

The Development of Future Tense Auxiliaries in Latin

By HARM PINKSTER, Amsterdam

0. *Introduction*

In this article I will discuss expressions consisting of *debere*, *posse*, *velle* and *habere* + infinitive which are regarded as alternatives to the normal synthetic future tense forms and are thought to be forerunners of periphrastic future tenses in Romance languages. The development of these verbs into temporal auxiliaries is taken for granted in our manuals (for example Szantyr 1965: 312–5) and has been documented most extensively by Thielmann (1885). Caroline Kroon and I have re-examined the evidence¹⁾ and have come to a conclusion quite different from the standard one. According to our findings the three modal verbs in question are not used as alternatives to normal future forms. Even though there are a number of odd instances of each of these verbs, the oddity is not due to the modal verb having lost its well-known meaning and selection restrictions. There is, however, enough evidence to assume that *habere* + infinitive developed into a periphrastic future tense (Pinkster, forthcoming a, b). In this article my aim is above all to compare this development of *habere* with the use of the other three verbs. I will deal with each of the verbs successively. By way of an appendix I will say something about *ire* as an auxiliary verb. Throughout the article I will confine myself to the Latin data. A detailed discussion of the Romance development can be found in Fleischmann (1982) and Müller (1964).

1. *The Modal verbs (debere, posse, velle)*

It is a well-known fact that modal expressions and modal forms are a source of future expressions or future forms (cf. Lehmann [1982: 27 ff.] on auxiliarisation in general, and Strunk [1968: 298 ff.] on Indo-European). So the real or putative existence of expressions in contemporary Romance languages containing forms that are etymologically related to the three Latin modal verbs under discussion

¹⁾ *debere*, *habere* and *posse* have been studied on the basis of published TLL lemmata. *velle* has been examined in the files of the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. I gratefully acknowledge the hospitality of Dr. Flury and his staff.

need not cause surprise. However, the auxiliarisation process may have started after the Romance languages had developed into separate languages. An indication of this might be the fact that different modal verbs are used in different languages. Latinists have tried to supply their Romance colleagues with examples which **might** be replaced by normal future tense forms. I approached the problem from a different angle, looking for cases which **must** be understood as having the function of normal future forms. The fact that expressions consisting of an infinitive and one of these verbs normally refer to future events is due to the lexical meaning of these verbs and no proof at all of their being temporal auxiliaries.

1.1. *velle* + infinitive

This combination has given rise to periphrastic future forms in modern Romanian (cf. Müller 1964: 67 ff.) but has also left a few traces elsewhere. It is a matter of dispute among Romanian scholars whether there is direct relation between antiquity and modern Romanian. Van Eeden (1985) observes that in the seventeenth century constructions of the type *velle* + inf. still have their normal modal meaning. However, the presence of a modern successor to the classical Latin construction stimulated Latinists to look for early parallels. Szantyr (1965: 314) formulates the standard opinion: the construction 'ist schon im Altlatein unter Zurücktreten der Absichtsbedeutung auf dem Wege zu rein futurischem Sinn'. The stock illustration is (1, a), which is regarded as equivalent to (1, b), both expressing the intention of the speaker:

(1) a ego ire in Piraeum *volo* ('I want to go to the Piraeus', Plt. *Most.* 66)

b nunc domum *ibo* ('Now for home', Plt. *Poe.* 851)

However, one need not go as far as that, because, in its context, *volo* is quite functional and has its own full lexical meaning, expressing Tranio's impatience towards Grumio. The following regularities can be observed in Plautus with respect to the distribution of the expressions *ibo*, *eo* and *volo ire*.

- (i) *ibo* refers to the immediate future, just like *eo*. It is typically used in asides, and is often accompanied by other future verb forms. Explicit future expressions (e. g. *cras* 'tomorrow') are absent.
- (ii) *eo* is hardly ever used in asides. Future expressions and indications of impatience are frequent.

- (iii) *volo ire* either indicates volition (*Cist.* 112; *Men.* 114; *Pers.* 578; *Tru.* 751 [add. Buecheler]) or signals an impatient reaction (*Ep.* 423; *Mo.* 66). It entirely lacks the contextual features given for *ibo.*²⁾

The conclusion must be that the expressions are not interchangeable at all.

Furthermore, it has been observed that in classical Latin *volo* is frequently found with verbs of communication. This phenomenon can be found in later Latin as well, for example (2):

(2) *sed interim volo sic ei respondere* ('in the meantime I 'd like to say this', Tert. *adv. Hermog.* 23).

However, the existence of such stereotyped combinations is no proof of a future tense auxiliary use of *velle*, as some scholars would like us to believe. Trying to discover future auxiliary use in both types of example only leads to over- or rather underinterpretation of the text.

The development of *velle* into a temporal auxiliary has recently been taken up by Petersmann (1977) in his in many ways commendable book on the language of Petronius. He observes that in (3)–part of a public announcement–the expression *commonstrare voluerit* obviously has a periphrastic function 'denn Geld soll jemand nicht für sein Wollen erhalten, sondern nur für sein Handeln' (: 185).

(3) *puer in balneo ante aberravit ... si quis eum reddere aut commonstrare voluerit, accipiet nummos mille* ('Lost recently in the public baths, a boy ... A reward of a thousand pieces will be paid to any person willing to bring him back or to indicate his whereabouts', Petr. 97, 2).

Petersmann's argument is correct, of course, but it does no justice to the fact that the text is a parody of official language–the Loeb translation brings this out well–and even if *voluerit* is redundant, it is not the lexical meaning of *velle* that conveys the future element, but rather its tense form. Also, the internal structure of the construction *voluerit + infinitive* is quite all right. Columella offers several instances of *voles + infinitive* occurring in a context with a 'normal future' (e. g. 5,11,3) and if in such cases one prefers to regard *voles* as contributing little of its lexical meaning and as a mere sign of variation–as Nyström (1926: 59) does–they can by no means be ad-

²⁾ These observations are based upon unpublished research by Caroline Kroon (1985).

vanced as evidence of the development of *volo* into a future auxiliary, since—again—the future element is in the inflection of *velle*.

In later authors as well, several instances of *velle* have been considered forerunners of the Romance development. Schrijnen-Mohrmann (1937: 26), following Watson (1896: 189 n.)³⁾ point to one instance in Cyprianus (*Ep.* 6,3: *liberari vellent*). However, *vellent* can be understood without difficulty if one takes the preceding context into account. Skahill (1934: 200–3) refers to a number of cases in Cassiodorus *Var.* (publ. 537–8) where ‘apparently nothing would be lost from the thought if *velle* were omitted altogether’. He also draws attention to the fact that *velle* and other modal verbs seem to be inserted by Cassiodorus because of ‘his desire for rhythm’. I quote one of his examples in which a functional explanation for the use of *velle* is quite obvious:

(4) in quibusdam etiam nititur *velle* superare (‘It even endeavours to be superior in certain respects’, Cassiod. *Var.* 1,45,10)

In (4) *velle* is redundant in so far as the intent is already expressed in *nititur*.⁴⁾ Embedded predications, in fact, quite frequently contain lexical elements which explicitate the meaning of the main predicate.⁵⁾ The phenomenon is well-known and can be exemplified from old Latin onward (see Löfstedt 1933: 182; Petersmann 1977: 186; Svennung 1936: 454–5 and Szantyr 1965: 796–7). However, it is not always realized that the same functional argument might explain quite a lot of instances that are adduced to illustrate the rise of future tense auxiliaries.

