THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF LATIN
HABEO + INFINITIVE

I

IT is well known that the future indicative and conditional (or future-in-the-past) paradigms of most Central and West Romance languages reflect a Latin infinitival construction with *habeo*, e.g. Italian *canterò* < *cantare habeo*, *cantaria* < *cantare habebam*.[1] Although the development was essentially a Vulgar Latin one and so belongs to the subliterate register of the language, it is reflected[2] now and again in the written material from the classical and post-classical periods. It is, therefore, possible by a study of its occurrences in the written material to make inferences about its origins within the antecedent morpho-syntactic system and the structural pressures that gave rise to its development.

The construction is not attested[3] before the late Republic; *habeo etiam dicere quem . . . de ponte in Tiberim deiecerit* (Cic. *S. Rosc.* 100) appears in fact to be the earliest example. Here, as in *item in multis hoc rebus dicere habemus* (Lucr. 6. 711), it is tempting to see the influence of the Greek ἔχω+infinitive.[4] However, neither Lucretius nor Cicero, who uses the construction more frequently than any other classical author, was addicted to Graecism at the grammatical level, and the usage does not gain ground in the Hellenizing registers of early imperial writers like Seneca. In any case foreign influences do not become established in a language unless the structural conditions in the latter are favourable;[5] so it is worth examining relevant functions of both *habeo* and the infinitive in earlier Latin.

Although the construction is not found in Plautus, Terence, Petronius, or the colloquial inscriptions of the republic and early empire, the conjecture[6] that it was in origin a colloquialism imported into the literary register by Cicero and

---

[1] The most recent discussion, by Valesio (the literature referred to in the present paper is listed at the end), is concerned primarily with the phonological aspects of the construction in proto-Romance, which are not treated here. For a general account of the paradigmatic remodellings within the independent Romance areas see Meyer-Lübke, 2. 311–24.

[2] It is assumed as a general principle that where a phenomenon that becomes established in the subliterate register (Vulgar Latin) and thereafter has important effects upon the grammatical system of the language appears in the literate register only as a deviant from the normal usage, the influence is from the former to the latter and not vice versa.

[3] The data used throughout depend almost entirely on Bulhart's citations.

[4] Especially attractive in *de diuis neque ut sint neque ut non sint habeo dicere* (Cic. *N.D.* I. 63), rendering Protagoras' περὶ μὲν θεῶν οὐκ

ἔχω εἰδέναι οὔθ' ὡς εἰσὶν οὔθ' ὡς οὐκ εἰσίν (D.L. 9. 51). The deviant *ut* clause, often taken as an interrogative conjunction, is more likely intended to reproduce the effect of the ὡς clause with εἰδέναι. The latter is sometimes employed elsewhere in Greek with prolepsis of the subject of the subordinate verb, e.g. τοσοῦτόν γ' οἶδα κἀμαυτὴν ὅτι ἀλγῶ (Soph. *El.* 332–3), cf. τοσοῦτόν γ' οἶδα κἀμαυτὴν ἀλγοῦσαν; see further Goodwin, 912. It is interesting that Plato twice characterizes Protagoras by attributing the construction to him, *Prot.* 323 B, 323 D. That the use of *habeo* here is not just an intrusive Graecism is suggested both by the earlier occurrences of the construction in Cicero and by his choice of *dicere* here rather than *scire*, which accords with the lexical restrictions in his use of the construction generally.

[5] See Weinreich, pp. 31 ff. The Greek origin is, however, accepted by Leumann, p. 69.

[6] See Thielmann [1], p. 51.

Lucretius remains attractive. For the structural conditions in which it must have arisen can be discerned specifically in the colloquial language.

The use of the infinitive to signal Purpose or Destination is well attested in Plautus, both as primary complement to verbs of motion and more relevantly as secondary complement to transitive-verb phrases, e.g. *uenerat aurum petere hinc* (*Bac.* 631a), *reddere hoc non perdere erus me misit* (*Ps.* 642). *id habeo+dicere* = 'I have it to say, I have it for saying' would exhibit a comparable pattern.

The infinitive as primary complement to transitive verbs like *uolo, debeo* and even to strictly intransitive ones like *possum, desisto* is familiar in all periods. Plautine Latin exhibits a wide range of verbs in the head position of this pattern, in particular *sed occupabo adire* (*Mos.* 566), *earumque artem et disciplinam optineat colere* (*Mil.* 186), *et bene facere et male tenet* (*Bac.* 655). A comparable analysis here would give *habeo+id dicere* = 'I have to-say-it, I have the saying of it.'[1]

Both patterns, *id habeo+dicere* and *id dicere+habeo*, could have become established independently, and many of the classical examples admit either analysis, e.g. *quid dicere habeant cur illa uera definitio sit?* (Cic. *Ac.* 2. 43), *quid enim dare maius habebant?* (Ov. *Met.* 9. 658), *plura quidem mandare tibi si quaeris habebam* (Ov. *Tr.* 1. 1. 123), *sed haec . . . in uniuersum . . . de toto genere huius arboris habui dicere* (Col. 5. 8. 7).

In some instances apparent rivalry with relative-clause constructions favours the first analysis, e.g. *haec fere dicere habui de natura deorum* (Cic. *N.D.* 3. 93), *de re publica nihil habeo ad te scribere* (Cic. *Att.* 2. 22. 6); cf. *haec habui de amicitia quae dicerem* (Cic. *Amic.* 104), *nihil habebam quod scriberem* (Cic. *Att.* 9. 10. 1).[2]

Clear instances of the second analysis are harder to discern. In theory *habeo etiam dicere quem . . . de ponte in Tiberim deiecerit* (Cic. *S. Rosc.* 100) and *de Alexandrina re causaque regia tantum habeo polliceri me tibi . . . satis facturum* (*Fam.* 1. 5a. 3) could be derived from *habeo id etiam dicere, tantum habeo id polliceri* by extension of the pronominal complement to the infinitives. But this seems somewhat strained in view of the frequency of patterns like *dico quem deiecerit, polliceor me facturum*, which in any event would have exerted pressure towards a re-analysis of *habeo id+infinitive* as *habeo+id infinitive*. Less disputable are *an melius quis habet suadere?* (Hor. *Epod.* 16. 23), where *melius* is better taken as an adverb with *suadere* than as direct object with *habet*,[3] *nec te si cupiat laedere rumor habet* (Ov. *Pont.* 3. 1. 82), where the verse-rhythm supports the construction of *laedere* with *habet* rather than with *cupiat*, and *habesne nobis dicere in libris rhetorum uestrorum tam apte tamque modulate compositam orationem?* (Gel. 17. 20. 5), where both the word order and the elaboration of the complement favour the second analysis.[4]

---

[1] Thielmann's explanation ([1] p. 65, [2] pp. 379–81) is different, but not incompatible. He saw a relation between *id dicere habeo* and *id mihi dicere est* as an extension of the series *id habeo*: *id mihi est, id habeo gratum*: *id mihi gratum est, id habeo dictum*: *id mihi dictum est, id habeo dicendum*: *id mihi dicendum est*. The objection to this specific formulation is that the two crucial entries *id habeo dicendum* and *id mihi dicere est* are, in the republic and early empire, as rare as *id habeo dicere* itself. The former, though attested early, *ibi agrum de nostro patre colendum habebat* (Ter. *Ph.* 364–5), was never very productive and the latter is not certainly attested before *nec sit mihi*

credere tantum (Verg. *Ecl.* 10. 46). However, in view of our meagre sources for urban colloquial Latin of this period outside the literary register the objection is perhaps not decisive.

[2] The rivalry of *habeo aliquid dicere* with *habeo quod dicam, habeo quid dicam* is emphasized by Leumann, pp. 68–70, as an important factor in the establishment of the construction.

[3] So Porphyry, who paraphrases *an quis habet meliorem suadelam.*

[4] *nec uos incessere luctu | orba habeo* (Stat. *Theb.* 6. 159–60) belongs here, if the text is sound.

We can confidently assert that the second pattern had completely established itself when the infinitival phrase is replaced by an intransitive or passive infinitive.[1] Examples of this extension are not found until very late in the classical period, *tollique vicissim / pontus habet* (V. Fl. 1. 671–2, if the text is sound), *ut iam in ambiguitatem cadat utrum per i quaedam habeant dici an per u* (Vel. gram. in *G.L.* 7. 49. 20–1),[2] *sic habeo queri quasi relinquar* ([Quint.] *Decl.* 16 .5). Thereafter examples are plentiful, e.g. *in omnem terram habebat praedicatio apostolorum* (Tert. *adv. Iud.* 5. 6), *corpus quod solum ab hominibus habet occidi* (Tert. *Scorp.* 10. 13).

From these it is clear that, whether or not one accepts the independent origin of the two patterns proposed above, it was the second of them, *habeo*+ *id dicere*, that finally prevailed, and it was this that dictated the subsequent developments.

