.12); these are the only sure instances that I know. The other ancient languages have acquired this use at their earliest stage known to us: we find accusatives freely used in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin as objects of verbal nouns[24] (Sanskrit and Greek infinitives, and Latin infinitives and gerunds,[25] though with Latin supines direct objects are met only with the form in *-tum*, never with the forms in *-tui* or *-tu*). What seems to me odder is the fact that in all three languages even nouns and adjectives that had not become part of the verb system could take objects. In Sanskrit this construction of participles and infinitives is shared, according to Whitney (90), "by a number of other derivatives, having a more

Greek infinitives are so diverse that, even with the aid of seeming cognates in Sanskrit, it is practically impossible to arrive at certainty concerning them; see Buck, *GL* 304–5.

[23] In other cases the gerund served in its place: this included genitive, dative, accusative with a preposition (occurrences of the infinitive with a preposition are confined to a few very rare ones with *inter* and *praeter*), and ablative. The gerund was not needed as a nominative, or as an accusative not with a preposition; and that is, in my opinion, the explanation for its eventual tendency to disappear in these uses (cf. note 8).

[24] The Greek and Latin infinitives had so fully developed into verbs that they, alone among verbal nouns so far as I know, could even take subjects as well as objects.

[25] The combination of a gerund with an object, which came to be largely supplanted by the gerundive construction (though only in the literary language, according to Aalto 145–46), was certainly not avoided in the early period. Aalto's lists of gerunds with objects from the early period are not very lengthy, but those for the commoner cases are not meant to be exhaustive (what is noteworthy is that he has plenty of examples from later periods). He cites 5 genitives (60), 4 datives (65), and 6 ablatives (68 and 69). Bennett's examples of the gerund in early Latin include 14 genitives with objects "expressed or understood" (448), 3 datives (449), and 11 ablatives (450). In addition Aalto cites for early Latin 3 instances of nominative gerunds with objects (94), and 2 instances of accusatives (one of these mislabeled; see below, note 79) which he deems "unsicher" but "nicht unmöglich" (89). Bennett does not accept the existence of a nominative gerund at all (see below, note 62), and he doubts the existence in early times of an accusative gerund with an object (see below, note 77). On these controversial points, see below, notes 101 and 50 respectively.

or less participial or infinitival character, and even sometimes by nouns and adjectives." The usage seems rare in Greek, but Schwyzer lists a few instances (2.73–74). In Latin, especially early Latin, it is not uncommon with action nouns[26] in -*tio*[27] (Szantyr 34). But in view of the Hittite evidence I doubt that such uses in the later languages represent the original state of affairs.

4. It follows from point 3 that, as an active transitive verb needs an object, the Hittite verbal noun or adjective, since it so rarely takes an object, is not usually employed in an active transitive sense. The action that it denotes must be envisaged as simply taking place; but, since it lacks an object, it seems to us passive rather than active. On the other hand if the verbal noun or adjective is intransitive, it naturally is not passive; and so it seems to us active. An interesting and illuminating example is provided in *Madd.* §24, where we find in rapid succession two parallel statements: 2.31, ZAB.MES-*ya MA-ḪAR* UTU-*SI u-wa-u-an-zi U-UL tar-na-i*, literally "he does not allow the troops for coming before my Majesty," and 2.32, *MA-ḪAR* UTU-*SI ar-ga-mu-us-sa u-tum-ma-an-zi U-UL tar-na-i*, literally "he does not allow the tribute for bringing before my Majesty"; in deference to our English speech-habits, we find it necessary to use an active in the first clause to render the verbal noun and a passive in the second, and say "he does not allow the troops *to come*" and "he does not allow the tribute *to be brought*," but really what the Hittite indicates is simply that the troops are not to be involved in the act of coming and the tribute is not to be involved in the act of bringing.[28]

5. The question now arises as to how, if the subject or object[29] of the verbal noun[30] was ruled out as indicated in point 3, the early language could denote the performer or recipient of the action involved.[31] The answer, I believe, is by the use of

[26] On my use of this term, see above, note 11.

[27] Aalto as usual has a good list (125–26). This construction has an important bearing on the construction with the gerund (see below, note 102).

[28] See for more examples and more details *TAPA* 74 (1943) 272–74.

[29] An object was more likely to be needed than a subject, for generally the clause indicated the doer of the action in some way through some substantive, expressed or at least implied.

[30] The verbal adjective of course was provided, by the substantive with which it agreed, with some indication of the performer or recipient of the action which it denoted.

[31] Not with a genitive certainly. Cf. below, note 44.

(partitive) apposition.[32]   This must have been extremely common in the Ursprache.[33]   When noun *a* denoted part of noun *b*—a literal part (such as a part of the body, or a member of a group), or a figurative part (such as a quality)—it was frequently put into the same case as noun *b*.   Sometimes noun *a* was not so obviously a *part* of noun *b*, but denoted some feature of it such as an action performed or received by it.   There is clear evidence that in such instances too the two nouns were placed in apposition with each other.   For convenience, I term nouns *a* and *b* respectively the part-noun and the whole-noun.   Naturally the whole-noun tends to precede, but, with the freedom of word-order typical of ancient languages, this was not invariable.

Partitive apposition is extremely common in Hittite.   It appears to be rare in Sanskrit, but it occurs to me that many of the Sanskrit compounds, especially the so-called possessive compounds, may have been ultimate developments of it.[34]   There are numerous vestiges of it in Greek; some, but fewer (perhaps because of the relatively greater lateness of our earliest remains), in Latin.[35]   Particularly significant, I think, is Homer's marked tendency to use it when he is describing an action as affecting both a person as a whole and a special part of his body.   He has a number of options here:[36] he can make either the whole-noun or the part-noun the complement of the verb, a dative or an

---

[32] For references and examples, see my article entitled "Partitive Apposition," *Cong.* 784–94.

[33] And it is still fairly common today.   Columbia University in writing the name of its Teachers College without an apostrophe is employing it.   Both German and English use it in forming compounds, only German writes the resultant compound as a single word, and English generally writes it as a hyphenated word or as two separate words.   Even French, though it tends rather to use a noun plus a prepositional phrase, *can* use a compound of the sort, as *garde-malade, crêpes Suzette*.

[34] The question of Sanskrit compounds is much too complicated to be taken up here.   See Whitney's excellent chapter on the subject (480–515).