The African writer Corippus is credited with the first certain example of the present indicative form of *velle* as a future auxiliary in his epic poem *Johannis seu de bellis Libycis* (written 550):

(5) miseris modo matribus Afris iam servire *volunt* (‘now they were willing to serve to previously miserable African women’, Corippus *Joh.* 6, 88–9)

It was first noticed by Koffmane (1879), picked up by Sittl (1882: 128) and Thielmann (1885: 168–9) and then found its way to Wackernagel (1926: I, 195) and eventually Szantyr (1965: 314).⁶⁾ However, Shea (1966: 76) rightly observes that ‘there is little in the context to sustain Wackernagel’s point’. There remain just two examples in the

³⁾ Adopted by Souter (1957: s.v. *velle*). Compare also the Budé translation.

⁴⁾ Notice, that a future infinitive of *superare* would be excluded in (4).

⁵⁾ Gougenheim (1925: 160 ff.) has instructive French examples of this phenomenon.

⁶⁾ Coleman (1971: 219, n.2) also seems to be convinced.

Acta apostolorum of a present participle of *velle* followed by an infinitive (20,13; 23,20) corresponding with the participle of *μέλλω* in the Greek source, where the Vulgate has the ‘classical’ participle future forms in *-urus*. And even these examples are quite all right, as far as their internal structure is concerned. (I shall come back to translations in general below).⁷⁾

In conclusion it must be said that there is no evidence whatsoever in our texts for the development of *velle* as an auxiliary in Latin. The internal structure of the predication to which *velle* belongs remains constant in the course of history. The subjects of *velle* are human Agents who are in control of an action or position denoted by the verb that occurs as its complement (AcI examples—to be sure—are not under discussion). Over-expression of the meaning of the main predicate in the embedded clauses does occur, but this is rather a counterargument against assuming a future auxiliary function of *velle*: future infinitives are excluded with *velle*. Examples of sentences (or clauses) containing *velle* coordinated with or co-occurring with future-oriented sentences, which might suggest some sort of equivalence, are not in the TLL files.⁸⁾

1.2. *debere* + infinitive

The construction *debere* + infinitive corresponds with the expression type *depo kantare* (‘I will sing’) in one Sardinian dialect and there are traces in (earlier periods of) other languages.⁹⁾ Scholars agree that our texts contain only weak indications for the later development. Szantyr (1965: 314), following others, cites (6) as an

⁷⁾ It is amusing that the Corippus passage has been an incentive for tracing earlier examples in Latin. Shea (1976: 66) ends up more or less withdrawing his criticism of Wackernagel because ‘there seem to be earlier instances’. Thielmann (1885: 169) also mentions two examples in *Hist. Apollon.* 48 (*volens ... redire*) and 50 (*volentis ... occidere*), but Klebs (1899: 245–6) has drawn attention to the author’s predilection for the present participle, in particular *dicens* and *volens*. Goelzer (1884: 422–3), finally, gives a few examples of ‘expletive’ *velle* in Hieronymus.

⁸⁾ Such a sentence might be of the type: *si quis demonstraverit, accipere volet* (compare ex. 3). Thielmann’s example (1885: 168) *velle pugnare = pugnaturum* is not correctly interpreted: *si non vicero scitote me post Gallienum velle pugnare* (‘if I fail to defeat them, reflect that I am striving to fight after Gallienus’ reign’ (‘The whole community is exhausted’ serves as an explanation), *Hist. Aug. Claud.* 7, 3).

⁹⁾ See also Fleischmann (1982: 147) on future uses of French *devoir*.

'Ansatz' and the example is taken up again by Petersmann (1977: 186–7):

(6) *sex pondo et selibram debet habere* ('she must have six pounds and a half of gold on her', Petr. 67,7)

However, in examples like (6) *debere* has not its best known **deontic** meaning ('be obliged to'), but an **inferential** meaning ('it must be the case that'), which it has in common with other modal expressions and which is found in many languages (cf. Bolkestein 1980). It should be observed that parallels for **inferential** *debere* can be found in earlier authors, among whom Cicero, so the common assumption that they are typical for everyday speech is also beside the point.

In the *Mulomedicina Chironis* (dated about AD 400), the verb *debere* is used pleonastically on several occasions (Grevander 1926: 79–80; 130). Two types may be distinguished, one in which we find *debere* and *oportere* combined in one construction (90; 648) which is of no relevance to our problem, and another one in which an embedded predication with *debere* + infinitive is governed by a verb that requires an imperative embedded clause (5; 37):

(7) *qui praecipunt fracturam numquam debere uri* ('who teach us to never cauterize a fracture', *Chir.* 37)

The second type can also be found in Theodorus Priscianus (*Eup.* 2,27–dependent on *cogo et suadeo*)—also around AD 400—and much later in Cassiodorus (Skahill 1934: 200–3 mentions *Var.* 1,45,2–*postulavit*; add *Hist.* 9,25, p.1141 D–*invitavit*) and Gregorius the Great (*Dial.* 1,4,3–*quaeris ne*, and others—see the Index Grammatical of A. de Vogué and P. Antin's edition [1980: 275–6]). By then we are in AD 593–4. It is clear that neither of these expressions can be proof of the future tense auxiliary function of *debere*,—on the contrary, if it were a future tense auxiliary it could not occur in an embedded imperative clause at all! (The fact that it does occur in such clauses might be regarded as proof of the semantic equivalence of the subjunctive mood and the lexical meaning of *debere*).

