

THE USE OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE IN CICERO.

----

by

Mary Jane Bennett

----

----

A thesis submitted to the Department of Latin  
and the Faculty of the Graduate School  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the  
Master's Degree.

A. T. Walker Department of Latin.

June 4, 1915.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page.
Introduction	1-2
Part I (Summary of Dr. Marouzeau's Discussion)	3-56
Survival of the Participles in Latin	3-4
Formation	4-5
Functions of the Present Participle	6-56
I. Verbal Functions	6-45
A. Expression of Voice	6-8
B. Expression of Time	8-13
C. Transitive Construction	14-22
D. Relation of Participle to	
Principal Verb	23-44
1. In Agreement with Subject	23-32
Introductory	23-26
A. Adverbial Use	26-28
B. Other Uses	29-32
2. In Agreement with Oblique	
Cases	33-34
3. In Ablative Absolute	34-37
4. Predicative Construction	37-44
A. Nominative	37-40
B. Accusative after Verbs	
of Perception	41-44

## TABLE OF CONTENTS. (Continued)

	Page.
Conclusion	44-45
II. Nominal Uses	46-55
A. Adjectival	46-50
B. Substantival	50-55
Tabulation of Dr. Marouzeau's Results	56
Part II. The Present Participle in Cicero	57-138
I. The Real Participle	57-104
A. Tabulation and Summary of Results	57-75
1. Explanatory of Table	57
2. Table for 48 speeches of Cicero	58
3. Various Combinations of Modifiers	59-60
4. Transitive Construction	61-67
a. Percentage of Transitive Participles	61
b. Complementary Expressions	62-67
1. Word Object	62-64
2. Complementary Clause	64-66
3. Complementary Infinitive	66-68
5. Indirect Object	68-69
6. Modifiers of the Participle	69-75
a. Adverb	69-71

## TABLE OF CONTENTS. (Continued)

	Page.
b. Subordinate Conjunction	71-72
c. Phrase	72-73
d. Ablative	73-74
e. Locative	74-75
f. Limit of Motion	75
g. Duration of Time	75
<b>B. Discussion</b>	<b>76-104</b>
1. Temporal Value of the Present Participle	76-79
2. Frequency of the Nominative Participle	80-81
3. "Adverbial" Use of the Present Participle	82-84
4. Participle Qualified by Adverb or Conjunction	85-86
5. Accusative Participle with Verbs of Perception	87-94
6. Participle in Lieu of Clause	95-98
7. Participle Coordinated with Other Expressions	98
8. Accumulation of Participles in the Sentence	99
9. Frequent Occurrence of Certain Verbs in Present Participle	99-104

## TABLE OF CONTENTS. (Continued)

	Page.
II. The Participial Adjective.	105-122
A. Tabulation of Adjectives for 48 Speeches	105-108
B. Discussion and Examples.	109-122
III. The Participial Substantive.	123-130
A. Tabulation of Substantives for 48 Speeches.	123
B. Discussion and Examples.	124-130
The Present Participle in the Cataline Speeches	131-137
Conclusion	138

### Acknowledgment of Indebtedness.

The writer is indebted to Miss Lella Watson, Fellow of the Department of Romance Languages of Kansas University 1914-15, and to Miss Frances Smith, graduate student in the Latin Department of the same institution, for translations of a large part of Dr. Marouzeau's *L'Emploi du Participe Present Latin A L'Époque Republicaine*; and to Miss Smith also for the compilation of the table on p. 56.

## INTRODUCTION.

The present inquiry follows in it's essential outlines the methods employed by Dr. J. Marouseau in his study entitled The Use of the Latin Present Participle in the Period of the Republic. Dr. Marouseau made use of the following authors: Plautus, Terence, Cato (Cat.); De Agricultura; Varro (Varr.), De Re Rustica; Sallust, Catiline (Cat.) and Jugurtha (Ing.); Caesar, De Bello Gallico (Bg.); De Bello Gallico, Book VIII (Bg. VIII), Bellum Alexandrinum (Bal.); Bellum Africanum (Baf.); Bellum Hispanense (Bh.); Catullus (Catu.); Lucretius (Luo.); Cicero, De Senectute, In Catilinam (Cat.), Pro Marcello (Mar.), Pro Ligario (Lig.), De Divinatione (Div.) ; Nepos.

It is my object to carry the investigation through a larger part of the Ciceronian field, covering the following speeches: Pro Tullio (Tull.); Pro Caecina (Caecin.); De Imperio Cn. Pompei (imp. Pomp.); Pro Fonteio (Font.); Pro Cluentio (Cluent.); De Lege Agraria (leg. Agr.); Pro C. Rabirio (Rabir.); In Catilinam (Cat.); Pro Murena (Muren.); Pro Sulla (Sulla); Pro Archia Poeta (Arch.); Pro Flacco (Flacc.); Cum Senatui Gratias Egit (Sen.); Cum Populo Gratias Egit (Quir.); De Domo Sua (dom.); De Haruspium Responso (har. resp.); Pro Sestio (Sest.); In Vatinius (Vatin);

Pro Caeliò (Cael.); De Frovinoiis Consularibus (prov. oone.), Pro Balbo (Balb.); In Pisonem (Pico.); Pro Plancio (Plano.); Pro Scauro (Soaur.); Pro C. Rabirio Postumo (Rab. Post.); Pro Milone (Milo.); Pro Marcello (Mar.); Pro Ligario (Ligar.); Pro Rege Deiotaro (Deiot.); In M. Antonium Philippicas XIV ( Phil. I-XIV). The abbreviations employed for Cicero's writings are those used in Merquet's lexicon, except in a few instances where Marouseau's have been substituted to avoid confusion.

For a thorough appreciation of the wide extension in function that the present participle enjoys in Cicero a rather full summary of Dr. Marouseau's whole discussion seems essential. Examples collated by the writer and employed to support Marouseau will be indicated by an asterisk. It may not be out of place to state here that the writer, before becoming familiar with the details of Dr. Marouseau's work, arrived at essentially the same conclusions with regard to Ciceronian usage.

## PART I.

## SUMMARY OF DR. MAROUZEAU'S DISCUSSION.

## Survival of the Participles in Latin.

There is but a weak survival in Latin of the Indo-European participles. The passive participle in -to is an issue from the verbal adjective. The future in -turus develops late and is of obscure origin. Traces of the middle-passive -meno- survive in a few nominal forms, *alumnus*, *femina*. The latter may be related to forms in -ndus and -mini (second plural passive). Of the Indo-European perfect active participle Latin has not preserved a single clear indication. The present active in -nt- has been retained, however.

Celtic possesses no such construction and employs some paraphrase to render the Latin present participle. In Uscon and Umbrian the very nature of the text transmitted does not allow a great variety of uses, and there are few certain examples. In Latin itself the early writers seem to have held the present participle in very light esteem, and despite its prolonged existence in literary Latin, it is practically ignored in the Romance languages.

It is the object of Dr. Marouseau's study to show how the present participle in -nt-, destined

in the prehistoric period, apparently, to follow the fate of other participles, has survived in Latin. The texts employed for this work are such as, by their nature and extent, give a rather faithful picture of old Latin.

#### FORMATION.

As regards formation several points seem worthy of consideration.

a. The same suffix occurs in non-verbal forms,- *fraudulens*, *quadrupedans*, *auricomans*. Words of this type are for the most part compared adjectives, whose formation has no interest other than to show the vitality of the suffix, at least so far as the adjective is concerned.

b. The connecting vowel before the *-nt-* in Latin is usually *e*. In Greek it is *o*.

c. The accusative plural in *-es* occurs three times in Plautus. Inscriptions and Plautus, as a rule, employ *-um* in the genitive. Terence uses *-is* in the accusative (only three examples) and *-um* in the genitive. Two of the *-is* accusatives in Terence show

the attempts of copyists to replace -is with -es. The evolution toward -i- stems is further indicated by the fact that Lucretius employs -is in the nominative by analogy with the accusative. It is only in the ablative singular that the extension of the -i- declension is restricted. Employed as a real participle, especially in the ablative absolute, or as a substantive, the participle has its ablative in -e. *Med absenti* occurs in Plautus, but *absens* is a true adjective.

Considerations of form are not without bearing on questions of function. M. Meillet observes (*De quelques innovations....*, p. 41) that the -ia of the nominative and accusative plural neuter is due to the fact that "the nominative and accusative plural neuter are rarely employed except with the value of an adjective." One might conclude from this rapid extension of -i- declension forms that the participle from the beginning of the historic epoch tends to lose its verbal value and pass to the category of the adjective.

## I. VERBAL FUNCTIONS.

### A. Expression of Voice.

As part of the verbal system the participle should have definite voice. In certain instances the participle in -nt- which was only active in Indo-European, plays the part of a middle-passive in -meno-. In explanation of this phenomenon M. Brugmann remarks that the point of departure must lie in verbs which, in addition to a middle, possessed an active inflection with absolute force: *vehens*, from *veho*, I carry, also from *vehor*, I go in a carriage. There is a considerable number of verbs in which the active and deponent forms have the same meaning (type: *vertens*, Pl., Per., 628), and a large number have only the deponent form, *sequens*, *utens*. Worthy of note also are forms which might be derived equally well from active or deponent of different meanings: *licens* (Caesar, sg., I, 18, 3: "quod illo licente contra liceri audeat nemo") which comes from *liceri*, not from *licere*; *versans*, which comes from *versare* in Luc., VI, 124, but from *versari* in Catu., 64, 149. Finally, certain participial forms can be referred to deponents that have

disappeared from the current language, evidens, animans, praecipitans. However one might recall in this connection the absolute uses of active verbs, for it is to actives that can be cited, that the participles of absolute sense belong, praecipitans, Luc., VI, 289; "duros nudantia dentes", Luc., 1051. Some of these participles derived from absolutes or middles actually partake of the nature of real passive participles: animans = a being animated, evidens = visible, praecipitans = precipitated, dirigens = directed, nudans = naked.

It was but a step farther to employ a participle properly active in a passive sense, at least in certain isolated instances. This happened in the case of the participial adjectives amans and desiderans in vulgar Latin inscriptions. But perhaps these participles, (usually real adjectives in the superlative degree), have been affected by the analogical influence of certain adjectives in -nt-, entirely foreign to the notion of voice, as elegans, opulens, even the bizarre piens of inscriptions.

Later in the Romance languages the present participle as an adjective expresses a distinctive quality without consideration of voice: buvant - drinkable, that which one can drink.

The existence of the above forms does not authorise speaking of a participle in -nt- as having a passive sense. They merely indicate in some few instances a certain lack of distinction in voice, conforming to the tendency of the participle to detach itself from the verbal system.

#### B. Expression of Time.

Dr. Marouseau's conception of the temporal force of the present participle in a few instances seems considerably at variance with the facts of the case. Some few of his statements and examples in this connection will be taken up again in the second part of this paper. The substance of his discussion follows:

The Latin present participle is indifferent to the expression of time. Consideration of the time aspect of the participial verb, whether it be complete or incomplete, is usually sufficient to render an account of the facts.

The participle is often employed to denote continued action with a principal verb used absolutely; one encounters examples of this sort in Cicero:

Div., II, 27, 59: Quasi vero quioquam intersit, mures  
diem nootem aliquid rodentes sounta corroserint.

ibid., 59, 121: Quis est qui totum diem iaculans non  
aliquando conliniet?

In consequence of this ability of the present participle to express continued action, it follows that the participial action may normally project beyond the duration of the principal action, so that in some cases it is not only simultaneous, but also anterior or posterior. (See second part of this paper).

The participle expresses prior action rather than contemporaneous in such an example as:

Ph. 615-616: id quidem agitans mecum sedulo  
Inveni..remedium huic rei

(This example is more fully discussed in the second part of this paper).

Examples of this type are not rare:

Sall., Jug., 113, 1: Haec...diu volvens tandem promisit  
(See second part of paper).

Sall., Cat., 32, 1: Multa..volvens..profectus est

In the above examples the participle expresses acts which are past in relation to the action of the principal verb.

But one also finds some instances where the action of the participle is future:

Cic., Div., II, 6, 16: *Mediouis morbum ingravescentem ratione providet*

ibid., I, 49, 111: *orientem tyrannidem multo ante prospiciunt.*

It is necessary in order to render these examples to deprive the participles of all temporal and verbal value: "the aggravation of a malady," "the rise of a tyranny." The future force then lies in "providet," "ante prospiciunt," not in the participle.

The participle like every other nominal form (Marouzeau employs "nominal" to designate both substantive and adjective) simply expresses, independently of all temporal idea, the role attributed to a given subject. This value is especially perceptible in examples like the following where one has no recourse in French other than to translate the participle by a simple substantive:

Cat. I, 8, 20: *Quid exspectas auctoritatem loquentium quorum voluntatem tacitorum perspicias?* = the authority of the spoken word.

There are moreover actions clearly without date that are expressed by the participle:

Cic., Div., I, 3: praeter Epicurum balbutientem de natura deorum

= who does nothing but stammer.....

ibid., II, 12, 28: licet verum exquirere..., mihi praesertim de plerisque dubitanti

= to me especially who am in doubt..

(The action expressed by the participle here is clearly contemporaneous however)

If the participle is employed to date an action the temporal idea is expressed by its relation to the context, not by the form of the participle: this is the case in the ablative absolute construction:

Cic., Div., I, 30, 64: facilius evenit adpropinquante morte.

Sall., Ing., 66, 2: quo Metellus initio, Jugurtha pacificante, praesidium imposuerat.

The ablative absolute even with a present participle sometimes expresses action that is not literally contemporaneous:

Bg. VIII, 15, 6: Datur petentibus venia, dissuasente primo

Vercingetorige, post concedente.

(See second part of paper).

On the other hand it is by no means necessary that the ablative absolute contain a participle in order to have contemporaneous force:

Nep., 25, 16: quae vivo se acciderunt.

An important consequence of this neutrality of the participle with regard to temporal expression is that it readily passes over to the category of the adjective. The fact that the participle of a verb expressing condition may be employed without an accessory temporal idea ought to be sufficient to enable it to denote a lasting condition, independent of such or such present circumstances, as *potens*, *valens*.

But on the other hand one must note that the effort of the literary language tends to attach the participle to the verbal system, for example in giving it an object. Hence the compromise which has caused the participle to waver between the two categories, verbal and nominal, even to the last records of the literary language.

One may wonder at the fact that, in restoring to the participle its verbal function, the

language has not attempted also to attribute a temporal value to it. Perhaps there are some attempts of this kind in such appositions as:

Cic., Att., 8, 9, 2: quid agenti? quid acturo?

Luo., I, 107: nata sit, an nobis nascentibus insinuetur.

But in order to obtain this result the concurrence of other participial forms would be necessary. Only very late does Latin develop a future participle (in -turo); as to its past participle in -to- it had but rarely an active value (deponent verbs), and its sense of perfect is too close to the present to permit a temporal opposition. So the participle as long as it existed preserved merely the name of present.

Note however the temporal opposition in the following:

\*Phil. V, 11, 28: ut haec referrentur de honoribus bene de re publica meritorum et merentium. Also *ibid.*, 13, 36

\*Caecin., 14, 39: ut ille cogatur restituere, qui ingressum expulerit, ille, qui ingredientem reppulerit, non cogatur.