[35] I have treated these in *TAPA* 85 (1954) 197–239 for Greek (with special reference to Homer), *TAPA* 84 (1953) 92–123 for Latin.   Incidentally, it may be noted that partitive apposition, both in Greek and in Latin, may be even commoner than we realize, since we may not always recognize it: when we have two genitives or two datives, we may take the whole-noun for a genitive of possession or a dative of reference; and when we have two accusatives, we may take the part-noun for an accusative of specification.   This last is of course far likelier to occur in Greek; but there are possible examples in Latin too, e.g. Plautus, *Men.* 858–59, *hunc senem dedolabo viscera*, and two instances in the *Aeneid* (doubtless imitations of Homer), 10.698–99 and 12.270–76.

[36] Cf. above, note 35.

accusative whichever it demands; if the whole-noun is the complement, he can designate the part-noun by either a dative or an accusative of specification, and if the part-noun is the complement, he can designate the whole-noun by a dative of reference.[37] However, his strong tendency is to use *either* two datives[38] *or* two accusatives,[39] according to the demands of the governing verb; and this I think is clear evidence that for Homer partitive apposition is still very much alive.[40]   As for Latin, the commonness of the so-called "double dative" doubtless points to the same origin.[41]

6. However, as primitive parataxis developed into hypotaxis, one of the two nouns in the original appositional construction came to be subordinated to the other.   Usually the whole-noun was put into the genitive.   We see the transitional stage very clearly in Hittite, especially in the Law-Code, which, like legal language in general, tended toward archaism; here frequently the appositional construction and the genitive construction alternate in parallel passages, or even in variants of the same passage.   This shift of the whole-noun to the genitive may be expected when the part-noun designates (1) a part of the body, or a quality, belonging to the whole-noun; or (2) an action[42] (a) performed, or (b) received, by the whole-noun; or (3) a member of the group designated by the whole-noun.[43]   But a noun that has entered the verb system, even though continuing to be more a noun than a verb, none the less evidently partakes too much of the verbal character to be accompanied by a genitive.[44]

[37] Or possibly a genitive of possession, as in English; but Greek and Latin, like French and German, prefer the dative to designate the person possessing the part of the body involved.

[38] As in e.g. *Il.* 1.24 Ἀγαμέμνονι ἥνδανε θυμῷ.

[39] As in e.g. *Il.* 13.506 Οἰνόμαον βάλε γαστέρα.

[40] See *TAPA* 85 (1954) 219, note 67, and the cross-references there given to other portions of the article.

[41] See *TAPA* 84 (1953) 107–11.

[42] That is, an action indicated by an "action noun."

[43] These genitives are classified in different ways: (1) possessive; (2) (a) subjective, (b) objective; (3) partitive.   That there really is some difference among them, at least in Latin, is indicated by the fact that when the noun is replaced by a pronominal word, e.g. of the first person plural, there is a tendency to use different forms: (1) *noster*; (2) (a) *noster*, vs. (b) *nostri*; (3) *nostrum*.

[44] I have already (note 31) commented on the fact that a genitive is not normal as the modifier of a verbal noun.

Before we consider what did happen in the case of such a noun, we must first consider the original state of affairs existing when the verbal noun—call it infinitive, gerund, or supine as one will—still stood in apposition with the whole-noun. Such instances have not been recognized as exemplifying partitive apposition, but I am convinced that they do.[45]   It is not hard to find examples in Hittite; I have collected some with the gerund (genitive), the infinitive (dative), and the supine (accusative, I believe[46]).   I know of no examples with the instrumental or the ablative; indeed, it seems doubtful that the verbal nouns possessed these cases. Sanskrit examples, involving the verbal nouns known as infinitives, are particularly common in the dative, and these are the only examples recognized by Delbrück (4.470–71); but Brugmann gives instances not only of the dative but also of the genitive, ablative, and locative (2.3.918–19).   Scholars in general treat the construction as an anomalous substitute for the "logical" one. Brugmann (917) attributes it to "anticipation," Whitney (352) to "attraction."   Delbrück (470) speaks of the object of the infinitive as shifted into the dative; he does not tell us what happens in the supposed regular passages where, as sometimes occurs, the whole-noun is not in objective but in subjective relation to the infinitive, which, as already here stated, can have an object but cannot have a subject!   Brugmann (919–21) cites as parallels some examples from Greek[47] with the whole-noun in the genitive or the dative (to which can be added some in the accusative) and an accompanying infinitive which he assumes is in the same case; but, as his Greek infinitives all lack the article, he cannot really prove what case they are in.   Both Brugmann (918) and Delbrück (471) compare the Sanskrit construction with the Latin gerundive;[48] but this is certainly an error.   What it really

---

[45] I have discussed them in detail elsewhere.   See *Cong.* 791–94, *Language* 29 (1953) 246–51, *Language* 42 no. 2 (June 1966).

[46] The supine in *-wan* is usually classed as a suffixless dative or locative, but I argue in *Language* 42 no. 2 (1966) in favor of viewing it as an accusative.   This form is used only with an auxiliary, and the accompanying whole-noun is almost certainly the object of the auxiliary, not of the supine; the supine too is doubtless the object of the auxiliary (like the complementary infinitive in Latin); thus the two accusatives may be regarded as appositives.

[47] For illustration, I cite just one of these examples, an instance of the genitive. This is Sophocles, *Ant.* 489–90: κείνην ἐπαιτιῶμαι τοῦδε βουλεῦσαι τάφου.

[48] The comparison was originally made by Benfey (1.432).

resembles is the Latin gerund—which at last brings me to my main subject.

I list here a number of instances of the Latin gerund used in partitive apposition [49] (a state of affairs in general unrecognized in Latin as in Sanskrit). It happens that all these examples involve the genitive,[50] and there have been various attempts to explain this genitive.[51] I classify the examples according to the gender and number of the whole-noun.

Feminine singular. Ennius, *Scen.* 248 (Vahlen), navis inchoandi exordium. Plautus, *Capt.* 1008, lucis tuendi copiam. *Truc.* 370, tui videndi copia (of a woman). Terence, *Hec.* 372, eius videndi cupidus (of a woman).

Feminine plural. Terence, *Haut.* 29, novarum spectandi copiam. Lucretius 5.1225, poenarum solvendi tempus.

Neuter plural. Plautus, *Capt.* 852, nominandi istorum copia. Cicero, *Inv.* 2.2.5, exemplorum eligendi potestas. Perhaps Varro, *LL* 5.7, verborum origines quorum quattuor explanandi gradus (where, however, *explanandi* need not be related to *quorum*, but may refer only to *gradus*).

Now it is my belief that actually examples from early Latin of the gerund in partitive apposition are more numerous than these. For instance, with Plautus, *Capt.* 1008 cf. Accius 275–76 (Ribbeck,

---

[49] I include all the instances from early Latin known to me, plus one apiece from Varro, Lucretius, and Cicero. For a number of other examples from Cicero and from later writers, see Aalto 156–57.