A third type of examples of *debere* in the *Mulomedicina Chironis* that is regarded as evidence of a future tense auxiliary status are cases where Vegetius in his more or less parallel version has a simple future tense. However, although some instances are remarkable, Grevander (1926: 77–80) amply illustrates the general preference of circumlocutionary expressions in the *Mul.* as compared with Vegetius (for example the use of causative *facere* ['make'] and of *uti* ['use']). The occurrence of parallel versions with a simple future

form and a circumlocutionary expression with *debere* is not really remarkable: instructions are a normal element in manuals of this type.¹⁰⁾ So we reach the same conclusion as in the case of *velle*: there is in our texts, as far as we can see, no evidence whatsoever for the development of *debere* into a future tense auxiliary.¹¹⁾

1.3. *posse* + infinitive

The construction *posse* + inf. is said to have a successor in a marginal Romanian expression *poate* + infinitive and also to have left traces elsewhere. Thielmann (1885: 167) is very firm about the use of the infinitive *posse* + another infinitive as a circumlocutionary alternative for the future infinitive after verbs denoting 'hope' from Caesar onwards.¹²⁾ The inevitable example is (8):

(8) Hac oratione adducti inter se fidem et ius iurandum dant et regno occupato per tres potentissimos ac firmissimos populos totius Galliae sese potiri *posse* sperant ('swayed by this speech, they gave a mutual pledge, confirming it by oath; and they hoped that when they had seized their kingship they would be able, through the efforts of the three most powerful and most steadfast tribes, to master the whole of Gaul', Caes. *Gal.* 1, 3, 8)

Earlier examples of *posse* + inf. depending on *sperare* and semantically related verbs, beginning with Plt. *Most.* 1015, can be found in Kuhlmann's recent TLL article, s.v. 140,66 ff. Kuhlmann regards them as alternatives for the future infinitive. Szantyr is more cautious (1965: 313) and, in fact, in all examples of this kind one may just as well maintain that *sperare se posse potiri* has a different meaning from *sperare se potituros (esse)*. Compare Perrochat (1932: 40; 42) and Coleman (1971: 220) for similar reservations. In the example at hand, in particular, *posse* is very much in its place: they hope that they *will be able* to execute their plans with the help of their citizens – the Loeb translation brings it out well.

Alternatively, as a different line of argument, one might point to the fact that both *sperare* and *posse* refer to future events or situa-

¹⁰⁾ On translations see below p. 195.

¹¹⁾ Adams (1976: 69) points to a strange instance of the infinitive *debere* in the *Excerpta Valesiana* (second half sixth century), 74. He takes it to be used as equivalent to the future. Elsewhere the author of this 'substandard' (Adams: vii) text uses the 'normal' present and future infinitives. Since the sentence in which this instance occurs is anacolouthic, I am inclined to be less confident than Adams about the status of *debere*.

¹²⁾ Compare also Zwanenburg (1927: 14 ff.).

tions which, when used in combination, cause a kind of seeming harmonious 'redundancy' (compare among others Givón 1973: 905; 919; but also already Thielmann himself, l.c.).¹³) The small number of embedded infinitival complements among the examples in TLL with verbs other than *sperare* can be explained along these lines. In fact, Kuhlmann observes that the future interpretation of *posse* depends on the governing verb or on specific adverbs (141, 11 ff.). Two examples are (9) and (10):

(9) adiurans animam primum se *posse* amittere quam sententiam ('swearing that he could sooner give up his life than his resolve', Amm. 20, 11, 3)

(10) prophetavit Ieremias post septuaginta annos captivitatis aedificari *posse* illam civitatem ('Jeremiah prophesied that after seventy years of captivity the city could be built', Aug. in *Psalm*. 121, 4, 1. 42)

In finite embedded clauses introduced by subordinators like *ut* and *ne* we find the same type of redundancy. One example may suffice:

(11) interdixit ei ne *posset* exire ('he forbade him to go out', Aug. *Civ.* 20, 7, p. 421, 30 D)

Similarly, in optional purpose and consecutive clauses we often find some form of *posse*:

(12) [omisi multas fabulas] si quis eadem forte conari velit, habere ut *possit* aliquid operis residui ('in order to leave a stint in reserve for anyone hereafter who may choose to try the same kind of writing', Phaedr. III *Epil.* 4–5)

Neither the kind of redundancy of the infinitive *posse* nor that of the finite subjunctive forms dealt with above can serve as an argument for assigning a future tense auxiliary status to *posse* as a substitute for a synthetic future tense. Moreover, what would be the status of subjunctive future forms?¹⁴) Once again, future tenses in embedded imperative clauses such as (11) are excluded. The occurrence of *posse* in (11) is rather a counterargument against regarding *posse* as some sort of future tense auxiliary.

¹³) Since *posse* itself has no future infinitive one might also maintain that in this case the usual construction of archaic and late Latin is not replaced by the typically 'classical' fut. inf. construction.

¹⁴) TLL distinguishes infinite and finite cases; the latter are treated as purpose expressions (s. v. 142, 21 ff.) and distinguished from future expressions (s. v. 140, 66 ff.). The redundant use of *posse* in purpose/consecutive clauses has been observed before. See Petersmann (1977: 188 ff.) and Svennung (1936: 452–3). In this case Skahill (1934: 200–3), too, accepts redundancy as an explanation and so Traube before him.

We have seen, so far, that redundancy of forms of *posse*—and the same has been established for *velle* and *debere*—in embedded clauses, mistakenly regarded as a sign of weakening of the meaning of the verb, has been a factor in assuming future tense auxiliary use. Another factor is constituted by neglect of the difference between the **ability** and **epistemic** meanings of *posse*. Several examples cannot be understood as expressing the ability of somebody to do something, but they can be understood as expressing possibility or likelihood. As an example take (13):¹⁵)

(13) *mirari posse quosdam peregrinos existimo haec lecturos forsitan* ('Now I think that some foreigners who will perhaps read this work may wonder ...', Amm. 14,6,2)

The following example (14) may belong here as well—if the text is sound—and (15) is another one. Notice in these cases the presence of *certum est* ('it is certain') and *indubitanter* ('undoubtedly'), both of which are in harmony with the epistemic meaning of *posse*:¹⁶)

(14) *neque tamen (Augustum) perseverasse, quia certum haberet posse (v.l. post se) per ambitionem quandoque restitui* ('that he had not carried out his purpose, feeling sure that they would one day be renewed through desire for popular favour', Suet. *Aug.* 42,3)

(15) *quid mali passus es a me, ut illuc me mittas, ubi possim indubitanter occidi* ('what wrong have I done to you that you send me to a place where it is very likely that I will be killed', Cassiod. *Ios. antiq.* 8,322)¹⁷)

A third factor involved in the assumption of a future tense auxiliary function of *posse*—and the same holds for other verbs—may be formulated as the failure to recognise the illocutionary force of certain utterances. (16) may serve as an illustration:

¹⁵) Plt. *Cas.* 474 *si quidem cras censes te posse emitti manu* ('if you think, you can be freed tomorrow') and Planc. apud Cic. *Fam.* 10,21,5 *nec tanta munera perditis hominibus dari posse sinam* ('and I will not permit the possibility of such generosity being wasted on a pack of desperados') belong here too. Perhaps ex. (9) can be reckoned as part of this category as well (Daan den Hengst, pers. comm.).

¹⁶) Unfortunately, all attention is drawn to possible future auxiliary verbs. It would be useful to examine in detail combinations of explicit expressions as *certum est* and 'normal' tense and mood expressions in Latin. For the sake of honesty I give one example I came across, which might be used against me: *qua eis certissimum sit semper se in illa esse mansuros* ('whereby it is most certain for them that they will always be faithful to it (viz. *voluntas*?), Aug. *corrept.* 11,32). Compare also example (18) below.

