

- 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 paper<sup>1)</sup> 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 derivation<sup>2)</sup> 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*.<sup>3)</sup> 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

---

<sup>1)</sup> 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.

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

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

or to the context of the phrase. *Obuagulatum ito* (Tab. xii. 2) 'he is to go and make/go for the purpose of making a formal complaint'<sup>4</sup>) is clearly not synonymous with *obuagulato*, let alone *obuagulabit*; in *oratum ierunt deam ut sibi esset propitia* (Pl. *Po.* 1134) the tense is decisive: 'they went, to ask the goddess', not *ibant* 'they were going to ask'; in *nunc huc meas fortunas eo questum ad uicinam* (Pl. *Cas.* 162) the presence of *huc* certifies that *eo* has its full lexical meaning 'now I am going in here, to complain to my neighbour about my fortunes', not 'I am going to complain'.

2.3. Even in *quom it dormitum, follem obstringit ob gulam* (Pl. *Au.* 302) *it dormitum* is clearly not synonymous with *dormiet* but means rather 'he goes to sleep, is on the point of sleeping', very close in fact to *dormiturus est*. Cicero, who often uses this supine to signal purpose with *uenio*, *mitto* etc. and also the (3 B) form *redditum iri* as future infinitive passive, rarely has the (1 A) or (1 B) forms. One of the few examples, *sessum it praetor* 'the praetor is on the point of taking his seat' (*N. D.* 3.74), occurs in a conversational narrative context and again is closer in meaning to *sessurus est* than to *sedebit*. Clearer examples of a future meaning are found in *quid . . . demerui . . . mali quam ob rem ita faceres meque meosque perditum ires liberos?* (Pl. *Au.* 735). 'What harm have I done you that you behaved like this and were going to ruin me and my children?', where *perditum ires* is used virtually as a future-in-the-past.<sup>5</sup>) However, the meaning of many examples of the (1 A) and (1 B) forms must have been sufficiently close to futurity to enable (2 B) to emerge as the passive partner to the future active infinitive. The semantic proximity of *redditum eo* to *redditurus sum* was no doubt important in this development, and it is therefore no accident that *praedam redditum iri* became the passive to *me praedam redditurum*.<sup>6</sup>)

<sup>4</sup>) Cf. Umbr. *auif aseriato etu* (Ig. Tab. 6 b 48) 'he is to go and observe the birds', with *aseriato* < \**adseriātum*.

<sup>5</sup>) For the role of future-in-the-past functions in the semantic extension of *habere* + inf. to form the Romance futures and conditionals see Coleman, C. Q. 21 (1971) 222–4.

<sup>6</sup>) The invariable form without *esse*, attested in Cato's *polliciti sese facturum omnia* (Prisc. 2.475 K), is more likely to have been remodelled to *facturos*, whence *facturos esse*, under the influence of *facturi sunt omnia* than vice versa, as Gellius (*N. A.* 1.7) apparently thought. We may reasonably conjecture that the invariable form was not only older but also occurred more often historically than our texts show. It is relevant that the Ciceronian example cited by Gellius, *hanc sibi rem praesidio sperant futurum* (*Ver.* 5.167) has been 'corrected' in the manuscript tradition of Cicero to *futuram* or *esse futuram*. If Postgate was correct (*I. F.* 4 (1899)

2.4. Stage (3 B) is guaranteed by *mihi istaec uidetur praeda praedatum irier* (Pl. *Ru.* 1242). For this implies e.g. *uideo instanc praedam praedatum irier*, with *praedam* as subject to what is now a periphrastic future infinitive *praedatum irier*. The supine *praedatum* and the infinitive *irier* are no longer semantically independent items, as *redditum* and *ire* were in stage (1 B). With this loss of independence has come also removal of the ambiguities that arose from their independence.