[50] There are also some possible examples with the accusative, but these involve a special problem and will be taken up below (see note 76 and the portion of the text to which it refers).

[51] There have been various attempts to explain the construction. Some (e.g. Gildersleeve-Lodge 280 and Hale 332) think one of the two genitives (the whole-noun) depends on the other; thus in Cicero, *Inv.* 2.2.5, Hale takes *exemplorum eligendi potestas* as equivalent to *exemplorum electionis potestas*, comparing *electio verborum* in *Or.* 20.68. But an objective genitive with an action noun (for what I mean by this, see note 11) is perfectly natural in Latin, whereas an objective genitive with a gerund is not (cf. note 31); and furthermore none of the upholders of this view explains why a genitive of this sort appears *only* with a gerund that is also in the genitive (cf. Homer's tendency to pair two datives or two accusatives, with the reference given above, note 40). Others (e.g. Lane 405, Ernout-Thomas 226) think the genitives are used independently of each other, both depending on the main word. A variation of this which appears in Hofmann 597 and Szantyr 374 (cf. their comment on the dative referred to below, note 57) comes the closest to my view, for they actually speak of the two genitives as in apposition with each other.

Trag.), luminis conspiciendi insolentia;[52] and with Terence, *Hec.*
372 cf. Plautus, *Capt.* 748, eius conveniundi copiam (of a man).
Why should we treat *luminis conspiciendi* in Accius differently from
its synonym *lucis tuendi* in Plautus just because *luminis* is neuter and
lucis is feminine? Why should we treat *eius* in *Capt.* 748 differ-
ently from *eius* in *Hec.* 372 just because the former is masculine
and the latter is feminine? We may well be guilty of misinter-
pretation—just such misinterpretation as I believe led to the
development of the gerundive construction. It is my belief that
because in *Capt.* 748 *conveniundi* looked as if it agreed with *eius*,
and because in Accius 275–76 *conspiciendi* looked as if it agreed
with *luminis*, such agreement actually came into effect, and because
in short whenever a masculine or neuter singular whole-noun in
the genitive was combined with a genitive gerund the gerund
looked as if it agreed with the whole-noun, such agreement actu-
ally came into effect—and the gerundive was created.[53] It is
also my belief that the same thing happened in the other cases.
The literal meaning of *Capt.* 748, for instance, must have been
originally "the opportunity of him, of meeting (him)," with
"him" in objective relation with the gerund "meeting," and so
the gerund seems active; and after the verbal noun was developed
into an adjective, the relation of "him" to this adjective was still
objective, and so the adjective seems passive;[54] but it was the

[52] The whole passage runs as follows: ita et fletu et tenebris obstinatus speciem
amisi luminis conspiciendi insolentia. Warmington shows by his translation (2.415),
"I lost the light of eyesight through disuse of vision," that he combines *luminis* with
speciem, but it seems to me more effective to combine it (as does Bennett 443) with
conspiciendi, which may also be slightly favored by the word order. I think if *luminis*
belongs with *speciem* the meaning of the phrase must be literally "sight of the eye," with
luminis practically otiose just as *eye* is in the English *eyesight* (*speciem* alone can mean
"sight," as in Lucretius 4.236 and 242, 5.707 and 724); but if *luminis* belongs with
insolentia it reinforces the previous *tenebris obstinatus* by repeating the same idea from
the opposite pole—"constrained by darkness," "unaccustomedness of the light."

[53] This is the general line of reasoning that I presented in the course of my article
in *TAPA* 74 (1943); see especially 280–84. I am glad to note that Aalto accepts and
adopts it—duly citing my article (32), which, however, he groups with Kirk's, from
which it differs to a considerable extent (see below, note 61).

[54] The most amazing assumption in this respect is that of Hale, who (329, note 3)
calls the gerundive active in *spes Carthaginis delendae* and passive in *Carthago delenda est*,
obviously because in translating these phrases into English he uses an active form for
the first ("the hope of destroying Carthage") and a passive form for the second
("Carthage must be destroyed")! The gerundives both refer to the noun "Carthage,"
and Carthage is the *recipient* of the destruction in both cases no matter what we do with
it in our English rendering. Such reasoning seems to me incomprehensible and
indefensible.

fundamental voicelessness of both the verbal noun and the verbal adjective that facilitated the shift.[55]

Precisely the same reasoning applies to masculine and neuter singulars in the other oblique cases, as e.g.: dative, Plautus, *As.* 250, argento comparando fingere fallaciam; accusative, *Bacch.* 338, diviti homini id aurum servandum dedit;[56] *Trin.* 646, ad quaerundum honorem; ablative, Terence, *Haut.* 142–43, opere faciundo sumptum exsercirent; Plautus, *As.* 873, opere faciendo lassus; Terence, *Haut.* 73, in opere faciundo. *As.* 250 must have corresponded originally to English "to devise a trick for money, for obtaining (it),"[57] and only later came to correspond to pseudo-English "to devise a trick for money to be obtained" (i.e. idiomatically, "to devise a trick for obtaining money"); and the others can be dealt with in the same way. At precisely what point of time this shift took place, and just how far the speakers of Latin were aware that it was taking place or that it had taken place, must remain open questions. That is what I have in mind[58] when I say unblushingly[59] that I cannot always "distinguish clearly" between the gerund and the gerundive.

[55] I am not denying that this very circumstance to which I have just referred— namely, that when a verbal noun accompanies a noun which is in objective relation to it the verbal noun has an active connotation, and when a verbal adjective is in agreement with a noun which is in objective relation to it the verbal adjective appears passive—led to the ultimate development of active force on the part of the gerund and passive force on the part of the gerundive. But in maintaining that they *always* exhibited such force, I think Professor Whatmough ignored certain evidence. Surely while both are fundamentally voiceless, at least to a speaker of English the gerund *seems* passive in Lucretius 1.312, anulus tenuatur habendo, and in Vergil, *Ecl.* 8.71, cantando rumpitur anguis, and *Georg.* 3.215–16, urit videndo femina; and, still more clearly, the gerundive *seems* active in Plautus, *Ep.* 74, puppis pereunda est, and *Trin.* 1159, si illa tibi placet placenda dos quoque est, and in Varro, *LL* 6.11, longissimum spatium senescendorum hominum; precisely as the noun *amor* in *amor matris seems* active when the implication is *mater amat* and passive when it is *mater amatur*, and the adjective *caecus seems* active when the implication is *non videt* and passive when it is *non videtur*. Really all that is indicated is that the emotion of love is present, or that the sense of sight is absent. It is dangerous to assume because our own language makes certain distinctions formally that a language which does not do so also possesses them.