¹⁷) Unless *possim* is regarded as redundant in a purpose clause.

(16) *se noverit ... gratiae nostrae ... incurrere posse periculum nec sibi ulterius esse credendum si iussionis nostrae ... temerator exstiterit* ('let him be aware that he may run the risk of losing our sympathy and that he cannot be given credit anymore if he turns out to be contemptuous of our command', Cassiod. *Var.* 7, 42, 3)

This example is mentioned by Szantyr (465: 313) as an instance of future use, which according to him appears from the fact that *incurrere posse* is coordinated with a gerund construction. Now, the text implies a warning or even a threat, which is, however, formulated in a very diplomatic way. What is presented as a 'possibility', is intended as, or has the illocutionary force of, a warning.

So far, I have been rather negative about the basis of the hypothesis that *posse* is used as a future tense auxiliary. More objective arguments, however, have been presented, for such an assumption and I will turn to these now. These arguments are based upon the existence of parallel versions of the same texts, which makes it possible to compare the use of the tenses in various versions. Though what I am going to say about it is not restricted to *posse* I prefer discussing it here, because the TLL lemma offers a solid starting point. Comparison of different versions of the same text is applied, in particular, to Latin translations of Greek Bible texts and this is the more rewarding if there appears to be a difference in the rendering by the Vulgata and one or more of the various Itala versions, the Itala versions being the more substandard ones. At first sight, the argument is very attractive, especially, if the choice for a particular wording in the Latin texts seems to be systematic. However, as far as the rendering of Greek future forms is concerned, it should be kept in mind that 'normal' future forms are the rule in the Latin translations as well. A 'deviant' translation of a Greek form for which the Latin paradigm has some parallel may be due to a difference of interpretation or of taste (or even simple clumsiness). The following example may illustrate the point:

(17) *quid vobis nocere potest?* ('who can do you harm?', *Itala I Petr.* 3,13)

The Greek has *τίς ὁ καλώσων*, i. e. it uses a substantival future participle for which no precise parallel is available in Latin; the Vulgata has *noceat* (so-called potential subjunctive) and Augustine *Serm.* 297, 10 has *quis vobis nocebit* (future indicative). In this instance the future element of the Greek participle has been aptly rendered by Augustine. Both *Itala* and *Vulgata* seem to have understood some 'modal' nuance in the future, which is not absurd. Moreover, *posse* is

also used to render Greek forms for which an equivalent is lacking altogether,¹⁸⁾ a special case being the use of a finite form of *posse* + infinitive to render a Greek optative (TLL 141,59 ff. has examples). However, the *future* form (*poterit*) is then preferred, the very use of which constitutes counterevidence against the assumption that *posse* itself is a substitute of normal future forms.¹⁹⁾ As a consequence there is not much evidence to be drawn from the translation literature in favour of the claim that *posse* is used as a future auxiliary. The examples in TLL are unobjectionable from the classical Latin point of view as far as their internal structure is involved. Sometimes one may wonder why an author uses *posse* at all. However, there are not enough examples to discover a systematic attempt to express a specific illocutionary force (see also below).

Another type of parallel versions is constituted by exegetic reformulations of the text of the Bible by christian authors. An example is (18):

(18) quidquid poscis, certum est tibi *posse* venire ('whatever you ask will most certainly come to you', Iuvenc.4,342–dated ca. 330–commenting upon *Ioh.* 11,22 *quaecumque poposceris ... dabit tibi deus* 'what you will have asked god will give you')

Cases like these can, to my mind, not be used as evidence for a future tense auxiliary status of *posse*. Iuvencus is not just rephrasing the original text by inserting synonymous expressions. On the contrary, what he does here is explicating the meaning of *dabit*. His paraphrase may be understood as an answer to a question about the precise implications of *dabit*. For him, it is roughly equivalent to 'it is certain that the conditions for the realization of your wishes are fulfilled: the realization, i. e. you will get it, is guaranteed'. What is presented with the illocutionary force of a prediction in the original is emphatically rephrased as a realistic likelihood! Examples like these are rather evidence of a difference in meaning than of synonymy.²⁰⁾

My conclusion will be obvious. Szantyr's statement: '*possum* mit Inf. ... dient vor allem der Umschreibung des passiven Futurs (Inf.

¹⁸⁾ For example, my number(15) translates Greek *πρὸς τὸν ἀποκτεῖναι ζητοῦντα*.

¹⁹⁾ Plt. *Asin.* 399 *si is est iam scire potero* ('now I can find out if that fellow is my man') does not belong here: it is an aside and simply means 'will be able to'.

²⁰⁾ It is customary, and sometimes rewarding, to compare Chiron's *Mulomedicina* with that of Vegetius, who has drawn heavily upon Chiron, but whose style is much closer to classical Latin. In the case of *posse*, however, the comparison is not very helpful due to one or more of the factors discussed so far. Zwanenburg (1927: 17) mentions a number of parallels and so does Grevander (1926).

und Konj.)' lacks sufficient support. Too many factors have been neglected and some at first sight problematic instances have too easily been interpreted as evidence of future tense auxiliary use of *posse*. It will be clear from this lengthy discussion that the data are less easy to assess than those of *velle* and *debere*, but neither internal structure nor external distribution are ostensibly different from classical Latin. As for the statement that the combinations of the finite and infinite forms of *posse* with a passive infinitive are particularly frequent, I would be little surprised if it could be proved that *posse* always had a 'predilection' for governing passive infinitives. Picking the first 150 cases of finite and infinite forms of *posse* with infinitives from Merguet's lexicon to Caesar (limiting myself to *Civ.* and *Gal.*), the overall ratio active dependent infinitives (that is: active endings and deponentia!): passive ones is 78:73. Passive infinitives even beat active ones with 16:10 when *posse* itself is used in the infinitive. So some statistical research will have to be done first, before we can interpret the observation that there is a predominance of passive infinitives in the way it usually is interpreted, viz. as a manifestation of future auxiliary use of *posse* favoured by certain gaps in the future passive paradigm (see below).

1.4. Conclusion

I have tried to show that for each of the modal verbs compulsive evidence for accepting examples of possible future tense auxiliary use is lacking altogether. On the contrary, all these verbs are used with their full lexical meaning in constructions in which they could not have been found if they had developed into future tense auxiliaries.