### C. Transitive Construction.

If temporal expression is foreign to the participle, at least it possesses sufficient verbal force to enable it to take an object.

Certain objects (infinitive, relative or interrogative clauses) can be attached almost indifferently to either a nominal or a verbal form. One says equally well: "dubius sum -" or "dubito - quid agam"; "maestus est -" or "dolet - quod non veneris"; "nescius eram -" or "nesciebam - to dolere." These are almost the only objects which the participle admits in Plautus

**Cis.**, 567-568: opsecrans...Ne deserat se

**Mil.**, 893: nescientes quod bonum faciamus

**Men.**, 129: congratulantes quia pugnavi fortiter.

There are in all seven clause objects in Plautus, three of them occurring in the arguments.

As regards an object in the accusative dependent on a transitive verb it is practically never attached to a participle in Plautus. In certain cases the statement is of such a character that the object might be considered that of a neighboring verb:

Mil., 1386: te...expectans expetit

Tri., 680: obiurgans me a peccatis rapis deteriorem in viam

Of the several examples where the participle seems to govern a direct object, one is in an argument, two in prologues. Two others occur in passages of artificial style (invocation of a divinity) as:

Rud., 694 et sq.: Venus alma, ambae te opsecramus,

Aram amplexantes hanc tuam lacrumantes

To these examples we may add:

Mil., 204-205: computat, feriens femur...Dexterum.

One may say then that the use of a verbal object with the participle is almost foreign to the language of Plautus. It is entirely so to that of Cato.

Terence also employs the participle governing a clause:

Eun., 594: expectans si quid

Ad., 673-674: dum.....Illinc veniret expectantem

(And five other examples).

But the participle with a real object occurs rather

frequently in Terence. This object may be either a pronoun:

And., 585: *idque adeo metuens vos celavi...*

or a noun:

Eun., 579-580: *adnuo.. Terram intuens modeste*

It is worthy of note that all these examples of the participle are in the nominative singular. There are two examples only in the accusative:

Ph., 521: *Pollicitantem et nihil ferentem, flentem*

Ht., 366: *Eius noctem orantem*

Two other examples of this exceptional type are outside the text of Terence in the periochae:

Ph., per., 4-5: Ht., per., 1-2.

Varro, besides the examples of the first category, which present all the participles in the nominative (I, 1; 2, 2; 49, 1; 69, 3; II, 1, 4; 4, 10; 7, 2; III, 9, 20; 16, 30), employs also the participle of a transitive verb, either with object understood:

II, 2, 10: *ut redintegrantes (eas)..alacriores faciant*

II, 7, 4: *cotidie adicientem (hordeum)*

II, 8, 4: *eodem tempore quo equos adducentes (eos).*

or in an expression of such a type that the object might be attached either to the participle or to the principal verb:

II, 5, 5: cum exportavit per mare...amans Europam

but also in cases where the object can depend upon nothing but the participle:

I, 1, 11: dicam, sequens naturales divisiones

In all these examples (except II, 7, 14) the participle is in the nominative. But we encounter the accusative also, more often than in Terence:

III, 9, 14-15: prodigendae in solem...,evitantem caldorem et frigus

Also I, 2, 1: II, 1, 7: III, 5, 18.

and one even in the dative:

II, 1, 6: quo facilius sumptibus multa poscentibus ministres.

In Sallust the use of the present participle in its verbal function is well developed; he furnishes 22 examples of clauses dependent on the participle, and

56 examples of word objects directly attached to it. The participle is employed more often with an object than intransitively. (Marouzeau lays particular stress upon this fact). Finally the participle is no longer confined to the nominative, where we find 19 instances of clause object, 34 of direct verbal object. For the two varieties of object, clause and word, we find respectively: 1 example and 10 after accusative, 3 examples and 12 after dative. The genitive alone is not represented (the ablative is discussed later).

Caesar does not appear to avoid the use of the participle in the oblique cases: 5 examples of the dative and the accusative (Marouzeau seems to "lump" the two cases) to 9 of the nominative with direct object. But the total number of direct objects after the participle is very small in Caesar. The 11 examples of which one may be sure occur in: V, 35, 8: VII, 42, 1: VI, 36, 2: VI, 1, 1: V, 34, 4: VII, 20, 12: I, 53, 5: VII, 19, 4: VII, 44, 1: IV, 18, 3.

Cornelius Nepos is conservative in his use of the present participle. He employs it often to introduce a clause (28 examples), but always in the nominative: frequently also with a word object (30 examples), but again

in the nominative, with the exception of 3 accusatives and 1 dative. The latter occur in: 23, 4: 18, 6: 17, 8.

Cicero is the first of the prose writers to admit all the uses of the participle. He often gives the present participle a direct object (76 examples in the field covered by Marouzeau), and it introduces an indirect question or an infinitive in 11 instances. With a direct object, it is found frequently in the nominative (43 examples), but often also in other cases: accusative 22, dative 4, ablative 1, genitive 6. With a clause object it is actually more frequent in the other cases (considered together) than in the nominative: accusative 3, dative 2, ablative 1, genitive 2, nominative 3.

Cicero is not afraid to heap up participles:

Div. II, 41, 85: qui lactens...Fortunae in gremio  
Sedens mammam adpetens...colitur.

He even assigns to a participle accompanied by an object the role of a substantive:

Div., II, 54, 112: Hoc..est...adhibentis diligentiam,  
non insani. Also Div., I, 6, 12: Div., II, 32, 69.

Cicero seems to turn to account all possible functions of the participle, without favoring one at the expense of the others. A similar tendency may be noted in Lucretius and Catullus, but with certain individual preferences.

In Lucretius the use of the participle with a direct object is well developed; there are about 125 examples for the nominative alone, an average of 1 example to every 50 verses, more instances, in fact, than of the participle without an object. Another noticeable fact is the small number of participles introducing a clause:

III, 423: *mortalem esse docens*

Also II, 602, 603: V, 980: VI, 637-638.

One example only outside nominative: I, 137.

There are however a number of participles completed by simple infinitives (Marouzeau cites 7 examples).

In Catullus 3 out of every 4 participles have objects, about 110 in all. The oblique cases are rarer than in Lucretius. 1 example only in the dative: 76, 1. 7 in the accusative: 64, 111: 129: 131: 212, 213: 21, 7: 67, 43. The participle hardly ever introduces a

clause (3 examples) or even a simple infinitive (3 examples).

The participle in the ablative absolute never admits an object in Plautus, Terence (with the exception of one clause object *Eun.*, 956), Cato and Varro. In Sallust we find 4 examples of the ablative absolute with an object, in Caesar 3. Nepos, though he exhibits a considerable number of participles in the ablative absolute, has only one with an object: 18, 5. Cicero does not avoid this construction, and even allows the ablative absolute to introduce a clause: *Div.*, I, 54, 123: *ibid.* I, 4: *Lig.* 6, 20.

Since Lucretius seldom employs a participle with an object in any case except the nominative, we find in him only 3 examples of the ablative absolute with an object: IV, 692: II, 1: I, 894.

Catullus admits this construction less often even than Lucretius. We find but a single example of the ablative absolute with an object.

66, 20: *Invisente novo proelia torva viro.*

In short, the use of an object with the participle is subject to a number of restrictions. It is entirely foreign to Cato, practically so to Plautus; Terence and Varro admit it rarely, and almost exclusively with a participle in the nominative. Cornelius Nepos,

Lucretius and Catullus employ it frequently, but avoid its use in the oblique cases. Caesar and his imitators do not affect this proscription of the oblique cases, but their use of the participle is somewhat restricted. On the other hand Sallust and the author of *Bellum Alexandrinum* show an extended use of the construction, and finally Cicero is the first to remove all restrictions from the participle. He even goes so far as to employ a participle in the genitive transitively.

Almost foreign to the ancient texts (Plautus, Cato), or to those of a popular character (*Bellum Hispanense*), this construction is scarcely admitted by writers of simple prose style (Varro, Caesar and his imitators). Adopted, but with some restrictions, by the freer language of Nepos and the richer style of the poets (Lucretius and Catullus), it takes its place definitely in the language only through the medium of the literary savants who fix the innovations of syntax (Sallust, Cicero and author of *Bellum Alexandrinum*).

#### D. Relation of the Participle to the Principal Verb.

Independently of its power to take an object, the participle shows its verbal character by the role which it plays in the sentence with regard to the principal verb. While an adjective expresses ordinarily an essential quality of an object considered independently of the action which it effects or undergoes, the participle expresses the situation of the object with reference to a defined action.

It is this relation of the participial action with that of the main verb which it is important to define, and as it may vary according as the two actions are connected with the same person or two different persons, it is necessary to distinguish between the use of the subject participle and that of the object participle.

##### 1. Participle in agreement with the Subject.-

The statement is commonly made that the Latin present participle is rarely employed in the nominative singular. Quite to the contrary, from Plautus to Cicero, the participle is connected more often with the subject than with the object. Terence especially avoids the participle in the oblique cases; we find in the whole body of his work only 15 examples against more than 100 in the nominative. Even of these 15 instances

many may be considered adjectives. On the other hand note with what ease Terence piles up participles in the nominative.

Ht., 149: laborans, parcens, quaerens, illi serviens

Ad., 472-473: ...laorumans, orans, obseorans,

Fidem dans, iurans se illam....

In the other writers the proportion of examples of the oblique cases to those of the nominative varies from 2:3 (Plautus) to 2:4 (Varro), 2:5 (Sallust, Nepos), and even 2:10 (Lucretius), 2:16 Catullus.

Thus it is through the medium of the nominative case that the present participle takes root more and more deeply in the literary language. It is also through the nominative, as has been shown above, that the participle acquires little by little the ability to take an object.

Meanwhile its progress could not be limited to the subject case; while certain authors, especially the poets, Lucretius and Catullus, were using the nominative freely and almost exclusively, the prose writers of the classic epoch, Caesar and Cicero, were extending the use of the participle to all cases and in all constructions.

Finally the oblique cases begin to gain ground over the nominative. This can already be observed in the author of *Bellum Africanum* and *De Bello Gallico VIII* (in the latter there are but 2 instances of the nominative). It is probably this fact that has given rise to the belief that there was a sort of proscription of the nominative in classic Latin.

In a general way, either in the nominative or the oblique cases, the participle serves only to note, almost in a parenthetical fashion, the secondary action which accompanies the more important action, termed principal. This is the case in innumerable examples of the type: *Cur.*, 338: "Saluto adveniens" (30 examples in *Plautus* alone of *adveniens* and *abiens*, which often have no other function than to furnish a scenic indication).

*Marouzeau* observes that the participles in a given text are apt to be derived from verbs of the same general character. In a comedy of intrigue *praesens*, *absens*, *adveniens*, *amans* may constitute about two-thirds of the examples of the participle. In an historical text we encounter almost exclusively participles that have to do with the movement of troops, as *resistentes*, *pugnantes*, *cedentes*, *venientes*. It is only with the progress of the

literary language, and almost exclusively in the nominative, that the participle begins to vary its uses.

A. One of the oldest uses is adverbial.-

Of two simultaneous actions, the one (termed participial) being considered accessory in its relation to the other (termed principal), it may happen that the first expresses merely the manner of the second. In a phrase like: Mil., 201: Quemadmodum astitit, severo fronte, curans, cogitans

one readily sees that the participle (cogitans), quite as the ablative of manner (severo fronte), corresponds to the adverb (quemadmodum).

\*Cf. Cic., dom., 55, 140: quem ad modum iste praeposteris verbis, ominibus obscenis, identidem se ipse revocans, dubitans...fecerit.

Certain participles have become fixed in this adverbial function, (See second part of paper). Lubens, sciens occur respectively 30 and 10 times in Plautus. Lubens is equivalent to lubenter; but lubenter is employed preferably when it is to be accompanied by an adverb of degree:

"Magis lubenter", Mos., 157; "nimium lubenter", Aul., 537; and when it accompanies a plural subject, Cap., 473; Rud., 923. As for *sciens*, it retains the value of a participle in such a place as:

Poe., pr., 112-113: omnis linguas scit, sed dissimulat sciens...Se scire

\*Milo., 10, 29: fecerunt id servi Milonis...nec imperante nec sciente..domino,

\*Cluent., 46, 129: Habebit igitur te sciente et vidente curia senatorem,

On the contrary it is employed as a simple adverb in:

Mer., 719: Cupio hercle scire.- Sed tu me temptas sciens.

where the juxtaposition of the two forms constitutes a play upon words that is hardly capable of translation. *Lubens* and *sciens* occur respectively 5 and 6 times in Terence, and Sallust sets about to preserve them.

Participles are also employed in an adverbial sense to express the haste or rapidity of the action performed by the subject. One finds in Plautus:

Mer., 175: me per urbem currens quaerebas

and in Terence:

Eun., 291: properans venit - in haste

This is another use which Sallust developes; besides properans, he employs "oertans" in the sense of "certatim," naturans, festinans.

\*Cf. however Cio. Phil. IX, 3, 6: At ille properans, festinans, mandata vestra conficere cupiens in hac constantia morbo adversante perseveravit, where properans - "refusing all delay" (Yonge), and where the nature of the context forbids reading any adverbial force into the participles. It is interesting also to note the behavior of the same participle (properans) when attached to an oblique case, where it can not, of course, qualify the action performed by the subject.

\*Cluent., 13, 36: longum est dicere mihi, praesertim ad alia properanté.

### B. Other Uses.

The participle in agreement with the subject again has an advantage over the accusative participle in being able to express the action which conditions the principal action; it can take the place of a gerundive in -ndo or the ablative of a noun of action.

Cf. Plautus, As., 709: ut cruciere...currens

with Terence, Eun., 846-847: miserrimus... Fui fugitando.

or again: St., 406: olim quos abiens adfecit aegrimonia

with the verse that follows, 407: eos nunc laetantis faciam adventu meo.

Note also: Mer., 164: dixi ego tacens - by my very silence.

\*It is interesting to compare with this:

Cic., har. resp: 4, 7: cum mihi stanti tacens minaretur,

- silently or "by dumb show."

The same use continues:

Sall., Jug., 94, 2: Saepius eadem ascendens descendensque,

dein statim digrediens, ceteris audaciam addere -

ascendendo, etc.

Catu., 68 , 21: Tu mea tu moreins fregisti comoda - by your death.

\*Cf. also: Phil., X, 5, 11: Alios ad negotium publicum ire cum cupimus, vix solemus extrudere, hunc retinentes extrusimus, - "by the mere fact of our desiring to retain him" (Yonge).

It is when the two actions (participial and principal) are connected with the same person, that it is more apt to stand in lieu of a clause, conditional, explicative, concessive, causal, restrictive, etc. (See second part of paper). These different uses are sometimes catalogued in the grammars under the captions: causal sense, concessive etc. of the participle. It is evident that the participle in itself possesses a causal or concessive force no more than a temporal. When Plautus says; Cap., 848: Am., 696: "vigilans somniat," the concessive force results from the simple juxtaposition of two words of opposite sense, and not from the use of the participle. A simple adjective may have the same value, if it be opposed to a word of contrary meaning: Am., 1001: faciam ut sit madidus sobrius.

Hec., 601-602: quam fortunatus..sum...

Hanc matrem habeas talem,...

And., 585: idque adeo metuens vos celavi - because I feared this..