[56] I see no reason for treating the accusative without a preposition differently from the accusative with a preposition. As has already been said (note 23), the accusative gerund *tended* to disappear except with a preposition because the infinitive took over its function, but that is not a reason for assuming that it never existed.

[57] Cf. Hofmann 597 (cited by me in *TAPA* 74.281, note 61), subsequently followed by Szantyr 374.

[58] I have some other points in mind too. To these I shall come later.

[59] In the second paragraph of this paper.

Bennett in regard to the question, which he calls "still un-settled," whether the gerund or the gerundive is the earlier, says (442): "In Early Latin the gerund is more frequent than the gerundive, though that circumstance is, of course, not decisive."[60] Kirk in *TAPA* 73 (1942),[61] although he himself believes that the gerund preceded the gerundive, none the less points out with justice that Bennett's argument needs modification, for his state-ment is true only "if gerunds of intransitives and of transitives without object are included" (297), and of course statistically these should not be counted if we are investigating the relative frequency of gerunds and gerundives. However, I would propose a further modification which would result in once more giving the numerical preponderance to gerunds. I believe ambiguous forms like those which I have just cited should not be counted, because they cannot be classed definitively as either gerunds (type *lucis tuendi*) or gerundives (type *lucis tuendae*). If this is done, we must exclude more than a third of his examples, and the final total is as follows.[62]

	Ambiguous	Surely Gerundive	Total
Genitive	17	12	29
Dative	9	17	26
Accusative	20	36[63]	56
Acc. with Prep.	4[64]	18[65]	22
Ablative	14[66]	17	31
Abl. with Prep.	6[67]	21	27
Total	70	121	191

[60] This statement is based on his list of gerunds (446–52) and of gerundives (442–46).

[61] His article (293–307) is an original and stimulating one which indeed suggested some of my views to me (cf. above, note 10); but I am by no means in complete agreement with it (see e.g. *TAPA* 74 [1943] 281).

[62] This tally does not include nominatives, as Bennett does not list these. Since he believes there is no nominative gerund (as he makes clear in his *Lat. Gram.* 220–21), he must take e.g. *agendum* in *Poen.* 1243 or *Rud.* 719 as a gerundive, and I cannot understand his failure to catalog such examples among his gerundives.

[63] In this category and the following one I am excluding from Bennett's lists of accusative gerundives (pp. 444 and 445 respectively) Plautus, *Cist.* 648 and (with a preposition) *Poen.* 599, in both of which he questions the reading with a gerund because of the uncertainty of the text (450). On both of these see below, note 77.

* Notes 64–67 are on the following page.

7*

Inasmuch as the ambiguous forms (masculine and neuter singular as opposed to feminine singular and all the plurals) might be expected to total a third of the entire number, it might be thought they constitute more than their proportionate share, especially since, if we decide that they should really count as gerunds, we would have to add them to all Bennett's indubitable examples of gerunds with objects.[64]   However, I agree with Bennett that statistics of this sort may not have any significance.

Thus I believe that the appositional construction *lucis tuendi*, by way of the ambiguous construction *luminis conspiciendi*, generated the gerundive construction *lucis tuendae*.   Such creations of new constructions because of the misinterpretation of an ambiguous locution are by no means unlikely.   I have argued in favor of the widely held but also widely rejected view that the *accusativus graecus* stemmed from a misunderstood accusative in partitive apposition,[69] and I have suggested that the infinitive in indirect discourse stemmed from a misunderstood past passive participle used predicatively.[70]   It is of particular interest to note that in Hittite the gerund[71] developed a gerundive in just the same way: a genitive neuter substantive in *-as* modifying a noun was misinterpreted as a masculine nominative adjective agreeing with the noun,[72] the development being in my opinion facilitated by the complete voicelessness of the Hittite verbal nouns and adjectives.

[64] I am excluding from Bennett's list (p. 445) one, Pacuvius 51, which if accepted as a gerundive would have to be classed as of the ambiguous type, but which I think may rather exemplify a gerund.   Again see note 77.

[65] I am excluding *Poen.* 599.   See note 63.

[66] Two of these, *Tab. Tri.* 1.9 and Cato, *Frag.* 43.7, as well as two of the following category, *CIL* 1.198.19 and Cato, *Frag.* 78.7 (pp. 445 and 446 respectively), include also indubitable examples of gerundives, and so perhaps the ambiguous examples should be classed as gerundives too.   However, there is no need of strict uniformity: even the authors of the classical period combine the different types with complete freedom.   I shall return to this later, in the concluding paragraph of the paper.

[67] See note 66.   [68] See above, note 25.

[69] *TAPA* 85 (1954) 239–89.

[70] *TAPA* 81 (1950) 117–29.   I was much gratified by the concurrence with this suggestion expressed by A. C. Moorhouse, *AJP* 76 (1955) 176–83, and by James W. Poultney, *AJP* 86 (1965) 214.

[71] This is an *-r/n-* stem (nominative in *-war*, genitive in *-was*), which has been variously referred to as a gerund, an infinitive, or simply a verbal substantive (cf. note 15 above).   I personally prefer the name gerund for both it and the *-r/n-* form in *-atar -annas*, which is used in precisely parallel ways, and which, incidentally, Sturtevant in *Language* 20 (1944) 206–11, following up a suggestion of Goetze's, with great plausibility equated etymologically with the Latin gerund.

[72] This was Götze's brilliant discovery, *Hatt.* 140.

But now what of the gerund construction *lucem tuendi*, which I have not so far discussed? Scholars argue as to whether *lucis tuendae* produced *lucem tuendi*, or *lucem tuendi* produced *lucis tuendae*. My answer is emphatically that neither happened, that *lucis tuendi* produced them both, operating initially in the genesis of the gerund with object construction through the variety *lucem tuendum*.

If I am right in my contention that verbal nouns were originally in partitive apposition with whole-nouns, we may expect to find accusative verbal nouns mainly, and doubtless at first (if we could get back that far) only, in combination with accusative whole-nouns. It is surely significant that the only Hittite verbal noun which appears frequently in combination with an accusative whole-noun is the supine in *-wan*.[73] The same thing is true so far as the Latin supine goes of the accusative supine in *-tum*. But in the other ancient languages the verbal nouns had gone further than the Hittite ones in acquiring the characteristics of verbs. The accusative whole-noun in combination with its appositive verbal noun must have looked like the direct object of a finite verb, and therefore it must have come to be interpreted as the direct object of the accusative verbal noun, and from this accusative verbal noun it must have spread to verbal nouns in other cases. Thus at the earliest stage that we can reach, we find accusative objects with infinitives of all cases in Sanskrit, and with gerunds[74] (though not supines) of all cases in Latin.[75]

I may be laying myself open to criticism for an explanation that, except for Hittite, is purely speculative. But I can contribute a little possible evidence so far as the Latin gerund goes.

