XXIII.—The Type *calefacio*

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

In Part I, the 61 causative verbs (30 regular and 31 irregular) in -*efacio* are described, listed, and classified according to type and date. In Part II, earlier theories as to their origin are summarized and refuted. In Part III, a new theory is offered and defended, namely, that the member ending in -*e* was originally an imperative of a second conjugation intransitive verb, used paratactically with *facio* after the manner of a jussive subjunctive.

PART I

Verbs of the type represented by the compound *calefacio*[1] "make warm" are causatives or factitives, normally indicating the production of the state denoted by the first member. This member ends in $\bar{e}$, which when the preceding syllable is short is regularly changed to $\breve{e}$ by the action of the iambic law;[2] thus we have *ārēfacio, fervēfacio*, but *calĕfacio*. There are, however, some exceptions, as in *Phorm.* 284;[3] variations, presumably *metri causa*, are cited for Lucretius, Catullus, and Ovid, e.g. Catullus 68.360: *tepēfaciet* but

---

[1] There are several other types of compounds with *facio*. Some are of self-evident formation: (1) those with adverbs, as *benefacio* and *malefacio, fabrefacio, satisfacio;* (2) those with genitive of value, as *multifacio, floccifacio;* (3) the syntactically peculiar *lucrifacio* (on which see *SS* 399–400); (4) *usufacio;* (5) *semifactus;* (6) *valefacio*, resembling *calefacio* in appearance but to be separated from it on syntactic grounds, as will appear at the end of this paper. All these are of obvious derivation; and most of them might well be written as two words rather than one, in view of the freedom in order involved in their use. Note e.g. *Per.* 488: bene faciant vs. *Men.* 1021: faciant bene, *Cas.* 861: est fabre facta vs. *Stich.* 570: apologum fecit quam fabre; quite possibly *facio* in these cases is no more closely joined with its adverb than in e.g. Cicero, *Lael.* 9: facis amice. Other compounds are more troublesome: (1) *magefio*, which if *mage* is an alternative for *magis* belongs with class 1 above (but why was not *magis* used, as *satis* was?); (2) *levifacio*, which from its form and its meaning ("set at naught") seems to be modeled after *multifacio*, though *levi* is not a genitive; (3) *turpifacio*, apparently similar to *levifacio;* (4) *linifio*, wholly unknown to me; (5) *vilefacio*, which if *vile* is a neuter used as an adverb may belong in form with class 1 above and in meaning with class 2, but which more probably belongs with *pinguefacio*, to be treated below. I know *linifio, magefio, turpifacio*, and *vilefacio* only through Gradenwitz (cf. below, note 11).

For abbreviations (other than those listed on page vi) and bibliography, see pages 334 f.

[2] Cf. Skutsch 103–4, 150–1, 210; Lindsay 201–2 and 210; and Stowasser, *ZOG* 52.194–5.

[3] Ita eúm tum tímidum ibi óbstupefecit pudor, according to Skutsch (103), who defends the MS reading *ibi obstupefecit* against those who would emend (e.g. by changing *ibi* to *illic* or *subito*).

66.29: *tepĕfecit*.[4]   There is great fluctuation in the dictionary recordings, not only in the far from trustworthy *ALS* but also in the admirable *EM;* and for this reason in citing the various verbs I shall disregard quantity altogether.   The short *e* occasionally disappears by syncope, resulting in, e.g., *calfacio* (as in Cicero, *Fam.* 16.18.2 *calface*); for some reason this seems to occur invariably in the case of *olfacio*.[5]   The form *arfacito* for *ārēfacito* found in some of the MSS of Cato, *RR* 69.2, and accepted by Keil in the Teubner text, if the recording is correct must be due to the influence of the regularly syncopated forms.[6]

This type of verb differs from the common "prepositional compounds" — i.e. verbs composed of *facio* preceded by a preverb — in two important particulars.[7]   (1) The *a* of *facio* is not weakened;[8] we have *calefacio calefactus* vs. *conficio confectus*.   (2) The passive in the present system, as in the case of the simple verb *facio*, is *fio;* we have *calefio calefieri* vs. *conficior confici*.   Here again there is some sporadic variation: anomalous forms cited include on the one hand *calficio* instead of *calfacio*, and *calfacior* instead of *calfio;* and on the other hand *irrefacio* instead of **irreficio*, the peculiar *prodefacio*[9] instead of **prodeficio*, and *defio*[10] instead of *deficior*.

Regular examples of the type are fairly common.   There are cited[11] 30 examples in all, or 58 if we add the compounds to the

---

[4] The uncertainty of the reading of the second part of the word has no bearing on the question under discussion here.   For other examples of variations in quantity, see Corssen 2.514.   Note especially Quintilian 1.6.21.

[5] No form **olefacio* is cited.   The presence of *l* is supposed to be conducive to syncope (*SS* 94); but why should this alter **olefacio* more completely than *calefacio?*

[6] Cf. Skutsch 291 on this difficult point.   Gradenwitz does not list the form *arfacio* at all.

[7] Cf. Priscian 2.377, 402, 3.269 (*GLK*).

[8] I shall revert to this later, fifth paragraph of Part III.

[9] The odd *prode-* seems to be a back-formation from *prodest, prodesse,* which appears in vulgar Latin *prodefuit* for *profuit*.

[10] Or rather *defit,* for the verb normally occurs in the third person only.   But between this *defit* and the regular *deficitur* there seems to be a difference: *deficitur* is the passive for *deficit* as a transitive "fail, desert;" but *defit* is a synonym for *deficit* as an intransitive "fail, be wanting," and an antonym for *superfit* (for which no corresponding active verb **superficio* is cited at all, except in the participle *superficiens*). For Plautus' use of both, see below, note 98 on *defit* and note 92 on *superfit*.

[11] All citations are based on Gradenwitz, whose lists include those used for the *TLL*.   A few verbs from parts of the alphabet not included in parts of the *TLL* already published, and also one (*magefio*) for which I have looked in vain in the appropriate volume of the *TLL*, do not appear in any of the dictionaries available to me, and therefore must be classed here as "unknown," though probably it is safe to assume that they are both late and rare; they are *linifio, lutefio, magefio, mollefacio,*

simple ones (by compound and simple examples of the *calefacio* type I mean those with and without verbal prefixes respectively). These are listed in Table I, the simple verbs in alphabetical order, each followed by any corresponding compound or compounds. Columns 1 and 2 show respectively the active and passive occurrences; in some cases no finite forms are recorded, but only the past passive participle, which is then placed in parentheses in the *-fio* column. In general, syncopated forms are not listed (except in the case of the uniformly syncopated *olfacio*, noted above); but

TABLE I

1	2	3	4	5	6
arefacio	arefio	areo	aresco	aridus	be dry
—	exarefio	—	exaresco	exaridus	.
calefacio	calefio	caleo	calesco	calidus	be warm
(*calfacio*)	(*calfio*)	—	—	(*caldus*)	
concalefacio	concalefio	concaleo	concalesco	—	
excalefacio	—	—	excalesco	—	
(*excalfacio*)	(*excalfio*)	—	—	—	
(*incalfacio*)	—	—	incalesco	—	
percalefacio	percalefio	—	percalesco	percalidus	
praecalefacio	—	—	—	praecalidus	
recalefacio	—	recaleo	recalesco	—	
(*recalfacio*)	(*recalfio*)	—	—	—	
candefacio	candefio	candeo	candesco	candidus	be dazzling
excandefacio	—	excandeo	excandesco	—	
percandefacio	—	—	—	percandidus	
fervefacio	—	ferveo	fervesco	fervidus	be red-hot
confervefacio	—	conferveo	confervesco	—	
defervefacio	—	deferveo	defervesco	—	
infervefacio	—	inferveo	infervesco	—	
—	perfervefio	perferveo	—	—	
suffervefacio	—	sufferveo	—	—	
frigefacio	—	frigeo	frigesco	frigidus	be cold
perfrigefacio	—	—	perfrigesco	perfrigidus	
ignefacio	—	igneo	ignesco	—	be on fire
languefacio	—	langueo	languesco	languidus	be faint
liquefacio	liquefio	liqueo	liquesco	liquidus	be fluid
—	colliquefio	—	colliquesco	—	
—	(*illiquefactus*)	(*illiquor*)	—	—	
madefacio	madefio	madeo	madesco	madidus	be moist
—	(*emadefactus*)	—	emadesco	—	

obsurdo, pallefactus, turgefacio, turpifacio, vilefacio, vivefacio. On the other hand, I do not take cognizance of forms not recognized by Gradenwitz, though cited elsewhere, as *vallefacio* (i.e. *valle feci*, discussed by Lachmann 191, on Lucretius 3.906), and *obsoleo* (on which see note 28).

TABLE I—*Continued*

1	2	3	4	5	6
permadefacio	—	—	permadesco	—	
mollefacio	—	molleo	mollesco	—	be soft
—	nigrefio	nigreo	nigresco	—	be black
nitefacio	—	niteo	nitesco	nitidus	be gleaming
olfacio	olfio	oleo	—	olidus	smell
subolfacio	—	suboleo	subolesco	—	
—	(pallefactus)	palleo	pallesco	pallidus	be pale
patefacio	patefio	pateo	patesco	—	be open
—	(impatefactus)	—	—	—	
pavefacio	—	paveo	pavesco	pavidus	be in terror
expavefacio	—	expaveo	expavesco	expavidus	
perpavefacio	—	—	—	—	
—	(pudefactus)	pudeo	pudesco	—	be ashamed
—	(impudefactus)	—	—	—	
putefacio	—	puteo	putesco	putidus	be rotten
putrefacio	putrefio	putreo	putresco	putridus	be rotten
rigefacio	—	rigeo	rigesco	rigidus	be stiff
rubefacio	—	rubeo	rubesco	rubidus	be red
squalefacio	—	squaleo	squalesco	squalidus	be rough
stupefacio	stupefio	stupeo	stupesco	stupidus	be amazed
obstupefacio	obstupefio	obstupeo	obstupesco	obstupidus	
tabefacio	tabefio	tabeo	tabesco	tabidus	waste away
contabefacio	—	—	contabesco	—	
tepefacio	tepefio	tepeo	tepesco	tepidus	be lukewarm
—	(timefactus)	timeo	timesco	timidus	be afraid
—	(pertimefactus)	pertimeo	pertimesco	—	
torpefacio	—	torpeo	torpesco	torpidus	be numb
tumefacio	—	tumeo	tumesco	tumidus	be swollen
—	(extumefactus)	extumeo	extumesco	extumidus	
turgefacio	—	turgeo	turgesco	turgidus	be inflated
umefacio	umefio	umeo	umesco	umidus	be wet

for the sake of completeness, these are included (within parentheses and in italics) in the case of the type verb *calefacio* and its compounds.

Column 3 shows the verbs in *-eo* with which each of the verbs in columns 1 and 2 is connected. (In the case of 15 of the compounds, no corresponding compound in *-eo* is cited; this may suggest that these compounds, and doubtless a number of others also, may be derived from simple verbs in *-facio* rather than from compound ones in *-eo*.) All the *-eo* verbs are intransitives denoting state or condition. Their meaning is given in column 6 in the case of all the simple verbs; the meaning of the compound verbs, being self-evident, is omitted. The meaning of the verbs in columns 1 and 2

is in factitive relation with that of the verbs in column 3; that is, *caleo* is "I am warm," *calefacio* "I make warm," *calefio* "I am made warm" or "I become warm."

There are only two verbs that show departure from this general pattern. (1) Since *oleo* means "smell, emit a smell," *olfacio* ought to mean "cause to emit a smell," which it actually does in Varro, *RR* 2.2.16 (cited by Skutsch, 289–90); its usual meaning, "smell, perceive a smell," is hard to explain. (2) While *pudeo*, which we meet in Plautus, means "I am ashamed," the much more common use of the verb is in the impersonal third person *pudet*, which is itself a causative,[12] *me pudet* being used in the sense of *pudeo* or conceivably of the apparently non-existent **pudefio* — which is probably precisely the reason why **pudefio is* non-existent, as is also **pudefacio*, only *pudefactus* being cited, and that very late.