2.5. It is theoretically possible that stage (4 A) preceded (3 B), but this is unlikely. For (4 A) is attested, as Létoublon points out (p.223), only in the citation from an otherwise lost passage of Cato that prompted Gallius's discussion of the matter (*N.A.* 10.14): *in hac contumelia quae mihi per huiusce petulantiam factum itur*. Moreover, while a reanalysis of *praedam redditum iri* or *me deductum iri* that made *praedam* and *me* not the objects of the supine but the subjects of the periphrastic infinitive is plausible enough, a corresponding reanalysis of *praedam redditum itur* and *me deductum itur* is not, entailing as it does both a shift of case, *praeda redditum itur*, and in the second instance also a shift of person, (*ego*) *deductum \*eor*.

2.6. The really weak link in the derivational chain is at (2 A), for which there is no evidence at all,<sup>7)</sup> apart from the implication of Gellius's explanation (*loc. cit.*) '*contumeliam factum iri*' significat '*iri ad contumeliam faciendam*', id est '*operam dari quo fiat contumelia*'<sup>8)</sup>. *Itur contumeliam factum* would then, if it ever occurred, be synonymous with *itur ad contumeliam faciendam*. But Gellius cites no example and, since he is not an author to pass over an opportunity to exhibit his learning, we may reasonably infer that he knew of none. This suggests that it may be worth while to seek an alternative derivation.

---

252) in deriving *facturum* from the locative *\*factou* + *\*esom*, an unattested Latin allomorph of *esse* ('to be in the act of doing'), then both future infinitives would reflect cases of the verbal noun in *-tu-*.

<sup>7)</sup> The impersonal *itur* itself is rare enough; cf. *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 1831, Pl. *Ba.* 447, Vg. *A.* 6.179 with Quint. 1.4.28. Some scholars simply eliminate this stage in the derivation, assuming that (2 B) *me ire praedam redditum* → (3 B) *praedam redditum iri*; viz. that the innovation occurred exclusively at the infinitival level. See e.g. C.D. Buck *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago 1948), p. 306, where no other possibility is even mentioned. However, inf. *ire* + supine in *-um* is also extremely rare; so nothing much is gained by this assumption.

<sup>8)</sup> The paraphrases seem chosen deliberately to exclude an equation with straightforward futurity, such as could have been conveyed by *id est 'hunc contumeliam facturum esse'* or *idem quod 'contumelia fiet'*.

3.1. Now the verbal noun in *-tu-* like all verbal nouns<sup>9)</sup> was strictly neutral as to voice; hence *res facilis dictu* ‘a thing that is easily said’ but *ita dictu opus est* ‘there is a need to say this’.<sup>10)</sup> A similar neutrality in the gerund is reflected in *domando spiritum* (Hor. C. 2.2.9) ‘by taming your spirit’ beside *ad domandum proni* ‘inclined to be tamed’ (Var. R. 1.20.2); *facile ad intellegendum* ‘easily understood’ beside *ad intelligendum nati sumus* ‘we are born to understand’. It is this property of verbal nouns that enables dependent genitives to represent both subject and object of a corresponding finite verb structure: *huius dignitatis petitio* ‘the seeking of this honour’ ← *hanc dignitatem aliquis petit* and *Sulpici petitio* ‘the seeking by Sulpicius’ ← *Sulpicius petit (dignitatem)*. Hence *eo petitem* like *eo ad petitionem*, *eo ad petendum* would originally have meant ‘I am on the way to an act of seeking’, the specification ‘I am on the way to seeking’ or ‘I am on the way to being sought’ being pointed by the context. Like *petitio* (and perhaps *petendum*) *petitus* would originally have had nominal patterns of dependency: *eo petitem dignitatis* like *eo ad petitionem dignitatis*. The shift to verbal complementation *eo petitem dignitatem* came with the closer association of the supines *-tum*, *-tū* with the verbal system.<sup>11)</sup> It was not shared by the non-supine uses of *-tu-* nouns, *terrae petitus* (Lucr. 3.172), *ad quae-stūs pecuniae* (Caes. *Fal.* 6.17), *post actum operis* (Quint 2.18) etc., or by the *-tion-* nouns, which remained detached from the verbal system.<sup>12)</sup>