When I listed the indubitable genitive examples of the *lucis tuendi* type, I promised to present later some possible accusative examples of the same type.[76] Here they are, for what they may be worth. Unfortunately the three early ones are not certain.[77]

[73] I have already (note 46) indicated my belief that the Hittite supine in *-wan* was an accusative.

[74] On the gerund with a direct object in early Latin, see above, note 25.

[75] As well as of course with infinitives in both Greek and Latin, which have ceased to show inflections for case (cf. note 23).

[76] Above, note 50.

[77] Bennett says definitely (450): "It is doubtful whether Early Latin shows any instance of the accusative of the gerund with a direct object." He classes all three of my possible examples as gerundives; see above, notes 63, 64, and 65.

Plautus, *Cist.* 647–48, hanc certum est non amittere; nam ad me adglutinandum totam decretum est dare.[78]

Plautus, *Poen.* 599, ad hanc rem agundum Philippum est.

Pacuvius 51 (Ribbeck, *Trag.*), ad stirpem exquirendum.

Varro, *RR* 1.23.6, alia ad serendum.

Varro, *RR* 2.11.2, ad perpurgandum ea.   (The reading here is not certain.)

Varro, *LL* 9.42, ad discernendum figuras.

In the two examples from Plautus, the editors regularly emend to *adglutinandam* and *agundam*.   The reading is certainly not so sure as in the examples with genitives; a scribe might easily change a single letter and write a *u* for an *a*, especially if his eye was caught by the preceding *me* (in *Cist.*)[79] or the following *Philippum* (in *Poen.*).   But none the less there is always the principle of the *lectio difficilior* to militate against emendation—especially as the *lectio facilior* apparently does not exist in any of the original versions.   The Pacuvius passage would be a sure instance were it not for the fact that Nonius tells us (226.29, 32) that *stirps* was once masculine.   He bases this statement on this particular passage from Pacuvius, which he may well be misinterpreting, but also on a passage from Ennius, *Ann.* 178 (Vahlen), a stirpe supremo, which seems certain.   Still, Pacuvius may not have agreed with Ennius.   Examples from Plancus (apud Cicero, *Fam.* 10.23.3) and Sallust (*Jug.* 5.3) are too late to be valuable as evidence for syntactic origins, and those from Varro would be were it not for his fondness for archaisms.   To be sure, he is said (e.g. by Szantyr 373) to be the first to furnish evidence for the construction; but this by no means proves that it did not exist earlier.

Now, these passages, so far as they are accepted as exemplifying gerunds at all (as those from Varro at least must be), are all supposed to exemplify the gerund with an object, and so they may; but on the other hand they seem to point back to an earlier partitive apposition, exactly like what we see in *lucis tuendi*; and I believe that just as we must (in my opinion) explain the ambiguous *luminis conspiciendi* as, at least in origin, an example of partitive apposition rather than as a gerundive construction, so we can

---

[78] On this special type see above, note 56, and below, note 111.

[79] As indeed seems to have happened even to the careful Aalto, who lists this passage as an example of the accusative gerund with a preposition (89).   See above, note 25.

class e.g. the ambiguous *ad stirpem exquirendum*[80] as, at least in origin, an example of partitive apposition rather than as the gerund with an object.

It is a relief to me to have succeeded, at least to my own satisfaction, in tracing both *lucis tuendae* and *lucem tuendi* to *lucis tuendi*, since this obviates the necessity of tracing either *lucis tuendae* to *lucem tuendi*, or *lucem tuendi* to *lucis tuendae*, either of which processes would seem to me extremely difficult, particularly the latter. Those who support this second view say that the neuter singular of the gerundive has become a substantive. I cannot cite an example from early Latin of the neuter singular of the gerundive used substantively, but if it was so used, surely it must have had a concrete meaning, and not that of a verbal noun. Bennett (442) cites two examples from early Latin of a gerundive used as a substantive, a fragment from Ennius, 256 (Ribbeck, *Trag.*), non cupienda cupiens cupienter cupit, and one from Cato, 42.8 (Jordan), neque fanda neque legenda audivimus. The meaning of these two gerundives is "things that should be desired" and "things that should be neither said nor read," and in the singular they would mean "a thing that should be desired, said, read," not "the act of desiring, saying, reading." Aalto accepts neither of these examples; he prefers a different reading for the first (104, note 2),[81] and he does not mention the second at all.[82] Among the examples that he does quote (104-5) are such well-known ones as Vergil, *Aen.* 3.170, haud dubitanda refer, and Horace, *Serm.* 1.2.75-76, non fugienda petendis immiscere. The construction, he declares (104), does not appear before Catullus, is always very rare, and is restricted to the neuter plural. How could it have produced the early and common gerund?

As a rule the only reason given for the assumption that the gerundive preceded the gerund is the occurrence in Oscan and Umbrian of gerundives but not of gerunds.[83] Practically all the

[80] If we assign to *stirpem* its possible masculine gender.

[81] This is Vahlen's *Scen.* 298, cupida ⟨mente⟩, instead of Ribbeck's, *Trag.* 256, ⟨non⟩ cupienda.

[82] If I understand the passage aright, which I am not sure I do (Jordan indicates that there is something wrong with the text), *fanda* and *legenda* are used adjectivally, not substantively. But Aalto does not list the passage with examples of adjectivally used gerundives either (to be sure, his very extensive research, while it covered Cato's *Agr.* exhaustively, quite justifiably did not similarly embrace the fragments; see 175).

[83] I see no reason whatsoever for Aalto's suggestion (118) that these languages may have borrowed their gerundives from Latin.

authorities refer to this circumstance. However, they usually add in the same breath that the lack of gerunds in these languages is not really an argument, and it certainly is not, in view of the scantiness of Oscan and Umbrian remains. For instance, Oscan and Umbrian verbs in their conjugations behave much as Latin verbs do. First person singular forms of the present indicative are cited for Umbrian regular verbs, but none for Oscan. Are we to conclude from this that the present indicative of Oscan regular verbs lacked a first person singular?

However, I am now going to venture a rather daring observation. I am not sure that the evidence is completely and conclusively against the existence of gerunds in Oscan and Umbrian. Let us list all the supposed gerundives cited for these languages, accompanying them with translations into Latin.[84]

The regularly-used Oscan gerundives are *upsann-* (seen in 4, 6, 7, 48, 49), verb *upsed* "fecit"; and *sakrann-* (29, 30), verb *sakarater* "sacratur." More difficult is *eehiian-* (31a) with its variant *vehiian-* (31b); there is no feminine genitive plural noun in these inscriptions for the gerundive to agree with,[85] and none seems to be lost, and there is no recorded verb for it to be derived from, so I think it must be a gerundive—if it *is* a gerundive and not just a noun that happens to look like a gerundive—that has become a feminine noun (like Latin *praedenda* or *Kalendae*), probably through original association with some feminine noun having most likely the sense of "victim." The passages containing the gerundives follow.