2. *habere + infinitive*

I have discussed elsewhere the development of *habere* into a future tense auxiliary verb in a number of Romance languages and I will not repeat what I said there (Pinkster, forthcoming b). I take it for granted that there is a straightforward development from the first attested example of *habere + inf.* (19) to the Romance examples, (20) proving that the development went very fast:

(19) multos ferro, multos veneno (occidit); *habeo* etiam dicere quem ... de ponte in Tiberim deiecerit ('many he killed by the dagger, many by poison. I can even give you an example of one man whom he threw from the bridge into the Tiber', Cic. *S. Rosc.* 100)

(20) (commenting upon *volens* in Vergil's text) 'volens' quae velle *habet*: nam 'volitura' aut propter asperitatem sermonis noluit dicere aut ... (*volens* 'wanting' means 'who will want': for he did not want to say *volitura* 'going to want', either because of the harshness of the expression or ..., Serv. ad Verg. *A.* 3,457)

In this article I will only pay attention to the interpretations assigned to *habere* in its construction with an infinitive, and the question whether the auxiliarisation of *habere* as a future auxiliary passed through the channel of modal expressions or not. I think not.

In the TLL and elsewhere instances of *habere* + infinitive are divided into at least three groups, viz. those expressing 'ability', like our example (19) above, those expressing 'obligation or necessity', and, finally, those indicating mere future. I will first discuss examples of each of these categories and then try to determine the relationship between these interpretations.

(i) ability

Example (19) is our first example of *habere* governing an infinitive. It is agreed that in this example *habeo* must be understood as roughly equivalent to *possum*. *posse* is indeed very often found with *dicere* as its complement and in several of the instances of *habere* in Cicero *posse* could have been found instead. This is, of course, no proof of synonymy of the two constructions. There are also instances in Cicero, where the *posse* interpretation is not feasible at all and where a paraphrase 'to have at one's disposal' seems to be a better equivalent (cf. TLL s.v. 2438,27 ff.).²¹) Notice that the infinitive is *dicere*, and, in fact, *habere* in the interpretation 'be able to' is initially restricted to verbs of communication. This restriction is given up in Tertullian. Notice, furthermore, that initially the infinitives belong to two-place verbs,²²) and that an explicit Object constituent is present in the context. Undisputable instances of one-place verbs and passive forms of transitive verbs occur much later, in fact, not before Tertullian.

(ii) obligation/necessity

Some of the *obligation/necessity* examples in TLL 2454,53 ff. cannot easily be distinguished from the ability group, especially a few

²¹) In Cic. *N. D.* 3,93 *haec fere dicere habui de natura deorum* ('this more or less is what I have to say about the nature of the gods') is followed by a purpose clause, which is not very likely after *posse* + inf. In Cic. *Att.* 2,22,6 *de re publica nihil habeo ad te scribere nisi ...* ('of the political situation I have nothing to tell you except ...') *posse* is not an attractive alternative either.

²²) I refer throughout to TLL s.v. *habere* 2454,12 ff. for the '*posse*' cases.

poetic ones²³) and instances in interrogative sentences, where the so-called deliberative subjunctive would seem to be possible with a similar kind of ambiguity (Gratwick 1972: 388–9), for example (21):

(21) quid *habeo* aliud deos ... precari quam ut ('what more have I to ask of the gods than that ...', Augustus quoted in Suet. *Aug.* 28, 2)

Early non-Christian examples where the similarity to –not necessarily synonymy with –*debere* is more obvious are (22) and (23):

(22) utrum per *i* quaedam *habeant* dici an per *u* ('whether certain words should be pronounced with *i* or with *u*', Vel. G.L. 7, 49, 20 – ca. AD 100)

(23) neque enim laborare *habet* ut se repraesentet ('he need not exert himself to be present', Ulp. *Dig.* 48, 5, 1, 6, 3 – ca. AD 200)

The examples given in the TLL section 'obligation/necessity' show no restrictions on the infinitival complement from the very beginning. Notice the passive *dici* and the inanimate subject *quaedam* in (22). Passive infinitives are more frequent in Tertullian and the other Christian writers. I give two more examples to illustrate the point; (24) with existential *esse* and (25) with an impersonal passive.

(24) de ... nomine nullum *habet* esse luctamen ('about the name there should be no quarreling', Pacian. *Epist.* 1, 2 – AD 360–90)

(25) Pauci prophetae intellegebant et quid desideraretur a Deo et quando *haberet* publice praedicari ('few prophets understood both what it was that God wanted and when public preaching was required', Aug. *in psalm.* 72, 1)

There are a few instances in which the obligation/necessity-interpretation is reinforced by the presence of *necessario* (for example Tert. *Carn.* 6, p. 437 med.).²⁴)

The obligation/necessity-examples are definitely later than the ability-ones discussed before, which raises the question whether there is a historical development which connects the two groups (I leave out of account the 'deliberative' ones like [21]) and what criterion may be used to distinguish the two groups (see below).

(iii) mere future

Bulhart divides the examples – the first of which are found in Tertullian, again much later than the second group – into purely tem-

²³) Val. Fl. 1, 671, Statius *Theb.* 6, 160 – in both cases the text is disputed – see Gratwick (1972: 390–1) who suggests *avere*, too obviously in order to suit his own case.

²⁴) There are quite a few examples of *nesesse habere* + inf. in Tertullian, which I leave out of account.

poral future use and what I will label ‘destination’ use, where in Greek the verb μέλλειν would be appropriate. The latter type quite frequently exhibits past tenses of *habere* and also otherwise bears resemblance to the use of past tenses of *habere* in contrary-to-fact-expressions (death with by Bulhart s.v. 2458, 19 ff.). In other words, *habere* is often used in expressions denoting future in the past and as such is often compared with the French conditionnel. I will not make this distinction here, considering the fact that the common element in these instances is that they refer to some point of time posterior with respect to a reference point, which is either the present or the past. In Dik’s terminology: they combine posterior phasal aspect with present or past reference time (forthcoming).

One type of context in which ‘posteriority expressions’ may be expected are, of course, predictions. In fact, we find quite a few examples, one of which is (26):

(26) (Christum) praedixisse, quod plurimae sectae *haberent* existere (‘that Christ had predicted that quite some sects would emerge’, Lact. *Inst.* 4, 30, 2 – early third century)²⁵

A second type consists of coordinated or hypotactic constructions in which the construction of *habere* + inf. is used instead of or parallel with normal future forms. I give some examples:

(27) (arguing that it is sensible to recognize a separate ‘modus promissivus’ which is exemplified by:) *dabo* – *tolle* inde istum modum et tollere *habes* promissionem (‘*dabo* I will give, – eliminate that mood (i.e. the future form – H.P.) and you will eliminate the promise’, Pomp. G. L. V, 214–15 – fifth or sixth century)

(28) *habes* erubescere, cum venerit (‘you will blush, if he comes’, Aug. *Serm.* 279, 7)

In some of these examples the obligation/necessity interpretation is not excluded. The ability interpretation certainly is.²⁶

The third and last type consists of epexegetic cases like (29):

(29) *iudicabit*: *iudicare habet* (‘he will judge: he is bound to judge’, Aug. *in psalm.* 95, 15)

In view of my remarks on *posse* above, p. 192 ff., I will leave such cases aside.