II

The functional range of the construction is difficult to define, but for the classical material we may follow Thielmann and set up meanings tangential to both (*a*) Possibility and (*b*) Obligation or Necessity. For post-classical Latin we can add meanings tangential to (*c*) Futurity[3] and, for the preterite morphemes of *habeo*, (*d*) Futurity-in-the-past and (*e*) Conditioned unreality. We must emphasize 'tangential', since throughout the whole of post-classical Latinity *habeo* in all its other uses reveals no shift in its basic semantic field. Meanings (*a*) and (*b*) continue to be signalled more commonly by their classical exponents, *posse* and *debere*, *necesse est*, etc., respectively.[4] Even meanings (*c*), (*d*), (*e*), in which the Romance phenomena prove that the *habere* constructions eventually supplanted the classical exponents in the spoken language, are still signalled far more often by the latter in written Latin of all periods.

A meaning tangential to Possibility is plausible for most of the classical examples. There are occasional uncertainties, as in *compos factus uotorum meorum . . . quid habeo aliud deos immortales precari quam ut . . . ?* (Suet. *Aug.* 58. 2), where the ambiguity as between Possibility and Obligation, which, incidentally, would also arise with the subjunctive *precer*,[5] is not resolved by the context.

[1] A similar argument applies to the comparable gerundival construction. In *multi enim habent in praediis quibus frumentum aut uinum aliudue quid prosit importandum; contra non pauci quibus aliquid sit exportandum* (Var. *R.* 1. 16. 2) *importandum* may be either the impersonal gerund or, less probably, a gerundive like *exportandum* but with *aliquid* 'understood'. However, only the former interpretation is possible for *pugnandum habebam* (Fuluius, in Sen. *Con.* 10. 2. 4) and *praesertim cum enitendum haberemus ut . . .* (Plin. *Ep.* 1. 8. 12).

[2] Keil follows Schneider in printing *debeant dici* for *habent dici* (cod. Parr.), *habeant dici* (Ursinus).

[3] Bulhart's division of Futurity into (i) *de euentu futuro de causis exspectando*, cf. μέλλειν, (ii) *de tempore*, (iii) *de uoluntate*, (iv) *sensu potentiali* is in general too refined to be usefully applied to such indeterminate phenomena. In any event a distinction between Possibility (*idem quod posse*) and *sensu poten-*

tialis, for instance, seems to belong to metaphysics rather than linguistics. More serious, Bulhart's omission of a separate and morphologically marked category for Futurity-in-the-past obscures an important morpho-syntactic link between Futurity and Conditioned unreality (*pro praeterito*: *in enuntiatione irreali*), which becomes crucial for the understanding of the subsequent Romance phenomena.

[4] As in the Romance languages by reflexes of **potēre* (Meyer-Lübke, 2. 248–51, 3. 325–6), *debere* (ibid. 2. 244–5, 3. 325–6) *necessarium est*. Both *oportet* and the gerund and gerundive, whose functions were transferred to infinitival constructions, were lost in proto-Romance, only the ablative gerund showing any subsequent reflexes (ibid. 3. 312).

[5] For the interchangeability of *habeo*+ infinitive and the subjunctive in interrogative statements generally see Compernass, p. 120.

Post-classical examples occur in both patristic and secular literature: *si inimicos . . . iubemur diligere, quem habemus odisse?* (Tert. *Apol.* 37. 1, where the interpretation is confirmed by the following sentence, *item si iidem laesi uicem referre prohibemur, . . . quem possumus laedere?*) ; *nam cum dicas 'acerrimus', quid habet remanere nisi 'acer'?* ([Serg.] in *G.L.* 4. 491), *quid enim dicere habebunt sanum, si conabuntur aliter interpretari hoc quod scribit?* (Iren. 5. 13. 5), *si enim non haberet caro saluari, nequaquam Verbum Dei caro factum esset* (ibid. 14. 1).

Although the Greek original is no longer extant for the last two passages quoted, the considerable amount of bilingual material available in the translation literature provides us with valuable semantic checks, especially where a number of Latin variants exist. Thus in the biblical translations: οὐδὲν εἶχον ἀντειπεῖν (Acts 4: 14), *nihil habebant contradicere* Vet. d e,[1] *nihil habebant quod contradicere* Vet. p, cf. *nihil poterant contradicere* Vulg. ; κατ' οὐδένος εἶχεν μείζονος ὀμόσαι (Hebr. 6: 13), *per neminem maiorem habuit ei iurare* Vet. r, cf. *neminem habuit per quem iuraret maiorem* Vulg.[2] From the secular literature we have οὔτ' ἀντιλέγειν ἔχων διὰ τάξίωμα τοῦ παρακαλοῦντος (Jos. *Ant.* 1. 338) *neque contradicere ualens propter dignitatem supplicantis.*

A meaning tangential to Obligation-Necessity can be discerned in *quid habui facere? perducere illum ad patrem? non feci* (Cest. ap. Sen. *Con.* 1. 1. 19) and in the sentence from Velius Longus cited earlier (p. 217 above). In post-classical Latin typical examples are *at uero Christus mori missus nasci quoque necessario habuit ut mori posset* (Tert. *Carn. Chr.* 6. 6), *eici de ecclesia et excludi habebat* (Cypr. *Ep.* 52. 3, where cod. P has *debebat*), *cum de uino ageretur quia debuerunt ostendere si acescere coeperat . . . dixisti quia habuerunt Aginesi ostendere* (Aug. *Ep.* 247. 3), *quo modo habemus dicere? dicit 'in numero plurali unum l ponere debemus et dicere milia'* (Pomp. gram. in *G.L.* 5. 185. 20–1).

The construction is rarely used to render the normal Greek exponents of Obligation or Necessity, e.g. ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν (John 19: 7), *habet mori* Vet. c, cf. *debet mori* Vet. codd. cett., Vulg. In Greek of the Christian era ἔχω+infinitive sometimes has this meaning,[3] and a few instances of the equivalence of *habeo*

---

[1] The versions of the Gospels in the *Vetus Latina* are cited from Jülicher–Matzkow–Aland, *Itala* (Berlin, 1938–63). For the other books of the New Testament in the *Vetus Latina* and for the *Vulgata* the edition of Wordsworth–White–Sparks–Adams (Oxford, 1889–1954) has been used. Although the *sigla* used for the various manuscripts in these two editions do not correspond, there seemed no danger of confusion in following them, since they are being cited throughout for different books. For a comprehensive and elaborate system reconciling the earlier systems of classification see B. Fischer, *Vetus Latina nach Petrus Sabatier*, 1 (1949), *Verzeichnis der Sigel*. The Greek text is that of A. Souter (Oxford, 1947). Passages where it is clear that the various Latin translators are following different Greek originals have of course been omitted.

[2] *habeo*+infinitive is rarely used in this sense in the *Vulgata*, e.g. μηδὲν ἔχων λέγειν περὶ ἡμῶν φαῦλον (Titus 2: 8), *nihil habens malum dicere de nobis* Vulg., cf. *nihil habens quod*

dicere de nobis malum Vet. d e. The construction of *non habeo quod* (or *quid*)+infinitive, which is found occasionally in post-classical Latin and reflected in Romance, probably results from a contamination of *non habeo quod* (or *quid*)+subjunctive and *non habeo quidquam*+infinitive. There is no need to assume, with Leumann, p. 68, the influence of the parallel Greek construction (for which see Mayser, 154. 20 ff.). Indeed the equivalence is sometimes rejected in the translation literature, as in the example just cited and in *non habent quid manducare* Vet. q for οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσιν, cp. *non habent escam* Vet. a, *non habent quid edant* Vet. e, . . . *quod manducent* Vet. aur., Vulg.; οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξαι (Luke 12: 17), *non habeo quo congregem* Vet. aur. q, Vulg., . . . *quo colligam* Vet. e, . . . *ubi congeram* Vet. a.

[3] No certain examples have been noted before the Christian period. Both ἀργύριον οὐκ εἴχομεν αὐτῶι προχρῆσθαι and ὅπως ἔχωμεν ἀποχρήσασθαι, the only two examples cited by Mayser, 154. 2, show the retention

to ἔχω can therefore be assigned to this category, e.g. πολλὰ ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν λαλεῖν (John 8: 26), *multa habeo de uobis loqui* Vet. codd. pler., Vulg. However, the frequency of this meaning in Greek of the Christian period has perhaps been exaggerated,[1] and ambiguous examples of the equivalence seem on the whole better assigned to the meaning Potentiality, e.g. the single extant bilingual instance of the construction in Irenaeus: ὡς ὑψηλότερόν τι καὶ μεῖζον ἔχοντες ἐπιδεῖξαι (1 praef. 1), *quasi altius aliquid et maius habentes ostendere.*

The semantic shift from future-directed modalities to simple Futurity is a commonplace of historical linguistics. Of the two modalities in question here,[2] Obligation-Necessity was probably the more decisive antecedent to the new semantic developments.

For there are no clear parallels for the shift from Possibility to Futurity.[3] Examples like οὔτε ὑμεῖς ἐὰν σιωπήσητε κρείττονι ἔργῳ ἔχετε ἐπιγραφῆναι (Ignat. *Rom.* 2), καὶ τότε ἀκοῦσαι ἔχεις ἐὰν ἄξιος γένῃ (Cyrill. H. *Catech.* 1. 2) are inconclusive in view of the possible ambiguity of ἔχω+infinitive in this period. In any event, though well attested in the patristic and early Byzantine documents,[4] the actual construction is not productive in Greek,[5] where exponents of Volition were already taking over future meanings.