3.2. Starting then from the assumption that the *-tum* verbal noun was neutral as to voice, we can reconstruct the following diachrony to replace that set out in § 2.1 above:

<sup>9)</sup> Including the single-word infinitives: *legere* < *\*legesi*, the loc. of a neuter s-stem noun, *legī* < *legei*, the dat. of a ‘root’ noun. Only *legier* is marked for voice: either < *legī* < *legei* + *-er* or < *\*legiē* (cf. the Vedic gerunds *vrtyā* etc.) + *-r*. For the IE perspective to this see Coleman ‘The IE origins and Latin development of the accusative with infinitive construction’ in *Syntaxe et Latin*, ed. C. Touratier (Aix-en-Provence 1985), p. 315.

<sup>10)</sup> Parallels in Vedic, where it is often hard to say whether the *-tu-* forms are used infinitivally or not (see Coleman (1985) pp. 307–8), include *śákyam aváptum* ‘that which is capable of attainment’, viz. ‘that which can be obtained’; *purá hán-toḥ* ‘before the striking’, in *RV* 3.30.10 specifically ‘before being struck’, *ná rád-haḥ páryetave* ‘not treasure for surpassing’, in *RV* 8.24.21 ‘treasure not to be surpassed’.

<sup>11)</sup> For IE parallels to this development see Coleman (1985) 308–9.

<sup>12)</sup> An exception is the early Latin formulaic phrases like *quid tibi hanc curatio est rem* ‘why are you concerned about this?’ (Pl. *Am.* 519) for the usual *huius – rei*.

(1 A) *eo praedam redditum* ‘I am on the way to returning the loot’ with (1 B) its infinitival form *me ire praedam redditum* and (1 C) *\*praeda it redditum* ‘the loot is on the way to being returned’ (lit. ‘going towards the returning’) with (1 D) infinitival *\*praedam ire redditum*. The latter pair were subsequently marked for passivity at the only point where they could be, yielding (2 D) *praedam redditum iri* and (3 C) *praeda redditum itur*. This derivation is not only simpler in itself but achieves its simplicity precisely by eliminating the most objectionable stage, the impersonal *itur* (cf. § 2.5). Even though it is much easier to derive (3 C) from (1 C) here than it was to derive the corresponding (4 A) from (2 A) in the previous diachrony, the fact that Gellius deemed the Catonian usage worthy of special treatment and offered no parallel for it still favours the derivation of (3 C) from (2 D): *uideo praedam redditum iri* → *praeda uidetur redditum iri* → *praeda redditum itur*.

4.1. We need not be surprised that Gellius connected both the current *factum iri* and Cato’s *quae factum itur* with the only passive use of the verb that he knew, the impersonal in Vergil’s *itur in antiquam siluam* etc. He could hardly have done otherwise. Now, after more than eighteen centuries, his explanation can perhaps be superseded.

## *Luteus*: Pink or Yellow?

By ROBERT EDGEWORTH, Baton Rouge

The accepted authorities assign more than one meaning to the Latin adjective *luteus*,<sup>1)</sup> including both “yellow” and “red.”<sup>2)</sup> Nevertheless, as will be seen below, modern translators show a very strong preference for “yellow” as a translation for this term, not only in contexts where red or yellow would be equally suitable, but even in passages where red (or perhaps pink) is clearly preferable.

<sup>1)</sup> Long *u*; not to be confused with *lūteus*, ‘sooty, grimy.’

<sup>2)</sup> E.g. von Kamptz in *TLL* VII. 2. 1895–97 *s. v.*: “2 a. *ruber* ... b. *flavus* ...”; Karl Ernst Georges, *Ausführliches Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch* (Basel 1951<sup>9</sup>) *s. v.*: “IIa) goldgelb, safrangelb, orangegelb ... b) rosenfarben, rosenroth, hellpurpurn ...”; Jacques André, *Étude sur les Termes de Couleur dans la Langue Latine* (Paris 1949), pp. 151–52: “‘orange’ ... ‘jaune.’”