²⁵ Earlier examples are Tert. *Scorp.* 9, p. 126, 25 (*prophetaret* – compare ex. (43) above with *posse*!); *adv. Iud.* 8, p. 715 (*praedicavit*); there is a consecutive clause in *adv. Prax.* 4, p. 432, 10; also Cassian. *Nest.* 7, 22, 3 (AD 431?) with *habeat* (v.l. *debeat*) accompanied by *forsitan*.

²⁶ In Tert. *ad Ux.* 1, 2, 3 we find a coordination of *-urus erat, oportebat* and inf. + *habebat*.

Having documented the three interpretations usually assigned to *habere* + infinitive we may now proceed to discuss the relationship between them and the question which interpretation was decisive for the historical development. The problem is interesting both in a historical perspective and, synchronically, with respect to Tertullian, in whose work the three interpretations are represented alongside each other. A fourth interpretation—volitive use—distinguished by Bulhart s.v. 2457,68 ff. I will leave aside, because—as Coleman (1971; 1976) observes—the examples are (very) late and can quite well be interpreted as ‘future’ expressions.²⁷⁾

An examination of the *habere* + infinitive cases in Tertullian shows that it is not easy to divide them into three distinct classes. It is especially difficult to distinguish between the *debere*-interpretation and the posteriority-one. This might suggest that the development of *habere* followed that of *debere*, in other words, that the development of *habere* into a future tense auxiliary verb followed its development into a modal verb indicating obligation. From a different angle Coleman (1971) rejects the idea that the possibility interpretation would have given rise to the future interpretation because language comparison shows us that this is a rare development, if it exists at all.²⁸⁾ So, in his opinion, the obligation/necessity interpretation will have been the most important factor. However, as I said, it is not that easy to distinguish the generally accepted interpretations. They seem to correlate with differences in the type of infinitive governed. In Tertullian the passages where one is inclined towards interpreting *habere* as equivalent to *posse* active two-place infinitives are by far the majority; with ‘posterior’-cases most infinitives are either passive or non-transitive one-place predicates; with *debere*-cases passive infinitives dominate over active or deponent ones; there are more active transitive infinitives, however, than in the posterior cases. It may be that the wish or necessity to select one of the interpretations as basic (both historically and synchronically) is the inevitable outcome if one starts by distinguishing different interpretations in the first place. Saying that in a specific context *habere* can

²⁷⁾ Coleman accepts the traditional opinion that *velle* is used as a future auxiliary, but we need not take that into account anymore.

²⁸⁾ Benveniste (1968) is more in favour of a ‘possibility’ origin of *habere* + infinitive, because it often occurs in relative clauses, where the *velle* interpretation is not very suitable. However, Benveniste exaggerates when saying (: 90) that the *habere* + infinitive expression was ‘restricted to SUBORDINATE, chiefly relative, clauses’.

be interpreted as more or less equivalent to *posse* or *debere* in a similar context does not mean that *habere* is synonymous with one of them or that they could be exchanged in any context (cf. Coleman [1976] for similar suggestions). There are certain indications for such an approach. If we compare the distribution of the three verbs *habere*, *debere* and *posse*, one distinction emerges: whereas in the cases of *posse* and *debere* we encountered redundant use, for example in imperative embedded clauses (exx. [7] and [11] above), no such examples occur with *habere*. The most likely explanation is that *habere* did not have a deontic and ability meaning allowing it to occur in environments which apparently suit *debere* and *posse* (this may also explain its absence in the *Mulomedicina Chironis*). Conversely, but I am not entirely sure about this, *habere* + inf. does not have an inferential or epistemic meaning either, which we noted for *debere* and *posse*, respectively; even the many passive sentences with inanimate subjects cannot be interpreted in that way. Finally, whereas *habere* is found with some frequency in embedded clauses with ‘prediction’ verbs, as in (26), *debere* is not found in similar contexts, at least not in Tertullian (of course, *posse* would even be more strange). On the basis of these impressions and facts we might conclude that *habere* is different from the other verbs and lacks the specific modal features of these verbs. The relationship between the various interpretations of *habere* is then quite understandable: *habere* just meant *habere* and just like with English *have to* and Dutch *hebben te* various interpretations may arise depending on person, sentence type, illocutionary force, etc.²⁹) In other words, the Latin data do not support the attribution of *habere*’s future tense auxiliary function to an earlier modal function of the same verb. Rather, the auxiliary use of *habere* will have developed via the channel of Praedicativum-constructions (Pinkster, forthcoming b): just as we find (30), we may also expect (31):

- (30) a) dare aquam bibendam (‘to give water to drink’)
 b) dare aquam bibere (‘to give water to drink’)
 (31) a) quid habes dicendum (‘what have you to say?’)
 b) quid habes dicere (‘what have you to say?’)

The infinitive in (30,b) is normally labeled ‘final’, or ‘purpose’. However, there is a notable distinction between such cases and pure final expressions as (32):

²⁹) Benveniste (1968: 90) also stresses the individual meaning of *habere* (according to him = ‘predestination’). Data on *debere* were assembled by Caroline Kroon and Margreet v.d. Griend.

(32) *senex in Ephesum ibit aurum arcessere* ('the old man will go to Ephesus to fetch the gold', Plt. *Ba.* 354)

The restrictions on the use of the infinitive are the same as those that hold for other types of purpose expressions: the main verb must be controllable—in fact most examples are like (32) in that they contain verbs indicating motion towards a goal. The subjects, therefore, typically refer to human beings. The infinitive itself is restricted to controllable (Action) verbs (Perrochat 1932: 161 ff.; Lamiroy 1984).³⁰) There are no such restrictions on the use of *habere* + infinitive. Therefore, I do not believe that the *habere* + infinitive construction is related to the final infinitive proper.

3. *ire* + infinitive

I add a few remarks on *ire* ('to go'). Motion verbs are a regular source of tense expressions. The question is whether in Latin, too, *ire* (and other motion verbs) may have this meaning.

Letoublon (1983) has recently discussed the status of *ire* in its construction with supine forms. An example of this construction is (33):

(33) *deos atque amicos iit salutatum ad forum* ('He has gone to the forum to pay his respects to the gods and his friends', Plt. *Ba.* 347)

Here, as in our example (32) above, we find a verb of movement with an Agent as its Subject and a Purpose Adjunct, the predicate of which is controllable. Letoublon rightly argues that *ire* in the construction with a supine cannot be regarded as an auxiliary because the supine is found with a range of verbs of movement—both one-place and two-place—, e.g. *currere* ('to run') and *mittere* ('to send'). The same holds for the infinitive of purpose in the example (32) (cf. Perrochat 1932: 165). Also in examples of *ire* + infinitive/supine where the aspect of movement is less obvious (TLL sv. *ire* 648, 18 ff.) the Subject of *ire* is always a human being and the dependent predicate controllable. In late Latin the restriction on controllability of the embedded predication seems to be weakened: we occasionally find passive infinitives.³¹) On the whole, however, *ire* + infinitive/

³⁰) Lamiroy denies the purpose-function of the Latin supine, I think without reason. Her description of the restrictions, in fact, suggests that the supine is a purpose-expression.