All the simple verbs but 1,[13] and all the compound ones but 8, have corresponding inchoatives, as *calesco* "I begin to be warm, I become warm," etc. All the simple verbs except 5,[14] and 8 of the 28 compounds, have corresponding adjectives, as *calidus* (*caldus*) "warm." There are also a number of verbs in *-facto -factare* which serve as frequentatives or intensives for *-facio* verbs, as *calefacto* "I make warm or hot." Thus is formed a regular pattern, which doubtless played a considerable part in the analogical creation of new verbs of the type, some of them anomalous in certain ways, as we shall soon see.

Another factor in the spread of the type must have been the fact that the meanings are grouped in certain definite categories, with a few of the verbs belonging to more than one category. We may classify them under the following general heads. Temperature: *frigeo, tepeo, caleo, ferveo, igneo,* perhaps *candeo.* Type of substance: *areo, madeo, umeo, liqueo,* perhaps *igneo;* contrast *rigeo* with *liqueo.* Texture: *molleo, squaleo, rigeo.* Color and brightness: *rubeo, nigreo, candeo, niteo, palleo.* Smell: *oleo, puteo, putreo.* Shape: *tumeo, turgeo,* perhaps *pateo.* Weakness or unsoundness: *palleo, langueo, tabeo, torpeo, rigeo, puteo, putreo;* perhaps *tumeo* and *turgeo.* Emotion: *paveo, timeo, stupeo, pudeo.*

---

[12] Cf. the group of verbs in Table II, discussed below.

[13] *Oleo.* The existence of *olesco* "grow" (recorded in Festus as a simple verb, and met in a number of compounds) may have interfered with the development of **olesco* "begin to smell."

[14] *Igneo, molleo, nigreo, pateo, pudeo.*

The type became well-established at an early period. Of the 30 verbs under consideration, 11, either in simple or compound form, are cited in pre-classical Latin (Plautus, Terence, Pacuvius, Cato), namely: *arefacio, calefacio, candefacio, fervefacio, perfrigefacio, madefacio, patefacio, perpavefacio, obstupefacio, contabefacio, pertimefactus.* We find 5 first cited for the Ciceronian age, *languefacio, liquefacio, olfacio, putrefacio, tepefacio;* 2 for the Augustan age, *rubefacio* and *tumefacio;* and 2 for Silver Latin, *rigefacio* and *umefacio.* Of the remaining 10, 2 are from the 2nd century (Gellius), *nitefacio* and *pudefactus;* 1 from the 3rd (Nonius), *torpefacio;* 4 from the 4th and 5th (Prudentius, Petrus Chrysologus, Theodorus Priscianus), *ignefacio, nigrefio, putefacio, squalefacio.* The other 3, *mollefacio, pallefactus,* and *turgefacio,* are almost certainly late, though I must class them as of unknown date.[15]

We now turn to verbs which, while ending in -*efacio,* diverge from the regular type either in meaning or in form.

TABLE II

1	2	3	4	4	6
abolefacio	—	aboleo	abolesco	—	destroy
—	(adolefactus)	adoleo	adolesco	—	magnify, burn
allicefacio	—	alliceo	—	—	attract
condocefacio	—	condoceo	—	—	instruct
commonefacio	commonefio	commoneo	—	—	remind
perterrefacio	—	perterreo	—	—	terrify
torrefacio	—	torreo	torresco	torridus	parch
—	(subtorrefactus)	—	—	—	
cavefacio	cavefio	caveo	—	—	beware

Table II shows a group of 8 verbs which, while formally they follow the pattern of *calefacio,* differ from it semantically because the presence of -*facio* does not render them causative, or, indeed, alter their meaning in any way, so far as can be judged. In 7 of the 8 cases this is because the verbs in -*eo* from which they are derived are themselves causative.[16] I would suggest that this

15 Cf. note 11.

16 3 of the 7, (*con*)*doceo,* (*com*)*moneo,* and *torreo,* are of the common causative type, showing *o*-grade in the root (see e.g. Brugmann, *Grund.* 2.3.244–69, Buck 260 and 269); (*per*)*terreo* probably belongs with these despite its *e*-grade (explained by *EM* 993 as a means of avoiding homonymy with *torreo*). The other 3 are much less clear, and all lack a corresponding simple verb: *lacio,* corresponding to the Plautine *allicio,* is cited in the glosses, but **laceo* not at all, and even *alliceo* is doubtful (it is

tautological group arose in an inappropriate following of the usual pattern as developed from the much commoner *-eo* intransitives;[17] for instance, perhaps in some outburst of Plautine gusto such as "eum timefacio, tremefacio, terreo," the final *terreo*, either through a genuine lapse or through a deliberate striving for comic effect, may well have been altered into *terrefacio*.[18]   All the members of this peculiar group except *commonefacio* (met in Plautus and often in Cicero) are rare, being apparently limited to one or two instances or to one or two authors.   We find *adolefactus* cited once from the Arval Brethren, *perterrefacio* once from Terence, *condocefacio* twice from Cicero and twice from the *Bell. Afr.*, *allicefacio* once from Seneca and once from Suetonius, *torrefacio* only from Columella, and *abolefacio* once from Tertullian.

The 8th word, *cavefacio*, is still more peculiar in that it is not a causative at all, but has precisely the same sense as the intransitive *caveo*.   It is both late and rare, being attested once in a provincial inscription from imperial times,[19] where it means "take care of," and once in the 6th century Christian poet Venantius Fortunatus, 8.3.193,[20] where it means "beware of."

The verbs in Table III, 23 in all, or, if we count compounds separately, 32, are peculiar in that there is no verb in *-eo* at their base.   For those in A, no related verb at all is positively citable; there is an allied verb of the first conjugation for those in B, and of the third conjugation for those in C.   In each case where an allied verb exists, it is listed in column 3.   In column 4 are recorded all existing inchoatives, as in Tables I and II.   Column 5 contains the allied adjective in *-idus* where one exists; failing that, an allied

cited by Charisius and Diomedes, and seems to be assigned to early Latin by the latter, 1.367 *GLK*), while *aboleo* and *adoleo* both present serious difficulties (see *WH* and *EM* s.v.).

[17] The illogical following of an established pattern has many examples: for instance, our own *available, dependable, dispensable,* and *laughable,* all of which seem to have been accepted without question, though *reliable* for some reason aroused a storm of protest (see *NED* s.v. *reliable*).   Therefore we do not need to follow those scholars who think that in the causatives derived from transitives the first member must be viewed as passive — Lachmann 191 (on Lucretius 3.906); Stolz 1.436; Sonnenburg, *IF* 12.387–8.

[18] Skutsch's explanation of these verbs as mere "gedankenlose Nachbildungen" (286) is similar, but I think not quite so satisfactory because not so specific.

[19] Orelli 3678: haec ita ut cavi [sic!] fieri praestarique volo hoc amplius ab heredibus meis volo praestari.

[20] Per tribulos gradiens spinae cavefecit acumen.   The reference is to the edition of F. Leo, Berlin, 1881 (= *MGH, Auct. Ant.* 4); in the edition of M. A. Luchi, Rome, 1786, it is 8.6.193 (*ALS* cites the passage wrongly as 8.6.192).

TABLE III

1	2	3	4	5	6
A					
assuefacio	—	—	assuesco	—	become accustomed
consuefacio	consuefio	consueo(?)	consuesco	—	
desuefacio	—	—	desuesco	—	
—	(insuefactus)	—	insuesco	—	
mansuefacio	mansuefio	—	mansuesco	(mansues)	
obsolefacio	—	—	obsolesco	—	become worn out
—	(cinefactus)	—	—	(cinis)	ashes
—	(incinefactus)	—	—	—	
pinguefacio	pinguefio	—	pinguesco	(pinguis)	become fat
rarefacio	—	—	raresco	(rarus)	become rare
vilefacio	—	—	vilesco	(vilis)	become cheap or vile(?)
B					
—	(domefactus)	domo	—	—	tame
—	(gelefactus)	gelo	gelesco	gelidus	freeze
labefacio	labefio	labo	labesco	labidus	totter
—	collabefio	—	—	—	
—	(illabefactus)	—	—	—	
—	lutefio	luto	lutesco	(lutum)	bedaub with mud
maturefacio	—	maturo	maturesco	(maturus)	ripen
obdurefacio	—	obduro	obduresco	(durus)	harden
obscurefacio	—	obscuro	—	(obscurus)	darken
obsurdefacio	—	obsurdo	obsurdesco	(surdus)	deafen
purefacio	—	puro	—	(purus)	cleanse
—	(sobriefactus)	sobrio	—	(sobrius)	make sober
—	vacefio	vaco	—	—	be empty
vacuefacio	vacuefio	vacuo	—	(vacuus)	make empty
C					
expergefacio	expergefio	expergo	(expergiscor)	—	arouse
incendefacio	—	incendo	—	—	kindle
quatefacio	—	quatio	—	—	shake
tremefacio	tremefio	tremo	tremesco	—	tremble
—	(intremefactus)	intremo	intremisco	—	
vivefacio	—	vivo	vivesco	vividus	live
revivefacio	—	revivo	revivesco	—	

adjective of any type, or even in two cases an allied noun.   The translation in column 6 is of the allied verb when one is found, otherwise of the inchoative; if that too is lacking, of the related word (no matter what its type) listed in column 5.

We note first the group consisting of *assuefacio, consuefacio, desuefacio, insuefactus,* and *mansuefacio.*   This is an early type: *consuefacio* is cited for Terence; the others for the Ciceronian age, but *mansuefacio* may have been in existence in pre-classical times, since the adjective *mansues,* perhaps due to false division of the verb,[21] is met in Plautus.[22]   There is no *sueo,*[23] with or without a preverb, from which these verbs can be derived; *consueo,* if it existed at all,[24] is surely a late back-formation from the pre-classical *consuefacio* and *consuesco.*   But in all of the cases[25] the corresponding incho-ative[26] is at least as old as the causative, and the proportion *calesco : calefacio = consuesco : x* would easily have brought *consuefacio* into existence.   The possibly Ciceronian *obsolefacio*[27] may belong to the

[21] A verb compounded with the noun-stem *man-* was evidently not so readily understandable as one compounded with a preverb, and so the formation of the adjective from it was very natural.   However, Stowasser takes the adjective as the primary form, explaining *mansuefio* as from *mansues fio* (*ZOG* 52.194), cf. *EM²,* (not *EM¹*).

[22] *A s.* 504: nequeon ego ted interdictis facere mansuetem meis?, *ibid.* 145: reddam ego te . . . mansuetem.   Cf. Apuleius, *Met.* 7.23: equos . . . mansuetos ac mansues . . . factos — where, however, the reading is far from certain.

[23] We find *sueo* listed in Gradenwitz; for what period he recognizes it I do not know (cf. note 11), but I am reasonably sure it would not have been early enough to affect this group of compounds.   Lucretius' forms *suemus, suerit,* etc., are almost certainly to be assigned to *suesco;* see Merrill on 1.60, and also *EM* s.v. *suesco,* where we find the categorical statement that there is no verb *sueo.*   According to *EM ibid.* (otherwise *WP* 2.456), the form in *-eo* that corresponded to the rare *suesco* (on which see below, note 26) is *soleo;* but obviously this played no part in the formation of the compounds in *-suefacio.*

[24] I include *consueo* in the table along with *consuefacio* because it is listed in Gradenwitz, but I doubt whether it really existed.   Priscian (2.508 *GLK*), while not himself recognizing a form *consueo,* adds: Charisius tamen etiam "consueo" ponit; but what Charisius actually says (1.253 *ibid.*) is: floreo floresco, consuevi consuesco— which probably involves a misinterpretation of the perfect *consuevi* (really a part of *consuesco*) as the verb which produced *consuesco,* but certainly does not imply the existence of a present *consueo.* — The *consuemus* of Propertius (1.7.5) is probably to be explained as for *consuevimus* from *consuesco,* precisely as is the *suemus* of Lucretius (1.60) as for *suevimus* from *suesco* (see note 23).   On *consue* as a separate element in Varro, *RR* 2.9.13, see below, note 113.