---

of the classical meaning Potentiality. The earliest instance cited by Arndt-Gingrich: καὶ εἶπεν ἐπειδὴ ἔχω λαλῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον (LXX, Gen. 18 : 31) could be read with either meaning and is in any case textually suspect, cf. the v.l. λαλήσω and the Latin version: *quia semel ait coepi loquar ad dominum* Vet., Vulg.

[1] A number of the instances cited in the lexicons could equally well be classified under Possibility, e.g. εἴ γε τὰ τῷ θεῷ διαφέροντα γνῶναι θέλεις, παρὰ τούτου μόνον ἔχεις (Clem. 1. 12), μικρὸν ἔχω ἀναπαυθῆναι καὶ πάντα σοι ἐπιλύσω (Herm. *Sim.* 9. 10, cf. *habeo modicam occupationem et omnia tibi explicabo* in the Latin version). Unassailable evidence for the meaning Obligation-Necessity seems to be relatively late, e.g. κατὰ τὴν πρώτην κλῆσιν εὐθὺς ἐλθεῖν εἴχομεν πρὸς τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην ἀλλά . . . (*Ep.* ap. C. Chalc. *act.* 4, cited by Lampe B2c). The whole pattern of development of ἔχω+infinitive in the Roman and Byzantine period is in fact still blurred by uncertainties and deserves a thorough re-examination.

[2] A third modality, Volition, is recognized by Bulhart, and is even accepted by Salonius, p. 284, as the *chief* antecedent to the development of future meanings with this construction. The assumed semantic shift itself is plausible enough. It is attested, though very rarely, in the post-classical use of *uolo*, e.g. *miseris modo matribus Afris* / *iam seruire uolunt* (Coripp. Ioh. 6. 88–9) ; μέλλοντες ἀναλαμβάνειν (Acts 20: 13) *uolentes suscipere* Vet. e, cp. *mox recepturi* Vet. c, *suscepturi* Vulg., and conversely ἀπολῦσαι αὐτούς . . . οὐ θέλω (Matt. 15 : 32), *non remittam eos* Vet. e k,

cp. *dimittere eos . . . nolo* Vet. codd. pler., Vulg. Moreover it is implied in the use of reflexes of *uoleo+infinitive to signal futurity in certain North Italian dialects (see Rohlfs, 2. 592) and of course in Rumanian, where *voiŭ sa cînt* 'I shall sing' < *uoleo *si *canto* and the older *voiŭ cînta* < *uoleo cantare, both developments no doubt supported by Slavonic (cf. OCS *xotętъ*+infinitive) and especially Greek influence (cf. Byzantine θέλω+infinitive, θέλω να+subjunctive). On all this see further Müller, pp. 66–71.

However, it is difficult to find any secure examples of *habeo*+infinitive with a meaning tangential to Volition, and most of those cited by Bulhart under the heading *de uoluntate* pose problems. *quid . . . non eligis si quos habes eligere* = τί . . . οὐκ ἐκλέγῃ . . . οὓς θέλεις (Past. Herm. *Sim.* 9. 9) is one of the very few plausible ones and seems to represent an extension from an already established future meaning rather than an antecedent to it.

[3] Which is favoured by Wackernagel, p. 197, as the explanation of the Latin development.

[4] See Lampe, s.v. ἔχω B2b; Sophocles, s.v. ἔχω (6). The latter does not attempt to distinguish Futurity from Obligation-Necessity.

[5] Jannaris, p. 553, regarded the Greek phenomena as Latinisms, characteristic rather than of the 'scholastic writers' than of 'popular speech'. It is not clear how independent OCS. *imamъ*+infinitive is of the Greek patterns, or Gothic *haban*+infinitive of the Latin, since neither language has any distinctive exponents of Futurity; see Lunt, 21. 11, Mossé, 246.

In Latin itself the use of *posse* as a future auxiliary is very rare indeed. *totius Galliae sese potiri posse sperant* (Caes. *B.G.* 1. 3. 8), though often cited in this connection,[1] more likely illustrates the absence of a future infinitive to *posse* than the equivalence of *potiri posse* with *potituros esse*. Later instances, though rare, are more secure; e.g. *et ideo scriptum est . . . quod utique Dominus non minaretur auferri posse coronam iustitiae* (Cypr. *Unit.* 20), *non timeo angelos tuos, illi autem me poterunt timere* (Pass. Petr. Paul. 23) = οὐ φοβοῦμαι τοὺς ἀγγέλους σου· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ μᾶλλον ἐμὲ φοβηθήσονται. However, these are evidence for the tangential relation between Possibility and Futurity, not necessarily for a shift from one to the other. They were unproductive[2] and the existing semantic field of *posse*, *potēre remained undisturbed.

By contrast, a shift from Obligation-Necessity to Futurity[3] is well illustrated in Germanic, where Goth. *skulan*, MHG *sollen*, OE *sculan (> NE *shall*)[4] were employed as exponents of both meanings and then, as they became established in the newer meaning, replaced in the original one by a different lexeme.[5]

In Latin itself we may cite here the gerundival suppletion of the future passive system (see pp. 222–3) and the late and very rare use of *debeo*+infinitive,[6] e.g. *si dixero tibi, quis te occidere debebit, tu occides illam et iam mutatur quod de te ipsa fata ordinauerunt*,[7] which is reflected in the Logodurian synthetic future tense, e.g. *depo kantare*.[8]

The collapse of the earlier future-tense morphology in popular Latin of the Empire left a gap in the verb system, which the developments we have just noticed enabled *habeo*+infinitive to fill. The collapse itself was the product of a number of different linguistic events, some of which are reflected in the range of variant renderings offered by the manuscripts of the *Vetus Latina* for ἐκπορεύσονται in John 5: 29: *procedent* d f (cf. Vulg.), *procident* c, *procedunt* ff[2], *resurgent* aur. b, *prodient* l q, *exiant* e.

Here *prodient/exiant* reveals among other things a tendency to confuse future indicative with present subjunctive, which came about partly through the functional overlap between the two, e.g. in certain types of prescriptive and conditional sentences, partly through the non-distinctiveness of the first person singular morphs of the third and fourth conjugations, *dicam, audiam*, etc., and the identity between the rest of their future indicative inflections and those of the first conjugation subjunctive, e.g. *dīcēs/dicēs, audiet/nuntiet*. The phonological

---

[1] See Szantyr, 175d, with references.

[2] With the trivial exception of the combination of present indicative+*poi* to signal Futurity in the French dialect of Vaud; see Meyer-Lübke, 2. 112.

[3] Favoured here by Thielmann [1] pp. 180–1, Löfstedt, p. 66, Blaise–Chirat.

[4] e.g. Goth. *þatei skuldedum taujan gatawidedum* (Luke 17: 10) = ὃ ὠφείλομεν ποιῆσαι πεποιήκαμεν, *skuli gaggan* (John 7: 35) = μέλλει πορεύεσθαι. Futurity has sometimes been denied for OE, but examples like the Lindisfarne gloss *hæfis* uel *ðú scealt habba gestriōn in heofne* on Mark 10: 21 *habebis thesaurum in caelo* seem conclusive.

[5] The criterion of lexical replacement is decisive, as in the Rumanian use of *voiŭ* as a future auxiliary (see p. 219, n. 2 above), which was concurrent wth the appearance

of a new paradigm *vreŭ*, rebuilt from the infinitive *vrea* (< *volēre), to signal volition.

[6] In some of the examples cited for this development the modal sense of *debeo* still seems prominent, e.g. the variation between *comedere debetis* and *comedetis* in Lev. 11: 2–3, etc. (Vulg.), cited by Valesio, p. 126, where both verbs have a prescriptive rather than future meaning.

[7] The whole passage, cited by Salonius, p. 283, from a tenth century *Alexander* romance contains a medley of exponents of Futurity.

[8] Also *apa a kantare* (< **habeat ad cantare*). The Campidian dialect of Sardinia, by contrast, is closer to the normal Romance type: *apa kantai* (< *habeat cantare). See Meyer-Lübke, 2. 112, 245.

convergence of /e·/and/i/, exhibited in *procident* and already attested at Pompeii,[1] neutralized the future/present distinction in *dicēs/dicis* and weakened it in *dicēmus/dīcimus dicētur/dīcitur* (cf. subsequent *dicímus*, etc.). This no doubt contributed to the (possibly already existing) tendency in Vulgar Latin to use the present indicative as an exponent of Futurity.