³¹) The range of verbs with which supines and infinitives are found is also widened. Compare Perrochat (1932: 166 ff.) who cites inter alia *unguere* in Fila-

supine, as far as its internal structure is concerned, cannot be proved to be a periphrastic future tense expression, comparable with French *je vais manger*. There is even counterevidence to be found in the external distribution of the construction, viz. the fact that the expression *ire* + supine itself occurs embedded with main predicates that do not govern future tense infinitives, e.g. *volo* ('I want') (Gell. 14,6,1); *polliciti sunt* ('they have promised') (Ps. Rufin. in Os. 8,8–10, p.1003^B); *licet* ('it is allowed') (Ven. Fort. *Carm.* 10,6,42).

As for *vadere* ('to go'), there is no indication of future auxiliary properties in the TLL material.

So far I have been dealing with active forms of *ire* and the conclusion is that there is no proof of auxiliary use (in spite of statements of Latin grammarians). Letoublon reaches the opposite conclusion for supine forms with the passive infinitive of *ire*, an example of which is (34):

(34) nisi se sciat vilico non *datum iri* ('unless she knows that she is not to be given to the bailiff', Plt. *Cas.* 699)

Perrochat (1932: 70) declares that in the few early Latin examples (Plautus and Terence) the aspect of movement is still present, but even in his best example the aspect of movement is inherent in the predicate in the supine, viz. *deductum* in (35):

(35) credebas dormienti haec tibi confecturos deos et illam sine tua opera in cubiculum *iri deductum* domum ('did you think the gods would do your work while you slept and that without your lifting a finger the wife would be brought home to the bridal chamber', Ter. *Ad.* 693–4)

(Notice the neat coordination of *-tum iri* with the—equally periphrastic—active future *confecturos*). *datum iri* in (34) indeed must be regarded as a periphrastic infinitival expression in which *iri* has lost its own meaning (and restrictions), and in which the original supine form *datum* lacks the purpose meaning found in (33).

The *-tum iri* construction is remarkable for a number of reasons. First of all, the passive form *iri* itself. We find cases of impersonal passive forms of intransitive verbs in Latin (for example *itur*, 'one goes'). However, the infinite form *-tum iri* in our examples seems to correspond with a personal finite form in direct speech (in [35]: *illa deducetur* 'she will be ...'). We possess only one personal finite exam-

strius of Brescia (second half fourth century) 107, 14: (*spiritus*) *unxit me evangelizare pauperibus, misit me praedicare* ('the holy spirit anointed me in order to evangelize the poor, sent me to preach').

ple of *itur* and a supine, quoted from Cato (*Orat.* 54) by Gellius 10,14,4 in an explicit discussion of the *-tum iri* construction. It runs:

(36) *contumelia, quae mihi per huiusce petulantiam factum itur* ('this insult which is going to be put upon me by the insolence of this man')

Gellius says that this–personal–construction is '*remotius*', 'less well-known', whereas the infinitival construction is found *vulgo* ('in everyday speech') and is already(?) a general form of expression (*istam esse verborum figuram iam in medio loquendi usu*). However, in (36) the meaning of the finite construction is the same as that of the infinite one, according to Gellius: 'Just as *contumeliam factum iri* means *iri ad contumeliam faciendam*³² ('to go to inflict an injury'), that is, to take pains that it be inflicted, just so *contumelia mihi factum itur* expresses the same idea, merely with a change of case'. Notice that Gellius in his paraphrase regards *iri* as an impersonal passive movement verb and the supine as a purpose expression governing *contumeliam* (accusative case form)³³. His further comment, however, makes it clear that he regards *contumeliam* in the infinitival construction as a Subject Patient. One hypothesis often advanced in the literature says that *contumeliam* was reinterpreted as a Subject in an Accusative and Infinitive construction, originally being an Object constituent, but as I remarked above there are no early examples to support this hypothesis. It is very unlikely that a personal construction like (36) was the basis of the infinitive constructions, since, as I said, personal passives of one-place verbs are most unusual³⁴ (cf. Wackernagel [1926: 149] and Letoublon [1983: 222–3; forthcoming]). As to the question whether the passive future infinitive expression *-tum iri* is an extension of a putative finite impersonal ex-

³²) We find impersonal *iri* once with a purpose expression, viz. Liv. 26,9,5 *ad defendendam iri patriam* ('that they were marching to defend their native city').

³³) There is one example of a *-tum iri* expression governing a dative constituent, vit. (*respondet*) *ipsi vero nihil nocitum iri, inque eam rem se suam fidem interponere* ('he answered, that he himself certainly no harm would be done and thereto he pledged his own word', Caes. *Gal.* 5,36,2). This example might be used to explain the accusative case form, as in (35) *illam*, as the normal expression for Objects (thus depending on *deductum*).

³⁴) There are a few nominative and infinitive expressions with *videri* ('to appear') plus *-tum iri*: Plt. *Rud.* 1242 (rejected by Szantyr 1965: 381, probably with reason); Cic. *Att.* 11,13,4 (against the majority of the mss. Translations do not really correspond with the expression that is taken for granted. Why not read *neque tam mihi desperatae videbantur*, or something like that?); Liv. 23,34,12; Quint. 9,2,88.

pression like **contumeliam factum itur* (reconstructed by Wackernagel [1926: 149] and others but rejected by Coleman [forthcoming] and Letoublon [1983; forthcoming]) as a future tense auxiliary, I am inclined to give a negative answer: firstly, there was no need for finite passive future forms as alternatives for the synthetic forms and, secondly, active *ire* had not been grammaticalized as a future tense auxiliary.

Another remarkable fact concerning *-tum iri* is that the passive voice is expressed on the auxiliary (*iri*). This is most unusual, as far as I know. In Latin passive auxiliaries are rare, and occur only if the governed infinite form is passive as well (e.g. *potestur*—TLL s.v. 136,77) as some sort of attraction.³⁵⁾

The explanations for the origin of the *-tum iri* expression in some way or other presuppose a development of *ire* + supinum from a purpose expression into more or less an equivalent of the normal future forms. It is strange, to my mind, to assume that the infinitival expression continued to exist (although it is not used very often—Szantyr 1965: 381), whereas there are no traces of the development in the case of finite forms. I have no suggestions of my own, except—tentatively—that the expression may have been coined instead of having developed gradually.³⁶⁾

References

- Adams, J.N. (1976): *The Text and Language of a Vulgar Latin Chronicle (Anonymus Valesianus II)*, London, BICS, Suppl. 36.
- Benveniste, E. (1968): 'Mutations of linguistic categories', in: Lehmann, W.P. & Y. Malkiel (eds.) (1968), *Directions for Historical Linguistics*, Austin/London, 85–94.
- Bolkestein, A. M. (1980): *Problems in the Description of Modal Verbs*, Assen, Van Gorcum.
- Coleman, R. (1971): 'The origin and development of Latin *habeo* + infinitive', *Cl. Q.* 21, 215–232.
- (1976): 'Further observations on *habeo* + infinitive', *Cl. Q.* 26, 151–9.
- (forthc.): 'The Latin Future Passive Infinitive', below pp.208–212.