Varro's usage is no less free:

I, 37, 2: ni, decrescente luna tondens, calvos fiam,  
Where tondens is equivalent to a condition.

Nepos and Cicero furnish similar examples:

Nep., 18, 5: ne uno loco manens equos militares perderet -  
if he remains in one place..

Div., II, 59, 121: Quis est enim qui totum diem iaculans  
non aliquando conliniet?

In Varro we find a participial statement that is virtually coordinate with that of the principal verb and has the force of a new independent clause:

III, 8: obiciunt triticum..., cotidie everrentes eorum stabula - and they sweep..

In Sallust examples abound where the participle is the equivalent of a subordinate clause:

Jug., 97, 5: multi, contra adversos acerrime pugnantes,  
ab tergo circumiri - dum pugnant

Iug., 113, 1: Haec Maurus secum ipse diu volvens tandem promisit - postquam volvit.

Caesar employs the participle with the force of a causal clause:

VII, 49, 1: Caesar cum iniquo loco pugnari..videret, praemetuens suis...misit.

praemetuans has the same value as cum videret.

A peculiar construction is that in which the participle is connected with a relative introducing the clause.

Baf., 37, 4: Quem iugum cingens...velut theatri efficit speciem

Cic., Div., I, 20, 39: De quibus disputans Chrysippus... facit idem quod...

\*Arch., 6, 14: quas ego mihi semper...proponens animum.. conformabam.

## 2. Participle in Agreement with the Oblique Cases.

All varieties of usage noted up to this point are peculiar to the participle in agreement with the subject. When the two actions, principal and participial, are connected, the one with the subject, the other with the oblique cases, they are more independent of each other, and it is rare in this case that the participle can be considered the equivalent of a clause, (see second part of paper). One must be very subtle to interpret the finer shades of meaning which the participle may have in:

Ad. 693: credebas dormienti haec tibi confecturos deos?

It is again in Sallust that one encounters for the first time a certain variety of use. (This is a misstatement as the same use occurs in Cicero; see examples below.)

Iug., 96, 2: multis rogantibus, aliis per se ipse dare beneficia - on their demand<sup>7</sup> - because they demand.

\*Planc., 10, 25: cui nihil est quod roganti concedi non iure possit.

\*Cael., 2, 5: et ea non petenti detulerunt, quae multis petentibus denegarunt; -"without his asking"... "despite their request."

### 3. Participle in the Ablative Absolute.

Progress of the present participle is especially noticeable in the construction called the ablative absolute. While the past participle frequently admits this construction in the more ancient texts (Tammelin, p. 136 et seq.), it is almost entirely foreign to the present participle in Plautus and even in Terence. Plautus employs the ablative absolute only in stereotyped expressions where the participle has become an adjective. There are about 50 examples of the formula: me praesente (absente), 4 of me lubente, 3 of me sciente (insciente). The only example that can not enter wholly into this category is "vigilante Venere" in Poe., 321-322.

Terence, with the exception of 10 examples of praesente (absente), employs only 3 present participles in the ablative absolute: Ht., 913: Eun., 956: Ad., 507.

Cato employs the ablative absolute only with participial-adjectives, with the exception of the stereotyped expressions: *luna decrescente*, 31, 2, and *luna silenti*, 29; 40, 1; 49, 2.

Varro also uses the expressions: *luna crescente*, I, 37, 1 and 3, - *decrescente*, I, 37, 2, *senescente* I, 37; 1, 3, and other expressions that serve to date; *desistente autumno*, II, 3, 8, *quinto anno incipiente*, II, 7, 2. With the exception of the above one encounters in Varro only 3 instances of the ablative absolute with present participle: III, 17, 1: I, 2, 2: II, 7, 8.

It is Sallust again who extends the use of a rare construction. Besides the examples of *praesente*, *sciente*, he has 22 real participles in the ablative absolute, several of which govern objects, and they offer a great variety of meanings. They serve not only to mark a date, but in lieu of a condition or an adversative clause: *Iug.*, 66,2: *Iug.*, 85, 48: *Iug.*, 92, 3.

Caesar uses the ablative absolute as frequently as Sallust, though the present participle on the whole is much rarer with him. The imitators of Caesar give an added impetus to the construction; for an amount of text less than Caesar's they exhibit twice as many examples.

Cornelius Nepos employs the ablative absolute with present participle frequently and freely (21 examples, exclusive of formulae of type praesente).

There is the same frequency and variety of uses in Cicero (for figures covering a wider field in Cicero see table in second part of this paper):

Div., I, 30, 64: facilius evenit adpropinquante morte - when death approaches.

Mar., 10, 33: Nisi te...salvo et in ista sententia...manente. (participle accompanied by a conjunction).

\*dom. 5, 11: concursus est ad templum Concordiae factus senatum illuc vocante Metello consule. (participle governs direct object and is modified by adverb)

\*dom. 28, 75: cum te, P. Lentule, legem de me ferente populus Romanus ipse vidit sensitque. (participle governs direct object and is modified by phrase)

\*Phil. V, 14, 38: cum Antonio diadema Caesari imponente se avertit. (participle governs direct and indirect objects)

\*Note also the freedom of usage in the following:

\*Milo. 6, 14: Divisa sententia est postulante nescio

\*Milo. 12, 32: quibus si non adiuvantibus, at coniventibus  
certe speraret se posse eludere

If one can note any arrest in the progress of the ablative absolute, it is in Lucretius and Catullus who avoid in a general way the use of the participle in the oblique cases. Lucretius, who employs the participle so often in the nominative, has only 12 examples of the ablative absolute. Catullus shows but 3 examples of a real participle in the ablative absolute.

#### 4. Predicative Construction.

##### A. Nominative.

The participle called "predicative" hardly exists in Latin. The familiar Plautine phrase "ut sis sciens" is almost the only clear instance of this use. Moreover sciens has passed to the category of the adjective, and this is the case with some other participles that admit this construction. In the phrase of Cato:

1, 4: minimeque male cogitantes sunt qui in eo studio occupati sunt. Male cogitantes is a simple adjective

formed after the model of malevolens, malemerens.

When Plautus says:

As., 620: Quia oculi sunt tibi lacrumantes

lacrumantes is adjectival, and expresses a manner of being, not an action.

In Catu. 63, 58: Rabie fera carens dum..animus est  
(carens = expers)

In the majority of cases the participle in this construction is coordinated with a simple adjective:

Ph., 623: Erus liberalis est et fugitans litium

Sall. Iug., 7, 1: quod erat Iugurtha manu promptus et  
appetens gloriae militaris

(in these two examples the adjectival value of the participle is shown by its construction with a genitive)

The attributive participle sometimes attests its verbal value by governing an object, but even in these cases it is coordinated with adjectives:

Nep., 15, 7: fuisse patientem, suorum iniurias ferentem civium. Also Eun., 759-760: Nep., 15, 3: ibid., 7, 1: Luc., III, 396-397.

Note also in Cicero:

\*Mar., 7, 22: quis est omnium tam ignarus rerum, tam rudis in re publica, tam nihil umquam neo de sua nec de communi salute cogitans.

\*Phil. XII, 12, 29: sunt fortes illi quidem, sed propter memoriam rerum, quas gesserunt pro libertate, nimis ferooes et ad suam vim omnia nostra consilia revocantes.

In addition to these examples we find in vulgar Latin:

Bh., 29, 2: ad dextram currens erat.

In summary, the predicate construction is exceptional in Latin; outside the cases where the participle has become an adjective, special circumstances were required in order to produce it, ordinarily the proximity of an attributive adjective which attracted the participle into the adjectival category. The few examples found are borrowed from a style naturally periphrastic, that of description or portraiture.

In reviving the present participle, the common language neglected to give it the predicate use with which it had enriched the verbal adjective in -to-.

It is, apparently, only the unskillful style of secondary writers or technical language which employs this cumbersome periphrase. The syntax of H. Blase (Hist. Gr., III, p. 256-257) notes that it is not found in poets of the Empire nor in prose writers of the first century, but on the other hand it occurs frequently in Vitruvius and other writers of low Latinity. In ecclesiastical writers *proficiscens sum* becomes a sort of present periphrastic, supplementing *profectus sum* (Cf. H. Goelzer, *La lat. de saint Jerome*, p. 389). It is moreover a turn of speech which the Romance languages inherit from the Latin.

The use of the participle in the predicate after other verbs is possible only where it has become an adjective. One encounters:

Cur., 87: *fi mi obsequens*

Luc., II, 768: *ut candens videatur et album*

There is a somewhat analogous construction of the participle in the accusative with the verb *facio*:

Ps., 1041: *qui te nunc flentem facit*

## B, Accusative after Verbs of Perception.

Dependent upon a verb of perception, the participle alternates with the infinitive (cf. Schmalz, Lat. Synt., p. 310 et seq., Tammelin, p. 58 et seq.). But of the two constructions the participle is the more ancient, comparison with the other participles clearly indicates this. The constructions: "dixit...facturum, factum, faciendum" are primitive, and their union with esse to constitute an infinitive is of relatively recent date. But even as early as Plautus, the infinitive is much more frequent than the participle with video (3 to 1), and it is almost exclusively employed with audio (2 examples only of the participle). The progress of the infinitive is due to a simple encroachment of the infinitive proposition, in consequence of the analogy: "dico eum legere - video eum legere." If the participle has persisted, it is because the possibility of a double construction provided in Latin, always careful of distinctions, a means of expressing subtle shades of meaning.

In general the participle expresses simply an attitude which one notes almost indifferently. (See second part of paper).

Bac., 968: Sed Priamum astantem eecum ante portam video

While the infinitive announces a fact of essential import:

Bac., 292: Quoniam vident nos stare, occeperunt - "quoniam nos stamus."

Besides this ability to express a certain shade of meaning, the infinitive construction has another advantage in Plautus; the infinitive may have an object, while the transitive use of the participle in Plautus is very rare. In fact, in a number of cases this is the only consideration which can explain the choice of the infinitive. One must, of course, employ the infinitive in the case of "esse" or a passive verb.

In Terence there is no instance of the participle with "audio". With "video" the examples of the infinitive are in the majority, 5 instances only of the participle. The few examples which Varro furnishes show that he employs the participle with "videre" and even with "audire." The participle is the rule in Sallust with both verbs. In Lucretius we find the participle employed with "cernere" as well as "videre," in Catullus with "videre," "audire" "prospectare". The participle occurs in Caesar

and his imitators with "videre" and "conspicere." In Nepos we find the participle used with "videre", "conspicere", "audire." Finally in Cicero:

Div., I, 9, 15: videmus haec signa numquam fere mentientia  
also, II, 41, 85: II, 63, 129: 70, 145 (bis); I, 32, 69.

It is not only "video" and "audio" which, in Cicero, are construed with a participle; one encounters also:

Lig. 4, 11: arguis fatentem

(See second part of paper)

Div., II, 69, 142: et advenientis et crescentis morbos  
intellegunt.

Also II, 25, 54: "praedicare"; II, 5, 14: "praesentire";  
Cat., IV, 6, 12: "proponere."

In Terence the verb "cognoscere" occurs construed with a participle,

Hec. 830. Nepos furnishes a similar example, 22, 2.

Hence the participle has in part preserved, in part lost its predicate use. With "esse" it is maintained only where it can play the role of a simple adjective. With "facere" the participle has resisted its rival the infinitive, merely to indicate a change in the meaning of the principal

verb: "facere - represent." In Plautus the infinitive has almost triumphed with "videre" and even more so with "audire"; completely so in Terence with "audire." Meanwhile the participle continued to be employed, without doubt owing to a distinction, as in the case of "facere", between two meanings of the introductory word; "videre" - "to see" or to "remark"; "audire" - "to hear" or "to hear said", but especially because the literary language tends to reinstate the participle in all its uses. Hence the participle reappears with "videre", even with "audire" in Sallust, and finally with other verbs of perception in Cicero and Cornelius Nepos.

In resume, the Latin writers of the republic do not employ all the forms and constructions of the present participle indifferently. Some employ it almost exclusively in the nominative (Terence, Lucretius, Catullus); others, while admitting it in all cases, avoid construing it with an object (Plautus, Varro, Nepos). It is only with the first classic prose writers (Sallust, Caesar, Cicero) that one finds nearly all possible constructions. These authors also give to the participle a great variety of values, gerundive, causal clause, concessive, etc.

The extension of the present participle does not follow a regular progression, since Lucretius, and especially Catullus, return to the usage of Terence in banishing nearly all the oblique cases in favor of the nominative. Perhaps the use of a declinable verbal form, calculated to prolong and complicate the sentence, was peculiarly favorable to the construction of the period, and well adapted to the analytical style of prose writers. Once received into the literary language the participle rapidly regains the ground it had lost; it reappears in the ablative absolute, in the predicate construction, it enters into rivalry with other verbal forms, infinitive, gerundive-, and its progress henceforth will be checked only by its tendency as a wholly participial form to be assimilated by the categories properly nominal, adjective or substantive.

## II. NOMINAL USES.

### A. Adjectival.

It is evident from the preceding discussion that the literary language tends to restore to the participle its verbal function. But the ancient condition of the language leads us to observe that of the two Indo-European functions of the participle, verbal and nominal, the Latin has a tendency to preserve only the latter. In the normal development of the language the participle, apparently, is inclined to pass over to the category of the adjective.

The confusion between the participle and the adjective is of Indo-European date; it is possible even that the adjectival category antedates the participial (K. Brugmann, *Grundr.*, II, 1, p 650); the history of the Latin participle in *-tus* shows us how an adjective can play the role of a participle. In the entire development of Latin as well as of Greek the line of demarcation between adjectival and participial functions has been a wavering one, and the distinction between the two uses was much debated by the old grammarians.

This distinction depends ordinarily on the feeling of the reader: one can not determine from the form itself whether such a word as "nocens" has the value of an adjective or a participle, whether it expresses a quality or an action. At the most one can say that the participle is distinguished from the adjective by "the straiter line which unites it with the principal action, in such a way that it appears to be attributed to its substantive only temporarily and in accordance with the action indicated by the phrase " (K. Brugmann, *Abr. Gr. comp.*, p. 641). Thus one may find adjectival quality in the participle of a verb which expresses action if it is employed to designate a specific characteristic: proserpens in the expression: "proserpens bestia" (As., 695, etc.) -"whose nature it is to crawl,"- and not: "which is in process of crawling." But this is only an imperfect distinction, considering that inversely the adjective proper may cease to express a specific quality in order to designate the character with which the subject invests it throughout the duration of the action; one says: "timidus incedere" just as "esuriens advenire."

From a strictly grammatical point of view the participle exhibits its verbal quality only through its ability to govern a verbal object. As to its adjectival

quality, it displays itself at times in certain changes of form, of construction, of significations. From this point of view the ancient language presents different degrees of adjectivity of the participle. The following cases may be presented:

1. The participle has become so well fixed as an adjective that the language has even lost recollection of the original verb: "recens," from an obsolete "reces"; "frequens", from "frequo"; "repens", from "repo"; "potens", from "poteo" (cf. A. Ernout, Rech. sur l'emploi du passif latin, Mem. Soc. Ling. XVI, p. 315).

2. The participle, detached from it's original verb, alters the primitive form; Cicero reminds us that "prudens" is equivalent to "providens":

Cic., Div., I, 49, 111: quos prudentes possumus dicere, id est providentes.