The spread of the *b*-morphs from the first and second conjugation future indicatives, supported by the presence of *b*-morphs in all the imperfect indicative formations is frequently attested; e.g. at Marc. 4: 24 we find *remitiebitur* (Vet. l) alongside *remetietur* (Vet. codd. pler., Vulg.) representing an analogic pattern *laudabatur : laudabitur→ remetiebatur : remetiebitur*.[2] However, the phonological convergence of medial /b/ and /w/,[3] which is also attested as early as the Pompeian graffiti,[4] and later all over the Empire,[5] neutralized the distinction between many morphs of the future and perfect active paradigms, e.g. *laudabimus/laudauimus, delebit/deleuit*.[6]

It was in these circumstances that *habeo*+infinitive must have become an exponent of Futurity. However, it is remarkable that imperial inscriptions exhibit the construction so rarely in any of its functions; *de cuo nihil queri habui* (*C.I.L.* 6. 27196), *quod sum essere abetis* (Diehl, *I. Chr.* 3. 865), *de quo nuncquam quaerellam habui referre* (ibid. 4306A) are perhaps the only instances. A salutary reminder of the gulf between what was happening in popular spoken Latin and our written evidence for it.

Examples of a meaning tangential to Futurity are more numerous, though not proportionately so, in the post-classical literary corpus; e.g. *aliquando christiani non erunt et idola illa coli habent quemadmodum antea colebantur* (Aug. *Enarr. in Ps. XL*, 1. 59–60), *si enim sustuleris istam tertiam* (sc. *syllabam*), *remanere habent duae; si remanserint duae, ratio disyllaborum erit* (Pomp. in *G.L.* 5. 129. 25–6), *praesens autem esse negauerunt, quod . . . si quid iam . . . confectum est, praeteritum sit; si quid mox perfici habeat, futurum sit* (Mar. Victorin. *Rhet.* 1. 26, p. 224.)

In view of the general decline of the passive morphological system in Vulgar Latin it is worth noting that throughout the whole post-classical period the literary evidence reveals a clear, and, in the earlier authors an overwhelming,[7]

---

[1] See Väänänen, [1] pp. 20–1. It is reflected generally in Romance, with the exception of Sardinian and a few dialects of Southern Italy.

[2] The analogic spread had already begun in early Latin, cf. the normal *exibo* and e.g. *dormibo* (Pl. *Tri.* 726). Its intensification in post-classical times in indicated by the grammarians' censure on such form as *legebo, cognoscebo* (cf. *G.L.* 4. 552. 13 ff.).

[3] Representing in phonetic terms on the one hand [b] > [β], on the other [w] > [β], whence subsequently [v]. For a full discussion of the subsequent phonology, as affecting *habeo* itself, see Valesio, pp. 129 ff.

[4] e.g. *baliat* (*C.I.L.* 4. 4874, = *ualeat*), *bibius* (ibid. 3145B, = Vibius), *uiuia* (ibid. 5924A, = *Vibia*).

[5] e.g. from Rome *botu* (*C.I.L.* 6. 303, = *uotum*), *uene* (ibid. 13271, = *bene*), *uestibit* (ibid. 31033, = *uestiuit*), *conparabit* (ibid. 35381, = *conparauit*); Italy *fobeat* (10. 477, =

foueat), *isperabi* (ibid. 8189, = *speraui*), *fungeuat* (11. 330, = *fungebatur*), *cibitatium* (ibid. 3939, = *ciuitatium*); the Eastern Empire *balete* (3. 371, = *ualete*), *collocabi* (ibid. 9508, = *collocauit*); Gaul and Germany *uiba* (12. 2762, = *uiuat*), *parbulum* (13. 1981, = *paruulum*); Spain *leuens* (2. 2705, = *libens*), *reqiebit* (Diehl, *Chr.* 1428). Although some of these may be idiolectal, especially in dialect areas where the later Romance languages show distinct reflexes of initial and medial /b/, the general situation cannot be doubted.

[6] The passive formations were not affected in the same way, since there were no **laudauimur, *deleuitur* beside *laudabimur, delebitur*. However the passive morphological system declined as a whole in popular Latin of the post-classical period and the Romance data exhibit a complete remodelling on synthetic lines, employing the passive participle and copula.

[7] Thielmann, p. 73, actually claimed

majority in favour of the passive infinitive with *habeo* in this function. In the biblical translations similarly a disproportionate number of instances of the construction render future passives in the Greek original. A comparison between the two versions of Oribasius[1] is revealing. In the earlier version we find *que lactem potaturus est ab omnibus cybis est abstinendus* (6. 42. 10), *oportit autem eum qui bibeturus est cenare consuetus cibus non ad sacietatem* (6. 412. 27); in the later version *qui lactem bibere habet et a bono cibo se abstineat* (6. 42. 10), *oportet autem eum qui bibere habet cinare quidem sed minus quam consuetus est et sic pausare* (6. 412. 35).

Although the classical exponents of Futurity remain throughout far more frequent than the new patterns, there were three specific areas where the existing morpho-syntactic system was inadequate or even defective, namely in the participial and infinitival functions and in the expression of Futurity-in-the-past; and it was these areas that were most susceptible to innovation.

The *-urus* suffix is not found with an unequivocally participial function before the first century B.C.,[2] e.g. *P. Seruilius . . . adest de te sententiam laturus* (Cic. *Verr.* 2. 1. 56), where the modal component of the meaning perhaps suggests the original semantic field of this puzzling morpheme, and *erat igitur et praesens caritas et futura fames* (Cic. *Dom.* 12), *est ergo . . . metus opinio impendentis mali, . . . libido opinio uenturi boni* (Cic. *T.D.* 4. 14). Passive meanings are not signalled 'participially' until the early Empire, when the gerundive sometimes performs this function, e.g. *quies inter labores aut iam exhaustos aut mox exhauriendos renouauit corpora animosque* (Liv. 21. 21. 8), *uoluptates breues paenitendas ac nisi magna moderatione temperentur in contrarium abituras* (Sen. *Ep.* 23. 6).[3] However, the rival use of the gerundive to supply the defective present participle[4] clearly made for an ambiguous and therefore unstable situation.

habens+infinitive appears early in post-classical Latin, and the passive functions are significantly more frequent, e.g. *tamquam ouis ad uictimam adduci habens et tamquam ouis coram tendente sic os non aperturus* (Tert. *adv. Marc.* 4. 40. 1). The construction, however, leaves no trace in Romance.

A Latin active infinitive formation is attested earlier than the participle. Originally invariable,[5] e.g. *altero te occisurum ait* (Pl. *Cas.* 692–3), *hanc sibi rem praesidio sperant futurum* (Cic. *Verr.* 2. 5. 167, cf. Gell. 1. 7. 2), it was replaced by *-urum esse*, the infinitival correspondent to *-urus est*. From the earliest times a variety of expedients were used to signal Passivity, e.g. *hoc ego numquam ratus sum fore me ut tibi fierem supplex* (Pl. *Ps.* 1318–19), *mihi istaec uidetur praeda praeda-*

a ratio of three to one for passive/active in Tertullian; cf. Löfstedt, p. 70. In the later *Vitae Patrum*, by contrast, active and passive examples seem almost equally common; cf. Salonius, pp. 282–90.

[1] Manuscripts Aa and La respectively. The relation of both to the Greek original is so free and the Latin so deviant that it is not always easy to ascertain equivalences, but the two pairs of passages cited at least seem to correspond.

[2] *quas hodie adulescens Diabolus ipsi daturus dixit* (Pl. *As.* 634) is probably corrupt and in any case not strictly relevant, *carbasus alta uolat pandam ductura carinam* (Enn. *A.* 573) is of doubtful authenticity, *qui prodeunt dissuasuri* (C. Gracch. ap. Gell. 11. 10. 4) is suspect of corruption. For the related con-

struction *-urus*+copula see below, p. 223.

[3] Priscian, *Inst.* 11. 29 (in *G.L.* 2. 567), notes that *amandus* corresponds to both φιληθησόμενος and φιλητέος. See further Aalto, pp. 73 ff., 100 ff.

[4] Well documented by Kirk.

[5] So Postgate, whose derivation of *-urum* from the locative *-ou* (or a dative *-ū*) of the verbal noun in *-tus*+*erum*(< **esom*, an allomorph of **essi*), in spite of its obvious difficulties, has not yet been superseded. Arguments against the original invariability, e.g. by Hahn, pp. 122–4, are inconclusive. Where a construction that deviates from normal concord patterns is attested rarely and in early texts, it is likely to be residual rather than innovatory. The manuscripts of the Cicero text cited all show *futuram*.

tum irier (Pl. *Rud.* 1242–3). In post-classical Latin the gerundive with *esse* is sometimes used, e.g. *spero utique aliud esse inueniendum* (Tert. *Pr. Haer.* 11. 2), *reppererant omnes christianos futuros si id fecisset et templa reliqua deserenda* (*Hist. Aug., Alex. Sev.* 43. 7). However, by this time *habere*+infinitive was already emerging in both active and passive meanings, e.g. *totiens animam reuocari habere quotiens minus quid intulerit* (Tert. *Anim.* 35. 1), *quidam tempus praesens esse negant, dicentes res aut factas esse aut habere fieri* (Sacerd. in *G.L.* 6. 432. 11–12), *et hoc splendidius quam si 'nasci habere' uel 'natum esse' dixisset* (Porph. ad Hor. *Ep.* 2. 1. 17: *oriturum . . . ortum*).