[25] In all but one it may be older: *consuesco* is cited for Plautus, *desuesco* for Titinius, *insuesco* for Terence; to these may be added *mansuesco* if the *mansuetior* of Asellio is from *mansuetus* (so *ALS*) and not *mansues* (as seems more likely to me).

[26] They are all common, though the simple *suesco* seems to be very rare, especially in the present system.

[27] The citation in Cicero is not certain.   The verb is not met again until Silver Latin.

same group;[28] at all events it almost assuredly is similarly derived from the inchoative *obsolesco*, whose participle *obsoletus* reminds us of *consuetus*.

For the only other examples in Table III A that antedate the Empire, Lucretius is responsible. Both present difficulties. The first is *rarefacio*.[29] Here again we may trace the causative to the inchoative, but *raresco* is not a well-established form like the inchoatives in *-suesco* and *obsolesco;* on the contrary it, too, seems to stem from Lucretius.[30] The suggestion has been made that Lucretius thought of *rare* as an adverb,[31] and was imitating such formations as *benefacio* and *malefacio*.[32] But the adverb in Lucretius is *raro*,[33] and a much better explanation seems to me that Lucretius on the basis of the adjective *rarus* is forming *raresco* and *rarefacio* as rhyme-words[34] for *aresco* and *arefacio*[35] — a particularly natural thing since the verbs indicate a not unlike change of state, from wet to dry in one case, from dense to rare in the other.

Even more peculiar is the second Lucretian word, *cinefactus*,[36] for which no allied word of any sort seems citable except the noun *cinis*.[37] Perhaps its formation may have been forwarded by such words as *calefactus* and *frigefactus*, slightly akin in both sound and meaning. At all events the meaning "turned to ashes" (given by Nonius) certainly seems demanded by the context.[38]

[28] It has been thought to come from *ob* + *soleo* (cf. note 23); it has also been explained as from *obs* + *oleo*, which might bring it into some sort of connection with *aboleo* and *adoleo*. But it, like them (cf. note 16), presents a most difficult problem; again see *EM* (s.v. *alo* and *ob*) and *WH* (s.v. *exolesco*). In any case, there does not seem to be such a verb as *obsoleo*, despite the tentative assumption of one in *ALS* (cf. note 11).

[29] 1.648, 2.1139, 3.442, 6.233, 870.

[30] 4.865, 6.214, 513, 841, 875.

[31] Some late *-facio* verbs of the type of *maturefacio* seem particularly easy to explain in this way, but even they are susceptible of another explanation, as we shall see later.

[32] See note 1.

[33] Cf. Sommer, *Krit. Erl.* 144. Güntert, *SHAW* 8.8.23, maintains that none the less *rare* must have *seemed* like an adverb to the Romans; this is hardly susceptible of proof.

[34] Cf. Sommer, *loc. cit.*

[35] He certainly could not have thought of *are* as an adverb! Cf. note 33, also note 110.

[36] Cited only from Lucretius (3.906–7: at nos horrifico cinefactum te prope busto insatiabiliter deflevimus).

[37] *Ignefacio*, from the verb *igneo* but suggesting the noun *ignis*, may have influenced Lucretius if it existed in his day; but this is doubtful, since it is not cited until Theodorus Priscianus.

[38] Lachmann (190, on Lucretius 3.906), clinging to logic more than is safe, refuses to admit this possibility, and maintains that the meaning must be "made the color of

The two remaining verbs in this group both have corresponding inchoatives, as well as corresponding third declension adjectives. Perhaps the relation *mansues*:*mansuefacio* may have helped to induce *pinguis*:*pinguefacio*, though doubtless the semantic relationship of *tabesco*:*tabefacio* would have had more influence in bringing about *pinguesco*:*pinguefacio*. At all events, Pliny uses both *pinguesco* and *pinguefacio*. About *vilefacio* I can hazard no opinion, since it is not known to me;[39] if it means "make cheap" or "make vile,"[40] it may owe its existence to the inchoative *vilesco*, itself very late (4th century), or to the adjective *vilis*.

The 12 verbs in Table III B, while associated with first conjugation verbs (most of them transitive), are surely not to be viewed as derived from them. Only 1 of them goes back to pre-classical times, *labefacio* (Terence). This cannot be influenced by the rare inchoative *labesco;* in Terence's time the only inchoative in use for *labo* seems to have been *labasco*. The adjective in *-idus*, if already in existence (we have a record of it somewhat later, in Vitruvius), may have had some influence (cf. *languidus*:*languefacio*, and *tabidus*:*tabefacio*); but *lābidus* "slippery" in both vowel quantity and meaning belongs with *lābor* "slip"[41] not with *lăbo* "totter" and *lăbefacio* "cause to totter," and so to bring it into the picture we must assume contamination of *lābidus* and *lăbo*.

Only two other verbs in this table belong to the Republic: *vacefio* (found only in two places in Lucretius[42]) beside *vaco* "be empty," and *vacuefacio* (Cicero and others) beside *vacuo* "make empty."[43] It is suggested in *EM* 1027 on the basis of Romance *vacitus* that there was a verb *vaceo* "be empty" to account for Lucretius' *vacefio;* this seems pretty daring in view of the discrepancy in time, and perhaps it is better to explain *vacefio* as a

ashes" (which involves positing a new verb *cineo*); this interpretation does not seem to me either poetic (despite Monro *ad loc.*) or probable. In Commodian 1.41.12: Babylon meretrix incinefacta favilla, the only meaning is "turned to ashes;" but that passage is too late to have a bearing on Lucretius.

[39] Cf. above, note 11.

[40] It might conceivably mean "make light of," like *levifacio;* in that case, cf. note 1.

[41] Strangely, Sonnenburg (*IF* 12.387) derives *labefacio* itself from *lābor*, and associates it with *expergefacio* as from a third conjugation verb.

[42] 6.1005 and 1017. The simple verb *vaco* occurs seven times in Lucretius.

[43] Had *vacuo* been common, the causatives in *-facio* would hardly have been needed. Lucretius uses *vacuatus* in the sense of *vacuefactus* (or *vacuus factus*) in 6.1024–5: simul a fronte est anelli rarior aer factus inanitusque locus magis ac vacuatus, but never the active forms, which seem to be post-Augustan only; *vacuefacio*, however, is met in the Ciceronian age and seems fairly common.

coinage of Lucretius after the manner of *rarefacio* because of the similarity in meaning, though the two verbs have not much else in common, *rarefacio* having the related inchoative *raresco* and adjective *rarus* but no related verb other than the inchoative, *vacefio* having the related verb *vaco* but no related inchoative or adjective. On the other hand its synonym *vacuefacio* has the related adjective *vacuus* like *rarus;*[44] and probably the synonymous *vacuefio* and *vacefio* reinforced each other in part on the basis of the relationship of the two verbs *vacuo* and *vaco* (even though these are not synonymous).

The remaining verbs in this table are late. The earliest of them, *domefactus,*[45] is found in Silver Latin (Petronius); it like *vacuefacio* is connected with a transitive verb, for which it was perhaps substituted through colloquial redundancy after the manner of the verbs in Table II.[46] The rest are post-classical.

One, *gelefactus* (6th century, Venantius Fortunatus), also connected with a transitive, *gelo* "freeze," is easily accounted for. There is an inchoative *gelesco* (Tertullian) as well as the older *gelasco* (Pliny); and there is the common adjective *gelidus,* frequently contrasted with *calidus;* so nothing could be more natural than the formation of *gelefactus* like *calefactus.* But the others present difficulties.

Presumably *lutefio,* which I know only through Gradenwitz,[47] means "become muddy," in view of the verb *luto* "bedaub with mud," the noun *lutum* "mud," and the inchoative *lutesco* "become muddy." Probably *lutefio* owes its being to the last, though there is a chance that it has the same relation to the noun *lutum* as the early *cinefactus* and the late *incinefactus* probably bear to *cinis.*[48]

We have no inchoative for *sobriefactus* (Apuleius). Possibly we really have here an example of the illogical use of an adverb with *facio*[49] through misunderstanding of the original type, perhaps suggested by *fabrefacio* (found as early as Plautus, and again in

---

[44] Note the association of *vacuatus* and *rarior* in 6.1024–5 (quoted in note 43).

[45] Perhaps the synonymous *mansuefactus,* already treated, had a part in its creation.

[46] *Domo,* though first conjugation, is probably to be compared with the causatives *doceo, moneo,* etc. See *EM* and *WH* s.v.

[47] Cf. note 11.

[48] Already discussed.

[49] For *sobrius factus.* Adjectives and adverbs do get interchanged; cf. the English fluctuation between *I feel bad* and *I feel badly.*

Livy).[50] But it seems to me more likely, since *sobrius* "sober" is often contrasted with *madidus* "drunk," that the word may have been coined, perhaps as a joke, in imitation of *madefactus*.

Finally we have a group of five verbs, dating from the 3rd, 4th, and 5th centuries, which resemble one another somewhat in sound and formation, and therefore may perhaps be assumed to have influenced one another. They are *obdurefacio*,[51] *obscurefacio*, and *purefacio* (all in Nonius), *maturefacio* (Theodorus Priscianus), and *obsurdefacio* (Augustine). The first conjugation verbs with which they are associated are clearly denominatives derived from first and second declension adjectives: one, despite the existence of allied causative and inchoative, can itself be used either as causative or as inchoative, namely *maturo*, which, like its English translation *ripen*, means either "make ripe" or "grow ripe;" one, *obduro*, is causative, "make hard," or denotes a state, "be hard;" two more, *obscuro* and *puro*, are causatives only, the fifth, *obsurdo*, is unknown to me.[52] Inchoatives are cited for three of these verbs, and of course may have existed for the others: beside the regularly-formed *maturasco* the common type *maturesco*, and for *obduro* and *obsurdo* only forms in *-esco*, are cited. Once more, these *-esco* forms may have produced the *-facio* causatives by analogy, though here again it might be suggested that a part was played by the adverbs, *mature*, *pure*, etc.[53]

In proportion to the causatives associated with first conjugation verbs, those associated with third conjugation verbs are surprisingly few. For ante-classical Latin we have only *expergefacio* (Plautus); the quite unlike inchoative *expergiscor* (note the *i* and the middle voice) probably played no part in its development, but it could easily have been formed as an emphatic synonym for the causative *expergo*[54] after the manner of the also Plautine *commonefacio* from *commoneo*, even more *perterrefacio* from *perterreo*. An exactly

---

[50] See note 1. If the verbs *sobrio* and *fabrio* existed as early as Apuleius, they might have played a part; but they are not cited until considerably later (Paulinus of Nola and Fortunatus Venantius respectively).

[51] Güntert (*SHAW* 8.8.24) traces *obdurefacio* to a form *durere*, but admits this is met only in the grammarians.

[52] Cf. note 11.

[53] Skutsch (291; cf. Güntert 23–4) takes the first part of these verbs, as also of *sobriefactus*, as adverbs.

[54] Perhaps the popular etymology which associated this transitive verb (almost certainly in error) with the normally intransitive *pergo*, may have contributed to the formation of a new transitive with the really redundant *-facio*.

parallel development may be posited for *quatefacio* (Cicero) as a synonym of *quatio;* probably the strongest influence may have been exerted here by the Terentian *labefacio*, rather similar in both sound and meaning.   We may trace the Ciceronian *tremefacio* back to the Lucretian *tremesco*, itself doubtless produced by the synonymous *timesco*,[55] or else to the pre-classical *pertimefactus* and *perterrefacio*. Perhaps the 4th century *incendefacio* (Trebellius Pollio) is a contamination of its synonym *incendo* with such regular causatives as *candefacio* and *excandefacio*, possibly with some influence from the inchoative *incandesco*.   The late *vivefacio* must be due to *vivesco*,[56] though here possibly the adjective *vividus* played a part.