3. Certain participial-adjectives are derived from verbs which, since the adjectivation of the participle, have undergone a change of construction: lubens and pudens apply to persons, while the corresponding verbs are impersonal.

4. Others, inbecoming fixed as adjectives, have deviated from the meaning of the original verb: "oonfidens" has the meaning "insolent"; "diligens" signifies "careful", "attentive", and not "one who loves or cherishes"; "praesens" corresponds no longer to the meaning of "praesesse" but to that of "adesse".

This adjectival quality is further manifested by the possibility of giving to the participle a construction purely nominal: predicative construction (type: Mil., 806 etc.: "Tibi sum oboediens") or a dependent genitive (type: Hec., 142: "cupiens tui").

But the participles which appear in other connections with the value of adjectives are almost exclusively those which serve as the point of departure for derived forms: comparative and superlative -entior, -entissimus, adverb -enter, substantive -entia, forms with negative prefix in-: insipiens. (For a detailed discussion of the participial adjective and it's application to various fields of endeavor; commerce, agricultur, astronomy, natural science, logic,- consult Marouzeau p. 59 seq.)

In conclusion Marouzeau says: It is sufficient in this rapid review of examples to note that if the Latin of the republic has restored to the participle it's verbal functions, it is not at the expense of it's nominal uses.

On the contrary, the participle is increasingly employed in the capacity of an adjective. But these two aspects of participial extension are of the same character; we are in the presence of an artificial progress; it is the literary language in both cases that has drawn aside from the existing forms in a development which the normal progress of the language does not lead one to foresee.

#### B. THE SUBSTANTIVAL.

A participle that has become an adjective may, as an adjective, become a substantive; usually it is through the medium of the adjective that the participle becomes a substantive. It is at first a type of exceptional formation, which results from a sort of ellipsis: a substantive employed constantly with the same adjective in a stereotyped phrase finally becomes useless, since it may be supplied so readily; this is the case in: *confluens (fluvius)*:

Bg., Iv, 15, 2: *ad confluentem Mosae et Rheni continens (terra); oriens et occidens (sol); praesens (tempus); serpens (bestia).*

But in the majority of cases, the substantive sprung from the participle assumes no ellipsis of a determinative noun; only the use of the masculine or the neuter indicates whether it refers to persons or to things: sapiens, adulescens..., ardentia, liquentia. One thus encounters in substantive function the majority of the adjectives enumerated above. Like the adjectives, they designate an object or a person by an essential quality, permanent, independent of such or such particular circumstances.

Substantivation is of different degrees:

"benevolens" has become so entirely a substantive in Plautus that it may be accompanied by a possessive: Cas., 435. On the contrary "amans", which often appears as a substitute for "amator", is not properly a substantive; Latin can not say "amanti tuo" as the French says "a ton amoureux."

The other substantives which one may cite in the texts employed are the following; designating persons: praesentes, absentes, fidentem (As., 561), confidentes, diffidentem (Ep., 112), diligens, intellegens, nocens, sciens, valens; designating things: ardentia consequentia, gignentia, liquentia; praesentia.

In all these examples the participle may be taken substantively because it has already passed into the

current language in the role of an adjective, because in short the verb to which it belongs expresses more often a quality or a state.

There is nothing in the structure of the phrase to distinguish the participial use from the substantive. When one reads:

Bg., VIII, 14, 3: neque resistentes neque cedentes  
adgrediendos...iudicabat

only the context aids him to understand by supplying eos:

"neither in their resistance nor in their retreat."

Caesar says:

VII, 71, 2: discedentibus mandat

as well as

VLL, 54, 3: discedentibus his exposuit

Other examples of the same sort occur with a great variety of verbs in Lucretius, Cicero, Nepos (Marouzeau p. 68).

The participle employed substantively may have the value of an indefinite, but not in these same writers: Examples occur in Plautus, Terence, Sallust.

Rud., 260: Vox me precantum huc foras excitavit.

In these different uses the participle has lost its verbal value to so slight a degree that it is still capable of governing an object:

Div., II, 54, 112: Hoc...est...adhibentis diligentiam.

With regard to the substantivation of the participle the following points are worthy of notice:

1. The process of making a substantive of the participle of a verb of action is not employed with a participle in the nominative; even Plautus and Terence, who avoid the participle in the oblique cases do not recognize this use.
2. The examples in Plautus which employ the participle absolutely are all of indefinite meaning: "loquentes" - of a person who speaks; "precantum" - of people who supplicate.

Neither the one nor the other of the above restrictions applies to the adjective substantive (Marouzeau apparently means those participial adjectives which have produced noun derivatives): intellegens - an intelligent man; praesentes - the persons present.

In the use which has just been defined the participle is only accidentally substantive; it preserves

it's verbal value since it may even govern an object. It is not surprising then that it's use is subject to certain limitations, which attest once more the little vitality of the participle as a verbal form.

The substantivation of the participial-adjective is not subject to the same restrictions; each writer may employ it to add new terms to the current vocabulary. After the type "praesentia", Nepos uses "instantia", Cicero has "gubernantibus" modelled on "dominans."

But these uses are not arbitrary; they have a significance; they are adapted to a certain kind of style and are only admissible in certain vocabularies. The only participial substantives which one encounters in the colloquial language, that of comedy, are: *cluens*, *sapiens*, (more often adjective than substantive), *adulescens*, *benevolens* (rarer), *praesentes* (always in plural). A certain number of participles are entirely foreign to the Latin, having crossed over from the Greek: "*bacchantes*" (gen.) in Catullus, 64; 61, which is usually an adjective; "*finientes*" and "*mentientem*" in Cicero (Div., II, 44, 92 and II, 4, 11).

The others belong to special vocabularies:

To the vocabulary of science belong "oriens" and "occidens", "confluens", "animans", "gignentis", "liquentia", "ardentia," "serpens", "lactans".

When Cicero has need of the phraseology of logic, he employs "consequentia" and "repugnantis"; when he treats of divination, he makes distinctions by means of the participial-substantives "divinantes" or "vaticinantes": "somniantes" or "dormientes", "vigilantes".

Here too the extension of the participle is artificial and does not respond to an essential need of the current language; it results from the adaptation to nominal uses of a verbal form, which, diverted from its primitive function, must accommodate itself to the innovations of scholarly language.

Tabulation of Dr. Marouzeau's Results.

Dr. Marouzeau does not supply figures for the unqualified participle. The table below gives his statistics, incomplete in several instances, for the transitive participle only.

\*Indicates that Marouzeau's figures are complete for that author.

W. O. indicates word object.

C. O. indicates clause object (including infinitives and indirect questions).

(Note: Marouzeau gives the number of dative and accusative word objects for Caesar as 5 but does not assign them to the individual cases. I have put them under the accusative).

Author	Nom.		Gen.		Dat.		Acc.		Abl.		WO..	
	W.O.	C.O.										
*Plautus	8	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	7
*Terence	22	6	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	26	8
Varro	8	10	0	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	17	10
Sallust	34	19	0	0	12	3	10	1	4	0	60	23
*Caesar	9	0	0	0	7	0	5	0	2	1	16	1
*Caes. Imitators	18	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	8	2	31	2
*Nepos	30	88	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	35	28
Cicero	43	8	6	2	4	2	22	3	1	4	76	14
*Lucretius	188	11	0	0	1	0	4	1	6	0	136	12
Catullus	97	8	0	0	1	0	7	0	2	0	107	5

## PART II. THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE IN CICERO.

### I. The Real Participle.

#### A. Tabulation and Summary of Results.

##### 1. Explanatory of Table.

The table below includes all real participles in 48 speeches of Cicero. It excludes clearly adjectival or substantival forms. The first column indicates the total number of participles both qualified and unqualified for each case. The second column contains the total number of unqualified forms (I have not considered "non" a qualifying expression). The third shows the complete number of qualified forms for each case, and by comparing this with the last column, one may gather some idea of the combinations of modifiers that often accompany the participle. Each participle has been listed as many times as it has different varieties of modifiers. However, if a participle governs more than one object or has more than one modifier of the same kind as e. g. two adverbs, it has been counted but once for that particular construction.

2. Table for 48 Speeches of Cicero.

Case	Total No. Participles.	Total No. Unqualified.	Total No. Qualified.	Word Object.	Complementary Clause Object.	Infinitive Clause Object.	Complementary Infinitive.	Indirect Object.	Modifying Adverb.	Subordinate Conjunction.	Modifying Phrase.	Modifying Ablative.	Modifying Locative.	Modifying Limit of Motion.	Modifying Duration Time.	Total No. Modifiers.
Nom.	161	54	107	45	1	0	3	10	17	0	32	16	1	1	2	128
Gen.	38	18	20	12	1	0	1	0	3	0	4	1	0	0	0	22
Dat.	119	47	72	33	1	1	2	0	17	1	22	3	1	0	0	81
Acc.	259	101	158	55	2	0	12	16	38	2	41	22	0	1	2	192
Abl.	25	18	7	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	7
Abl. Abs.	232	170	62	22	1	0	0	5	29	2	12	4	0	0	0	75
Totals	834	408	426	171	6	1	19	31	105	5	113	46	2	2	4	505

### 3. Various Combinations of Modifiers.

It is unnecessary, of course, to enumerate the various combinations of modifiers with which Cicero qualifies the participle and extends its verbal scope. But it may prove interesting and profitable to consider the nominative case e. g. with its wealth of dependent constructions.

The nominative participle occurs twice with both direct and indirect objects, but no other qualifications:

Milo., 16, 43: Hunc diem..sibi proponens..Milo veniebat?

Phil. XIII, 8, 17: cum Caesari diadema imponens Antonius servum se illius quam collegam esse malebat.

Once with direct object and accusative of duration of time:

Deiot., 13, 38: Haec ille reputans et dies noctesque cogitans non modo tibi non suscenset.

4 times with direct object and phrase as:

Milo., 16, 43: Milo..scelus et facinus prae se ferens et confitens..veniebat?

Once with direct object and adverb:

Cael., 24, 59: parietem saepe feriens eum

Twice with direct object and ablative:

Piso., 25, 61: ut scriba...caput sinistra manu perfricans  
commurmuratus sit.

Once with object, adverbs, phrase:

Mar., 7, 22: Quis est..tam nihil unquam nec de sua nec  
de communi salute cogitans.

1 example occurs with direct and indirect objects, phrase,  
adverb:

Arch., 6, 14: quas ego mihi semper in administranda re  
publica proponens animum..conformabam.

Once with phrase and accusative of duration of time:

Mar., 7, 22: de te dies noctesque cogitans casus...  
extimesco..

Other combinations that occur are: adverb and phrase 4  
times; indirect object and ablative once; indirect object  
and adverb 3 times; indirect object and phrase once. The  
other cases of the participle also occur frequently with  
various combinations of dependent constructions.

#### 4. Transitive Construction.

##### a. Percentage of Transitive Participles.

The clearest and least wavering indication of the verbal force of the participle is its ability to govern a direct object. Of the 834 present participles in the field covered 171 or 20.5% govern direct word objects. 26 others govern complementary clauses or infinitives, In the nominative case 45 out of a total of 164 or 27.4% govern direct word objects, while 4 govern a clause or complementary infinitive. The genitive shows only 38 instances of the present participle, but of these 12 or 31.6% govern word objects, while 1 has a complementary clause and 1 an infinitive. The dative shows 33 word objects out of a total of 119 participles or 27.7%. The dative also governs 1 complementary clause, 2 complementary infinitives, and the only instance of a complete infinitive clause object. The accusative shows a smaller percentage of objects than any case except the ablative (including ablative absolute). Of the 269 accusative participles 55 or 21.13% govern word objects, and 27% if we include the 2 clause objects and 13 complementary infinitives. The ablative

(exclusive of ablative absolute) shows 4 participles with objects out of 25, or 16%. The ablative governs only word objects here. Out of a total of 232 the ablative absolute governs but 22 word objects, 9½%. In one instance the ablative absolute governs a complementary clause.

## b. Complementary Expressions.

### 1. Word Object.

Of the 171 instances of the present participle with direct word object, 28 verbs furnish 96 instances. The following participles occur twice with direct objects: revocans, proponens, imponens, audiens, tenens, legens, spectans, timens, retinens, accusans, adpetens, metuens, sperans, cupiens. The following occur 3 times: faciens, defendens, exspectans, quaerens, intuens. The following are found 4 times: agens, occultans, sentiens. Suspicans occurs 5 times, ferens 6, cogitans 7, petens 7, molliens 7, gerens 9.

It is not difficult to account for the rather frequent occurrence of certain participles with an object. In 6 cases out of 9 gerens governs "bellum" as its object:

Phil. V, 1, 3: Nihil est profecto, quod possit dari  
bellum gerenti

In the other instances it governs "negotium", Phil. II,  
25, 63; "consulatum", Sest., 16, 36, "rem", Sull. 20, 56.

Ferens governs "suffragium" twice, "lex" twice:

dom., 28, 75: cum te, P. Lentule, legem de me ferente,  
populus Romanus...vidit..Also har, resp., 28, 48.

Sest., 26, 57: eisdem operis suffragium ferentibus est  
rogatum. Also Piso., 24, 57.

In the other 2 instances ferens governs "soelus et facinus,"  
Milo., 16, 43; "condicioes" Phil. XIII, 17, 36.

Petens governs an elective office 5 times out of 7,  
"consulatum" (3), "aedilitatem" (2) as:

Muren., 3, 7: Nihil tibi consulatum petenti a me deficit.  
Also ibid., 33, 68; har. resp., 20, 43.

Plano., 5, 13: reddam tibi istam aedilitatem etiam  
neglegenter petenti. Also Sest., 55, 118.

As one would expect sentiens and cogitans usually govern neuter pronouns or adjectives. Sentiens occurs twice with "idem" as object, twice with "unum et idem":

Phil. III, 13, 32: magnum numen unum et idem sentientis senatus. Also Cat., IV, 9, 19.

Phil. XIII, 17, 36: non posse eos sibi parcere idem sentienti. ibid., 17, 36.

Cogitans occurs twice with "haec" (once coordinated with "alia"), 3 times with "nihil":

Sest., 22, 49: Haec ego et alia cogitans hoc videbam.

Phil. X, 4, 8: hunc videbam nihil nisi de pace cogitantem.

Agens governs "aliquid", "nihil," "aliud" (each once):

Piso., 10, 22: Quis te sobrium, quis agentem aliquid vidit? Cluent., 64, 179, Phil. XI, 9, 20.

Once with "gratias":

Sest., 55, 117: Ei manibus passis gratias agentes benivolentiam declararunt.

## 2. Complementary Clause.

The present participle in the field covered governs a complementary subjunctive clause in 6 instances, and an infinitive clause once. The examples follow arranged by cases:

Nominative governing indirect question:

Flaco., 22, 53: cum quidem idem hic mihi Maeandrius...  
 aderat ~~subiciens quid in~~ subiciens quid in suos civis..  
 dicerem.

Genitive governing indirect questions:

leg. agr. II, 34, 94: quae concursatio percountantium  
 quid praetor edixisset, ubi cenaret, quo denuntiasset!

Dative with indirect question:

Milo., 9, 26: M. Favonio quaerenti ex eo, qua spe fureret  
 Milone vivo, respondit...

Also with infinitive clause:

Plano., 42, 103: Nolite..iis...dare laetitiam gloriantibus  
 vos eius hostis exstitisse.