The tendency to replacement of the accusative+infinitive exponent of in-direct discourse by clauses with *quod, quia, quoniam* reduced the main contexts of occurrence of the future infinitive formations, and no reflexes of either the classical types or *habere*+infinitive appear in Romance. However, the establish-ment of *quod*, etc., in this function required finite exponents of Futurity-in-the-past.

Classical Latin already exhibits *-urus eram, fui* in this function. Grammati-cally these phrases correspond to *-urus sum*, the present-based exponent of Expectation-Imminence, e.g. *euolaturae sunt aut etiam inceperunt* (Var. *R.* 3. 16. 30), which is sometimes used to signal simple Futurity, e.g. *ipse hanc acturust Iuppiter comoediam* (Pl. *Am.* 88, cf. ibid. 94: *hanc fabulam inquam, hic Iuppiter hodie ipse aget*), *quid futurum est? et . . . quid puero misero fiet?* (Cic. *Fam.* 14. 1. 5). This neutralization of the semantic distinction between the two formations,[1] which continues in post-classical Latin, e.g. *semper dicimus et diximus et dicturi sumus* (Vict. Vit. 3. 17), is implied by the classical use of *-urus sum* to supply a future subjunctive, e.g. *non dubito quin tu idem existimaturus sis* (Cic. *Att.* 14. 17. 4): cp. the ambiguous *non dubitare quin . . . grauissimum supplicium sumat* (Caes. *B.G.* 1. 31. 15).

The use of *-urus eram, fui* to signal Futurity-in-the-past does not appear unequivocally[2] before Livy, e.g. *uos cum Mandonio et Indibili consilia communicastis et arma consociaturi fuistis* (28. 28. 5). However, usages like *dicit se . . . uenisse quaesitum ab eo pacem an bellum agitaturus foret* (Sal. *Iug.* 109. 2), where the ambiguity of the normal *agitaret* is avoided by the periphrasis, imply an indica-tive base *agitaturus erat* (cf. *existimaturus sim* from *e. sum* above). The differentia-tion between Futurity- and Imminence-in-the-past, a tenuous enough one in theory, does not arise in practice, since there was, in contrast to the future-in-the-present system with *agitaturus sum/agitabo*, no available choice of exponents.[3] The two classical examples just cited can be paralleled often in post-classical

---

[1] That the distinction did not become obsolete is proved by the frequent use of *-urus sum* beside *incipio* to render μέλλω, e.g. μέλλει γὰρ ‘Ηρώδης ζητεῖν (Matt. 2: 13), *quaesiturus est enim Erodes* Vet. k, *futurum est enim ut Herodes quaerat* Vet. b c f, Vulg., *incipit enim Herodes quaerere* Vet. d; ἡμῖν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν (John 14: 22) *nobis manifesta-turus es* Vet. f Vulg., *nobis incipis manifestare* Vet. b c e, *incipies nobis manifestare* Vet. d. *habeo*+infinitive is by contrast rarely used in this function. This use of *incipio* as a tense auxiliary may help to account for its dis-appearance in Romance (except in Rhaetic and Rumanian), where reflexes of **comini-*

tiare have replaced it as exponents of incoha-tive meaning.

[2] Earlier occurrences, e.g. *quod crediturus tibi fui omne credidi* (Pl. *Mos.* 437) seem, like attributive *-urus* (cf. p. 222), to have modal rather than temporal meanings—Volition, Obligation or, most often, Conditioned unreality.

[3] For this reason equivalences like *quae enim saluaturus erat eorum primitias eum sus-cepisse dicunt* (Iren. 1. 6. 1), ὧν γὰρ ἤμελλε σώζειν τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν εἰληφέναι are less significant than those cited in n. 1 above. Greek, like Latin, had no choice of exponents in this semantic area.

Latin, e.g. *quasi clausulam sacrificationis et gloriae saecularis quam Christus erat ad-empturus* (Tert. *Idol.* 9. 4), . . . *ita ut . . . usque ad illam horam qua est mortuus scripserit quid acturus esset* (*Hist. Aug., Hadr.* 16. 7). A typical instance of the use in indirect discourse is *nam prouidens Deus quod hanc circumcisionem in signum non in salutem esset daturus populo Israel* (Tert. *adv. Iud.* 3. 3). But these usages all date from the period when *habebam, habui*+infinitive was already emerging in this function.

Indeed the latter construction neatly supplied an exponent of Passivity[1] and it was probably in this function that it first established itself, e.g. *tamen et creatori notum erat futurum. an non utique notum quod . . . habebat reuelari?* (Tert. *adv. Marc.* 5. 18. 4), *quod scripturas sanctas intellecturi Iudaei non essent, intelligi autem haberent in nouissimis temporibus posteaquam Christus uenisset* (Cypr. *Test.* 1. 4), *sciebat igitur et eos qui persecutionem passuri essent, sciebat et eos qui flagellari et occidi haberent propter eum* (Iren. 3. 18. 5). Once established for passive meanings the construction would easily be extended to active uses like *et ipsum et legatos eius praedixisse quod plurimae sectae haberent existere* (Lact. *Inst.* 4. 30. 2) beside *id autem quod per Christum dari haberet consummatum fore* (ibid. 20. 10) and in the translation literature ἤμελλεν ἔρχεσθαι (Luke 10: 1), *habebat uenire* Vet. d, *erat ipse uenturus* Vet. aur. Vulg., *introiturus erat* Vet. e.

The priority of the use to signal Futurity-in-the-past to that signalling Futurity is revealed by the acceptance of the former by many authors who do not exhibit any examples at all of the latter. This is true, for instance, of both Lactantius and Irenaeus's translator.

To sum up, it is clear that in written Latin (we cannot say anything of the spoken language) the new construction established itself within the finite morpho-syntactic system first as an exponent of Futurity-in-the-past and subsequently, no doubt by the specific process of extension that can be represented by the proportional formula: *habebam agere : acturus eram→habeo agere : acturus sum*, as an exponent of Futurity, where greater resistance would be offered by the surviving future-tense morphemes alongside the periphrastic formations. Within the non-finite system *habens agi* supplied the almost defective passive participle, whence *habens agere* emerged as a rival to *acturus*; *habere agi* replaced the heterogeneous group of exponents of Passivity in infinitival function, whence *habere agere* providing a homogeneous exponent of Activity would encroach on *acturus*. Clearly the presence of *-urus, -urum* formations in the obsolescent exponents of the finite and non-finite systems alike would reinforce the new construction in both areas.

One further development remains to be considered, that of *habebam (habui)* and *habueram*+infinitive as exponents of Conditioned Unreality in present and past respectively. This meaning can easily be related either to one tangential to Possibility—'I was capable [under certain conditions] of doing this' > I should now be doing this [had those conditions been fulfilled]'—or to one tangential to Obligation-Necessity—'I was bound to do this [under certain conditions]' > 'I should now etc.'[2] Support for such a development is provided

---

[1] The gerundive+*esse* is perhaps employed thus in post-classical texts, but it is very rare and interpretation is not certain; e.g. *nemo erat laedendus ab operariis unitatis* (Opt. Mil. 3. 6), which is usually cited, continues *sed nec ab episcopis mandata diuina contemni debuerant,* so that the meaning Obligation is more probable.

[2] Although it is not a decisive objection to this development, it is worth noting that the evidence often adduced for the use of the normal classical exponents of these modalities to signal Unreality is very disputable. Thus *Platonem existimo, si genus forense dicendi tractare uoluisset, grauissime et copiosissime potuisse dicere* (Cic. *Off.* 1. 4), *non esset harena/*

by the parallel use of εἶχον+infinitive in patristic Greek, e.g. εἰ δὲ καὶ σὺ τοιαῦτα πράγματα ἑωράκεις, οὐκ εἶχες ταραχθῆναι ἐπὶ τούτοις (*A. Phil.* 129, p. 58), εἰ γὰρ ἐγινώσκετε τὸν Χρίστον, καὶ ὑμεῖς εἴχετε ἐπιστρέψαι εἰς τὸ φῶς καὶ ῥυσθῆναι ἐκ τῶν δαιμόνων τῶν πλανώντων ὑμᾶς (*A. Anast. Pers.*, p. 6. 35). However, the Greek usage seems to be quite independent, and in any case too late to have influenced the Latin.[1] In fact it is probable that the immediate antecedent of the Latin phenomenon was the rivalry of *habebam*+infinitive with *-urus eram* as an exponent of Futurity-in-the-past.[2]

One of the striking features of the classical exponents of Unreality is their degree of redundancy. A semantically adequate pattern would have been provided by (i) a backward tense-shift in the indicative of the protasis, with some exponent of modality in the apodosis, cf. εἰ τοῦτο ἤθελες, ἐπορευόμεθα ἄν[3] and *if you wanted this, we should be on our way*; or (ii) an exponent of modality in both protasis and apodosis, without any tense shift, cf. O.E. *gif þū wǣre hēr, nǣre mīn brōþor dēad*, 'if you had been here, my brother would not have died'; or (iii) an exponent of modality in the protasis with a backward tense-shift of the indicative in the apodosis. Of type (ii) a residue appears in the early Latin use of the imperfect subjunctive to signal Past Unreality, e.g. *deos credo uoluisse; nam ni uellent, non fieret, scio* (Pl. *Aul.* 742). The third type may perhaps survive in such sentences as *quingentos simul, | ni hebes machaera foret, uno ictu occideras* (Pl. *Mil.* 52–3), *praeclare uiceramus, nisi . . . Lepidus recepisset Antonium* (Cic. *Fam.* 12. 10. 3), which are usually explained as 'vivid' retentions of the indicative.[4] Whether or not we interpret the classical usage as a contamination of two earlier rival patterns, such as (ii) and (iii), the fact is that both protasis and apodosis regularly exhibit both an exponent of modality, the subjunctive, and a shift of tense.