Accusative singular. *Masculine or neuter:* 6, [ups]annu aamanaffed "faciendum locavit" (object lost). *Feminine:* 4, triibum ekak upsannam deded "domum hanc faciendam dedit"; 7, passtata ekak upsan. deded "porticum hanc faciendam dedit"; 48, upsannam deded "faciendam dedit" (object lost). *Neuter:* 49, pestlum upsann[um] "templum faciendum."

Nominative plural. *Feminine:* 29, iuvilas sakrannas "iovilae[86] sacrandae"; 30, iuvil. sakrann. "iovilae sacrandae."

Genitive plural. *Feminine:* 31a, pustrei iuklei eehiianasum "in

---

[84] These are mainly taken from Buck, *OU.* Where I depart from his translation, I so indicate; see notes 88, 90, 92, 93.

[85] Cf. note 97 below.

[86] *Iovila* is a made-up Latin word to translate *iuvila*, designating some sort of sacred object dedicated to Jupiter (Buck, *OU* 247).

postera consecratione emittendarum"; 31b, pustr. iuklei vehiian. "in postera consecratione emittendarum."

The Umbrian gerundives are *anferen-* (6a.19), verb *aferum* "circumferre, lustrare"; *pelsan-* (1a.26, 2a.6, 2a.43, 3.32, 6b.22), verb *pelsatu* "sepelito";[87] *pihan-* (6a.8, 6a.19, 6a.20, 6b.48), verb *pihatu* "piato." The passages containing the gerundives follow.

Nominative singular. Masculine: 2a.43, katel asaku pelsans futu "catulus ad[88] aram sepeliendus esto."

Genitive singular. Masculine: 6a.18–19, esisco esoneir seueir popler anferener "his[89] sacris omnibus[90] populi lustrandi"; 6a.8, ocrer peihaner[91] "montis piandi";[92] 6a.18–19, esisco esoneir seueir . . . ocrer pihaner "his sacris omnibus[93] montis piandi"; 6a.19–20, ocrer pehaner paca "montis piandi causa"; 6b.48, pusi ocrer pihaner "ut montis piandi."[94]

Accusative singular. Masculine: 2a.6, Iuvie unu erietu sakre pelsanu fetu "Iovio unum arietem sacrificum sepeliendum facito";[95] 3.31–32, uvem pelsanu feitu "ovem sepeliendum[96] facito."

Accusative plural. Feminine: 1a.26 and 6b.22, pelsana[97] fetu "sepeliendas facito."

All the recorded examples of supposed gerundives in Oscan and Umbrian have now been examined. Two of the nine Oscan examples, and seven of the ten Umbrian ones, have proved to be of

[87] The meaning "bury" is not certain, but Poultney argues very convincingly for it in his note on 6b.22 (p. 261).

[88] This seems to me more natural than Buck's "apud."

[89] The postposition *-co* corresponds etymologically to the Latin preposition *cum*, but the latter is not possible in the translation.

[90] I adopt this as closer to the Umbrian than Buck's "ad haec sacra omnia."

[91] This is a free use of the genitive which lacks a precise counterpart in common use in Latin. Possible parallels are the genitive of the gerund in Terence, *Ad.* 270, ne id adsentandi mage quam quo habeam gratum facere existumes, and of the gerundive in Sallust, *Fr. Phil.* 10, quae ille cepit legum ac libertatis subvortundae.

[92] Here and in the three following examples, I substitute "montis piandi" for Buck's "arcis piandae" in order to preserve the masculine gender of *ocrer* in the translation.

[93] See notes 89 and 90.

[94] See note 91.

[95] I think the verb has the same sense here and in the three following examples as its cognate *facio* has in Vergil, *Ecl.* 3.77, cum faciam vitula pro frugibus.

[96] I am following Buck in giving Latin *ovis* its very rare masculine gender, in order to preserve the gender of Umbrian *uve*.

[97] Here the use of the feminine plural gerundive with no noun for it to agree with reminds me of the Oscan *eehiianasum* (noted above). Poultney (160 and 260) translates "sacrifice (the victims) for burial."

the ambiguous type—a total of 9 out of 19, or once more, as in Latin, more than a proportionate share of the whole sum. Oscan: accusative singular, masculine or neuter, (*ups*)*annu* (6); neuter, *pestlum upsann*(*um*) (49). Umbrian: genitive singular, masculine, *popler anferener* (6a.19), *ocrer pihaner* (variously spelled), four times (6a.8, 19, 19–20, 6b.48); accusative singular, masculine, *erietu pelsanu* (2a.6), *uvem pelsanu* (3.31–32). If I am right in my belief that ambiguous forms of the sort in Latin may point to the original use of the gerund in partitive apposition with a whole-noun, and to its eventual development into a gerundive, then the same thing must be true of Oscan and Umbrian. Therefore, quite apart from the fact that unpreserved or undiscovered documents giving pertinent information may well have existed once upon a time, I maintain concerning those Oscan and Umbrian remains which we actually have, considered purely as independent entities, not that they absolutely prove the priority of the gerund, but that they certainly do not prove, or even suggest, the priority of the gerundive.

I trust then that I have amply demonstrated the truth of my thesis: (1) that the gerund almost certainly generated the gerun-dive; (2) that both were originally voiceless, although undoubtedly in Latin the gerund always tended to be used in an active sense and the gerundive in a passive sense. And on the basis of this demonstration, we are ready at last for the nominative gerund!

Certainly it makes sense to assume that as a well-developed verbal noun the gerund, while confined to the singular number, had all the cases (except, of course, the vocative). But it is dangerous to posit the truth of a state of affairs simply because it makes sense; language as the (unconscious) product of human beings can be erratic. However, I think there is good reason to believe that there *was* a nominative gerund, and, incidentally, that this played a large part in generating a nominative neuter gerundive.