The accusative introduces a new type of clause:

Milo., 34, 92: timidos atque supplices et, ut vivere  
 liceat, obsecrantis etiam odisse solemus.

Piso., 41, 99: nec te minus libenter metuentem videbo  
 ne reus fias.

The ablative absolute governs an indirect question:

Phil. II, 26, 64: Expectantibus omnibus quisnam esset tam impius.

### 3. Complementary Infinitive.

There are 19 instances of the participle governing a complementary infinitive. "Cupiens" appears 8 times, "conans" 2, "incipiens" 2.

The nominative participle governs a complementary infinitive 3 times (all instances of "cupiens").

Phil. IX, 3, 6: At ille mandata vestra conficere cupiens perseveravit. Also Ligar., 1, 3; Deiot., 3, 7.

The genitive occurs once with complementary infinitives:

Phil., XI, 2, 4: Alteri se Brutus obiecit impetumque furentis atque omnia diveare ac diripere cupientis conligavit.

The dative governs a complementary infinitive in 2 instances: (both examples of "cupiens").

Phil. II, 22, 53: Tu princeps C. Caesari omnia perturbare cupienti causam belli...dedisti. Also: Phil. V, 7, 20.

The accusative occurs 13 times with complementary infinitive:

Lael., 28, 66: cur Licinium fugere conantem manus ista de manibus amiserit.

Also: Piso., 24, 57; Cael., 24, 60; Milo., 1, 1; Sest. 69, 144; Phil. V, 16, 44; Cat. I, 1, 3; Planc. 41, 100; Phil. XIII, 17, 36; Phil. XIV, 12, 33; Phil. IX, 4, 9; Piso., 24, 57; Phil. X, 9, 18.

## 5. Indirect Object.

There are 31 participles with indirect objects, distributed as follows: 10 in nominative, 16 in accusative, 5 in ablative absolute. 8 govern both direct and indirect objects; *imponens* is used twice in this construction, *proponens* twice, while the other verbs represented are compounds of *fero*.

Phil. V, 14, 38: cum Antonio diadema Caesari imponente se avertit... Also Phil. XIII, 8, 17.

Arch., 6, 14: quas ego mihi semper in administranda re publica proponens animum..conformabam.

Also Milo., 16, 43.

Phil. II, 20, 49: cum te ultro mihi idem illud deferentem numquam sim adhortatus.

*Inferens* in Flacc., 2, 5; *offerens* Planc., 10, 24; *perferens*, Ligar., 3, 7.

In these 8 examples then only 2 simple verbs are represented, *pono* and *fero*.

23 verbs govern indirect objects alone; they are diffido (4), consulo (3), minitor (2), gratificor, renuo, fido, studeo, immineo, adsentio, despero, impendeo, obsisto, resisto, inhio, repugno, praesideo, insidior.

Diffidens in all 4 instances governs "rebus" modified by a possessive pronoun as:

Piso., 41, 99: diffidentem tuis rebus...videre te volui, also *ibid.*, 36, 89; *imp. Pomp.*, 9, 23; *Cluent.*, 7, 20.

## 6. Modifiers of the Participle.

### a. Adverb.

There are 105 present participles qualified by adverbs. The ablative case (exclusive of absolute) shows but <sup>1</sup> adverbial modifier, while the genitive has only 3 instances of this construction. 2 of the genitives are instances of "merens" modified by "bene" and "optime", and 1 an example of sentiens qualified by "bene": *Phil. III*, 14, 36; *Phil. V*, 11, 28; *ibid.*, 13, 36.

The participle is qualified by various kinds of adverbs.

Time:

*Cael.*, 32, 79: hunc nunc primum florecentem pervertere.

*Caecin.*, 8, 22: iam ingrediens intra finem eius loci,

Duration of time:

Ligar., 1, 2: cum diu recusans nihil profecisset,

Repetition:

Phil. V, 9, 24: qui illum ferre potuissent semper  
poscentem....

Comparison of two periods:

Quir., 6, 15: collega eius...primo non adversante.  
post etiam adiuvante

Degree:

Piso., 34, 83: eum...multum dubitantem confirmasti.

Balb., 13, 30: nullam esse gentem tam dissidentem a  
populo Romano...

Distance:

Piso., 23, 54: te..non longe a porta..errantem...

Place:

Milo., 1, 3: quos undique intuentis,..videtis

Vatin., 9, 21: hominem certe nusquam progredientem

Manner:

Phil. XII, 11, 27: Memini colloquia cum gravissime  
dissidentibus civibus.

Phil. XII, 3, 7: urbi fortissime conanti e manibus est ereptus Antonius.

Emphatic Adverbial Particles:

Sest., 30, 64: qui me ne iacentem quidem protexerunt.

Phil. XI, 9, 20: Quis potest refragari non modo non retenti. verum etiam recusanti?

b. Subordinate Conjunction.

There are 5 present participles introduced by subordinate conjunctions in the field covered. "Nisi" introduces a participle in 4 instances, dative once, accusative twice, ablative absolute once:

Flanc., 30, 72: id accidere nisi forti viro et pugnanti comminus non potest.

dom., 23, 59: quem nemo nisi lacrimantem confectumque vidit.

Sull., 26, 74: Postea vero quis P. Sullam nisi maerentem, demissum, affictumque vidit?

Mar., 10, 32: Nisi te salvo et in ista sententia manente salvi esse non possumus.

"Si non" qualifies a participle in the ablative absolute:

Milo., 12, 32: quibus si non adiuvantibus at coniventibus  
certe speraret se posse eludere.

### c. Phrase.

The participle is qualified by a phrase in 113 instances. All cases are well represented except the ablative (exclusive of ablative absolute) 2, and genitive 4. Of the phrases dependent upon genitive participles 2 are "de re publica" modifying "merens": Phil. V, 13, 36; *ibid.*, 11, 28. The other examples in the genitive are:

Cat. IV, 6, 11: versatur mihi ante oculos aspectus Cethegi  
et furor in vestra caede bacchantis.

Ligar., 5, 14: cave te fratrum pro fratris salute  
obsecrantium misereat!

The 2 ablative examples, 1 modified by 2 phrases:

Cael., 5, 12: ex contrariis et inter se pugnantibus  
studiis...

Rabir., 7, 21: se cum..ceteris ad mortem propter vitae turpitudinem confugientibus congregare..

The nominative participle is qualified by a phrase in 32 instances, dative 22, accusative 4<sup>1</sup>, ablative absolute 12. It is unnecessary to go into further detail with reference to this construction.

#### d. Ablative.

There are 46 modifying ablatives distributed as follows: Nominative 16, genitive 1, dative 3, accusative 22, ablative absolute 4. Various ablative constructions are represented:

##### Means:

Flaoc., 15, 36: Laelio..vi legis..terrenti nihil scripsisse videantur.

##### Manner:

Phil. V, 3, 8: non modo tonante Iove sed prope caelesti clamore prohibente...

##### Accordance:

Planc., 23, 56: me pugnantem more meo pristino non videbitis.

## Cause:

Balb., 25, 56: ut aliqui sermones hominum alienis bonis  
maerentium permanarent.

## Specification:

Muren., 17, 36: Q. Catulum humanitate antecellentem..

## Separation:

Phil. III, 10, 25: P. Naso, omni carnis cupiditate...

## Place from Which:

Milo., 18, 48: quem Clodius Roma proficiscens reliquerat  
morientem.

## e. Locative.

There are but 2 instances of locatives  
dependent on the present participle:

Piso., 37, 91: tu Ambraciae sedens...

Milo., 7, 16: cum P. Africano domi suae quiescenti illa  
nocturna vis esset illata.

## f. Limit of Motion.

In 2 instances the present participle is qualified by an accusative denoting limit of motion:

Scaur., 6, 10: Arinem..proficiscentem Romam negotium dedisse liberto...

Planc., 14, 33: cum ille... domum decedens rogasset Granium.

## g. Duration of Time.

There are 4 participles (2 each in nominative and accusative) qualified by accusatives of duration of time:

Mar., 7, 22: de te dies noctesque cogitans casus... extimesco..

Muren., 37, 78: audite consulem..totos dies atque noctes de re publica cogitantem.

Also: Deiot., 13, 38: Vatin., 11, 26.

It is interesting to note that in all 4 instances of the above construction the participle is "cogitans."

## B. DISCUSSION.

### 1. Temporal Value of the Present Participle.

In his discussion of the temporal force of the Latin present participle Dr. Marouzeau refers several times to Kühner (*Ausf. Gramm. II*), and in general his views seem to coincide with those of the German grammarian. In some few points, however, Kühner seems to give a better exposition of the facts in the case.

Dr. Marouzeau (*L'Emploi du Part...p. 7*) makes this statement: "If it is true that the present participle expresses action under an imperfect or durative aspect, it follows that the participial action may normally project beyond the duration of the principal action so that in some cases it is not only simultaneous, but also anterior or posterior." This statement, if left unqualified, would give the impression that this is an unusual phenomenon, whereas it is really the common thing; and that the contemporaneous aspect of the present participle is less persistent than the facts indicate.

Marouzeau gives the following example:

Ph., 615-616: id quidem agitans mecum sedulo

Inveni...remedium huic rei,

and quotes M. Tammelin (De partic. prisc. latinis., diss. Helsingf., 1889, p. 22) to the effect that "in order to avoid giving to 'agitans' the value of an aoristic participle it is necessary to explain it as the equivalent of 'agitando'." But the mere fact that the gerund (expressing the method by which the result is achieved), conveys the thought perfectly indicates that there is a very close temporal relation between the two actions (principal and participial). It is true that the "deliberation" had been progressing some time before the "remedy" was found, but it would be absurd to say that the participial action was definitely completed before the transpiring of the principal action.

Kühner (Ausf. Gramm. II, 136) says in this connection: "Only apparently is the present participle employed for a completed action as: 'Offendi adveniens', not 'when I had arrived', but 'when I arrived', 'on my arrival'; the subordinate action is still in close relationship with the action of the principal verb."

The writer has noted but two instances of this apparent priority of action in the Ciceronian field covered:

Piso., 36, 89: inde te reicipiens in villa Euchadiae  
iacuisti, = cum te reciperes.

Muren., 20, 42: habuit proficiscens dilectum in Umbria,  
= cum proficisceretur.

We may render "on your withdrawal," "on the way",  
The two actions (principal and participial) in each case  
are in the same general "temporal scene", and the parti-  
ciples merely play the role of situation clauses for  
principal verbs used absolutely.

As another example of the anterior force of  
the present participle Marouzeau cites:

Sall. Jug., 113, 1: Hæc..diu volvens tandem promisit.

Strange to say he neglects to remark in this connection  
the analogy of this use of the participle to that of the  
present indicative with iam pridem, iam diu, etc. Kühner  
(Ausf. Gramm. II, 136) cites this same example, and refers  
to his discussion of the indicative (Ausf. Gramm., 31, 4)  
where he says: "The present often denotes actions which  
in themselves actually belong to the past, but at the same  
time they extend into the present, or in their consequences  
they continue to have force in the present. Thus in

connection with past adverbs of time denoting the stage of the action, iam pridem, iam dudum." In such an example as the above the two actions (participial and principal) are so closely united psychologically that one can not say "here the one action leaves off and the other begins."

In another example cited by Marouzeau: Sall. Cat., 32, 1: Multa volvens...prefectus est, it is impossible to see anything but concomitance.

Kühner (Ausf., Gramm. II, 136, 4) also makes the statement: "Not until later are there certain indications that the writer has no scruples about employing the present participle to denote an action that is past with reference to the principal action, the exact equivalent of a perfect active.

Verg. A. I, 305: At pius Aeneas per noctem plurima volvens, ut primum lux alma datast exire.

This use becomes common in late Latin."

The Latin present participle then persistently expresses contemporaneous action, and no instance is cited from Ciceronian Latin of a present participle employed in a clearly aoristic sense.

## 2. Frequency of the Nominative Participle.

In connection with his discussion of the participle in agreement with the subject (see p. 23), Marouzeau says: "The statement is commonly made that the Latin present participle is rarely employed in the nominative singular. Quite the contrary holds true, as, from Plautus to Cicero, the participle is connected more often with the subject than with the object." I have been unable to find a grammatical statement to the effect that "the Latin present participle is rarely employed in the nominative singular." Nutting (Prose Composition, p. 8, foot-note) makes the statement that the present participle is rarely to be employed in the nominative case. He is justified in his proscription of the free use of the present participle as regards Latin composition, but his discrimination against the nominative in particular is not borne out by the facts.

This statement, however, occurs in Hale and Buck's Grammar 250: "In prose the substantive uses of the adjective and participle are confined within certain limits, as follows: I. In the singular: a) The masculine of the

participle is freely used in any case except the nominative and vocative, and in any construction. c) The masculine nominative of either the adjective or the participle is rare in prose, unless modified by a pronoun. II. In the plural: a) The masculine of either the adjective or the participle is freely used in any case and in any construction." Lane makes the statement: "The present participle is rarely a substantive in the nominative and ablative singular, but often in the other cases." Similar statements with regard to the participial substantive may be found in other school grammars.

It is true, as Dr. Marouzeau says, that the facts utterly disprove any statement to the effect that the participle is rarely employed in the nominative singular. However, statistics from a wider Ciceronian field than that covered by Marouzeau show that the nominative participle does not occur so often as the accusative. The writer's table above shows 161 nominative participles to 259 accusative. Of these 161 nominative examples 132 are singular, while only 29 are plural. The nominative singular then, far from being discriminated against, is a very popular form indeed.

### 3. "Adverbial" Use of the Present Participle.

Marouzeau states (p. 26) that one of the oldest uses of the nominative participle is adverbial, and that certain participles have become fixed in this adverbial function, as *lubens*, *sciens*. He neglects to state however that this so-called adverbial use is not confined to the nominative case, nor does he make a careful distinction between this usage and the clearly participial one. It is not enough to say that at times *sciens* and *lubens*, demand an adverbial rendering in our language, and at other times a clearly participial one, without noting the discrimination in meaning that underlies these demands. (Marouzeau, of course, can not mean that *sciens* and *lubens* are real adverbs; for these forms are never used except when the syntax demands a singular). Compare the following examples:

Mar., 5, 14: ut prudens et sciens tamquam ad interitum ruerem voluntarium

Milo., 10, 29: feocerunt id servi Milonis..nec imperante, nec sciente..domino. also Cluent., 46, 129.

In the first example "sciens" does not postulate knowledge of any definite fact, but merely indicates that the agent

performs the action of the principal verb by a deliberate effort of the will. This use of "sciens" is analogous to our "wittingly." In the second example on the other hand "sciente" denotes actual knowledge of a definite fact, and we render the ablative absolute "neither on the order nor with the knowledge of their master."

Sciens in this so-called adverbial use occurs in the accusative and ablative as well as in the nominative. However, in each case it qualifies the agent whether expressed in nominative, subject of infinitive, or ablative of agent.

All instances found by writer follow:

Cael., 21, 53: sciens tu aurum ad facinus dedisti.

har. resp., 18, 38: Quis enim ante te sacra illa vir sciens viderat?

Also in nominative: Caecin., 25, 71; Cluent., 46, 129  
Mar., 5, 14.

In accusative:

Rab. Post., 9, 24: Plane confiteor fieri nihil posse dementius quam scientem in eum locum venire.