Already in republican Latin *-urus eram* sometimes appears as a free variant for the pluperfect subjunctive as an exponent of Past Unreality, e.g. *quod si tacuisset, | tamen ego eram dicturus* (Pl. *Cis.* 152–3), *conclaue illud, ubi erat mansurus, si ire perrexisset* (Cic. *Div.* 1. 26). Here the verbal adjective sufficed to signal the appropriate modality without a tense-shift in the copula. The first clear examples of a systematic pattern, *-urus eram* (present unreality)/*-urus fueram* (past) are in Livy, e.g. *grauior ultor caedis, si superesset, rex futurus erat quam priuatus* (1. 40. 4), *quem senatus dictatorem dici iussurus fuerat* (10. 11. 4).

The expression of Unreality in indirect discourse was hampered by the

tutior et poterant fallere plana magis (Mart. 5. 31. 5–6) both show *posse* with its normal lexical meaning fully intact. Similarly *quod si Romae Cn. Pompeius priuatus esset hoc tempore, tamen ad tantum bellum is erat diligendus atque mittendus* (Cic. *Man.* 50) shows the gerundive in its normal sense. Indeed the nearest approach to the relevant semantic shift is discernible only in such rare usages as *si felix essem, Piste mea uiuere debuit* (*C.I.L.* 6. 15546).

[1] For the contrary view see Compernass, pp. 117 ff. The equivalence is sometimes recognized in the later translation literature, e.g. εἰ ἤθελεν ὁ Θεὸς ἵνα φάγω μέλι, μέλι εἶχες βαλεῖν (Nau, *R.O.C.*, 1908, p. 51), *si uoluisset Deus ut mel manducarem, mel habuisti mittere* (*Vit. Patr.* 5. 4. 59).

[2] The Greek parallel here is the rare use of

ἔμελλον, e.g. στρατηλάτης ἔμελλε γενέσθαι, εἰ μὴ ἐτελεύτα (Callin. 81. 12).

[3] The modal particle ἄν (earlier κε) of course distinguishes such sentences from the straightforward past conditional, e.g. 'if you wanted this, we were on our way' in the example given.

[4] Type (iii) is still attested as late as Gregory of Tours, e.g. '*si illi*', inquid, '*moreretur, recte tibi . . . regnum illius reddebatur*' (*H.F.* 2. 40, p. 89. 13 ff.), *si fas fuisset, angelum de caelo euocaueram* (ibid. 5. 18, p. 222. 17–18). It explains the alternative conditional paradigms in Provençal and Spanish respectively, *cantéra, cantara* (< **cantaram* for *cantaueram*) alongside *cantaría* (< **cantare habebam*). See Meyer-Lübke 2. 309, 311–24.

limited range of distinctiveness in the infinitival system. (The ambiguities resulting from loss of mood and tense distinctions in the protasis of reported conditionals do not concern us here, where only the apodotic exponents are in question.) *-urum fuisse*, the infinitival correspondent to *-urus fui* (*fueram*) served to render both the pluperfect subjunctive and also, though examples are rare, the imperfect, e.g. *iudico, nisi unus adulescens illius furentis impetus . . . cohibuisset, rem publicam funditus interituram fuisse* (Cic. *Phil.* 3. 2 (5)), *quid censes si ratio esset in beluis? nonne suo quasque generi plurimum tributuras fuisse?* (Cic. *N.D.* 1. 78). The post-classical replacement of accusative+infinitive by *quod* constructions would have led to an increase in frequency of *-urus eram/fueram* in this function; but by then *habebam, habueram*+infinitive, which was already encroaching on *-urus eram/fueram* in other functions, spread to this one as well.

Once again the passive meanings were particularly susceptible to the innovation, lacking as they did any classical exponents comparable to the *-urum fuisse* pattern. Thus *illud in totum habebat intellegi et si non significaretur, at istud in dubio nisi significaretur* (Tert. *adv. Herm.* 21. 3), where the meanings 'could have' or 'would have been understood' are of course equally plausible. The new construction becomes widespread later, e.g. *nisi Deus admonuisset me nocte in uisione, habueram peccare in te* (Arnob. *Comm. Ps. CIV, P.L.* 53. 480D), *si diceret 'fines terrae' et non diceret 'uniuersi fines terrae', dicere habebant 'ecce habemus fines terrae in Mauretania'* (Aug. *Enarr. Ps. XXI*, 2. 28).

There are, apparently, no instances in the biblical translations, which nevertheless exhibit the precarious survival of the older patterns, e.g. οὗτος εἰ ἦν προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκεν ἄν (Luke 7 : 39), *hic si erat propheta, sciret utique* Vet. a, *hic si esset propheta, sciebat* Vet. d, *hic si esset profeta, sciret utique* Vet. ff², cf. Vulg., *hic si esset profeta, cognouisset* Vet. e; εἰ ἐμὲ ᾔδειτε, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου ἂν ᾔδειτε (John 8: 19), *si me nossetis, utique patrem meum nossetis* Vet. a, *si me nossetis, et patrem meum nossetis* Vet. d, *si . . . nossetis, et . . . scietis* Vet. ff², *si . . . nossetis, et . . . sciebatis* Vet. e, cp. *si me sciretis forsitan et patrem meum sciretis* Vulg.

The replacement of the subjunctive exponents of Conditioned Unreality was a much slower process than that of the classical future morphemes, which had disappeared already in the earliest attested stages of the Romance languages. By contrast the preterite subjunctive, a fusion of original imperfect and pluperfect formations, is still widely attested in medieval Romance. Thus in Old French *s'il eust, il donast* first signals both present and past unreality, with the latter subsequently differentiated by *s'il eust eu, il eust doné*. The future-in-the-past morphemes, already established in other uses, then took over the apodotic function: *s'il eût, il donnerait* (with the replacement in modern times of the protatic subjunctive by the imperfect indicative).

III

The sudden emergence of all the post-classical functions of *habeo*+infinitive in Tertullian is very remarkable. Indeed his usage provides a descriptive model for the semantic range of the construction right through into medieval Latin.

It has been suggested[1] that the construction was a special feature of African Latinity, which was adopted into the literary register by Tertullian and spread thereafter as a result of this author's influence as a theologian and apologist. Some caution is needed here. The fact that so many of the major literary texts

[1] See Thielmann [1], pp. 72, 180–1.

of the first two centuries of post-classical Latin come from Africa means that it is difficult to distinguish what were distinctively local characteristics from what belongs to the general diachronic drift of the language in this period. The same difficulties would arise in any attempt to establish an Iberian element in Silver Latinity on the basis of the known Spanish origin of a number of its most prominent authors. One thinks here also of the problem that Pollio's attribution of *Patauinitas* to Livy (Quint. 1. 5. 56, 8. 1. 3) has presented to modern scholars.

All that we can do is to look at the other evidence afforded by African Latin on this point. In Apuleius the few instances of the construction all occur in works that have little trace of colloquial influence, and they conform closely to the Ciceronian pattern: e.g. *quod non ex innocentiae fiducia, quamuis liceat negare, tamen potius habeant defendere (Apol.* 28), *qui nihil habet adferre cur prandeat, impransus ad opus foras extruditur (Flor.* 6). In later times[1] Lactantius, though he extends the construction to non-Ciceronian functions, shows much more restraint in its use than Tertullian.[2] In view of the fact that *habere*+infinitive never quite disappeared from post-Ciceronian classical usage, the occurrences in Apuleius and Lactantius may be seen as part of their inheritance from the Ciceronian tradition. By contrast the restriction of the construction in Cyprian and Augustine to their more informal registers clearly suggests the influence of colloquial Latinity. So we can posit two interacting influences throughout the post-classical period generally: the precedent for a strictly limited use in the Ciceronian tradition of formal prose, and the more extensive developments that were taking place contemporaneously in Vulgar Latin.