We have now completed a survey of all the recorded causatives in *-facio*.[57]   Table IV groups them according to date.   Each verb is listed in a given column according to the period of its earliest citation, whether with or without prefix: pre-classical in column 1; Ciceronian, 2; Augustan, 3; Silver, 4; post-classical, 5.[58]

A study of this table makes obvious certain facts.   (1) The formation is an old one.   Of the 61 verbs cited, 17 or more than a quarter are from the pre-classical period; and of course of the 21 first cited from Golden or Silver Latin a number may also go back to early times despite the accident that our documents do not happen to include them.   On the other hand, of the 23 post-classical verbs, many are so late and so rare as probably to justify the assumption that they do not go back to the early period, and that at a late date the type had a sort of renaissance, marked by the creation of a large number of new examples.   (2) Almost half the entire number are completely regular, i.e. they conform absolutely to the type *calefacio*.   (3) The early examples are mainly regular (11 out of 17 in pre-classical Latin), and the regular examples are mainly early (of the entire 30, 11 or more than a third are pre-classical, and 16 or more than half are Republican).   On the other hand of the 23 formed in the long post-classical period, 13 or more than half show irregularities of various kinds.

[55] Cf. *SS* 314.   A form *tremisco* also exists; and in the case of the compound with *in-* (for which there is no parallel form from *timeo*) the only inchoative is *intremisco*.

[56] A form in *-isco* is also cited.

[57] Surveys have been made before this one by several scholars (e.g. Sonnenburg, *IF* 12.386–7; Güntert, *SHAW* 8.8.22), some of whom have merely listed the verbs while others have classified them in various ways.   Of all such treatments known to me, the best seems to me that of Leumann, *IF* 42.63 note 2.   I use a different method of approach; but some of my conclusions in regard to the development of individual verbs, while reached independently, resemble some of his.

[58] I am including under column 5 the few verbs which I cannot date.   See note 11.

TABLE IV

Table	1	2	3	4	5	Total
I	11 (a)	5 (b)	2 (c)	2 (d)	10 (e)	30
II	3 (f)	1 (g)	0	2 (h)	2 (i)	8
III	3 (j)	7 (k)	0	2 (l)	11 (m)	23
II and III	6	8	0	4	13	31
Total	17	13	2	6	23	61

Table I. Regular verbs.   Tables II and III. Irregular verbs.   II. Irregular in meaning.   III. Irregular in formation: no allied verb in *-eo*. (A. No allied verb. B. Allied verb of 1st conjugation.   C. Allied verb of 3rd conjugation.)

Column 1. Pre-classical.   2. Ciceronian.   3. Augustan.   4. Silver Latin.   5. Post-classical (includes verbs probably late, but of unknown date; these are followed by x).

(a)   arefacio, calefacio, candefacio, fervefacio, perfrigefacio, madefacio, patefacio, perpavefacio, obstupefacio, contabefacio, pertimefactus.
(b)   languefacio, liquefacio, olfacio, putrefacio, tepefacio.
(c)   rubefacio, tumefacio.
(d)   rigefacio, umefacio.
(e)   ignefacio, mollefacio (x), nigrefio, nitefacio, pallefactus (x), pudefactus, putefacio, squalefacio, torpefacio, turgefacio (x).
(f)   adolefactus, commonefacio, perterrefacio.
(g)   condocefacio.
(h)   allicefacio, torrefacio.
(i)   abolefacio, cavefacio.
(j)   A. consuefacio; B. labefacio; C. expergefacio.
(k)   A. obsolefacio, cinefactus, rarefacio; B. vacefio, vacuefacio; C. quatefacio, tremefacio.
(l)   A. pinguefacio; B. domefactus.
(m)   A. vilefacio (x); B. gelefactus, lutefio (x), maturefacio, obdurefacio, obscurefacio, obsurdefacio, purefacio, sobriefactus; C. incendefacio, vivefacio (x).

On the basis of the foregoing discussion, we may decide that any explanation of the type which fits the 30 regular examples — i.e. the verbs in which the causative is derived from an intransitive of the second conjugation — is both desirable and adequate, inasmuch as the 31 irregular examples — i.e. those which show departures of one sort or another from the typical model — have all been explained as none the less due in some way to the model.

We are now ready to decide what our explanation shall be.

PART II

Much study has been given to the question what the first member of the compound is.   Nearly all the scholars with whose views I am familiar identify it with the first member of the Latin

indicative in -*bam* and future in -*bo*, and give the same explanation for both.[59]   The explanations, all of which in my opinion are open to serious objections,[60] vary considerably.   I shall summarize them briefly, paying most attention to the three principal suggestions, those of Güntert, Skutsch, and Leumann.

(1) The member is viewed as a verbal stem.[61]   But a stem is an abstraction without actual existence; only genuine words can enter into a periphrasis.[62]   Most scholars of to-day realize this; yet the explanation has recurred in comparatively recent treatments, namely those of Güntert (1917) and of *M V* (1927).   The suggestion of *M V* (275), that the form is "un thème de caractère nominal," "une sorte de thème d'infinitif," simply restates the old view in new terms.   But Güntert[63] is more original and more elaborate. Having defended his view that an auxiliary verb can be added to the bare stem as in no way surprising ("auffallend") either for

---

[59] The list includes the following (in chronological order): Thurneysen, *BB* 8.280; Lindsay 490; Stolz, *SS* 256; Skutsch 214; Sommer, *Hdb.* 521, *Krit. Erl.* 144; *MV* 275; Buck 278 (he, however, has no explanation for either form); Kent 130. Güntert, *SHAW* 19, specifically groups the two formations as both involving the addition of an auxiliary to a verb stem, but gives different explanations for the two stems: an old aorist stem of heavy base in the case of the imperfect, a causative stem of the second conjugation in the case of *calefacio*.   Pedersen 2.448 declares that we may "unbedenklich" compare *calefio* with the Britannic compound verbs formed with *-bheu* "werden," and that both alike come from the early Italo-Celtic form of expression which also gave the Latin -*b*- imperfect and the Italo-Celtic -*b*- future. Insofar as the Britannic verbs and *calefio* both (like the imperfect and future in -*bam* -*bo*) show a second element derived from *-bheu*, he is of course right; but otherwise the two types are quite unlike, for the "werden" of the Britannic verbs is the "werden" that with an infinitive forms a future *active* (they are translated "wird kommen," "wird kaufen," etc.), whereas *fio* in *calefio* corresponds to "werden" as used with a participle to form the passive ("wird gekauft," etc.).   Besides, I think that *fio* came into our type of verb only analogically through *facio*.   (Cf. below, 320 and note 171.) — The only scholars who, so far as I know, explicitly register dissent concerning the identification of the imperfect and *calefacio* are Leumann (*IF* 42.63 and 66), who has an explanation for *calefacio* inapplicable to the imperfect, and Petersen (*Language* 3.176), who has an explanation for the imperfect inapplicable to *calefacio*, which he terms an unknown quantity.   Also, Brugmann, who in *Grund.*[1] 1267 and *KVG* 582 had assigned both to a common origin, admits in *Grund.*[2] 2.3.506 that possibly Skutsch's explanation may apply to *calefacio* (cf. below, note 82), though he will not accept it for the imperfect.

[60] So far as these views apply to the imperfect and future rather than to *calefacio*, I expect to discuss them in detail in a paper on the Latin formations in -*bam* and -*bo* to be published in *Language*.

[61] So many of the early scholars: e.g. Corssen (1870), who says (2.514) that the stem is the object of *facio*.

[62] Cf. the well-taken objections voiced by Schmidt, *KZ* 26.396–7; Stowasser, *ZOG* 52.193; Hoffmann, *RhM* NF 73.223.

[63] "Zur Herkunft und Bildung des italischen Imperfekts," *SHAW* 8.8 (1917).

Indo-European (16) or for Italic (18), he proceeds to his explanation (20-1), which is based on the fact that the second conjugation included a great number of intransitive verbs denoting condition or state, and also a number of transitive causative verbs;[64] and concludes as follows (21): "alte idg. Kausative wurden durch Anfügung von *facere* an den einstigen Kausativstamm umgebildet und neu hergerichtet." I find this unacceptable and indeed well-nigh incomprehensible.[65] It is illogical and tautological to add the causative verb *facio* to a form already causative. To be sure, language is not always logical, and if of the causative verbs in *-facio* those with an independently causative first member were both early and numerous, we might have to regard Güntert's theory of the origin of the type as correct; but we have already seen that this is far from being the case. As is made clear by Table IV, of the 17 examples belonging to the early period, only 3 are connected with transitive *-eo* verbs, and of the 13 first cited in the Ciceronian age, only 1; moreover, there are only 7 examples altogether out of the entire total of 61.

(2) The member is viewed as an old infinitive[66] or infinitive-like formation,[67] *cale* — in other words, a case-form of a verbal noun, which has been variously identified as the "indefinite" case,[68] dative,[69] instrumental,[70] locative.[71] But there is no reason to believe that such a form existed in old Latin. As a matter of fact, there is no reason to believe that Hirt's "casus indefinitus" existed even in Indo-European; it is an assumption and an abstraction

[64] Cf. above, note 16.

[65] Cf. Hoffmann's objections, *RhM* NF 73.231 note 1.

[66] Schmidt *KZ* 26.397, who compares Skt. *dāmanē*, Gk. δόμεναι; Thurneysen, *BB* 8.280; *EM* 307, despite *MV* 275.

[67] Stolz, *SS* 255; also Brugmann, *Grund.*[1] 2.1265, and Sommer, *Hdb.*[1] 568, but both later modified their opinions (see Brugmann, *Grund.*[2] 2.3.506, and Sommer, *Krit. Erl.* 140–1; also, cf. below, notes 71 and 81 on Sommer, and note 82 on Brugmann).

[68] Hirt, *IF* 17.45.

[69] Bartholomae, *BB* 15.244.

[70] Bartholomae, *BB* 12.91 (but observe note 69); Lindsay 489; Stolz 1.436; Brugmann, *IF* 6.101 (but see note 67).

[71] Streitberg, *IFA* 2.170. We may also note that Sommer, in *Krit. Erl.*, after expressing his doubt in regard to the explanation of the form in *-e* as "infinitivartig" (140; cf. above, note 67), tells us (142) that for a while he thought of a connection with an old locative of such *-es* nouns as *tabes, labes, lues,* an explanation which assumes that these nouns were originally *-ē* stems, and that they had locatives in *-ē*; in view of the complete lack of evidence for either of these assumptions, and on the basis of other cogent reasons as well, he finally abandoned the hypothesis (142–3) — very wisely in my opinion.

like the bare stem. As for the other case-forms, even if they did exist in old Latin, they would not fit syntactically with *facio*, which, as Corssen saw,[72] would require the first member to be its direct object.

(3) The member is viewed as a genuine Latin infinitive, **calēsi* (pronounced *calēzi*), which suffered syncope.[73] But there is no indication that the infinitive was used with *facio* at the time when the compounds become current; the construction is not cited from prose until Varro,[74] and even thereafter it is never common in classical Latin.[75]

(4) The member is a participle, *calens*. This is the famous Stowasser-Skutsch doctrine,[76] which has won some support. The objections to it have been mainly on phonetic grounds: we would expect *-sf-* to produce *-ff-*, as in *differo* and *difficilis*.[77] Stowasser (194) and Skutsch (287–8), assuming unobjectionably the loss of *n* before *s*, justify the change of **calesfacio* to *calefacio* on the basis of Brugmann's theory[78] that *res fert* lay at the base of *refert;* but this is to explain the dubious by the dubious.[79] Skutsch (288) also cites *pubes* from **pums-fes* according to the suggestion of Prellwitz, and *trafero* from *transfero* according to the reading of the 9th century Mediceus MS of Cicero (*Fam.* 5.20.3: traferri); but the first is purely hypothetical,[80] as he himself admits, and as for the second,

---

[72] Cf. note 61.

[73] Hoffmann, *RhM* NF 73.231 note 2; Kent 130 (however, Kent also speaks of this member as a stem, 112–3).

