The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for ***The Classical Review***:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Weisweiler on the Latin Participle in - *dus* Das Lateinische Participium Futuri Passivi in seiner Bedeutung und Syntaktischen Verwendung, von Dr. Joseph Weisweiler. Paderborn, 1890. Mk. 2.80.

E. P. Morris

The Classical Review / Volume 6 / Issue 06 / June 1892, pp 265 - 266

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X0018597X, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X0018597X

How to cite this article:

E. P. Morris (1892). The Classical Review, 6, pp 265-266 doi:10.1017/S0009840X0018597X

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

WEISWEILER ON THE LATIN PARTICIPLE IN *-DUS*.

Das Lateinische Participium Futuri Passivi in seiner Bedeutung und Syntaktischen Verwendung, von DR. JOSEPH WEISWEILER. Paderborn, 1890. Mk. 2.80.

THIS pamphlet purposes to establish the following points:—(1) the name of the adj. form *amandus* should be the future passive participle, not the gerundive; (2) the original voice-meaning was not neutral or active, even in the gerund, but passive; (3) the tense-force is nearly future, and this form of the verb was not originally a present passive participle; (4) the meaning of obligation or necessity is in the participle, not in the combination with *est* and the dative; (5) the gerundive is not derived from the gerund, but the gerund from the participle. In each of these positions the author controverts a view which has met with some acceptance. The doctrine that the gerundive was originally a pres. pass. ptc., especially, has been generally adopted, even in the school grammars.

The argument is complicated and difficult to summarize justly.

Chap. I. The adj. form is usually called by Roman grammarians the fut. pass. ptc., and this name is as accurately descriptive as the name of any ptc. The term *gerundium* arose from the attempt to apply the terms of Greek grammar to the phenomena of the Latin language, and has been further confused and misunderstood by modern scholars.

II. The numerous etymologies for the ending *-ndo-* are conflicting, and none has won general acceptance. We must be content to regard this as a completed termination in Latin, or at least we may feel sure that this is one of the cases in which the meaning of an ending can afford no help toward the explanation of the syntax. That must be determined by the facts of usage.

III. But a connection is probable between the fut. pass. ptc. and certain tense-stems. The variety of form (*-bundus*, *-endus*, *-undus*) can hardly be explained except by supposing a variety of origin. So the adj. in *-bundus* is connected with the 3rd plu. of the fut. in *-b*, *-buntur*, and *-endus* with the fut. of the 3rd. conjug. in *-entur*, while only the form in *-undus* is from a pres. stem, *-untur*. But the fut. in *b* came from the pres. stem by composition with the stem *bhu*, and only gradually assumed the distinct future sense; the adj. in *-bundus* was an off-

shoot from it before the present sense was wholly lost, and was therefore easily forced into a regular present meaning by the competition of the later-formed ptc. in *-andus*. The fut. in the 3rd conjug. came from the pres. subj. and even as late as the time of Plautus the two are not wholly differentiated, so that we may expect to find traces of subjunctive meaning in the ptc. in *-endus*, but with a general tendency toward the future. From the pres. stem came *oriundus*, *secundus*, *labundus*, etc. Then, as in the fut. indic. and perf. indic., the force of analogy brought the forms in *-endus* and *-undus* together, with parallel meaning, somewhere between the fut. and the pres. subj., and later, by further analogy of formation, the ptcc. in *-andus* and *-endus* of 1st and 2nd conjug. were made. [This chapter is exceedingly suggestive, and though the connection between the 3rd plu. *-nt* and *-ndo-* is not very clear, the main point appears to be fully established.]

As the attributive use of the fut. pass. ptc. coincides in general with this theory, it is necessary to discuss only the facts which seem to be opposed to it or, which call for fuller explanation, viz., the apparently active or neutral meaning in the periphrastic conjug. and in the gerund, the relation of the gerund to the ptc., and the source of the idea of necessity.