As for its origin in the specifically African area of Vulgar Latin, Thielmann made much (pp. 157 ff.) of Isidore's assertion *birtus boluntas bita et his similia quae Afri scribendo uitiant (App.* 3, *ad Etym.* 1. 27, *P.L.* 82. 732B) as evidence for the early phonological confusion that led to the collapse of large parts of the distinctive future morphology. But the convergence of /b/ and /w/ was widespread in the Empire, as we have already seen (p. 221 n. 5), and though attested in Africa, e.g. *pleui (C.I.L.* 8. 828 = *plebi)*, is certainly no more frequent in the epigraphy of the area than in many other parts of the Empire. Moreover, the construction in question, admittedly rare in inscriptions generally, does not seem to be recorded at all in *C.I.L.* 8, and there are a number of places in *Vetus Latina* where it is found in other families of manuscripts but not in the specifically African codices e and k. Thus ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν (John 19: 7), *debet mori* Vet. e etc., Vulg., *habet mori* Vet. c; ἀποκτενεῖ ἑαυτόν (John 8: 22), *occisurus est se* Vet. d e, *interficiet se ipsum* Vet. aur. c ff[2] (cf. Vulg.), *occidere se habet* Vet. a; σκανδαλισθήσεσθε (Mark 14: 27), *scandalum patiemini* Vet. a c k, *scandalum habebitis* Vet. aur., *scandalizabimini* Vet. f Vulg., *scandalizari habetis* Vet. d ff[2]. From all this we may conclude that while Tertullian must have been drawing upon the colloquial Latinity of the area in which he lived (just as Cicero had probably drawn on the colloquial register of Rome in his day for the antecedents of this construction), there was nothing peculiarly African about the

[1] The only example cited from Minucius Felix, *cum Octauius integra et illibata habeat singula si potest refutare (Oct.* 15. 1), is ambiguous and textually suspect. The construction is rare in Cyprian.

[2] This is of course true of other self-conscious stylists of post-classical Latinity,

e.g. Boethius: *quare illae differentiae . . . specificae differentiae dici non habent (Porph. Comm. ed. pr.* 2. 7). The example sometimes cited from *Tr. Theol.* 3. 46, *omne simplex esse suum et id quod est unum habet*, must surely be rejected, since *esse* here seems rather to be used like τὸ εἶναι 'essence'.

phenomenon. Indeed the reflexes of *habeo* and *habebam*+infinitive in the future and conditional morphemes of Central and West Romance generally provide evidence of the emergence of these constructions in their new functions over a wide area of imperial Vulgar Latin.

It has been commonly asserted[1] that the Vulgar Latin usage itself was due to Greek influence. Now it is true that the population of Rome and other parts of Italy and perhaps other areas of the Western Empire too contained a large number of bilingual Greek–Latin speakers, who might have provided the vehicle for such an infiltration. However, we know even less about what was happening in subliterate Greek throughout this period than we are able to infer by a combination of the written documents and proto-Romance recon-struction for the corresponding level of Latinity. The evidence of Greek texts themselves indicates that, however interesting some of the parallels that they offer to *habeo*+infinitive might be, these represent deviations from normal usage that remain unproductive within the native morpho-syntactic structure.[2] It is inherently unlikely that a phenomenon whose status was so insecure in its native context could have infiltrated an alien linguistic structure (however favourable the conditions in the latter were for innovation), much less produce such a massive reshaping of its tense system. The one place in which evidence of infiltration might be expected, namely the translation literature, does if anything confirm the independence of the Latin developments. For ἔχω+ infinitive is sometimes rendered by other constructions than *habeo*+infinitive; e.g. μὴ ἔχοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι (Matt. 18: 25), *et cum non haberet unde reddere* Vet. e, *non hante eo unde reddere* Vet. l, *cum autem non haberet unde redderet* Vet. cet. Vulg.; εἰς πονηρίαν ἔχεις πεσεῖν (Nau, *R.O.C.*, 1908, p. 273), *in fornicationem incursurus es (Vit. Patr.* 5. 5. 35); ἐρημωθῆναι ἔχει ὁ τόπος οὗτος (ibid., 1913, p. 137), *desolandus est locus iste (Vit. Patr.* 6. 1. 5).[3] Conversely, *habeo*+infinitive sometimes renders other constructions than ἔχω+infinitive; e.g. ἔχετέ τι βρώσιμον ἐνθάδε; (Luke 24: 41), *habetis aliquid manducare hic?* Vet. d e *(hic aliquid)* l *(aliquid hic)*, *habetis aliquid quod manducare?* Vet. q, *habetis quod manducetur?* Vet. aur. f, Vulg.; μέλλουσαν . . . ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς (Rom. 8: 18), *quae in nos habeat reuelari* ap. Tert. *Scorp.* 13, *quae reuelabitur in nobis* Vulg., σκανδαλισθήσεσθε (Mark 14: 27), *scandalizari habetis* Vet. d, *scandalum habebitis* Vet. aur., *scanda-lum patiemini* Vet. e l q, *scandalizabimini* Vet. f, Vulg.

It seems preferable, therefore, while not rejecting outside influence entirely, to treat the whole development, as we have attempted above, primarily in terms of the native structure and the pressures and reactions that arose within it.[4]

From the combined evidence of Tertullian and the *Vetus Latina* we may infer that the new developments were already well advanced in Vulgar Latin.

[1] e.g. by Rönsch, pp. 447–9, Plater and White, p. 38, Ernout and Thomas, p. 217, Szantyr § 175g. Löfstedt p. 66 is more cau-tious on this point.

[2] In contrast to the pattern ἔχω γεγραμ-μένον which in patristic and Byzantine Greek occurs in free variation with the perfect γέγραφα (cf. ἔχω γράψας, ἔχω γεγραφώς, which are attested already in classical Attic, principally in verse; examples in Goodwin, 47), and survives in the modern Greek per-fect ἔχω γραμμένο beside ἔχω γράψει.

[3] The variety of equivalences was already noted by Hofmann, pp. 111–12.

[4] An instructive contrast is provided by the use of *futurus sum*+infinitive, e.g. *quia ipse est qui futurus est redimere Israhel (Epist. Avell.* 75. 4) = ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν 'Ἰσραήλ. This usage is re-stricted to the translation literature, where it is used exclusively to render μέλλω+ infinitive, and cannot be related to any existing morpho-syntactic patterns in Latin itself. For further discussion with examples see Löfstedt, p. 64.

Nevertheless, there are some surprises in the distribution of the construction. Thus in the 'pilgrimage' texts, which in so many respects offer a rich harvest to the student of Vulgar Latin, the examples show no more than a modest extension of the Ciceronian types with which our survey began: *ipsam ergo uallem nos transuersare habebamus ut possimus montem ingredi* (*Silv. Pereg.* [31]. 2. 1), *ubi diaconus perdixerit omnia quae dicere habet, dicet orationem primum episcopus* (ibid. [56]. 24. 6), *ut quod habis emere non tangas antequam pretium des* (*Ant. It.* 8). Moreover, there appear to be no instances in Palladius, and very few indeed in Gregory of Tours, e.g. *in Gallias habui iam redire sed propter istum . . . me remoratum profiteor* (*Virt. Mart.* 1. 16), *qua* (sc. *corpora*) *cum uiritim sepelire . . . non haberent, congregatam ossuum massam in unam proicientes fossam humo operuerunt* (*Glor. Mart.* 64). There is a striking contrast here with Alcuin, who shows a range of uses comparable to Tertullian: Obligation in *illi enim habent rationem reddere Deo quomodo uos ammoneant* (44. 16.), Potentiality in *uestra excellentia amplectere et tenere habebit* (p. 188. 2), Futurity in *tamen uolente Deo uisurus* (sc. *sum*) *uos uel necessitate coactus habes dicere quod cartula conticuit* (p. 254. 33), and Conditioned Unreality in *multa tecum habuissem conferre* (p. 93. 22, a conflation of *contulissem* and *habueram conferre*).[1]

The continuing distinctiveness of the two components of the construction provided a new point of reference for the organization of the tense system comparable to the currently emerging synthetic perfects:[2] a future *habeo scribere* beside a perfect *habeo scriptum*, both explicitly related to a present morpheme *habeo*, as *habebam scribere, habebam scriptum* relate to *habebam*. It is at least a possibility that this patterning was itself a contributory factor in establishing the construction under discussion here.[3]

So long as both components remained free forms, each also participating in a whole range of independent functions, the meaning 'have' was still prominent.[4] The precise semantic areas on which the construction was encroaching—Possibility, Obligation, Futurity, Unreality—would therefore be determined by the specific context. It is perhaps remarkable that a construction whose semantic range was so diverse and inherently indeterminate should have continued in this state for so long. However, the great variety of meanings signalled by the subjunctive mood in all periods of Latin—Volition, Obligation, Conditioned Unreality, and even Futurity—indicates that a high degree of inherent semantic indeterminacy could be tolerated within the grammatical system, provided that the immediate context was capable of supplying adequate definition.

Bulhart,[5] refining upon an earlier generalization by Thielmann, proposed certain formal criteria for differentiation between meanings tangential to Possibility and those tangential to Necessity. For the former he observed a strong tendency for the infinitive to follow *habeo*, for the latter a less marked tendency for the infinitive to follow where the utterance is interrogative but to precede elsewhere. In the material examined as a preliminary to the writing of the present paper the approximate percentage of instances in which the infinitive follows *habeo* under each of the five semantic categories proposed earlier emerges as: (*a*) Possibility 75 per cent (*b*) Necessity 55 per cent (*c*) Futurity 45 per cent (*d*) Futurity-in-the-past 35 per cent (*e*) Conditioned Unreality

---

[1] These and other examples are listed by Taylor.
[2] On which see Thielmann [2]
[3] Cf. Müller, p. 95.
[4] Cf. Valesio, pp. 123–4.
[5] Col. 2455. 14, 55–6, cf. Thielmann, p. 80.