[74] *RR* 3.5.3: earum aspectus ac desiderium marcescere facit volucres inclusas. It is interesting to note that the infinitive is of the inchoative variety; *marcere facit* would have offered a more conclusive parallel for our type of verb. For verse three early examples are cited by Thielmann (*ALL* 3.180), respectively from Plautus (*Epid.* 411–2), Ennius (*Ann.* 452 Vahlen²), and Lucilius (*Incert.* 131 Mueller). But in the first and the second the reading, and in the second and the third the context, is uncertain; in the third at least *facio* may be a *verbum declarandi*, as it surely is in Terence, *Heaut.* 31 (so Bennett, 1.369).

[75] Cf. Skutsch (284), who with justice points out that the regular constructions with *facio* are (1) the subjunctive with *ut*, (2) the bare subjunctive, (3) a participle (287).

[76] Stowasser, *ZOG* 52.193–5 (1901); Skutsch, *ibid.* 195–7 = *KS* 214–6, *ACISS* (1903) 2.191–204 = *KS* 283–96. (All references to Skutsch throughout this paper are to the pages of *KS*.)

[77] See e.g. Güntert, *SHAW* 8.8.19.

[78] *IF* 8.218–27. Skutsch later (323) justifies the change *res fert* > *refert* (for which he now offers a different explanation from Brugmann's) by the change *frige(n)s facio* > *frigefacio* — surely circular reasoning!

[79] Cf. Bennett's refutation, 2.378.

[80] Despite Solmsen, *IF* 31.476; cf. *EM* s.v.

the testimony of a single instance in a single MS (even if it *is* an
authoritative one) seems scarcely adequate. Yet such admirable
phonologists as Sommer[81] and Brugmann[82] consider Skutsch's ex-
planation at least possible, so the objections based on phonetic law
are perhaps not insuperable. However, in my opinion there are
other objections as well. Skutsch points out quite truly that the
participle, unlike the infinitive, really is used with *facio* in early
Latin,[83] and cites as an example *Amph.* 1030: quem . . . faciam
ferventem.[84] But the example reveals one weakness of the theory.
There is no doubt that *calens*, once established, could easily have
supplanted the plurals *calentes* and *calentia*;[85] but how did *calens*
get established when two out of three examples with *facio* must,
like the one just cited, have employed *calentem* instead? Skutsch
himself had realized the difficulty (214–5), but believed it com-
pletely cleared up by Stowasser's suggestion (193–4) that the con-
struction originated with the passive *calens fit*, where all three
genders would have had *calens*, and only later spread to the active,
where the neuter *calens* (with *facio*) would have reinforced the
passive forms in supplanting the masculine and feminine *calentem*.
This does not seem to me to improve the situation in the least.
As Güntert says (19), there is no proof at all that *calens fio* is older
than *calens facio*;[86] and I would add that there is every reason to
believe that it is both more recent and rarer. Of this construction
Skutsch can cite no example; fewer forms in *-fio* are recorded than
those in *-facio*;[87] and, though *calefio* would naturally come into

---

[81] After some hesitation he is inclined to accept it (*Krit. Erl.* 144).

[82] He pronounces *calefacio* "allerdings semantisch und *vielleicht* auch lautgesetziich
auf *-ens facio* zurückführbar" (*Grund.* 2.3.506).

[83] Cf. above, note 75.

[84] Güntert (*SHAW* 8.8.8) objects that this example is really against Skutsch, for
why have we *ferventem facio* when we should have *fervefacio?* I am not sure this
argument is valid; if we seek to posit a construction A as having generated a form B,
are we to accept, or even demand, as a prerequisite for the belief that A once existed
(and generated B) the fact of its complete non-existence in extant literature? Güntert
in general views Skutsch's theory as "ganz unwahrscheinlich, ja unglaublich" (19);
and, evidently with an eye to Stowasser's courteous request to his old master, "er
möge einen seiner Schüler auf dieses Thema hetzen," he makes the rather clever but
malicious comment that Skutsch "unbarmherzig Stowassers Einfall zu Tod hetzt."

[85] Stowasser (194) aptly compares the inflection of *possum*, to which Skutsch (215)
adds that of Skt. *dātāsmi*.

[86] I have already raised the same argument against Pedersen (note 59) and shall
raise it again against Leumann (in the next paragraph).

[87] Cf. Tables I, II, and III.

being once *calefacio* had become current, I cannot believe in the creation of *calens fio* or *calefio* as an original entity, since the less cumbersome *calesco*, regularly recognized as older than *calefacio*, was already in existence in precisely the same meaning.[88]

This concludes the summary of views which account for *calefacio* and *calebam* in the same way. The only discussion of *calefacio* known to me which separates the two formations is that of Leumann.[89] He suggests that *calescit* was divided *calē + 'scit*, and *'scit* was interpreted as *escit*,[90] an old form having the meaning of *erit* and probably of *fit;* when *escit* (as in the *superescit* of Ennius and Accius[91]) was replaced by *fit* (as in the *superfit* of Plautus[92]), *calescit* became *calefit*. This while ingenious is not persuasive, for there are a number of serious objections. (1) It seems most unlikely that *calescit* would have been interpreted as *cale + escit;* the fact that in *escit* the *e* is short and in *calescit* it is long (as Leumann himself pronounces them, *SS* 314) would almost certainly have militated against any popular association of the two verbs. (2) Leumann's assumption that *escit = fit* seems dubious. There is no evidence for this either in its etymology (for such an old *-sc*-formation is not necessarily inchoative in meaning[93]) or — what is more important — in its use. In the passages from the Twelve Tables quoted by Gellius and Cicero,[94] *escit* and *escunt* are clearly equivalent to the futures *erit* and *erunt* or possibly *fiet* and *fient*,

---

[88] Thus is invalidated Sommer's main reason for accepting Skutsch's view, namely, the practical need for a convenient transitive to match the inchoative *calesco* (*Krit. Erl.* 144); the active *calefacio* would be required for this, but much less the passive *calefio*, since the inchoative though intransitive often approaches a passive meaning, e.g. in Vergil, *Georg.* 4.86–7: hi motus animorum atque haec certamina tanta pulveris exigui iactu compressa quiescunt, where *quiescunt* means not so much "become quiet" as "are quieted, are made to become quiet."

[89] *IF* 42.65 (1924) and *SS* 320. Cf. above, note 59.

[90] On this form see Sommer, *Hdb.* 531.

[91] Ennius, *Ann.* 494 (Vahlen): dum quidem unus homo Romanus toga superescit. Accius 266 (*SRPT*): quoi, si hinc superescit, Spartam atque Amyclas trado.

[92] Leumann cites *Epid.* 346, *Mil.* 356, *Stich.* 592, *Trin.* 510; to these we may add *Pseud.* 456.

[93] Like *posco, vescor*, etc., *escit*, comparable to Gk. ἔσκε, is certainly inherited, and therefore not necessarily inchoative. The *-sc-* formation in Latin probably got its inchoative force from *cresco* (cf. *SS* 548, Kent 110), perhaps with some help from *nascor, nosco*, and *disco*.

[94] Gellius 20.1.25: si morbus aevitasve vitium escit, qui in ius vocabit, iumentum dato. Cicero, *Leg.* 3.9: ast quando duellum gravius gravioresve discordiae civium escunt, oenus ne amplius sex menses, si senatus creverit, idem iuris quod duo consules teneto.

not to the presents *fit* and *fiunt*. The passages from Ennius and Accius[95] are cited by Festus[96] as evidence of the use of *superescit* for *supererit*. It is quite true that in Plautus the peculiar form *superfit*[97] is peculiarly used in the sense of *superest* (not *supererit!*) as is *defit*[98] in the sense of *deest* (note especially *Men.* 221: neque defiat neque supersit); but this does not imply that *fit* is normally a substitute for *escit* or that a prepositional compound like *superfit* should be cited as a parallel for the type *calefit*. (3) Forms like *superescit* actually disappeared from the language, but *calescit* continued beside *calefit*. As we have seen, all the 30 regular *-facio* verbs except *olfacio*,[99] and more than half (16) of the 31 irregular ones, have corresponding inchoatives in *-esco*. Furthermore, we find an enormous number of *-esco* verbs for which no corresponding forms in *-fio* (or *-facio*) are cited at all (the sum total of simple and compound verbs in *-esco* reaches the huge figure of 520[100]). (4) Leumann's thesis is open to the same criticism as Stowasser's, to wit, that there is no reason to believe that *calefio* preceded *calefacio*.[101]

PART III

While I disagree with Leumann's hypothesis as to the origin of the causative *-facio* forms, I agree with him thoroughly in his separation of these forms from the imperfect in *-bam*, an older formation[102] and one of quite another sort.[103] We may note the following important differences between the two.

(1) The first member of the imperfect ends with various vowels, *-a*, *-e*, *-i* (or *ie*) according to the conjugation; the first member of the causative invariably ends in *-e*, forcing us to tie it up closely with the second conjugation.

[95] Quoted in note 91.

[96] Page 394 of the Teubner text (edited by Lindsay). Paulus in his excerpts cites the Ennius passage (*ibid.* 395), and he glosses *escit* as *erit* (68).

[97] Cf. above, note 92, also note 10.

[98] *Mil.* 1261: animus per oculos meos defit, and *Rud.* 1107: omnia iterum vis memorari . . . ut defiat dies. Also *deficit: As.* 609: quam si intellegam deficere vita. See above, note 10.

[99] See above, note 13.

[100] Plus 46 inchoatives in *-asco* and 83 in *-isco*, which of course should have been subject to the same change as those in *-esco* if *-sco* was interpreted as '*sco*.

[101] Cf. note 86.

[102] Cf. Leumann, *IF* 42.62–3.

[103] My own explanation for the imperfect (referred to above, note 60) presupposes a much earlier date for the development of this form and would not apply at all to *calefacio*.

(2) The final vowel of the first member of the imperfect (except in dăbam) is invariably long; that of the first member of the causative is subject to iambic shortening.[104]

(3) The second member of the imperfect, from the same verb as *fio*, has changed its original *f* (from a still earlier *bh*), in accordance with phonetic law, to *b*; if the causatives really corresponded with it, we would expect **calebio* instead of *calefio*, while the compounds of *facio* ought to show *d* (from an earlier *dh*), which we actually meet in early prepositional compounds of the same sort such as *condo*.[105]

(4) The two members of the imperfect are fused into a single indivisible unit; those of the causatives are treated as two separate words, as is shown in the following ways. (a) The *a* of *facio* is not weakened into *i* as it is in the prepositional compounds such as *conficio*.[106] (b) The second member, whether *facio* or *fio*, retains its own accent.[107] (c) The two parts are in Republican Latin sometimes separated by an intervening word or words ("tmesis") or placed in reverse order. The following examples occur.

Cato,[108] *RR* 157.9: ferve bene facito.[109]
Varro, *RR* 1.9.2: sole perferve ita fit ut radices satorum comburat.
Ibid. 1.41.2: tenellum enim cito facit putre.
Ibid. 2.9.13: consue quoque faciunt ut alligari possint.

[104] Cf. above, note 2, and below, note 114.

[105] Of course there is no doubt that the existence of *facio* and *fio* as independent verbs was instrumental in retaining the *f* in *calefacio* (as in *conficio*) and *calefio;* but this must presuppose a later date for these formations than for *calebam*. If *calefio* had really entered the language at the same time and under the same circumstances as *calebam*, it ought to have behaved in the same way; and if old *fuam* (which lasted as late as Plautus), not to mention *fui* and *futurus*, could not preserve the *f* of **calefam*, one wonders why *facio* and *fio* should have been more potent in the case of *calefacio* and *calefio*.

[106] Cf. note 8.

[107] We have this on the authority of Priscian (2.402 *GLK*). The first member probably also had an accent: see Lachmann 191 (on Lucretius 3.906); Haupt, *Hermes* 1.403; Corssen 2.887. Otherwise Güntert, *SHAW* 8.20. Bekker (*Hom. Bl.* 1.311–2) also objects, because he thinks *tepe* cannot be separated from *facio* (cf. below, note 129). He admits tmesis from the well-known examples from Cato and Varro, concerning which he says it can take place in compounds whose first member looks like an adjective or an adverb; but he does not seem to realize that *ferve, consue,* and *excande* in the passages he quotes do not look like any known adjectives or adverbs, whatever we may say about Lucretius' *rare* — which, incidentally, he does not cite.