IV. Suffixes ante-date the distinctions of voice and therefore do not directly determine them, but as the adjectives formed from verb-stems assumed participial functions and took their places in the completed system of conjugation, their voice-meaning became more clear and precise, and there is no more reason for expecting a neutral meaning in the fut. pass. ptc. than in other forms of the verb. The confusion arises from dependent or neuter-passive verbs. In these there is a contradiction between form and function, which shows itself, for example, in the perf. ptc., and which leads to the active-neutral sense of *secundus*, *oriundus*, *volundus*, etc. With active-transitive verbs, which afford the only real test, the passive meaning in the periphrastic conjugation is always distinct. The word *Kalendae* and the phrases *dea deferunda*, *adolenda*, etc., in the Act. Frat. Arval., are explained at length.

V. The gerund (or neut. of fut. pass. ptc.) in periphr. conjug. is an impersonal, and like

the regular impersonal has passive form with active or neutral meaning. The apparently active sense of *mihi faciendum est* is therefore properly strong proof of the passive sense of *faciendum*, since only a passive form could give the active meaning. The acc. after such forms (*uia, quam nobis ingrediendum sit*) is retained from the active.

VI. The gerund is neither equivalent to an inflected infinitive, nor is it an abstract substantive from the neuter of the ptc. It is the declined form of the impersonal ptc., that is, *amandi* bears the same relation to *patriae amandae* that *amatur* bears to *patria amatur*. This explanation is in accord with the general use of the impersonal, and is supported by the impersonal use of the perf. ptc. (*inaugurato, de improviso, facto opus est*), and by the fact that down to late Latin the 'gerundive' construction is much more frequent than the gerund.

VII. In accordance with the future character of this ptc. it is found most frequently in those cases which express an end or aim, in the gen. final, in the dat., in the acc. with *ad*, and least frequently in the abl. The later increase in the use of the abl. corresponds to the increasing use of the abl. of nouns in the later Latin.

VIII. The hypothesis that the fut. pass. ptc. is connected with fut. stems, with some shading from the pres. subj. through forms in *-endus*, explains the idea of necessity more easily than the received explanation by analogy with *opus est mihi* and verbals in *-tio*, or the laboured metaphysical theory of Haase. The resemblance to clauses of purpose adds weight to this hypothesis. The nearest approach to pres. sense is in the abl. without preposition. The pure future sense, which is rare and rather late, shows that the ptc. has followed, though more slowly, the same course of development as the tenses from which it is derived, toward a precise and true future.

The process here outlined, by which the forms in *-bundus, -endus* and *-undus* from different sources were brought, under the working of analogy, to perform the same function, may at first sight seem unnecessarily complicated, but it is precisely the same process as that which has produced the future tense and the perfect (*te-tigi, par-*

si, ama-ui). At this point the theory is in full accord with the methods and results of historical grammar, and this harmony is one of the best evidences of its correctness.

The theory that the form under discussion was originally a pres. pass. ptc. seems to have arisen partly from a supposed connection between the suffix *-ndo-* and *-nt-* of the pres. act. ptc., and partly from the difficulty of explaining in any other way such words as *oriundus, secundus, Kalendae*. As to the first ground, it is the merit of this essay that the author recognizes the fact that the meaning of a suffix, even when it is clearly known, may be of little value in explaining the syntactical use, may indeed add a new difficulty to the question by revealing a wide gap between the proper sense of the suffix and its actual use. And as to the second point, arguments from the rare to the usual are always weak: any plausible explanation which brings the rare phenomena into harmony with prevailing usage lets the whole theory drop to the ground. Weisweiler's explanation of the pres. and act. sense of *oriundus, secundus*, etc., is far simpler and more convincing than any before proposed.

While therefore Weisweiler's theory of the fut. pass. ptc. is too complex and revolutionary to be accepted off-hand, I believe that it is, in its main lines at least, correct and destined to supplant the doctrine now found in many grammars. To establish it completely we need thorough examinations of the usage of different authors, especially in the earlier period. If the earlier literature should be found to show traces of difference of meaning between *-bundus, -endus* and *-undus*, beside those already known, such evidence would be conclusive. A study of the voice-meaning of fut. pass. ptec. with reference to the deponent, neuter-passive or transitive character of their verbs might also be fruitful. These are lines of work which might well be followed up by university students.

It may be added that the essay is written with clearness, with vigour of expression, with excellent temper and with not a little super-Teutonic humour.

E. P. MORRIS.

Yale University.