Balb., 5, 13: Hunc foedera scientem neglexisse dicere audebit?

Also in accusative: Balb., 5, 13; *ibid.*, 5, 13.

In Ablative:

Sull., 31, 86: nullum a me sciente facinus occultari.

Lubens occurs but 4 times in the field covered.

Once "adverbially":

Milo., 14, 38: cum totius Italiae concursus...facti  
illius gloriam lubens agnovisset.

In one instance it seems clearly participial:

leg. Agr. II, 18, 49: quam ego, etsi libente illo, tamen  
absente illo per vos consecutus sum.

In the other instances it is adjectival:

har. resp., 5, 11: libenti animo...parebo,

Also Cluent., 2, 6.

There is also one example of tacens employed in this  
"adverbial"sense:

har. resp., 4, 7: cum mihi stanti tacens minaretur,

- "silently" or "by dumb show."

#### 4. The Participle Qualified by Adverb or Conjunction.

In discussing the modifiers of the present participle Dr. Marouzeau makes two statements that are rather remarkable in face of the facts: "Sallust is the first to employ the participle accompanied by particles, adverbs or subordinate conjunctions, but this use increases with the progress of the literary language toward the end of the classic and in the imperial epoch." And again: "Only Sallust joins to an oblique participle an adverb or a conjunction." An example cited by Marouzeau himself disproves both these statements:

Bg., VIII, 15, 6: Datur petentibus venia, dissuadente primo Vercingetorige, post concedente.

These misstatements can not be accounted for on the ground of insufficient data, as in speeches of Cicero covered by Marouzeau the writer has found a number of instances of both the nominative and oblique cases of the participle qualified by adverbs and subordinate conjunctions:

Ligar., 1, 2: cum diu recusans nihil profecisset

Cat., IV, 3, 6: obscurus serpens multas iam provincias

occupavit.

Mar., 10, 32: Nisi te salvo et in ista sententia..  
manente salvi esse non possumus.

Ligar., 1, 2: Habes igitur..confitentem reum, sed tamen  
hoc confitentem.

Cat., I, 2, 5: ducem hostium intra moenia...videmus  
intestinam aliquam cotidie perniciem rei publicae  
molientem. ibid., 1, 3: mediocriter labefactantem.

Cat., II, 1, 1: Videor enim mihi videre hanc urbem..  
subito uno incendio concidentem

The table on p. 58 indicates the free use of the adverb with the participle in the oblique cases. As regards conjunctions the participle (in each instance in an oblique case) is introduced 4 times by "nisi", once by "si non." Planc., 30, 72; dom., 23, 59; Sull., 26, 74; Mar., 10, 32; Milo., 12, 32.

## 5. The Accusative Participle with Verbs of Perception.

One of the most important uses of the Latin present participle is that in which it modifies the object of verbs of perception and the operation of the senses. Dr. Marouzeau says in this connection: "Dependent upon a verb of perception, the participle alternates with the infinitive. But of the two constructions the participle is the more ancient." And again: "If the participle has persisted it is because the possibility of a double construction provided in Latin, always careful of distinctions, a means of expressing subtle shades of meaning. In general the participle expresses simply an attitude which one notes almost indifferently:

Bac., 968: Sed Priamum astantem eecum ante portam video,

While the infinitive announces a fact of essential import:"

But in conclusion Dr. Marouzeau says: "Meanwhile the participle continued to be employed, without doubt owing to a distinction as in the case of "facere", between two meanings of the introductory verb; "videre", "to see", or "to remark"; "audire", "to hear", or "to hear said",

but especially because the literary language tends to reinstate the participle in all its uses."

Dr. Marouzeau then commits himself to two wholly different bases of distinction between the infinitive and the participle after verbs of perception. The second, based upon different meanings of the introductory verb, is practically the same as that made by Gildersleeve: "The participle is used after verbs of perception and representation to express the actual condition of the object of perception or representation." And in notes on pages 331 and 338: "The naturalization of this construction is due to Cicero and other students of Greek models. The poverty of Latin in participles was a serious drawback to the convenient distinction from the infinitive; and it may be said that the participle was never perfectly at home." "As there is no present participle passive the infinitive must be used, and thus the difference between intellectual and actual perception is effaced even in the active."

Gildersleeve's statement that "the naturalization of this construction is due to Cicero and other students of Greek models" deserves some attention. Dr. Marouzeau (p. 41 seq.), after making the statement that the participle is the older of the two constructions,

continues: "Comparison with the other participles clearly indicates this. The constructions 'dixit...facturum, factum, faciendum' are primitive, and their union with esse to constitute an infinitive is of relatively recent date. But even as early as Plautus, the infinitive is much more frequent than the participle with 'video' (3 to 1), and it is almost exclusively employed with 'audio' (2 examples only of the participle). The progress of the infinitive is due to analogy: 'dico eum legere - 'video eum legere'." And again Marouzeau makes the statement: "Besides this ability to express a certain shade of meaning, the infinitive construction has another advantage in Plautus; the infinitive may have an object, while the transitive use of the participle in Plautus is very rare. In fact, in a number of cases this is the only consideration which can explain the choice of the infinitive."

In Terence there are 5 instances only of the participle after "video", none after "audio". The few examples from Varro show that he employs the participle with both verbs. The participle is the rule in Sallust with both verbs. In Lucretius the participle is employed with "cerno" as well as "video", in Catullus with "video", "audio", "prospecto", Caesar and Nepos both employ the participle with "video" and "conspicio."

The writer has made no collection of infinitive examples, and it would be hardly possible to arrive at any definite conclusion with regard to the relative antiquity of the infinitive and participle in this construction without such statistics. However the attitude of Plautus and Terence toward the use of the participle after verbs of perception, and the persistent increase in scope of this construction tend to indicate that it developed later than the infinitive.

The distinction between the infinitive and participle after "audio" is well-defined.— "audio eum venientem" = "I hear him <sup>(ACTUALLY)</sup> coming". With "video" however and kindred verbs of seeing the distinction is not always so clear. On perceiving the approach of some person one may remark either "video eum venire" or "video eum venientem", "I see that he is coming" or "I see him coming", and the ordinary hearer makes no subtle distinction. An example from Cicero seems to indicate that he did not always recognize a clear demarcation between the infinitive and participle here, for he correlates the rival constructions in:

Cat. IV, 6, 12: Cum vero mihi proposui regnantem Lentulum,...

purpuratum esse huic Gabinium, cum exercitu venisse  
Catilinam....

Dr. Marouzeau cites the above example to illustrate the extension in the use of the participle after verbs of perception, but fails to remark the coordination of participle and infinitive.

If there is any definite distinction between the use of the participle and that of the infinitive after "video" and kindred verbs, it does not seem to be that drawn by Marouzeau, at least so far as Cicero is concerned. Of 41 examples of verbs of perception, namely video (37), intueor (2), prospicio (1), aspicio (1) collected by the writer the participle in practically all instances expresses an essential fact, not a mere attitude. The writer can cite but one example where the participial action seems clearly to be of little import:

Vatin., 7, 16: de quibus duos praetextatos sedentis vides.

The distinction in many cases must be subjective, and there are a very few other instances which someone else might class with the example above. In the great majority of examples, however, the importance of the participial action

is clearly indicated, and it's choice seems to rest rather on Marouzeau's second basis of distinction and that given by Gildersleeve (see above), that the participle is used to express the "actual condition of the object of perception or representation."

Note the following examples:

Cat., Iv, 6, 11: Videor enim mihi videre hanc urbem..  
subito uno incendio concidentem.

Planc., 39, 94: cum videam navem secundis ventis cursum  
tenentem suum...

Piso., 10, 22: Quis te sobrium, quis agentem aliquid..vidit?

Phil., XIV, 10, 27: qui fugientem vidit Antonium.

Deiot., 9, 26: Deiotarum saltantem quisquam aut ebrium  
vidit unquam? (In this example and Piso., 10, 22 above  
note the correlation of the participle with an adjective).

Sull., 26, 74: Postea vero quis P. Sullam nisi maerentem,  
demissum, affliotumque vidit? (Note that the participle  
is introduced by "nisi").

Piso., 41, 99: circumspectantem omnia, quicquid increpuiisset,  
pertimescentem, diffidentem tuis rebus,...horrentem,  
tremantem, adulantem omnis videre te volui.

The verbs of perception employed with the participle before Cicero, as noted by Marouzeau, are video, audio, cerno, prospecto, conspicio. Cicero extends the use to other verbs of perception and representation. We find in the field covered video (37), intueor (2), prospicio (1), aspicio (1), propono (1), pono (2), audio (1), attendo (1).

Cael., 24, 59: me intuens flentem. Also Sest. 9, 20.

har. resp., 28, 62: Haec eadem profecto, quae prospiciamus impendentia, pertimescetis.

Sull., 6, 20: neque eosdem Marcellos pro huius periculis lacrimantes aspicere...potui.

Cat., IV, 6, 12: Cum vero mihi proposui regnantem Lentulum,...

Phil. XIII, 2, 4: Ora vobis eorum ponite ante oculos... latera terentis alios, alios praegredientes amicos.  
Also leg. Agr. II, 20, 53.

Sull., 11, 33: me de invidiosis rebus..dicentem attendite.

Phil. II, 5, 10: ut me pro me dicentem benigne..audiatis.

It is interesting to compare with this last example:

Muren., 37, 78: audite consulem...totos dies atque noctes  
de re publica cogitantem!

where the participle is merely descriptive of the object  
and does not represent the content of hearing.

Marouzeau among his verbs of perception cites:

Ligar., 4, 10: Arguis fatentem.

and neglects to note the context. A few lines before we  
find the sentence: "Habet igitur, quod est accusatori  
maxime optandum, confitentem reum" - "You have then the  
thing which a prosecuting attorney most desires, a  
defendant who confesses." In "Arguis fatentem" then  
"arguo" is used in its sense of "accuse", and the example  
does not enter into this consideration.

## 6. Participle in Lieu of Clause.

Dr. Marouzeau (p. 30) makes this statement: "It is when the two actions (participial and principal) are connected with the same person, that the participle is more apt to stand in lieu of a clause, conditional, concessive, causal, etc." And again (on p. 33): "When the two actions (principal and participial) are connected, the one with the subject, the other with the oblique cases, they are more independent of each other, and it is rare in this case that the participle can be considered the equivalent of a clause." Dr. Marouzeau evidently does not include the ablative absolute in the oblique cases, as he treats that construction under a separate heading. It goes without saying that the ablative absolute, with or without a participle, plays the role of various kinds of clauses.

The genitive participle, it is true, seems very seldom to take the place of any clause other than relative. The writer has found but one instance of another force:

Dom., 38, 101: Sp. Maeli regnum adpetentis domus est complanata, - (may be interpreted as causal.)

Dative and accusative participles, however, may rather frequently be interpreted as subordinate clauses. The matter is of course a more or less subjective one, but the writer has found that in a large number of cases one may translate the oblique participle by a clause without forcing the sense. This is especially true with regard to the temporal clause. The following examples, in the writer's opinion, are clearly playing the role of subordinate clauses:

Temporal:

dom., 43, 14: hoc si quis tibi aedificanti illam porticum diceret.

Piso., 7, 15: quae enim L. Catilinam conantem consul prohibui.

Also: Cat. II, 1, 1; har. resp., 26, 56; Mar., 6, 16.

conditional:

Planc., 30, 72: id accidere nisi forti viro et pugnanti comminus non potest.

imp. Pomp., 13, 39: sed ne cupienti quidem cuiquam permittitur,

## Adversative:

Flacc., 15, 36: Laelio..vilegis, iure accusationis...  
terrenti...nihil scripsisse videantur.

Cat. I, 2, 6: Multorum te etiam oculi et aures non  
sentientem...speculabuntur atque custodient.

Also Arch., 10, 26; Balb., 4, 10.

## Causal:

Cluent., 13, 36: longum est dicere mihi, praesertim ad  
 alia properanti.

Phil. XII, 12, 29: nam Martiam et quartam nihil cogitantis  
 praeter dignitatem comprobaturos esse certo scio.

In such an example as the following it is difficult to  
 determine whether the dominant force is adversative, or  
 causal:

Cat. 1, 1, 3: P. Scipio, pontifex maximus, Ti. Gracchum  
 mediocriter laebefactantem statum rei publicae privatus  
 interfecit.

## 7. Participle Coordinated with Other Expressions.

Cicero coordinates the present participle with various other forms of expression. Present Participle and adjective:

Piso., 30, 74: timidus ac tremens

Present Participle and adjective in -bundus:

dom., 52, 134: si dixit aliquid verbis haesitantibus,  
postemque tremibunda manu tetigit.

cf. Piso., 33, 82: tremētibz labris.

Present Participle and phrase:

Phil. II, 28, 68: te neque vigilantem neque in somnis  
credo posse mente consistere

Present and past participles

Phil. XII, 1, 2: qui nullam pacem probaret nisi cum cedente  
atque victo.

Present and past participles and infinitive:

Phil. VII, 1, 1: qui senatum dolent ad auctoritatis  
pristinæ spem revirescere, coniunctum huic ordini populum  
Romanum, conspirantem Italiam,

### 8. Accumulation of Participles in the Sentence.

Cicero does not hesitate after once committing himself to the construction to pile up participles in a sentence. As many as six are found depending upon one verb of perception:

Piso., 41, 99: circumspectantem omnia..pertimescentem,  
diffidentem tuis rebus,..horrentem, tremetem, adulantem  
omnis videre te volui.

The writer has noted in passing about forty sentences which contain two or more present participles, but no account has been kept of all such instances. In many the participle occurs in several case forms:

Cael., 24, 59: cum me intuens flentem significabat  
interruptis ac morientibus vocibus...

### 9. Frequent Occurrence of Certain Verbs in the Present Participle.

Certain verbs seem more prone than others to appear as present participles. The writer has made a count

of the occurrences of each individual verb in the field covered, and has come to the conclusion that this frequency of certain participles is due to the more extended use of their verbs in certain relations rather than to popularity of the participle itself. The fact that "audiens" appears 18 times in a list of 834 participles seems a bit surprising at first, but in 13 instances "audiens" is used in the ablative absolute as an almost stereotyped expression which an orator might feel called upon to employ rather frequently.

Fiso., 33, 81: quod vobis audientibus saepe iam dixi.

Phil. V, 8, 21: qui audiente populo Romano dixerit.

Analogous to "audiens" is the use of "inspectans" which occurs 20 times, in each instance in the ablative absolute. In 7 instances the expression is "vobis inspectantibus", in 4 "inspectante populo Romano", and one may feel rather safe in concluding that Cicero regarded such expressions as somewhat stereotyped.

Phil. II, 36, 92: Inspectantibus vobis toto Capitolio tabulae figebantur.

Phil. III, 5, 12: Quo enim ille die populo Romano inspectante est contionatus.

"Accusans" (employed 9 times) one might expect to find frequently in the speeches of a pleader. "Cogitans" (employed 13 times) appears 4 times in a highly rhetorical phrase "dies atque noctes cogitans". "Cupiens" appears a rather surprising number of times (13), and in 8 instances it is completed by an infinitive.

In view of the frequent occurrence of the verb "dico" in general one might expect to find "dicens" employed more frequently than it is in the field covered (9 times).