As was pointed out long ago by Roby (lxxi), the use of the gerund as subject of the verb "be" with or without a dative as he calls it "to express the agent" (I would rather call it a dative of reference,[98] but the point is not important), may be compared

---

[98] Actually, as Roby himself realizes, it comes very close to a dative of possession, since *mihi est* with the nominative gerund is used much as is *habeo* with the accusative gerund. Cf. below, note 110.

with that of other verbal nouns (i.e. what I call action nouns) to
indicate that which is needful.[99]   We may note with Roby (lxxi)
and Aalto (124–25) *cautio est* as a parallel for *cavendum est* "there is
need for caution," and *curatio est* as a parallel for *curandum est*
"there is need for care."[100]   As examples, all in Plautus, I
would cite for the first pair *Bacch.* 597–98, mihi cautiost ne etc.,
and *Pseud.* 474, cavendumst mihi aps te, and for the second pair
Amph. 519, tibi hanc curatio est rem, and *Bacch.* 691, hoc tibi
curandumst.   It should be noted that *curandumst* has a direct
object,[101] precisely as has the action noun *curatio*.[102]   Thus in
these particular examples *cavendum est* is voiceless and *curandum est*
is active.   But once they were duly established, they must have
suggested the passive participle in such familiar forms as *cautum
est* and *curatum est*, and perhaps this helped to bring about the shift
from the voiceless or active substantive, the gerund, to the passive
adjective, the gerundive.   And when this in its turn was in
process of being established, simultaneously the object of the
gerund when it had one must have shifted to the subject of
the periphrastic predicate consisting of the verb "be" with the
gerundive as predicate adjective.   This of course would happen
whether the original object was a pronoun, as in *Amph.* 891,
faciundum est mi illud, or a noun, as in *Cist.* 657, faciundum est
puerile officium.[103]

   [99] I would suggest as a parallel the use of the infinitive in commands and pro-
hibitions in both Greek and Latin, the latter, according to Szantyr 366, a feature of
popular speech.   We meet similar uses of verbal nouns today, as the infinitive in
German (*nicht hinauslehnen!*) and the gerund in English (*no smoking*).   Cf. too the
similar use of action nouns in German (*Achtung!*) and English (*caution*).
   [100] Action nouns in -*tio* are used as a parallel for the gerund in the accusative as
well.   See below, note 110.
   [101] There is no reason why the nominative gerund should not have an object just
like gerunds in other cases.   Cf. above, note 25.
   [102] The use of an accusative with an action noun in -*tio*, whose bearing on the
syntax of the gerund is now manifest, was remarked on above in note 27.
   [103] Once the original neuter object *hoc* or *illud* or *officium* was established as the
subject, it could easily give rise to a subject in a different number and/or gender.
Perhaps the first step in this development might have been to a neuter plural subject—
type *haec tibi curanda sunt, faciunda sunt mi illa, faciunda sunt puerilia officia.*   But of course
any gender and/or number was now possible: I cite for the feminine gender a singular,
Terence, *Ad.* 207, accipiunda et mussitanda iniuria adulescentiumst; and two plurals,
one with a pronoun subject, Plautus, *Truc.* 895, adeundae haec mihi, and one with a
noun subject, Ennius, *Ann.* 45–46 (Vahlen), tibi sunt ferendae aerumnae.   The
person of the verb might also shift, of course; thus we have Plautus, *Bacch.* 73, mala-
cissandus es.   This development from the nominative of the gerund, which, as we
have seen (note 99), shares with other verbal or action nouns used as subjects the idea

Where the noun or pronoun in question is a neuter singular as in the examples just given, and hence may be either nominative or accusative, once more we have an ambiguous type, and once more I must confess to an inability to distinguish between a transitive gerund (with a neuter object) and a passive gerundive (with a neuter subject).[104]   But where we find in combination with the -ndum form a noun or pronoun which is indubitably in the accusative, being of a gender or number other than neuter singular, then there is no longer ambiguity, and I pronounce unhesitatingly in favor of the gerund,[105] for a nominative gerund seems to me much easier to accept than a transitive gerundive.[106]

This combination of a nominative gerund with an accusative is met at all periods.   The best lists known to me are those given by Roby (lxxii–iii) and by Aalto (94–97); the latter has a number of examples, especially from late Latin, not included by Roby. I give here a complete list of instances from early Latin, and, except that I include only one example apiece from Varro and Lucretius, both of whom use the construction very frequently, a complete list for the golden age.   They follow.

Plautus, *Trin.* 869, agitandumst vigilias.

Afranius 99 (Ribbeck, *Com.*), optandum uxorem.

Perhaps Accius 174 (Ribbeck, *Trag.*), ferum feroci contundendum imperiost.[107]

of obligation, would also account for the same notion in the gerundive when it is used predicatively, but not elsewhere.   This notion of obligation might have led to the notion of possibility present in some (mainly negative) attributively used gerundives; cf. the double use of adjectival *to be done* in English.

[104] What I am sure that we have not is an *active* gerundive with an object (cf. note 105).   Some compare the construction with the Greek "verbal," as in Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.7.2, τί ἂν αὐτῷ ποιητέον εἴη; There is no doubt that this verbal does take an object (as in Euripides, *Or.* 769, οἰστέον τάδε); but I think it is very different from the Latin gerundive.   It alternates with complete freedom between active and passive implications (like the Hittite participle), and it has no history of connection with any verbal noun.

[105] Whatmough is sure that in such instances the verbal form governing the accusative is a gerundive and not a gerund; this is rather surprising in view of his categorical statement that the gerundive is always passive (cf. note 106).

[106] The extremely rare occurrences of the attributive gerundive in a seemingly active (really voiceless) sense noted above (in note 55) would not justify the assignment of active *transitive* force to the predicative gerundive.

[107] Aalto in including this passage (94) evidently interprets *ferum* as a masculine substantive, or as the modifier of a masculine substantive.   But if it is neuter, the passage should not be included, being of the ambiguous type.   Note that Ribbeck, *Trag.* 183, suggests that *genus* is to be supplied, and Warmington evidently agrees, to judge by his translation (2.373) "a brutish breed."

Catullus 39.9, monendum test mihi.

Lucretius 2.1129, manus dandum est.

Varro, *RR* 1.13.1, vasa vinaria et olearia faciendum.

Cicero, *Sen.* 2.6, viam quam nobis ingrediundum sit.