³⁵⁾ For this kind of attraction cf. Bolkestein (1980: 121). Letoublon suggests that the supine might be regarded as a semantically passive form but this is not very attractive.

³⁶⁾ I thank a number of colleagues, especially Dr. A. M. Bolkestein, Dr. D. den Hengst, Prof. Dr. C.J. Ruijgh and my (former) assistants Margreet v.d. Griend, Hotze Mulder and—above all—Caroline Kroon for their help.

- Dik, S. C. (forthcoming): 'Copula auxiliarisation: how and why', Paper ISHL Pavia (1985).
- Eeden, W. van (1985): *Invataturi Reste Toate Zilele* (1642), Edition et étude linguistique, Amsterdam, Rodopi.
- Fleischman, S. (1982): *The Future in Thought and Language. Diachronic Evidence from Romance*, Cambridge, U.P.
- Givón, T. (1973): 'The time-axis phenomenon', *Lg* 49, 890–925.
- Goelzer, H. (1884): *Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la Latinité de St. Jérôme*, Paris, Hachette.
- Gougenheim, G. (1929): *Étude sur les Péripfrases Verbales de la Langue Française*, Paris.
- Gratwick, A.S. (1972): 'Habeo and aveo: The Romance future', *Cl. Q.* 22, 388–98.
- Grevander, S. (1926): *Untersuchungen zur Sprache der Mulomed. Chironis*, Diss. Lund.
- Klebs, E. (1899): *Die Erzählung von Apollonius von Tyros*, Berlin, Reimer.
- Koffmane, G. (1879): *Entstehung und Entwicklung des Kirchenlateins*, Breslau, Koebner.
- Lamiroy, B. (1984): 'The Latin Supine and the French Infinitive', *SiL* 8, 253–8.
- Lehmann, Chr. (1982): *Thoughts on Grammaticalisation*, Köln, Akup 48.
- Letoublon, F. (1983): 'Les verbes de mouvement et l'auxiliarité en latin', *Glotta* 61, 218–228.
- (forthcoming): 'D'une phrase de Caton interprétée par Wackernagel et du retour aux nuits attiques' (paper 3° Coll. Latin Linguistics, Bologna 1985).
- Löfstedt, E. (1928 [1942²], 1933): *Syntactica*, Lund, Gleerup, 2 vols.
- Müller, B. (1964): 'Das lateinische Futurum und die romanischen Ausdrucksweisen des futurischen Geschehens', *Rom. Forsch.* 76, 44–97.
- Nyström, G. (1926): *Variatio Sermonis hos Columella*, Göteborg, Elander.
- Perrochat, P. (1932): *Recherches sur la Valeur et l'Emploi de l'Infinitif Subordonné en Latin*, Paris, Belles Lettres.
- Petersmann, H. (1977): *Petrone's urbane Prosa*, Wien, Akademie.
- Pinkster, H. (forthcoming a): Some methodological remarks on research on future tense auxiliaries in Latin', in: Calboli, G. (ed.) ...
- (forthcoming b): The Strategy and Chronology of the Development of Future and Perfect Tense Auxiliaries in Latin, in: Harris, M. & P. Ramat (eds.), Proceedings of the colloquium on auxiliaries of the ISHL, Pavia 1985, Berlin, De Gruyter.
- Schrijnen, J. & C. Mohrmann (1936–7): *Studien zur Syntax der Briefe des hl. Cyprian*, 2 vols., Nijmegen, Dekker & Van de Vegt.
- Shea, G.W. (1966): *The Johannine of Flavius Cresconius Corippus. Prolegomena and Translation*, Unpubl. Ph.D. Columbia (Univ. Microfilms 67–808).
- Sittl, K. (1882): *Die lokale Verschiedenheit in der lat. Sprache*, Erlangen.
- Skahill, B.H. (1934): *The Syntax of the Variæ of Cassiodorus*, Washington DC, Cath. Univ.
- Souter, A. (1957): *A Glossary of Later Latin to AD 600*, Oxford, U.P.
- Strunk, K. (1968): 'Zeit und Tempus in altindogermanischen Sprachen', *IF* 73, 279–311.
- Svennung, J. (1936): *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache*, Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksells.

- Szantyr, A. (1965): *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, München, Beck.
- Thielmann, Ph. (1885): 'Habere mit dem Infinitiv und die Entstehung des romanischen Futurums', *ALL* 2, 157–202.
- Wackernagel, J. (1926, 1928): *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, Basel, Birkhäuser & Co., 2 vols.
- Watson, E. W. (1896): 'The style and language of St. Cyprian', in: *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* IV, 189–324 (Oxford U.P.).
- Zwanenburg, H. (1927): *Posse et son évolution en vieux français*, Amsterdam, Paris.

The Latin Future Passive Infinitive

By ROBERT COLEMAN, Cambridge

1.1. In her interesting paper in *Glotta* 61.218–28 Françoise Létoublon reopened the problem of the origin of the Latin future passive infinitive. The present paper¹⁾ deals with certain of the difficulties to which she drew attention in the existing accounts of the phenomenon and its history.

2.1. The standard derivation²⁾ goes something like this: (1 A) *eo praedam redditum* 'I am going to return/am on the way to returning the loot' with (1 B) its infinitival form *me ire praedam redditum* → (2 A) an impersonal *itur praedam redditum*, again with its infinitival form (2 B) *iri praedam redditum* → (3 B) a reanalysis of (2 B) with *praedam* treated as subject (as it is in *praedam reddi, praedam redditam esse*): *praedam redditum iri* → (4 A) *praeda redditum itur*. Each of the four stages poses difficulties.

2.2. In (1 A) and (1 B) it is impossible to establish an unequivocally future meaning for the combination *eo redditum*.³⁾ The supine *redditum* is simply the accusative of a verbal noun in *-tu-*, used in an allative function with a verb of motion to signal the goal or end point of the action; cf. *eo ad praedam reddendam*. As such it often has a purposive meaning with *eo*, as with *uenio, mitto, do*, and this can be recovered by reference either to the tense or mood of *ire* that is used

¹⁾ Which has benefited from discussion with Dr. Létoublon herself, Dr. Michèle Fruyt and Prof. H. B. Rosén; none of whom should, however, be held to blame for what follows.

²⁾ Based on Aulus Gellius *N.A.* 10.14. See J. Wackernagel *Vorlesungen über Syntax* 1.149 and the subsequent literature cited by Létoublon.

³⁾ Létoublon's scepticism (220–1) is, if anything, understated.