

XII.—Genesis of the Infinitive with Subject-Accusative

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

Scholars believe concerning the infinitive with subject-accusative in Latin (1) that it originated in the type *iube hunc abire*, with the accusative as object of the verb and the infinitive a dative of purpose; and (2) that it spread thence to other verbs, as in *dic hunc abire*, where the accusative is not object of the verb and the infinitive does not express purpose. Hittite confirms point 1; with verbs of ordering and allowing, it uses an accusative object and a dative verbal noun expressing purpose. But point 2 seems to me very difficult. I propose rather (1) that the construction with verbs of perceiving, knowing, saying, etc., had a quite different origin, in an accusative with a predicative modifier, as *faenus creditum audio, dicant te benignum*; and (2) that the two constructions eventually coalesced. Again Hittite confirms point 1, as it sometimes uses an accusative with an expression of predication after a verb of perceiving or saying, as "fratrem aegrum viderunt," "fratrem aegrum audiverunt," "hominem in Aegypto audivit," "tibi multos filios dicunt." As to point 2, a verb of allowing might have served as connecting link; since *patior* could govern an infinitive, *abductam* in *abductam illam aegre pati* would be interpreted as *abductam esse*, and then *occlusam* in *occlusam ianuam video* would be interpreted as *occlusam esse*.

In this paper, I aim to consider the genesis of the familiar Latin construction of infinitive with subject-accusative in the light of the evidence afforded by Hittite.

The infinitive with subject-accusative, met mainly with verbs of ordering and allowing, seeing and hearing, saying and thinking and knowing, is a construction which in its fully developed form exists only in Greek and Latin,¹ and which must have evolved independently in these two languages,² from germs which were inherited by them and by other linguistic groups from Indo-European.

Scholars³ are in general in complete accord in their treatment of the problem, in most cases even to the passages which they cite

¹ Or perhaps Italic in general, since it is met in Oscan, as *Tab. Bant.* 9-10. See Carl Darling Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston 1904) § 321.

² In view of the not inconsiderable difference between Greek and Latin usage in respect to both participles and infinitives, the development of the construction in the two languages may have been quite different. I am here concerned only with Latin.

³ To mention but a few, I cite the following: K. Brugmann, *Abrégé de grammaire comparée* (translated into French by J. Bloch, A. Cuny, and A. Ernout, Paris 1905) 638-9; Karl Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*⁴ (revised by Albert Thumb, Munich 1913) 597; Karl Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*⁵ (Strassburg 1897-1916) 2.3.909-10, 927, 929-30; A. Meillet and J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée* (Paris 1927) 561; Hofmann in *Stolz-Schmalz lateinische*

as typical examples of the starting-point of the construction! These are Homer, *Iliad* 2.11 θωρήξαι ἐκέλευε . . . Ἀχαιοὺς, and Terence, *HT* 585-6 iube hunc abire. In other words, the usage must have had its genesis in connection with a verb that was in some way causative in its meaning, such as Latin *iubeo* or *cogo*. The accusative was originally the direct object of this verb, and the infinitive was used in the sense of purpose which was doubtless its original one, as befitted a form that started as a verbal noun in the dative case.⁴ So *iube hunc abire* meant originally "drive him for the purpose of going, order him for the purpose of going." Verbs of allowing, such as *sino* and *patior*, readily adopted the same pattern.

The explanation so far is completely confirmed by Hittite, which has an exactly analogous construction in which a transitive verb and its direct object are combined with the dative of a verbal noun denoting purpose. Two types of these verbal nouns exist, which so far as I can see function in precisely the same way;⁵ they end, respectively, in *-anna* (sometimes *-anni*) and in *-wanzi* or *-manzi*. The *-anna* *-anni* forms are datives of verbal nouns in *-tar* (*-r/n*-stems); and the *-wanzi* *-manzi* forms are undoubtedly datives too, though their formation is not quite so clear.⁶ Both types are called infinitives by Sturtevant, though some other authorities term the *-wanzi* *-manzi* forms supines.

As examples of these nouns used purely to express purpose, we may cite⁷ for the form in *-wanzi* *KUB* 12.62.2.4 KASKAL-*si ka-ri-pu-wa-an-zi pa-a-i-mi* "I am going on the road to eat," and for that in *-anna* *Pap.* 3.49-50 *nu-za a-da-an-na e-sa-an-da-ri* "they sit down to eat." Since these are nouns rather than verbs, they have no

*Grammatik*⁸ (revised by Manu Leumann and Joh. Bapt. Hofmann, Munich 1928) 583; Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (completed by Albert Debrunner, Munich 1939-50) 2.372-3.

⁴ Most Greek and Latin infinitives are either dative or locative case-forms; but there is reason to believe that the dative and locative were originally variants of a single case, one of whose uses was that of place whither, goal, or purpose, ultimately inherited by the dative. See Sturtevant, *TAPA* 62 (1931) 18-25, on this original case; and Carl Darling Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago 1933) 304-6, on the Greek and Latin infinitives.

⁵ Cf. Fritz Ose, *Supinum und Infinitiv im Hethitischen* (Leipzig 1944) *passim*.

⁶ See Edgar H. Sturtevant, *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language* (Philadelphia 1933) §§ 158, 162, 436.