"Sentiens" with its compounds, "adsentiens", "consentiens", "dissentiens" occurs 28 times, but these too one would expect to encounter frequently in forensic speeches.

"Refero" occurs 13 times, in every instance in the ablative absolute, the formula of bringing business before the senate.

Muren., 32, 57: Dixisti senatus consultum me referente esse factum.

"Sciens" is employed 12 times, in 10 instances in its so-called adverbial use.

The writer, of course, has no idea that these suggestions will be considered at all conclusive, but merely indicative of a line of investigation that it might prove

profitable to pursue in connection with the use of the present participle. In addition to the verbs tabulated below 174 verbs occur but once each in the field covered.

Verbs That Occur Twice or More.

abiens	2	conivens	3	errans	2
accusans	9	consentiens	5	expectans	4
adiuvans	7	conspirans	3	exultans	6
admirans	2	consulens	5	faciens	3
adpetens	3	cupiens	13	ferens	7
adprobans	2	decedens	8	flagitans	5
adsentiens	2	defendens	7	flagrans	5
adveniens	4	deprecans	6	flens	10
adversans	2	desperans	2	floreus	5
aestuans	2	dicens	9	fugiens	7
agens	10	diffidens	4	fureus	9
ardens	3	dimicans	2	gemens	3
audiens	18	dissentiens	11	gerens	9
cedens	5	dissidens	3	haesitans	4
cogitans	13	dormiens	3	iacens	11
conans	5	dubitans	4	imminens	3
confitens	5	egrediens	4	impendens	10

imperans	6	obsecrans	2	quiescens	2
implorans	3	occultans	4	reclamans	2
imponens	2	offerens	2	recusans	5
incipiens	2	opinans	4	rediens	6
iniens	8	oppugnans	2	redundans	2
ingrediens	4	oriens	2	referens	13
inquirens	2	oscitans	2	regnans	4
inspectans	20	parans	2	repetens	3
intuens	6	percunctans	2	repugnans	13
invehens	2	petens	13	resistens	2
labens	2	pollicens	2	retinens	2
laborans	4	poscens	3	rogans	8
lacrumans	6	postulans	9	sciens	12
libens	2	praecipitans	6	sedens	12
lugens	4	praeteriens	2	sentiens	10
madens	2	proficiscens	7	spectans	4
maerens	10	progrediens	2	sperans	2
manens	3	prohibens	3	spirans	4
merens	4	properans	3	stans	15
metuens	3	proponens	2	studens	2
minans	2	prospiciens	2	suspicans	5
minitans	4	providens	2	tacens	7
moliens	8	pugnans	7	tenens	3
moriens	5	quaerens	4	timens	5
negans	2	querens	2	tremens	3

triumphans	4
veniens	5
videns	4
vigilans	3
volitans	2

## II. The Participial Adjective.

### A. Tabulation of Adjectives for 48 Speeches.

The tabulation below includes all participial forms (with exceptions noted below) which impressed the writer as clearly adjectival in force. No count has been kept of "adulescens" or "sapiens," as either adjective or substantive. It has not seemed worth while to include "absens" and "praesens" in the tabulation of adjectives or substantives. "Praesens" moreover has abandoned the meaning of "praesum", and has assumed that of "adsum." The writer has merely noted the frequency of occurrence of "absens" and "praesens" without separating adjective from substantive uses, or attributive from predicative. "Absens" occurs 52 times in the field covered, "praesens" 86. Compared forms (of type amantior, amantissimus) and forms with prefix (of type innocens) occur 148 and 110 times respectively.

Forms that appear only as adjective or substantive are marked with an asterisk. Under predicative adjectives have been included some few predicate accusatives.

Adjective	Attributive	Predicative	Total
*abhorrens	4	1	5
*abstinens	0	1	1
*abundans	2	0	2
adfluens	2	0	2
*adrogans	1	4	5
*amans	2	0	2
appetens	1	2	3
ardens	5	0	5
*(dioto) audiens	0	2	2
*confidens	1	2	3
*constans	17	2	19
*continens	1	1	2
*diligens	4	5	9
*distans	1	0	1
dormiens	1	0	1
*egens	12	1	13
*eloquens	1	0	1
eminens	1	0	1
*excellens	20	0	20

Adjective	Attributive	Predicative	Total
* <i>experiens</i>	1	0	1
<i>flagrans</i>	1	0	1
<i>florens</i>	2	5	7
* <i>fluens</i>	2	0	2
<i>furens</i>	2	1	3
<i>gerens</i>	1	0	1
* <i>intellegens</i>	1	0	1
<i>libens</i>	2	0	2
<i>merens</i>	0	1	1
<i>metuens</i>	1	0	1
* <i>neglegens</i>	0	1	1
* <i>nocens</i>	6	4	10
* <i>oboediens</i>	1	0	1
* <i>observans</i>	1	0	1
<i>oriens</i>	1	0	1
* <i>patiens</i>	2	0	2
* <i>perseverans</i>	0	1	1
* <i>potens</i>	7	2	9
* <i>praecellens</i>	1	0	1
* <i>praestans</i>	15	0	15
* <i>pudens</i>	5	0	5
<i>retinens</i>	0	1	1

Adjective	Attributive	Predicative	Total
sitiens	1	0	1
*temperans	3	0	3
*valens	6	1	7
vigilans	9	0	9
Total	147	38	185

### B. Discussion and Examples.

The writer has in general based the distinction between clearly participial and adjectival uses on the "rule of thumb" given in many grammars that when the participle is used as an adjective it expresses a permanent condition. In some cases however the classification has necessarily been subjective. One must be prepared to make rather subtle distinctions in the case of certain participial forms that appear frequently as adjectives, e. g., "florens," "furens." "Florens" is clearly adjectival in such a sentence as;

Phil. XIII, 16, 33: te videlicet salvum, beatum, florentem esse cupiebant. "Florens" here is as much an adjective as "salvus" or "beatus."

On the other hand "florens" is a real participle in:

Sen. 12, 31: Vos me florentem semper ornastis, laborantem mutatione vestis et prope luctu vestro--defendistis.

There might well be a difference of opinion however with regard to the following example, which the writer has classified as a participle:

Phil. II, 7, 15: senatum illum, qui quondam florens orbi terrarum praesidebat.

With regard to the distinction between clearly participial and adjectival forms Dr. Marouzeau says: "The confusion between the participle and the adjective is of Indo-European date.---In the entire development of Latin as well as of Greek the line of demarcation between adjectival and participial functions has been a wavering one, and the distinction between the two uses was much debated by the old grammarians. This distinction depends ordinarily on the feeling of the reader: one can not determine from the form itself whether such a word as "nocens" has the value of an adjective or a participle, whether it expresses a quality or an action. At the most one can say that the participle is distinguished from the adjective by "the straiter line which unites it with the principal action in such a way that it appears to be attributed to its substantive only temporarily and in accordance with the action indicated by the sentence "(K. Brugmann, Abr. Gr. comp., p. 641).---But this is but an imperfect distinction, considering that inversely the adjective proper may cease to express a specific quality in order to designate the character with which the subject invests it

throughout the duration of the action; one says: 'timidus incedere' just as 'escuriens adve<sup>re</sup>ire'."

Cf. dom., 52, 134: postem tremibunda manu tetigit

with Piso., 33, 82: tremetibus labris.

The adjective and participle in the above examples are equally temporary in force.

There are of course other means of distinguishing participle and adjective in the case of certain words. "Adrogans," "confidens," "diligens" and a few other adjectives have acquired meanings different from those of the original verbs. Certain other adjectives as "amans," "appetens", "metuens," "retinens" govern genitives, while their verbs govern accusatives.

These distinctions can be illustrated only by a more complete tabulation than that given above with examples of clearly participial usage (where such have been found) contrasted with adjectival examples. The forms that do not occur as real participles will be indicated as before by an asterisk. The adjectival example will be given first (with dependent genitives where they occur) and immediately below an example which the writer has considered clearly participial.

\*abhorrens.

Flacc., 4, 9: Nam, si quis unquam de nostris hominibus---  
non abhorrens fuit. Also Sest., 63, 132, Planc., 24, 58; et al.

\*abstinens.

Planc., 26, 64: mercatoribus iustus, mancipibus liberalis,  
sociis abstinens, omnibus eram visus in omni officio  
diligentissimus.

\*abundans.

Phil. II, 27, 66: non illa quidem luxuriosi hominis, sed  
tamen abundantis. Also Mar., 3, 8.

adfluens.

adjective-Cluent., 66, 189: domum illam in perpetuum scelerum  
omnium adfluentem reliquisset. Also leg. agr. II, 30, 82.  
participle-Sest., 8, 18: Alter unguentis adfluens, calamistrata  
coma, despicens conscios stuprorum---

\*adrogans.

har. resp., 8, 16: ne haec praedicatio non grata potius quam  
adrogans videatur.

\*amans.

Cluent., 17, 50: Ego, qui neque illis talibus viris ac tam amantibus mei rem possem ullam negare--

Also Rab. Poet., 16, 43.

appetens.

adjective-imp. Pomp., 3, 7: Et quoniam semper appetentes gloriae--atque avidi laudis fuistis,

Also leg. agr. II, 16, 42; *ibid.*, 8, 20.

participle-dom., 38, 101: Sp. Maeli regnum appetentis domus est complanata. Also Phil. II, 44, 144; Piso., 24, 57.

ardens.

adjective-Planc., 8, 20: hic habuit studia suorum ardentia.

Also Piso., 20, 46; Sest., 54, 116; har. resp., 18, 39.

participle-Milo., 23, 61: qui ingressus in forum ardente curia, Also Phil. V, 16, 42; Phil. IV, 2, 4.

\*(dicta) audiens, an idiom distinct from the ordinary use of audiens, which, of course, is of frequent occurrence.

Deiot., 8, 23: qui dioto audientes in tanta re non fuissent.

Also Phil. VII, 1, 2.

\*confidens.

Cluent., 65, 183: Quodsi aut confidens astutia aut callida esset audacia.

Also Phil. VII, 1, 3; Caecin., 10, 27.

\*constans.

Cluent., 38, 108: qui condemnavit constans existimatur.

Also Sull., 6, 20; Flaco., 36, 89; Cluent., 16, 46; et al.

\*continens.

Caecin., 5, 15: qui fundo eius antiquo continens esset.

Also Piso., 5, 11.

\*diligens.

Cluent., 67, 191: neque in eo solum diligens fuit.

Also Piso., 7, 14; imp. Pomp., 19, 58; leg. agr., 2, 4; et al.

\*distans.

Phil. II, 27, 67: Oceanus videtur res tam distantibus in

locis positas absorbere potuisse.

dormiens.

adjective-Cat. II, 5, 10: hoc vero quis ferre possit inertes homines fortissimis viris insidiari, stultissimos prudentissimis.

ebriosos sobriis, dormientis vigilantibus.

("dormiens" here signifies "inactive" and denotes a permanent characteristic).

participle-Muren., 37, 78: a quo numquam me consule dormientes opprimemini.

\*egens.

Cluent., 26, 70: cum esset egens, audax--

Also Milo., 14, 36; Phil. II, 27, 65; dom., 44, 116; et al.

\*eloquens.

Phil. II, 5, 11: tu homo sapiens, non solum eloquens.

eminens.

adjective-har. resp., 27, 59: aut tam eminentibus canibus  
Soyllam tamque ieiunis, quam quibus istum videtis.

participle-Vatin., 2, 4: Repente enim te tamquam serpens e  
latibulis oculis eminentibus, inflato collo, tumidis cervicibus  
intulisti,

(The context shows the temporary application of "eminens").

\*excellens.

Balb., 5, 13: populi Romani excellens dignitas---

Also Muren., 26, 54; Sest., 41, 88; et al.

\*experiens.

Cluent., 8, 23: vir fortis et experiens et domi nobilis.

flagrans.

adjective-har.resp., 18, 38: coniventes ("blind" in this instance) illos oculos abavi tui magis optandos fuisse quam hos flagrantis sororis.

participle-Sest., 67, 140: hunc flagrantem invidia propter interitum C. Gracchi populus Romanus liberavit.

Also Muren., 31, 65; Flacc., 28, 67; et al.

florens.

adjective-Milo., 34, 93: sint incolumes, sint florentes,

Also Phil. XIII, 16, 33; dom., 19, 49; Sest., 60, 128.

participle-Sen., 12, 31: Vos me florentem semper ornastis, laborantem mutatione vestis et prope luctu vestro--- defendistis.

Also Cluent., 38, 107; Phil. II, 7, 15; et al.

\*fluens.

adjective-Sen., 6, 13: gravibus oculis, fluentibus buccis.  
Same in Liso. 11, 25.

furens.

adjective-Phil. II, 28, 68: quamvis sis vinulentus et  
furens. Also har. resp., 22, 47; *ibid.*, 3, 4.

participle-har. resp., 1, 1: Itaque hominem furentem  
exultantemque continui, simul ac periculum iudicii intendi;  
(The context here shows the participial force of "furens").  
Also Cat. II, 1, 1; Phil. XIV, 12, 33; et al.

gerens.

adjective-Vatin., 5, 12: homines negotii gerentes inretires.  
(Note dependent genitive).

participle-Cael., 28, 67: qui tot viros muliebri bellum  
gerentes tulerit. Also Sest., 13, 36; Sull., 20, 56; et al.

\*intellegens.

Liso., 29, 68: lubricum genus orationis adolescenti non  
acriter intellegenti---

libens.

adjective-Cluent., 2, 6: ne repugnetis eamque animis vestris  
aut libentibus aut aequis remittatis; Also: har. resp., 5, 11.

participle-leg. agr. II, 18, 49: quam ego, etsi libente  
illo---consecutus sum. Also Milo., 14, 38.

merens.

adjective-Flanc., 33, 80: qui sunt boni cives, qui belli,  
qui domi de patria bene merentes--?

participle-Phil. V, 11, 28: ut haec referrentur de honoribus  
bene de re publica meritorum et merentium: (the participial  
force is brought out by the temporal opposition of the two  
participles).

Also Phil. XIV, 5, 13; prov. cons., 9, 24; Phil. V, 13, 36.

metuens.

adjective-Sen., 2, 4: consules modesti legumque metuentes  
impediebantur lege. (note dependent genitive).

participle-Seet., 5, 12: quos stimulos admoverit homini casum  
nimium metuenti.

Also Milo., 23, 61; Piso., 41, 99.

\*neglegens.

Planc., 23, 57: ita neglegens vobis esse videbitur.

\*nocens.

Sest., 45, 97: qui neque nocentes sunt nec improbi.

Also Cluent., 23, 62; Planc., 33, 82; et al.

\*oboediens.

Liso., 34, 84: quae natio semper oboediens huic imperio  
---Macedoniam tutata est.

\*observans.

Rab. Post., 16, 43: Equitem Romanum---studiosum, amantem,  
observantem sui---excepit.

(Note dependent genitive).

oriens.

adjective-Muren., 41, 89: ad orientis ("eastern") partis  
--exercitus duxit--

participle-dom., 25, 67: quanta vis illa fuerit oriens  
et congregata. Also Phil. XIII, 21, 48.

\*patiens.

har. resp., 5, 11: non modo patienti, sed etiam libenti animo----parebo. Also Phil. X, 11, 23.

\*perseverans.

Phil. XI, 1, 1: L. Cinna crudelis, C. Marius in iracundia perseverans, L. Sulla vehemens (erat);

\*potens.