[108] This by a slip is attributed to Varro by Leumann, *SS* 320.

[109] Sommer, though inclined to accept Skutsch's explanation of *fervefacio* as for *fervens facio* (cf. above, note 81), acknowledges (*Hdb.* 522) that such a passage as this of Cato constitutes a difficulty.

Ibid. 3.4.1: excande me fecerunt cupiditate.
Lucretius 6.233: rareque facit lateramina vasis.[110]
Id. 6.962: terram sol excoquit et facit are.

It may be argued that tmesis has little significance in Lucretius, since he has several amazing instances doubtless used *metri causa;*[111] but the evidence of Cato and Varro is impressive,[112] and in view of it I believe any acceptable explanation of the derivation of *calefacio* ought to do what has not been done by any of the explanations made to date, justify the use as separate words of at least some of the elements that Cato and Varro seem certainly to have employed as such. The explanation that I shall propose will accomplish this in the case of *ferve, perferve, putre,* and *excande;* also Lucretius' *are. Consue,* and Lucretius' *rare,* will probably have to be viewed as analogical.[113] It is perhaps significant that precisely the two passages involving these non-existent entities exemplify the simplest type of tmesis, the insertion of an enclitic "and" (compare the examples from Lucretius cited in note 111). In any case, even more impressive than tmesis as evidence that we have two separate words to deal with is inversion, like Varro's *facit putre* and Lucretius' *facit are;* Ennius might say *cere- comminuit -brum,* but would he have said *brum-cere?*

My suggestion is that in *calefacio* and all the verbs precisely like it — i.e. those in Table I — the first member was originally a present imperative second person singular.[114] The type once estab-

---

[110] Note that Lucretius deals with *rarefacio* in much the same way as with *arefacio* (cf. above, note 35).

[111] E.g. 1.452: seiungi seque gregari, 1.651: disiectis disque sipatis, 2.1104: indignos inque merentis, 3.484: inque pediri, 4.832: inter quaecumque pretantur (for other examples see Monro on 1.452, and Merrill on 3.343). Still, to say with Stowasser (*ZOG* 52.194) that Lucretius sins against the genius of the language in writing 6.962 seems to me very hazardous.

[112] Skutsch, who anticipates the use of these cases of tmesis as a refutation of his view (cf. above, note 109), makes what seems to me a rather lame defense. He says that tmesis often involves mistakes (291); but his main argument (285) is that its use in the case of the causatives may be a feature of "Buchlatein," since in our best source for the spoken language, the comic writers, it never occurs. To me Cato at least seems no more literary in style than Plautus and Terence.

[113] The Varro passage does not, I think, justify us in assuming an early verb *consueo;* cf. note 24. On *rare,* cf. notes 33, 35, and 110.

[114] The iambic shortening undergone by *cale* etc. is not an argument against this. Genuine imperatives must have been subject to this too, but later they regained their final long vowel in conformity with the regular pattern (*Grund.* 2.3.823), whereas those imperatives which had lost their full imperatival force did not (cf. note 133 on *cave* and note 162 on *ave*).

lished, it must have spread so that new verbs not susceptible of this explanation — i.e. those in Tables II and III — were created by analogy, as has already been shown in detail.[115]

I believe that the imperative *cale* is in paratactic relation with *facio*[116] precisely as is the jussive subjunctive in such examples as the following:

> *Amph.* 63: faciam sit . . . tragicomoedia.
> *Amph.* 876: faciam res fiat palam.
> *Men.* 644: faxo scias.
> *Truc.* 643: faxo dicat.
> *Ad.* 209: accipiat iam faxo.

The last example is particularly apposite, because in it the word order corresponds to that in *calefacio*. However, we have already seen that this order is susceptible of change, as in Varro 1.41.2: facit putre, and Lucretius 6.962: facit are; hence the instances in which the subjunctive follows *facio* are also apposite.

It is not surprising to find the imperative used after the manner of a jussive subjunctive, since the two are practically equivalent, as in e.g. *Bacch.* 990: taceas, and *Amph.* 707: tace; *Bacch.* 417: morem geras, and *Amph.* 277: gere patri morem meo; *Cap.* 551: tu ab istoc procul recedas, and 954: tu illuc procede;[117] *Hec.* 638: accipias puerum, and *Cur.* 423: cape, signum nosce.

A reinforcing word, generally an adverb or another verb, often accompanies an imperative, being placed either before it, as *quin*, *age*, or after it, as *dum*, *modo*, *sis*, *amabo*.[118] An accompanying

---

[115] I doubt whether any explanation whatsoever could be found for all 61 verbs without recourse to the phenomenon of analogical creation as a means of accounting for some of them.

[116] An excellent parallel is provided by the group *videlicet, scilicet,* and *ilicet* if, as some scholars believe (e.g. Kent 130), the first element in these words is an imperative. It is true that this element, like *cale* in *calefacio*, has also been explained as an infinitive with the final syllable lost by syncope (Skutsch 104 and note 4, 284 note 1; Leumann, *SS* 328; *EM* 452 s.v. *ilicet; WH* 1.679 s.v. *ilicet*). There is certainly much more evidence for the employment of the infinitive with *licet* than with *facio* (cf. note 75); but a study of the use of *licet* in early Latin, particularly in Plautus, inclines me rather to the belief that in these three compounds we have imperatives. (This material I hope to publish elsewhere.)

[117] The tone of the passages in the *Captivi*, though the force of the two words is the same, is perhaps a little different (the subjunctive is used by a captive to his owner, the imperative by a master to his slave). But this is not the rule; the imperative can be used in requests and even entreaties as well as commands (see examples in Bennett 1.352–3).

[118] See examples in Bennett 1.349–50.

verb is used with particular frequency, as in *Amph.* 500: imperce quaeso, *Eun.* 685: tace obsecro, Petronius 67.1: narra mihi, Gai, rogo; and such verbs are usually, as in the three examples just cited, precisely those which may also be combined with a jussive subjunctive. Thus we may note striking parallel uses: preceding *oro*, *Mer.* 992: modo pacem faciatis oro, *Eun.* 912: move te oro; following *quaeso*, *Men.* 1073: quaeso ignoscas, *And.* 8: quaeso animum attendite; following *obsecro*, *Aul.* 715–6: obsecro ego vos mi auxilio . . . sitis, *Rud.* 867: obsecro te subveni mi; with *ne*, preceding a verb of asking, *Hec.* 338: te . . . ne quid sit huius oro, *Eun.* 95: ne crucia te obsecro; with *ne*, following a verb of asking, *Heaut.* 291–2: obsecro ne me in laetitiam frustra conicias, 1052: age quaeso ne tam offirma te; following *dico* (used as a verb of ordering), *Poen.* 1155: dico ne dictum neges, *Men.* 696–7: tibi dico mane, redi; preceding *face*, *Poen.* 1035: linguam compescas face, *Stich.* 185: veni illo ad cenam sic face;[119] preceding *licet*, *Trin.* 1179: tute item videas licet, *As.* 598–9: nunc enim esse negotiosum interdius videlicet[120] Solonem; following a verb of permitting, *Ad.* 996–7: sino habeat, in istac finem faciat, and Cato, *RR* 91: sinito arescat, *Men.* 690: patiar tibi habe, aufer, utere, and *Trin.* 384: tibi permitto posce, duce; preceding *necesse est*, Lucretius 3.470: fateare necessest, 962: concede necessest. We may compare further the use of both subjunctive and imperative in a proviso clause with *modo*: *Eun.* 889–90: volet . . . civis modo haec sit, *As.* 240: modo tecum una argentum adferto facile patiar cetera.

In each of the foregoing examples, it would be hard to decide whether we should view the relation of the subjunctive or imperative to its accompanying verb as paratactic or hypotactic; and in order not to commit myself, I have in no case used any mark of punctuation between them.

Naturally the subjunctive developed far more extensively as a mood of subordination,[121] since it afforded the convenience of differentiated forms to suit variations in person and tense,[122] for instance in *Stich.* 177: paupertas fecit ridiculus forem. But the use of the imperative in a subordinate clause, though rare, is not

---

[119] Here, however, it is possible that the imperatives are completely coordinate, in view of the *sic* and still more of the fact that two other imperatives follow in the next line: promitte vero, ne gravare.

[120] See note 116.

[121] The very name of the mood was given to it in recognition of this development.

[122] Cf. below, note 156.

unknown.[123]   Not only may an imperative occur paratactically in a clause which is equivalent to a conditional protasis, both in the very common construction with *amabo*,[124] e.g. *Bacch.* 100: propera, amabo, and also in other cases, e.g. *As.* 350: ausculta ergo, scies,[125] *Rud.* 1010: tange, adfligam ad terram te,[126] Petronius 44.3: serva me, servabo te (here again we can cite the comparable use of a jussive subjunctive, as Cato, *RR* 157.4: in ea volnera teras brassicam, sanum faciet[127]).   We also find the imperative used three times by Cicero in a completely subordinate clause: in two instances it is employed with a relative,[128] *Rep.* 2.45: hic ille iam vertetur orbis, cuius naturalem motum . . . discite adgnoscere, and *L. Agr.* 2.95: quid enim viderunt? hoc quod nunc vos, quaeso, perspicite atque cognoscite; in the third with *tametsi, Cluent.* 183: mihi enim venit in mentem quid dici possit, tametsi adhuc non esse hoc dictum mementote (perhaps here it might be said that *tametsi*, after the manner of *quamquam*, can be used in the sense of "however" as well as of "even if, although;" but the fact remains that normally it introduces a subordinate clause).

As I have said, my explanation of *calefacio* has the not inconsiderable advantage over all others known to me, that it alone identifies the first member, which, as we have seen, can be cut

---

[123] See Brugmann, *Grund.* 2.3.824–6, where examples are given from Sanskrit, Greek, Germanic, and Slavic as well as from Latin.

[124] For other examples see Bennett 1.349 and 357.   There can be no doubt that the true meaning of the *amabo* construction, as seen e.g. in *As.* 894: dic amabo, is "tell (me), I'll love (you)," i.e. "if you tell me, I'll love you;" but the construction suffered contamination with that seen e.g. in *As.* 29: dic obsecro, and *Men.* 498: responde . . . quaeso, where the imperative is equivalent to an object-clause, and so we find the jussive subjunctive with *amabo*, probably in *Rud.* 427: amabo vel tu mi aias vel neges, and certainly (note *ut*) in *Truc.* 872–3 amabo ut . . . sinas eum esse apud me, and in *Eun.* 537: amabo ut illuc transeas (directly after the regular construction in 534: fac amabo).

[125] In reverse order, *Truc.* 116: scies, respice huc.   Contrast with both the completely hypotactic form in *Rud.* 679: si respexis, scies.

[126] For other examples from early Latin, see Bennett 1.353.   Note further the cases where protasis and apodosis are joined by *et*, either imperative and indicative, as in Vergil, *Ecl.* 3.104: dic . . . et eris mihi magnus Apollo, or two imperatives, as *ibid.* 106–7: dic . . . et Phyllida solus habeto.   (With the latter cf. English "live and learn," "spare the rod and spoil the child," "feed a cold and starve a fever.")

[127] For other examples see Bennett 1.178 (however, in his first example, *Trin.* 441, I think the subjunctive in the protasis must be identical with that in the apodosis, i.e. potential, not jussive).