Once we have established, as I think we have, the existence of a nominative gerund, this presupposes the existence of an accusative gerund without a preposition, since any of the foregoing passages can be recast as a main statement in indirect discourse. Indeed, we have an example of this in Vergil, *Aen.* 11.230, pacem petendum [108] (which depends on *legati responsa ferunt* in 227). I believe that with this may be classed the group of fourteen early and Ciceronian examples depending on *censeo* cited by Aalto (82–83), I think rightly, as instances of the accusative gerund without a preposition, [109] of which I quote just one as typical of all, Plautus, *Rud.* 182, illis curandum censeo. Of a different sort are the accusatives, again without a preposition, used predicatively with a small group of verbs, mainly *habeo*, [110] *curo, loco, do, peto,* and *rogo*. [111]

I have already explained the relative rarity of the nominative gerund and of the accusative gerund without a preposition as the result of their replacement by the infinitive, [112] which always "competed" with the gerund so far as its inferior flexibility permitted. [113] As for the diminution in use of both types of gerund construction, *lucis tuendi* and *lucem tuendi*, this was due to the encroachment of the gerundive construction *lucis tuendae*, the more concrete type of expression which the Romans obviously

---

[108] This reading has the support of Servius, though, not surprisingly, some manuscripts have the easier *petendam*, a lection which was perhaps induced not only by the far greater commonness of the gerundive construction but also by the parallel employment (229–30) of the gerundive phrase *arma quaerenda*. On the occasional use as parallels of a gerund phrase and a gerundive phrase, cf. notes 66 and 115.

[109] He makes the interesting suggestion (82) that this usage belongs to the archaic or archaizing official language ("Amtsprache").

[110] Since *habeo* is used as a parallel for *mihi est* (cf. note 98), it is not surprising to find it accompanied by the accusative of both the gerund and nouns in *-tio* (on these see Aalto 126) just as *mihi est* is accompanied by the nominative of both the gerund and nouns in *-tio* (cf. note 100).

[111] Bennett (443–44) calls all these instances gerundives, but I am quite ready to regard the ambiguous ones as gerunds; cf. notes 56 (on *Bacch.* 338) and 78 (on the type in general).

[112] See once more note 23.

[113] I discussed the use of the infinitive and case-forms of the gerund as parallels or equivalents in *TAPA* 74.287, note 89. See also Szantyr 348 and 378.

preferred, probably for the same reason as they preferred the comparable "ab urbe condita" construction with the passive participle,[114] e.g. Caesar, *Bel. Gal.* 3.10.2, iniuriae retentorum equitum Romanorum, rather than *retentionis equitum* (as in Cicero, *Att.* 13.21.3, retentionem aurigae). But both the gerund constructions could always be used, especially when there was a particular reason for their employment, such as the avoidance of cacophony (two successive genitives in *-orum* or *-arum*), and we often find one or the other of these two constructions made parallel with the gerundive construction.[115] In one particularly interesting passage all three types stand side-by-side and absolutely parallel; this is Cicero, *Phil.* 5.3.6, agitur utrum M. Antonio facultas detur opprimendae rei publicae, caedis faciendae bonorum, urbis, agrorum suis latronibus condonandi, populum Romanum servitute opprimendi, an horum ei facere nihil liceat.[116] And

---

[114] Cf. the absolutely parallel uses of the passive participle and the gerundive in Livy, *Praefatio* 6, ante conditam condendamve urbem. In this passage, if it were possible, which I am sure it is not, to use the (post-classical) fourth declension noun *conditus* in place of the participle, and the (here wholly unlikely) gerund *condendum* in place of the gerundive, and say *ante conditum urbis vel ante condendum urbem*, the substitute phrases would lack the merit which Livy's construction possesses not only because of its neat balance but also even more because of its indication of temporal distinction, the meaning being "before the city had been founded or was in process of being founded."

[115] Cf. above, note 66, and, on the Vergil passage (*Aen.* 11.229-30) cited as an example of the accusative gerund with an object, note 108.

[116] To be sure, the gerund construction *populum Romanum opprimendi* here has been questioned. Manutius shifted to the gerundive construction, changing *populum Romanum* to *populi Romani*, and a number of modern editors, though by no means all of them, have accepted the emendation; for instance, C. F. W. Mueller, editor of the Teubner text, pronounces the conjecture "certissima," whereas Albertus Curtis Clark, editor of the Oxford text, preserves the reading of the MSS. It is true that no other example of the accusative gerund with a direct object is citable from Cicero, but direct objects with other cases of the gerund do occur in his works: e.g. with the ablative in *Caec. Div.* 18.60, eas ferendo; *Verr.* 2.5.43.113, testis interficiendo; and *Phil.* 2.43.110, addendo diem. There may be a special reason for at least two of these accusatives. In the first passage, were *eas ferendo* replaced by the ablative gerundive *eis ferendis*, the gender of *eis* would be ambiguous, and its agreement with that of the preceding *iniurias* would not be obvious. In the second passage, and possibly in the third, were the accusatives to be changed from objects of the gerunds to ablatives modified by gerundives, their contrast in each instance with a second accusative might become less impressive. This is certainly true of the Verrine passage, which runs *non posse Verrem testis interficiendo exstinguere*, where *testis* as object of *interficiendo* is undoubtedly contrasted with the lost object of *exstinguere*, possibly *testimonium* (the very plausible suppletion by Gulielmus Peterson in the Oxford text), which forms a neat parallel with *testis*. And concerning the Philippic passage, which runs *an supplicationes addendo diem contaminari passus es, pulvinaria noluisti?*, I have wondered whether this furiously

just as these two gerund constructions, the earlier *lucis tuendi* as well as its derivative *lucem tuendi,* always survived, even in the face of the competing gerundive, so too in my opinion did those particularly rare forms of the gerund, the nominative and the accusative without a preposition, even in the face of the competing infinitive.

contracted invective was to be expanded into *an supplicationes addendo diem contaminari passus es, (addendo) pulvinaria (contaminari pati) noluisti?,* with *diem* as object of the expressed *addendo* to be contrasted with *pulvinaria* as object of the supplied *addendo.* However, the editors in general seem to expand as *an supplicationes addendo diem contaminari passus es, pulvinaria (contaminari pati) noluisti?,* with *supplicationes* as subject of the expressed *contaminari* the word to be contrasted with *pulvinaria* as subject of the implied *contaminari*; and in that case I can think of no reason at all for the use of the accusative *diem* rather than the ablative *die.* The lack of any special reason for the use of the accusative *diem* might be held to help justify the use of the accusative *populum Romanum* even were there no special reason in *its* support. But at all events I *can* think of a special reason for the use of the accusative *populum Romanum*: Cicero's well-known love of balance may be satisfied by the succession of first two gerundives and then two gerunds. (To be sure, some editors insert an extra gerundive before or after *urbis,* which would spoil this balance; but if I were going to emend, I would rather do so by inserting *et* before *agrorum* or -*que* after it, on the basis of *Phil.* 13.19.42, urbis et Italiae partitionis, and 13.20.47, urbis Italiaeque partitio, thus securing correspondence of *agrorum* and *Italiae,* both of which suggest the country as contrasted with *the* city par excellence, namely Rome. Note that the just preceding *caedis bonorum* in 5.3.6 similarly corresponds to the just preceding *optimi cuiusque caedis* in 13.19.42 and *caedes bonorum* in 13.19.47.)