Balb., 26, 59: qui et multi et potentes sunt. Also Cael., 26, 63; *ibid.*, 26, 62; et al.

\*praecellens.

Balb., 10, 25: vir animo et virtute praecellens--

\*praestans.

Cael., 13, 32: pro tua praestanti prudentia--  
Also Sest., 5, 12; Ligar., 1, 1; et al.

\*pudens.

Cael., 25, 61: datum esse aiunt pudenti adolescenti.  
Also Flacc., 36, 89; Cluent., 34, 94; et al.

retinens.

adjective-Flanc., 23, 55: pater--nimium retinens equestris iuris et libertatis videtur.

(Note dependent genitive).

participle-Phil. X, 5, 11: hunc retinentes extrusimus.

(Note direct object). Also Flanc., 9, 22.

sitiens.

adjective-Flanc., 5, 13: Deinde sitientem me virtutis tuae deseruisti. (Note dependent genitive).

participle-Eiso., 25, 61: ut--ad portam Caelimontanam sitiens pervenerim.

\*temperans.

Phil. VIII, 5, 16: sanctum, temperantem, modestum civem---  
Also Cael., 26, 63; Font., 18, 40.

\*valens.

Cluent., 9, 28: puer--cum valens in publico visus esset--  
mortuus est. Also har. resp., 28, 60; dom. 14, 37; et al.

vigilans.

adjective-leg. agr., 1, 3: Exspecto, quid tribunus plebis  
vigilans et acutus excogitet.

Also Muren., 38, 82; Cat. III, 7, 17; et al.

participle-Phil. II, 28, 68: Nec vero te unquam neque  
vigilantem neque in somnis credo posse mente consistere.

(The coordination with "in somnis" reveals the participial  
force of "vigilans").

Also *ibid.*, 28, 68; Flanc., 42, 101.

### III. The Participial Substantive.

#### A. Tabulation of Substantives for 48 Speeches.

The tabulation below includes all participial forms which impressed the writer as clearly substantive, with the exceptions before noted, "adulescens", "sapiens", Forms that are always used as either substantive or adjective in the field covered will be marked with an asterisk.

Substantive	Times Used	Substantive	Times Used
*arrogans	1	*pudens	1
*colens	1	quiescens	1
*egens	9	*reprehendens	1
fugiens	2	<i>triumphans</i>	1
gerens	1	*valens	1
imperans	1	Total.....	32
inridens	1		
insequens	1		
laborans	1		
moriens	1		
*nocens	3		
*paenitens	1		
*plorans	1		
*potens	2		
*precans	1		

## B. Discussion and Examples.

With regard to the substantive use of adjectives and participles Hale (p. 142) makes the following statement: "In prose the substantive uses of the adjective and participle are confined within certain limits, as follows:

### 1. In the singular:

a) The masculine of the participle is freely used in any case except the nominative and vocative, and in any construction.

b) The masculine of the adjective is freely used in the predicate genitive only. (The predicate genitive seems to be freely used in the case of the participle also. Note that there are five instances of this construction in examples given below).

c) The masculine nominative of either the adjective or the participle is rare in prose, unless modified by a pronoun. (The writer has found no clear instance of the nominative singular participial substantive).

### 2. In the plural:

a) The masculine of either the adjective or the

participle is freely used in any case and in any construction.

The writer has classed as substantives only those participial forms which seemed clearly to designate a class of persons rather than definite individuals. At times a close scrutiny of the context reveals the fact that a form apparently substantival depends on some definite substantive to be readily supplied from a neighboring clause or sentence. In such an example as

Phil. XII, 1, 2: qui nullam pacem probaret nisi cum cedente atque victo.

the participles seem clearly substantive, until one examines the context and finds that the reference is to a definite person (Antony) and to a particular instance of submission. As in the case of the adjective any classification here must be somewhat subjective, and it will be well again to note examples for each substantive listed above. Where clearly participial instances have been found of any word they will be cited below the substantival example.

\*arrogans.

leg. agr. II, 1, 2: ne arrogantis sit apud vos dicere, ingrati tacere. (Note coordination with adjective substantival).

\*colens.

Plano., 33, 80: qui sancti, qui religionum colentes, nisi qui meritam--gratiam---persolvunt? (Note dependent genitive).

\*egens.

Plano., 35, 86: egentes in locupletes, perdit in bonos, servi in dominos armabantur. Also Flacc., 10, 23; dom., 33, 89; et al.

fugiens.

substantive-Cat. III, 4, 8: praesto esset ille qui et fugientis exciperet. (In this instance "fugientis" signifies merely "fugitives" in general). Also Deiot., 5, 13.

participle-Piso., 24, 57: sic est animi lucem splendoremque fugientis. Also Milo., 15, 40; Phil. XIV, 10, 27; et al.

gerens.

substantive-Sest., 45, 97: Sunt municipales rusticique Romani, sunt negotii gerentes, sunt etiam libertini optumates.

participle-Deiot., 5, 13: teque Alexandrinum bellum gerente utilitatibus tuis paruit. Also Cael., 28, 67; Sest., 16, 36;

imperans.

substantive-Balb., 16, 36: verbi genus hoc imperantis est.

participle-Phil. XI, 12, 28: Lex est recta ratio imperans  
honesta--- Also Sest., 26, 57; Milo., 10, 29; et al.

inridens.

substantive-Plenc., 31, 75: inridentis magis est quam  
reprehendentis. (Note predicate genitive construction).

participle-Sest., 33, 72: quem homines in luctu inridentes  
Gracchum vocabant.

insequens.

substantive-Deiot., 5, 13: postremo venit ad fugientem,  
non ad insequentem.

participle-Phil. III, 11, 27: Qui enim haec fugiens fecerit,  
quid faceret insequens?

laborans.

substantive-Planc., 34, 84: qui miseris et laborantibus  
negare nihil possumus.

participle-Sen., 12, 31: Vos me laborantem--- defendistis.

Also leg. agr., II, 2, 5; Scaur., 23, 46.

moriens.

substantive-Cluent., 10, 30: Et ad hanc mortem tam repentinam  
voceque morientis omina---fuerunt. (This might perhaps be  
regarded as clearly participial, but the writer has interpreted  
"voce morientis" as "utterances at death" rather than as  
definitely concrete).

participle-Milo., 18, 48: quem Clodius--reliquerat .

morientem. Also Cluent., 12, 34; *ibid.*, 66, 187; et al.

\*nocena.

Phil. V, 6, 15: nocentium salus desperata est. Also Piso.,  
18, 43; Cat. IV, 6, 12.

\*paenitens.

Phil. XII, 2, 7: Optimus est portus paenitenti mutatio  
consilii.

\*plorans.

Piso., 36, 89: cum concursum plorantium ac tempestatem  
querellarum ferre non posses.

\*potens.

Milo., 36, 100: Ego inimicitias potentium pro te appetivi.  
Also Sest., 66, 139.

\*precans.

Balb., 16, 36: verbi genus hoc non precantis est.

\*pudens.

Phil. II, 32, 81: nec scit quod augurem, nec facit quod  
pudentem decet.

quiescens.

substantive-Sest., 43, 93: bellum inferre quiescentibus.

participle-dom., 33, 87: altero praetore quiescente, tuum  
scelus meum probrum putas esse oportere? Also Milo., 7, 16.

\*reprehendens.

Planc., 31, 75: inridenti magis est quam reprehendenti.

triumphans.

substantive-Muren., 5, 11: An, cum sedere in equis  
triumphantium praetextati potissimum filii soleant.

participle-Phil. XIV, 5, 12: ne prope triumphantem  
populus Romanus in Capitolium tulerit.

Also Muren., 25, 51; Cael., 14, 34; prov. cons., 8, 18.

\*valens

Cael., 28, 66: ne tot unum, valentes imbecillum, alacres  
perterritum superare non possent?

## The Present Participle in the Catiline Speeches.

Inasmuch as the Catilinarian orations constitute the medium through which secondary school students become acquainted with Ciceronian Latin, it may prove interesting to note the behavior of the present participle here.

Exclusive of participial forms that are indubitably adjectival in force, and substantives of the type *sapiens*, *adulescens*, we encounter 38 examples of the present participle in the four speeches (in the Mueller text an average of almost one to a page).

Of these 38 examples, 6 occur in the nominative, 4 in the genitive, 1 in the dative, 25 in the accusative, 2 in the ablative absolute construction. 2 genitives and 1 accusative are clearly substantive, however, and will be treated separately. Only 1 of the nominative examples is plural, 2 of the genitives appear in the plural, 1 dative, 1 accusative, 2 ablative absolutes.

10 deponent verbs are represented; *baecchor*, *egredior*, *insidior*, *loquor*, *latrocinator*, *minitor*, *molior* (twice), *nascor*, *proficiscor*, *suspicio*.

There is no instance in the four speeches of a nominative wholly unqualified. 2 nominatives are construed with direct objects (1 pronominal):

Cat. II, 12, 26: quem ego hoc prospiciens in agrum Gallicum praemisi.

Cat. IV, 2, 3: qui expectans huius exitum diei stat in conspectu meo..

1 instance of a nominative with indirect object:

Cat. II, 13, 38: si impendens patriae periculum me de hac animi lenitate deduxerit.

2 nominatives are found qualified by phrases, Cat. II, 5, 10; I, 9, 24; 1 modified by an adverb, Cat. IV, 3, 6.

Of the genitives one is unqualified, the other modified by a phrase. Both are interesting examples:

Cat. I, 8, 20: Quid expectas auctoritatem loquentium quorum voluntatem tacitorum perspicis?

Cat. IV, 6, 11: versatur mihi ante oculos aspectus Cethegi et furor in vestra caede bacchantis.

With regard to the first example Marouzeau (see above) calls attention to the utter lack of temporal connotation in

"loquentium" - their spoken word. Another fact that is perhaps worthy of notice is that the participle depends on the unexpressed antecedent of the relative.

In "baechantis" too the temporal idea is negligible; the portrayal of the subject of thought in a certain role is the dominant force of the participle. "Baechantis" is also interesting as a Greek importation.

The one dative example might better be considered an adjective, perhaps:

Cat. II, 5, 10: hoc vero quis ferre possit, inertes homines fortissimis viris insidiari...dormientis vigilantibus.

Of the 24 (excluding 1 substantive) accusative examples, 9 are unqualified (1 modified by non). 4 modify subjects of infinitive clauses. The following examples are worthy of note:

Cat. II, 1, 1: ipsum egredientem verbis prosecuti sumus,- where "ipsum" is virtually adverbial in force - sponte, and the expression means "going of his own accord."

Cat. II, 7, 16: tamen latrocinantem se interfici mallet quam exulem vivere.

The opposition of the participle to "exulem" indicates that

it merely means "see a brigand." The verbal force seems very weak here.

7 accusatives occur with direct objects, and 3 of these are also modified by adverbs. 2 of the objects are pronominal and one is "nihildum."

Cat. I, 8, 21: ut te haec...relinquentem usque ad portas  
prosequantur.

Cat. II, 1, 1: L. Catilinam..pestem patriae nefarie  
molientem..ex urbe eiecimus..

There is 1 instance of an accusative with complementary infinitive phrase:

Cat. I, 1, 3: Catilinam orbem terrae caede atque incendiis  
vastare cupientem nos consules <sup>E</sup>perfermus?

There are 5 instances of the accusative participle with indirect objects. The verbs represented are : mitor, insidior, inhiō, studeo, consulo. One of these participles is also modified by ablatives:

Cat. II, 1, 1: L. Catilinam...vobis atque huic urbi ferro  
flammaque mitorantem ex urbe vel eiecimus.

1 example occurs qualified by ablative only, and one with both ablative and adverb:

Cat. IV, 6, 11: Videor enim mihi videre hanc urbem...  
subito uno incendio concidentem.

3 of these accusatives occur after verbs of perception:

Cat. I, 2, 5: ducem hostium intra moenia..videmus..  
cotidie perniciem rei publicae molientem

Also ibid. IV, 6, 11, cited above.

Note especially:

Cat. IV, 6, 12: Cum vero mihi proposui ragnantem Lentulum...  
purpuratum esse huic Gabinium, cum exercitu venisse Catilinam,

Marouzeau calls attention to this last example as indicating the extension in Cicero of the use of the participle after verbs of perception; we are no longer confined to "video" and "audio." He does not however note that in this sentence the participle appears coordinated with two infinitives, the rival construction.

The two ablative absolutes are rather good indications of the ability of the participle to emphasize some idea other than that of concomitance of action:

Cat. I, 5, 13: num dubitas id me imperante facere quod iam tua sponte faciebas?

"me imperante" - "at my command", and stands in strong

opposition to "tue sponte"

Cat. II, 1, 1: *hanc iam cum hoste nullo impediante bellum iustum geremus.*

"nullo impediante" - "with none to hinder" indicates the favorable condition or situation under which the main act is to take place.

3 participial substantives occur, 1 in accusative, 2 in genitive:

Cat. III, 4, 8: *praesto esset ille qui et fugientis (the refugees) exciperet.*

Cat. IV, 8, 17: *animos egentium atque imperitorum,*

Cat. IV, 6, 12: *qui non dolore et cruciatu nocentis suum dolorem cruciatumque lenierit.*

There are 23 examples of participial adjectives (including 1 instance each of *innocens* and *impudentissima*). 7 occur in the superlative: *amantissimus* ("rei publicae" follows twice, "otii" once), *impudentissimus*, *potentissimus*, *florentissimus*, *diligentissimus* (2).

The other adjectives that occur are: *vigilans* (20), *egens*, *valens*, *praesens* (8), *absens*, *diligens*.

Cat. II, 9, 20: homines tenues atque egentes.

The coordination with "tenues" tends to give "egentes" the more enduring quality of an adjective. The 1 instance of "absens" is in an ablative absolute:

Cat. III, 7, 17: Quae nunc illo absente sic gesta sunt.

Praesens in 1 example is coordinated with a real participle:

Cat. IV, 6, 13: virum praesentem et audientem.

It occurs twice in the predicate:

Cat. III, 6, 14: qui omnes praesentes erant: also, III, 9, 21.

"Praesens" is applied 4 times to manifestations of divine power:

Cat. III, 8, 18: ita praesentes auxilium tulerunt.

"praesentes" is virtually adverbial in force - "manifestly."

Cat. III, 9, 21: Illud vero nonne ita praesens est ut nutu Iovis factum esse videatur, - "is it not obvious or evident?"

## CONCLUSION.

Consideration of Dr. Marouzeau's discussion and of the behavior of the present participle in a fairly wide Ciceronian field must convince one that Cicero gives to this construction a vitality and scope that it has not before enjoyed. However, it can by no means be considered a popular construction. In 48 speeches the writer has found but 1189 participial forms, including all real participles, participial adjectives and substantives. Deducting adjectives and substantives from this total we have but 834 real participles, an average of about 17 to a speech. But even this modest number can not be allowed to stand unchallenged as indicative of a somewhat extended use of the present participle; we must take into consideration the frequent occurrence of certain verbs (listed above). Of the 834 participles in the field covered 17 verbs that occur 10 times or more make up 214 instances. Such considerations would lead one to the conclusion that the present participle, while it suffers few, if any, restrictions in verbal function in Cicero, has not achieved a general extension and popularity in the language.