[128] Elsewhere (e.g. Cicero, *Cluent.* 168: is hunc suo testimonio sublevat; quod recita, on which see *SS* 718), we may have a "connecting," i.e. coordinating, relative; but in the two passages cited above, the relative clauses are genuinely subordinate ones.

apart from the second one, as an actual extant word.[129]   It may be objected that this word if it is a present imperative second person singular does not satisfactorily fit into the examples given above where it occurs separately: that in Varro 2.9.13 and Lucretius 6.233 we need the plural number, in Varro 3.4.1 the past tense and the first person, and in all the other six the third person.   But the imperative, like the infinitive, is actually a very pliant form.   The example of it that we know as the second singular present is after all merely the bare stem of the verb, and quite likely was not restricted originally to the second person or the singular number;[130] other elements were added to it[131] which came eventually to denote the plural number as opposed to the singular, the third person as opposed to the second, what we call the future tense as opposed to the present; and the stem form such as *cale* then served merely as the first, and doubtless the commonest, member of the paradigm.   But that this distinctive force was not an essential feature of it is indicated by the commonness with which the form loses it, becoming a mere interjection or particle,[132] as *em, age, i* or *abi* (cf. German *geh'*, English *go on*), *cave*,[133] etc.

It does not always denote second person.   In *Eun.* 739: sine veniat, precisely as in the English equivalent *let him come*, the imperative is addressed not to a particular "you" but to any one;[134] as a matter of fact, the speaker, Thais, seems to be talking to herself.   In the same way no specialized listener is necessarily directed to look by the French *voici* and *voilà* or the English *behold*, equivalent to, and often coordinated with, the interjection *lo* (itself

[129] Thus there is finally furnished an answer to the question which Bekker, in attacking Lachmann (cf. above, note 107), posed as unanswerable (*Hom. Bl.* 1.312): "was ist das abgesonderte und auf eigene füsse gestellte *tepe?*   welch ein redetheil? die frage ist so einfach wie nothwendig: nam quodcunque erit, esse aliquid debebit id ipsum."

[130] See *Grund.* 2.3.821.

[131] We have noted above the frequency of reinforcing particles after the imperative.

[132] See Hofmann, *SS* 575 and *Umgang.* 35–9; and, for similar instances in Greek, Brugmann-Thumb 620–1.   An excellent example of the equivalence in English of an imperative and an adverb is provided in a recent newspaper article concerning President Truman (by Bert Andrews in the *New York Herald Tribune*, Jan. 1, 1948, p. 1): He said the one word — now — in a chiding tone as if he meant, "Now, now," or "Come, come."

[133] Such stereotyped forms, e.g. *cave* and *puta*, are subject to iambic shortening just like our own *cale-*.   Cf. note 114.

[134] The use of the second plural imperative with the subject *aliquis*, as in *Mer.* 131: aperite aliquis, is not wholly dissimilar, though it is probably to be classed rather as an example of partitive apposition.

perhaps a quasi-imperative in origin). The use in a generalized sense of the second person singular of the imperative — and for that matter of other moods too[135] — is a common feature of language, particularly in the colloquial style.[136]

It does not always denote singular number. The speaker is addressing a group in *Men.* 994: cave quisquam quod illic minitetur vostrum flocci fecerit (as is made clear by *vostrum*)[137] and in Petronius 51.5: vide modo. The "frozen" forms *age* and *cave* often precede plurals, as in *Mil.* 928: age igitur intro abite, *Poen.* 117: cave dirrumpatis;[138] similarly French *voici* and *voilà* remain invariable regardless of the number of persons addressed.

It does not always denote present tense. The use of the imperative to refer to the past in lively narrative seems to be Indo-European.[139] A number of instances are cited from German, both mediaeval and modern.[140] One instance is cited from French.[141]

[135] Especially the generalized subjunctive, as Livy 2.43.9: crederes victos.

[136] Cf. Hofmann, *Umgang.* 100. A good example is Petronius 44.3: serva me, servabo te. Cf. the English proverbs quoted in note 126; also "look before you leap," "don't count your chickens before they are hatched," and (in the indicative) "what you don't know won't trouble you;" also nursery rhymes, as "Ride a cock-horse to Banbury Cross," "Sing a song of sixpence." We may note too the English use of *you* as an indefinite (and of *vous* in French where *on* will not serve).

[137] In *cave quisquam vostrum fecerit* we have a phenomenon the reverse of that observed (note 134) in *aperite aliquis*.

[138] For other examples see *Grund.* 2.3.823; Bennett 1.350; Hofmann, *Umgang.* 37.

[139] See *Grund.* 2.3.826–7. Special treatments of the subject, with examples from various languages, include those of Wackernagel, *DPhSch* 279–81 (1887); Sittl, *BPhW* 7.1552 (1887); Wunderlich, *Umgang.* 221 (1894); Kretschmer, *Glotta* 2.274–6 (1910); Kieckers, *PBB* 44.509–13 (1920), *IF* 40.160–1 (1922).

[140] We may note as examples the following: from Scheffel's *Trompeter* (first cited by Wackernagel 280):

> Dort bei Prag am weissen Berge
> Wird um Böhmens Kron gewürfelt.
> Pfalzgraf, 's war kein kurzer Winter,
> Pfalzgraf, hast die Schlacht verloren,
> Sporn den Gaul und such das Weite;

and from Busch's *Max und Moritz* (first cited by Kretschmer, 276 note 2):

> Und geschwinde stopf! stopf! stopf!
> Pulver in den Pfeifenkopf.

[141] The use of *sauve qui peut* (first cited by Kretschmer, 274 note 1). This follows the present in the passage quoted by Kretschmer (from Boileau, *Ép.* 6.165–7):

> Quelquefois de fâcheux arrivent trois volées . . .
> Alors sauve qui peut.

But the usage is not confined to the present; note the example of the substantive use given by Littré, s.v. *sauver:* Ce fut un sauve-qui-peut général.

The construction is wide-spread in Slavic, being met in Serbian, Bulgarian, Ukrainian, Russian, Czech, Polish; it is particularly common in Serbo-Croatian, so common indeed that it has practically ceased to be an imperative, according to Kretschmer.[142] (It is pertinent to note that alike in German and in Slavic, the second singular imperative is used in this construction for both numbers and all persons.)   I can add an example from English, met in a review by J. C. Long in the *New York Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review*, Apr. 25, 1948, p. 5: He was what he was, take it or leave it.

Latin does not exhibit this historical use of the imperative, though Wackernagel believes that this is the origin of its historical use of the infinitive, which he thinks was substituted in this construction for its equivalent the imperative.[143]   But there are two Latin passages with imperatives that have been cited in some of the discussions of the historical imperative, usually without differentiation therefrom.   These are *Trin.* 288–9: quod manu non queunt tangere tantum fas habent quo manus abstineant, cetera rape, trahe, fuge, late;[144] and *Pseud.* 138–9: haec habent consilia, ubi data occasiost, rape, clepe, tene, harpaga, bibe, es, fuge.[145] Actually, the tone here is descriptive rather than narrative, and the reference is to a general state of affairs (existing in the present) not to a single specific event in the past.   But the two passages do resemble the others in that the march of the thought is suddenly interrupted by the substitution of a vivid second person singular

[142] *Glotta* 2.276: "dass der Sprechende in diesen Fällen die Imperativbedeutung fast nicht mehr fühlt."

[143] *DPhSch* 276–83 (1887); accepted by Delbrück, *Grund.* 4.457, and by Brugmann, *KVG* 639–40; but the latter in *Grund.*[2] 2.3.944 accepts in part the opposing view of Kretschmer, *Glotta* 2.270–87.   Kretschmer (276) objects to Wackernagel's theory because Latin does not actually use the imperative in past narrative — a fact which Wackernagel (281) admits but explains (cf. below, note 156).   Since the imperatival infinitive is found in Greek, German, and Lithuanian as well as in Latin, I agree with Wackernagel (281) — despite Brugmann's agnosticism (*Grund.* 2.3.942) — that it is probably inherited; but since the historical infinitive (from which I think we need not separate the descriptive infinitive as Brugmann does, *Grund.* 2.3.944) is found in Slavic and Germanic as well as in Latin, I believe that it too may be inherited; and thus if the historical infinitive got its use from the older imperatival infinitive in imitation of the historical imperative, infinitive and imperative being related (Wackernagel 281–2; cf. above, 327), this must have happened in Indo-European, not in Latin.   In that case we may well assume that the use in narrative possessed by both imperative and infinitive in the parent-tongue, might in a given derived language, such as Latin or Lithuanian, be restricted to one or the other.

[144] First cited by Sittl, *BPhW* 7.1552.

[145] First cited in *BPhW* 7.1552 in brackets, presumably by the editor.

imperative for the expected third person plural of another mood: *rape* in the first passage for the indicative *rapiunt*, and in the second for the subjunctive (*ut*) *rapiant*. Furthermore, the two passages differ from each other,[146] as is shown by the difference in mood represented: *rape* in the first represents the action engaged in by the persons concerned, thus closely resembling the "stopf! stopf! stopf!" of the German or the "sauve qui peut" of the French,[147] while *rape* in the second may be viewed as a direct quotation of the words uttered by each of the individuals concerned,[148] and thus is more like our own *facit putre, facit are*, etc. (In the same way proper names and other nouns cast in the form of imperatives may be equivalent either to an imperative or to an indicative: Kieckers[149] cites as examples of the first *Fürchtegott, Lebrecht, Vergissmeinnicht*, of the second *Taugenichts, Guck-in-die-Luft;* we can cite as English parallels for the first group *Praise-God Barebones, Mrs. Doasyouwouldbedoneby* and *Mrs. Bedonebyasyoudid*,[150] *forget-me-not*,[151] and for the second *Know-Nothing*.[152])

The interruption of the sentence-structure by one or more words constituting, either implicitly or explicitly, what at least purports to be a direct quotation, as in the passage just quoted from *Pseud.*, is very common in colloquial language.[153] We have both impera-

[146] Cf. Kieckers, *PBB* 44.510.

[147] See notes 140 and 141.

[148] Addressed to himself, as I believe was the case in the use of *ilicet* (cf. note 116), "go (to perdition) you may (that's all that is left for you)," developing into the adverbial interjection, "all is lost."   To be sure, it is doubtful that any one would actually give himself the specific command, "seize, steal," etc.; but that does not concern the indignant speaker.

[149] *PBB* 44.513.

[150] In *The Water-Babies*, by Charles Kingsley. Contrast with these names of fairies that of the fairy Set-'em-right in another juvenile book (*Mixed Pickles*, by Mrs. E. M. Field), which belongs in the second category.

[151] The person addressed varies: Praise-God Barebones is probably speaking to himself (cf. note 148), Kingsley's two fairies to the children whom they are training, while the forget-me-not probably conveys a message from the sender to the recipient. However, this last name has been given other interpretations, as in two familiar poems (authors unknown to me): in one the shy flower itself can say only "vergissmeinnicht;" in the other it has forgotten the name originally assigned to it, so God gives it a new name, in which apparently the name itself speaks, "forget-me-not."   This divergence of application of the imperative shows how flexible the form is.

[152] Names of games fall into the same category, as the one variously known as *hide-and-seek* and *hide-and-go-seek*, and a game of my childhood days which cost me acute suffering because it was known as *lay, sheepie, lay* and I preferred *lie, sheepie, lie*.

[153] Cf. Wunderlich, *Umgang*. 221.

tive and indicative in Petronius 44.3: aediles male eveniat qui cum
pistoribus colludunt: serva[154] me, servabo te (here again we note the
singular used in a general sense to refer to each member of a whole
group). We have imperative alone in Petronius 45.12: adeo de
magna turba adhibete acceperant.[155]   On the other hand the quota-
tion of the imperative in the person in which it was originally
uttered may be due not so much to a preference for direct quotation
over indirect, as to the inability to use it in any other person; in
the case of the subjunctive, which can be easily altered in person,
we frequently find it so altered, thus presenting an indirect quota-
tion,[156] in passages equally colloquial, e.g. Petronius 46.6: venit dem
litteras, where *dem* represents an original subjunctive *des*, or pos-
sibly even the imperative *da*, put into an indirect quotation in the
only way available for it.[157]

   The particularly common imperatives *vale, salve,* and *ave*[158] have
a double development.   With *iubeo* they change to the appropriate
subordinate form, the infinitive, as in Cicero, *Att.* 5.2.2: illum . . .
salutavi, post etiam iussi valere; *As.* 593: salvere me iubes; Martial
3.5.10: Marcus avere iubet.   With *dico* they retain their original
form,[159] as in Seneca, *Ep.* 2.5.11: tibi valedicere non licet gratis;
Varro *ap.* Servius on *Aen.* 11.97: mortuis salve et vale dici; Caelius

---

   [154] The fact that the imperative is logically subordinate to the indicative (already
discussed above) has no bearing on the point being made here.

