

CORRESPONDENCE

To the EDITOR, *Greece and Rome*

26 June 1933.

Dear Sir,

With some effort, I think I have mastered Mr. Witton's simplified explanation of gerunds and gerundives, but I cannot yet agree that it is 'simple and satisfying'.

I should value his criticism of the following explanation, which I state dogmatically to save time.

The obvious connexion between two such sentences as *aqua mihi bibenda est* and *mihi eundum est* is the idea of necessity. The first is usually translated literally 'water is meet-to-be-drunk by me', or if you want to make the dative more natural 'for me water is meet to be drunk'. Since all intransitive verbs can only be used impersonally in the passive, and the gerundive is passive, why not translate my second example 'it is meet-to-be-gone by me' (i.e. an impersonal gerundive)? I use 'it' simply as the ordinary pseudo-English way of getting round the Latin impersonal.

It is not very difficult to see how the gerundive is used, too, in such phrases as *epistolae scribendae causa*, which can be translated 'for the sake of the letter-which-has-to-be-written'. Nearly all 'gerundive attraction' phrases have some idea of necessity about them, and the few which have not can be easily explained as arising out of blind habit. It only remains to say that the gerund or verbal noun is really an abstract noun possibly derived from the neuter of the adjective (gerundive), just as many Greek neuter adjectives are used as abstract nouns.

Yours faithfully,

R. S. STANIER.

*The Grange, King's School,
Canterbury.*

26 June 1933.

Dear Sir,

The reviewer of Ritchie's *Fabulae Faciles* is not quite up to date in his defence (*G. & R.* ii, p. 183) of his comment on the quantity of the vowels in *hic* and *hoc*. The last edition of Kennedy's *Revised Latin Primer* (1930) does not mark those vowels long, and a brief footnote gives the gist of the excellent paragraphs you have printed on p. 183. Lewis and Short's Dictionary is not a safe guide to quantity when, for example, despite *Geo.* 2. 12, *siler* is marked with its first vowel long and, *s.v.* Hylas, *havoc* is made of *Ecl.* 6, 44. Since 1895 Gildersleeve's *Latin Grammar* has been known as Gildersleeve and Lodge; and if it is cited

as an authority, a similar place might be found for Hale and Buck's *Latin Grammar*, where, already in 1903, the true doctrine of *hic* and *hoc* was expounded for 'high school students'.

Yours faithfully,

J. F. MOUNTFORD.

The University of Liverpool.

COMPETITION

(1) *A Speech in Defence of Catiline*, or (2) *A Sea Voyage from Rome to Athens*.

ONLY five entries were received, four of them attempting a defence of Catiline. The prize is awarded to C. H. Wilson, De Aston Grammar School, Market Rasen, Lincs. Within the short compass allowed he compresses a good deal of material and brings out his points clearly—historical precedents, discrediting of the official evidence, and a plausible alternative to the Senatorial version of the Allobroges affair, while he hints at Cicero's rather doubtful dealings in the past with Catiline and his credulity. He writes in an easy flowing style and does not try to imitate in English the superlatives to which Cicero is so prone. The other competitors did not have so clear an idea of what they wanted to say, their points were not clearly made, and they gave way to a rather bombastic effort to imitate Cicero. R. L. Brigden (Portsmouth Grammar School) wrote well with good knowledge of the background of the conspiracy and of the tactics of a special pleader. Margaret Steppat (St. Paul's Girls' School) gave too much away for her defence to be convincing; the Senate was asked to take the good character of his defender as proof of Catiline's innocence. T. Hadoux had good material but did not marshal his facts, while his English was involved.

J. H. Hughes' account of a sea voyage from Rome to Athens, though painstaking, was not particularly informative or lively in its description.

The winning entry is printed below.

A DEFENCE OF LUCIUS CATILINA, DELIVERED IN THE SENATE

FAR be it from me, Conscript Fathers, to defend wanton rebellion against the Republic; yet it will be my endeavour to prove that Catiline has not only followed the precedents set by the champions of the Senatorial power—nay, by the Senate itself—but also that only the obstinacy and arrogance of the Senate has forced him to take these measures, which otherwise he would not