55 per cent (with an overall figure of 55 per cent).[1] These figures support Bulhart's conclusion as to (a) and do not effectively contradict him on (b), since if the interrogative instances are deducted there the percentage drops from 55 per cent to something over 45 per cent. (The fact that the figures for (b) are closer than (a) to (c) (d) (e) incidentally supports the suggestion already made on other grounds that (b) was the more probable antecedent to the new developments comprised in these last three categories). However, it is worth noting that the tendency for the infinitive to follow *habeo* seems to hold for all five groups. Although the examples are not sufficiently numerous to justify dogmatism, they do raise a more general question.

For it appears that other factors besides the semantic function of the construction itself must be taken account of as determinants of the choice of order. For instance we find that the approximate percentages for the passive infinitive following are: (a) 50 per cent (b) 45 per cent (c) 25 per cent (d) 25 per cent (e) 55 per cent (overall, 30 per cent); for the active infinitive following: (a) 85 per cent (b) 60 per cent (c) 60 per cent (d) 60 per cent (e) 55 per cent (overall, 60 per cent). This certainly points to a tendency to prefer the preceding position for the passive, the following position for the active infinitive. Other possible factors suggest themselves too—the presence or absence of a complement to the infinitive, the ordering of other items in the immediate context, considerations of prose rhythm and idiolectal tendencies in other infinitival constructions. Furthermore, it is easy to point to inconsistencies within the same idiolect, the same order occurring with different meanings, as in *aliud non habens facere quam ex malo proferre* (Tert. adv. Herm. 14. 1, Possibility), *habens fallaciae operatione fungi creatori* (Tert. adv. Marc. 5. 16. 6, Necessity), or a different order with the same meaning, as in *sed ne quidem causam reddere habebunt* (Iren. 2. 3. 1), *sed non habent ostendere* (Iren. 2. 23. 2), in both of which the meaning is tangential to Possibility. As a generalization it seems to be true that Tertullian and Cyprian favour the infinitive preceding,[2] Augustine and especially Ambrose the infinitive following. But the question is a complex one and requires a much more thoroughgoing stylistic analysis before really firm conclusions can be reached.

What is certainly clear is that there is no diachronic trend towards the order infinitive+*habeo*, such as must be assumed to have occurred in Vulgar Latin.[3] The first evidence for the coalescence of the two components is in the famous passage of Fredegar's Chronicle *et ille respondebat 'non dabo'. Iustinianus dicebat 'daras'* (2. 62, p. 85. 32).[4] If the reported incident is authentic, then it confirms that the spoken language had travelled a long way beyond the stage represented by our written sources, the most vulgarizing of which still have the classical exponents of Futurity and Conditioned Unreality in overwhelming frequency and never reveal any hint of coalescence in the new formations.

[1] The constituencies to which these percentages relate are (a) 16 (b) 44 (c) 81 (d) 35 (e) 17 (total 193 examples). These include a few examples not cited by Bulhart, especially from the translation literature, but exclude some whose interpretation seemed disputable and many more that for practical reasons could not be examined in detail.

[2] So also the *Vitae Patrum*; see Salonius, pp. 284–9, Hofmann, p. 112.

[3] The disappearance of passive infinitive + *habeo* belongs to the general decline of the passive system of morphology in Vulgar Latin, but it is worth noting that in this particular combination the minimal distinction between e.g. *dare habeo* and *dari habeo* would be liable to phonetic erosion.

[4] On which, together with *adarrabo* (ibid. 2. 58, p. 83. 18) see Valesio, pp. 279–93.

However, it is worth remembering that French is alone among the medieval Romance languages concerned in showing exclusively synthetic forms, *salvarai, prindrai* (Strasburg Oaths), *sostendreiet* (St. Eulalie Sequence), etc. At the other end of the scale are isolated instances of free variation in order, as in the medieval Lombard dialect with *ò dir, a portare* (cf. *dirò, porterà*) beside *dirai, farai*.[1] Medieval Provençal and Spanish, with *dir vos ai* beside *dirai, dezir vos he* beside *entraredes* respectively,[2] reveal that even though the items could still stand as free forms the order was invariant. If the trend towards this fixed order began early in Vulgar Latin, Tertullian's preference for the preceding infinitive may be confirmation of the hypothesis that he was drawing on the colloquial register of his own times.

Much must remain uncertain. Both the initiation and the completion of the development belong to the subliterate register of the language and its dialects and can only be reconstructed conjecturally, the latter from the Romance system that reflects it, the former from the pre-existing Latin system that gave rise to it. Of the pattern of the development itself the literary material of the late Latin period can still provide valuable if indirect evidence.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge   ROBERT COLEMAN

REFERENCES

P. AALTO, *Untersuchungen über das lateinische Gerundium und Gerundivum* (Helsinki, 1949).

W. F. ARNDT and F. W. GINGRICH, *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, 1957) s.v. ἔχω, 6.

A. BLAISE and H. CHIRAT, *Dictionnaire Latin–Français des Auteurs Chrétiens* (Paris, 1954) s.v. *habeo*, 10–11.

V. BULHART, in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, 6. 3: s.v. *habeo*, col. 2454. 12–2458. 83.

J. COMPERNASS, 'Vulgaria', *Gl.* 8 (1917), pp. 88–121.

A. ERNOUT and FR. THOMAS, *Syntaxe latine* (2nd ed., Paris, 1953).

W. W. GOODWIN, *Syntax of the Greek Moods and Tenses* (Edinburgh, 1912).

E. A. HAHN, 'Genesis of the Infinitive with Subject-Accusative', *T.A.P.A.* 81 (1950), pp. 117–29.

J. B. HOFMANN, 'Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Vulgärlateins', *I.F.* 23 (1926), pp. 80–122.

A. N. JANNARIS, *An Historical Greek Grammar* (London, 1897).

W. H. KIRK, 'The Syntax of the Gerund and the Gerundive', *T.A.P.A.* 73 (1942), pp. 293–307, and 76 (1945) pp. 166–76.

G. W. H. LAMPE, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961) s.v. ἔχω, B. 2.

M. LEUMANN, 'Lateinisch *habere* mit Infinitiv', *Mus. Helv.* 19 (1962), pp. 65–71.

E. LÖFSTEDT, *Syntactica* 2 (2nd ed., Lund, 1956), Kap. 4: 'Zur Auflösung des Futurums und des Locativs'.

H. G. LUNT, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar* ('s-Gravenhage, 1959).

E. MAYSER, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, 2. 3 (Berlin, 1934).

[1] Rohlfs, 2. 590.
[2] Meyer-Lübke, 3. 319. The alternants *dar vos emos, daremos* are still retained in modern Portuguese (ibid. 2. 212).

W. MEYER-LÜBKE, *Grammaire des langues romanes* (French tr., Paris, 1895–1906).

F. MOSSÉ, *Manuel de la langue gotique* (Paris, 1942).

B. MÜLLER, 'Das lateinische Futurum und die romanischen Ausdrucksweisen für das futurische Geschehen', *Rom. Forsch.* 76 (1964), pp. 44–97.

F. NAU, 'Histoire des solitaires Égyptiens', *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 12 (1907), pp. 43–69, etc. (nine parts, concluding ibid. 18 (1913), pp. 137 ff.).

W. E. PLATER and H. J. WHITE, *Grammar of the Vulgate* (Oxford, 1926).

J. P. POSTGATE, 'The Future Infinitive Active in Latin', *I.F.* 4 (1894), pp. 252–8.

H. RÖNSCH, *Itala und Vulgata* (Marburg and Leipzig, 1869).

G. ROHLFS, *Historische Grammatik der italienischen Sprache* (Berne, 1949–53).

A. H. SALONIUS, *Vitae Patrum: kritische Untersuchungen über Text, Syntax und Wortschatz* (Lund, 1920).

E. A. SOPHOCLES, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (rev. ed. of J. H. Thayer, New York, 1887) s.v. ἔχω.

A. SZANTYR, *Lateinische Grammatik 2: Syntax und Stilistik* (rev. ed. of Leumann–Hofmann's Grammar) München, 1963.

PAULINE TAYLOR, 'The construction *habere*-with-infinitive in Alcuin', *Rom. Rev.* (1924), pp. 123–7.

PH. THIELMANN, 'Habere mit dem Infinitiv und die Entstehung des romanischen Futurums', *A.L.L.* 2 (1885), pp. 48–89, 157–202.

—— 'Habere mit dem Part. Perf. Pass.' ibid., pp. 372–423, 509–49.

V. VÄÄNÄNEN, *Le Latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1959).

—— *Introduction au latin vulgaire* (Paris, 1963).

P. VALESIO, 'The Romance synthetic future pattern and its first attestations', *Lingua* 20 (1968), pp. 113–61, 279–307.

J. WACKERNAGEL, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* 1 (Basel, 1924), pp. 196 ff.

U. WEINREICH, *Languages in Contact* (New York, 1953).