   [155] Cf. Theognis 487–8: σὺ δ᾽ ἔγχεε τοῦτο μάταιον κωτίλλεις αἰεί.

   [156] It has already been suggested above that the greater flexibility of the subjunctive
accounts for its being much more widely used in subordinate clauses than the im-
perative.   Wackernagel (*DPhSch* 281) gives a similar reason for the use in Latin of the
historical infinitive rather than the historical imperative (otherwise Kretschmer,
Glotta 2.276).

   [157] The two corresponding modes of quotation are interestingly combined in a
passage from *Die Journalisten* (2.2) cited by Wunderlich 221: Sie sollen mit mir
trinken.   Und wenn ich jemandem sage, er soll mit mir trinken, Herr, so meine ich
nicht nippen, wie die Frauen, sondern trink aus, schenk ein.   The imperative here
seems more indefinite and impersonal than the form with *soll:* "er soll trinken" is
addressed specifically to the individual (unspecified to be sure) designated "jemandem,"
"trink aus" to any one and every one; it is almost equivalent to an infinitive like
nippen (cf. note 143).

   [158] The Romans certainly used *ave avere* (or *have havere;* cf. Quintilian 1.6.21) as
an absolute parallel for *salve salvere* and *vale valere,* though this was probably etymolog-
ically incorrect (see *EM* and *WH* s.v.).

   [159] The construction, however, is not precisely that of the direct quotation, for
which we should need *inquam,* as in *Cap.* 479: "salvete," inquam; note that here the
imperative has the proper plural form, which is by no means normal with *dico.*   (*Vul-
gate.* Matthew 28.9: Jesus occurrit illis dicens avete, has not a classical ring.)

ap. Cicero, *Fam.* 8.16.4: simul atque ave mihi dixit.[160]   The com-
binations with *dico* have become stereotyped to such a degree that
both *vale* and *ave*, like the English *farewell*,[161] have to all intents and
purposes turned into nouns;[162] they can be coordinated with a noun,
as in Martial 7.39.2–3: et fastus et ave potentiorum cum perferre
patique iam negaret; used as object of a verb other than *dico*, as in
Martial 3.95.1: numquam dicis ave sed reddis, Naevole, semper;
modified by an adjective, as in Ovid, *Met.* 10.62–3: supremumque[163]
vale, quod iam vix auribus ille acciperet, dixit, and *Her.* 13.14: vix
illud potui dicere triste vale;[164] or combined with a participle to
form an ablative absolute, as in Ovid, *Tris.* 1.3.57: saepe vale dicto
rursus sum multa locutus.   The special nature of the combination
vale dico[165] is recognized by the common practice of writing the two
words as one, like *calefacio*.

In late Latin *valefacio* was substituted for *valedico*.   Exactly
like the use of *vale dicto* in the previous example is that of *vale facto*
in Apuleius, *Met.* 4.18.1: post haec vale facto discessimus.   And
like the combination of *ave* with *dixit* in the quotation from Caelius
given a little earlier, is that of *vale* with parts of *facio* in Augustine,
Ep. 65: cum . . . vale fecisset collegae suo, and, vale faciens collegae
suo.   While *valefacere*, since it governs the dative, must be viewed
as following the pattern of *valedicere* and not that of *calefacere*,
still it is of interest as providing one more example of the combina-
tion of a "frozen" imperative with *facio*.

A sufficient number of examples have now been given to show
that Latin possessed such "frozen" imperatives, even if not on such
a large scale in some ways as Germanic or Slavic.   Why they

---

[160] However, Suetonius blends the two constructions, using the infinitive with
dico, e.g., *Aug.* 53: sedentibus valere dicebat, *Galba* 4: veterem . . . morem . . .
retinuit, ut liberti servique bis die frequentes adessent ac mane salvere, vesperi valere
sibi singuli dicerent.

[161] *Good-by*, from *God be wi ye*, has had a similar development.

[162] That *ave* at least had ceased to be viewed as an ordinary imperative is indicated
by the fact that it was pronounced (according to Quintilian 1.6.21) with a short *e*,
exactly like *cale* in *calefacere* (cf. above, note 114).

[163] Or possibly *supremum* is an adverb like *aeternum* in Vergil, *Aen.* 11.97–8: salve
aeternum mihi . . . aeternumque vale (cf. Catullus 101.10: atque in perpetuum . . .
ave atque vale).

[164] Cf. Shakespeare, *King Henry VIII* 3.2: Farewell, a long farewell, to all my
greatness!, and Helen Gray Cone, "The Good Ship Alma Mater" 20: we speak the last
farewell.

[165] Stolz (1.408) compares the formation of *valedico* with that of *benedico* and
maledico, but they seem to me quite unlike.

developed in particular with verbs in *-facio* seems clear to me.
Reference has already been made to the advantage possessed by the
subjunctive over the imperative in that through its personal end-
ings it can more efficiently designate the doer or agent of the action
it denotes.[166]   The infinitive cannot do this; and so when it is used
as the main verb in its clause, a substantive, usually in the accusa-
tive,[167] must be present to serve as its subject.   Originally the
function of this accusative was surely rather as object of the verb
on which the infinitive depended;[168] there cannot be any essential
difference between *servos* in *Men.* 955–6: tu servos iube hunc ad me
ferant, and *hunc* in *Heaut.* 585–6: iube hunc abire hinc aliquo.   Now
with *facio* the use of a direct object was extremely common; note
for instance the following:

> *As.* 28: te faciam ut scias.
> *Per.* 414: possum te facere ut argentum accipias?
> *Aul.* 443: ego te faciam miserrumus mortalis uti sis.
> *Truc.* 816: numquam te facere hodie quivi ut is quis esset diceres.
> Titinius 103 (*SRPC*): nunc haec res me facit festinem.[169]

Quite probably the accusative was usually present in the early
occurrences of *cale facio*.[170]   With *cale* in its true sense an object
te would of course have been redundant, as is *te*, or, in the last case,
me, in the examples just quoted.   But when the *cale* form became
"frozen" so as to represent any person and number, the presence
of an accusative to designate the doer of the action denoted by it
would be extremely helpful.   The subjunctive could show this by
its termination, and so in Titinius' *me facit festinem* the *me* is as little
needed as *te* in the original *te facio festines* (or *te facio festina*) which
by extension it represents; but in Varro's *excande me fecerunt* the

---

[166] Cf. above, note 156.

[167] In the nominative with the historical infinitive.   It is presumably the ability
to use this nominative with the infinitive which made Wackernagel consider the
infinitive more convenient than the imperative (cf. above, note 156).

[168] Cf. *SS* 580 and 583, *MV* 561.

[169] Nonius (482.31) says *festinem* is used for *festinantem*.   He is evidently inclined
more toward Skutsch's view of the *facio* construction than toward mine!

[170] The locution may have run *cale te facio* (cf. *Curc.* 308: eloquere te obsecro); or,
in a different order, less common with the imperative but more common with the sub-
junctive, *facio te cale* (cf. *Rud.* 867: obsecro te subveni mi) or *te facio cale* (cf. *Hec.* 721:
te oro . . . adiutor sis mihi).   The order of *cale te facio* is preserved in Varro, *RR* 3.4.1:
excande me fecerunt; that of *te facio cale* in *id.* 1.41.2: tenellum . . . facit putre, and
in Lucretius 6.962: terram . . . facit are.   But when *cale* and *facio* became more
closely united, the phrase must have tended to shift to the form *te cale facio* (cf. *Cap.*
240: te uti memineris moneo).

presence of the direct object *me* is necessary to render the sense complete. The circumstance that it was perfectly natural to use such a direct object with a compound of *facio* may have been an important factor in the wide spread of the type *calefacio*.[171]

[171] Once the active form *calefacio* was established, the passive *calefio* would easily follow. The proportion *facio:fio = calefacio:calefio* would probably have sufficed to produce it, and there were plenty of other proportions to reinforce this one, as *hoc facit: hoc fit = calefacit:calefit; te magni facio* (cf. *As.* 114: te . . . facio hau magni):*magni fio* (cf. *Ad.* 879: me amari et magni fieri postulo) = *te calefacio:calefio;* etc. Nor was an act of analogical creation of this sort really necessary, for *cale* is as appropriate with passive forms as with active. If the original paratactic locution *cale, te facio* "be warm, I make you (do so)" was possible, similarly so was *cale, fis* "be warm, you are made (to do so)." And just as *cale*, losing its specific second person force, became applied to other persons with *facio*, as *cale me facit* or *me cale facit, cale eum facio* or *eum cale facio*, so, too, could it be applied to other persons with *fio*, as *cale fio, cale fit*.

List of Abbreviations

ACISS—Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Scienze Storiche
ALS—(Andrews-Lewis-Short) A New Latin Dictionary (Harpers' Lat. Dict.)
BB—Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen
DPhSch—Vorhandlungen der neununddreissigsten Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner
EM—(Ernout-Meillet) Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine
IF—Indogermanische Forschungen
IFA—Anzeiger für indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde
KZ—Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung
NED—New English Dictionary
PBB—Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur
SHAW—Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse
SRPC—Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta, Comicorum Fragmenta (Ribbeck)
SRPT—Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta, Tragicorum Fragmenta (Ribbeck)
WH—(Walde-Hofmann) Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch
WP—(Walde-Pokorny) Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen
ZOG—Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien

Bibliographical references are to be interpreted as follows: Bekker, *Hom. Bl.* = Immanuel Bekker, *Homerische Blätter*, 2 vols.; Bonn, 1863–72. Bennett = Charles E. Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*, 2 vols.; Boston, 1910–4. Brugmann, *Grund.* = Karl Brugmann and Berthold Delbrück, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 5 vols.; Strassburg, 1st ed. 1886–1900, 2nd ed. 1897–1916 (all references are to the 2nd edition, unless otherwise specified). Brugmann, *KVG* = K. Brugmann, *Abrégé de grammaire comparée des langues indo-européennes*, tr. into French by J. Bloch, A. Cuny, and A. Ernout; Paris, 1905. Brugmann-Thumb = Karl Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*⁴, rev. by Albert Thumb; Munich, 1913. Buck = Carl Darling Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin;* Chicago, 1933. Corssen = W. Corssen, *Über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache*², 2 vols.; Leipzig, 1868–70. Delbrück, *Grund.:* see Brugmann, *Grund.* Gradenwitz = Otto Gradenwitz, *Laterculi Vocum Latinarum;* Leipzig, 1904. Hofmann, *Umgang.* = J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*²; Heidelberg, 1936. Hofmann, *SS:* see *SS.* Kent = Roland G. Kent, *The Forms of Latin;* Baltimore, 1946. Leumann,

SS: see *SS.* Lindsay = W. M. Lindsay, *The Latin Language;* Oxford, 1894. *MV* = A. Meillet and J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques;* Paris, 1927. Pedersen = Holger Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen,* 2 vols.; Göttingen, 1909–13. Skutsch = Franz Skutsch, *Kleine Schriften;* Leipzig, 1914. Sommer, *Hdb.* = Ferdinand Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre;* Heidelberg, 1st ed. 1902, 2nd ed. 1914 (all references are to the 2nd edition, unless otherwise specified). Sommer, *Krit. Erl.* = Ferdinand Sommer, *Kritische Erläuterungen zur lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre;* Heidelberg, 1914. *SS* = Manu Leumann and Joh. Bapt. Hofmann, *Stolz-Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik*⁵; Munich, 1928. Stolz = Fr. Stolz, *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache,* vol. 1; Leipzig, 1894. Stolz, *SS* = Friedrich Stolz and J. H. Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik*⁴; Munich, 1910. Wunderlich, *Umgang.* = Hermann Wunderlich, *Unsere Umgangsprache in der Eigenart ihrer Satzfügung dargestellt;* Weimar, 1894.