⁷ In writing Hittite words, for the sake of convenience I omit the diacritic marks over *s* and under *h*. In citing Hittite and Latin, for the sake of brevity I quote only enough to make the syntax and sense clear, with no indication of omissions. All Latin quotations are from Plautus and Terence, unless otherwise indicated.

voice,⁸ and the subject may serve as the recipient rather than the agent of the action denoted by the verbal noun, as in *KUB* 13.5.2.17 UDU *a-da-an-na u-un-na-an-za* "a sheep (is) brought to be eaten." Of course "for eating" is really a closer translation in each case than either "to eat" or "to be eaten."

The same expression of purpose is frequently combined with a verb of ordering or allowing and its direct object. A particularly interesting passage syntactically is *Madd.* 2.31-2, where we have in direct succession ZAB.MEŠ-*ya ú-wa-u-an-zi Ū-UL tar-na-i* and *ar-ga-mu-us-sa ú-tum-ma-an-zi Ū-UL tar-na-i*. The first is literally "he does not allow the troops for coming" and the second is literally "he does not allow the tribute for bringing," but in our idiom we should have to render the first by an active, "he does not allow the troops to come," and the second by a passive, "he does not allow the tribute to be brought." As an example with a verb of ordering, we may cite *Hatt.* 4.4 *na-an-kán A-NA ERÍN.MEŠ ni-ni-in-ku-u-an-zi ú-e-ri-ya-at* "he directed him to the troops for gathering," i.e., "he directed him to gather the troops."⁹

We have, then, ample justification so far as Hittite parallels go for the usual interpretation of the original meaning of *iube hunc abire* or *sine hunc abire*. But the next step in the process which is regularly assumed by the authorities whom I have quoted does not seem to me an easy one. They assert that *iubeo hunc abire* would have generated *dico hunc abire*, where not only is the accusative no longer an object of the main verb, but the infinitive — and this seems to me even more troublesome — is no longer used to express purpose. If *iubeo hunc abire* "I drive him for going, I order him to go" had really created *dico hunc abire*, the latter ought, I should think, to mean "I appoint him for going, I tell him to go," whereas we know that, although *dico hunc* may under some circumstances really mean "I appoint him," *dico hunc abire* could not

⁸ Cf. the present writer, *TAPA* 74 (1943) 269-74. Indeed, the possession of voice seems another special achievement of the Greek and Latin infinitives.

⁹ The Hittite construction here, with "troops" as well as the verbal noun in the dative, reminds us somewhat of the double dative in Latin, and still more of the use of two datives, one an ordinary noun and the other an infinitive, in Sanskrit; on the possibility that the Latin gerund and gerundive construction arose in some such combination, see the author, *TAPA* 74.274 and note 25, and 281-2. The construction that Latin or English would naturally use to translate this particular sentence, "iussit eum copias colligere" or "he directed him to gather the troops," is hardly possible in Hittite, since verbal nouns, being, as I have already said, nouns much more than verbs, very rarely take an object.

possibly mean "I appoint him for going, I tell him to go"; the latter could be rendered only by *dico huic abeat*. I think we must seek to trace the development of *dico hunc abire*, as well as *scio hunc abire*, *credo hunc abire*, *audio hunc abire*, etc., to quite a different starting-point — not with verbs of ordering and permitting, but with verbs of sensual perception.¹⁰

These verbs readily took a direct object accompanied not by a dative verbal noun of purpose, as is the case with verbs of ordering and allowing, but by a participle (or other adjective) modifying, and of course agreeing with, the accusative noun. This participle might be a simple adjectival modifier, as in *Mil.* 533–4 *vidi et illam et hospitem complexam atque osculantem*, and *Amph.* 1098–9 *uxorem tuam neque gementem neque plorantem audivimus*. Here in both cases the verb is used in its literal sense — "I saw her hugging and kissing," "we heard your wife neither groaning nor wailing."

But at times the participle is used ambiguously; do we actually see or hear something happening, or do we see or hear *that* something is happening? Thus does *Stich.* 308 *occlusam ianuam video* mean "I see a shut door" or "I see the door is shut"? Does *Most.* 905–6 *nusquam me scio vidisse umquam abiectas aedis* mean "I know I never saw a house thrown away" or "I know I never saw that a house was thrown away"? In *Trin.* 42 *te videam emortuam*, would Callicles be satisfied to *see that his wife is dead*, or does he blood-thirstily yearn to *see her dead*?

I think we actually have the ambiguity utilized for a pun (a pretty far-fetched one) in *Bacch.* 212–3. Pistoclerus asks, *num invitus rem bene gestam audis eri?* "are you sorry to hear *that* your master's affair has been well carried out?"; but Chrysalus (taking *rem* in the sense of "story" or even "play," something like *fabula*) interprets this as meaning "are you unwilling to listen to your master's drama well performed?", with the participle attributive rather than predicative, as he shows by his answer, *non res, sed actor, mihi cor odio sauciat* "not the drama, but the actor, offends me to the very core."

A verb of speech or mental action as well as of sensual perception can be thus used in a double sense, though here the difference is relatively slight. Thus *Trin.* 740 *dicant te benignum* may mean either "they would call you kind" or "they would say that you are

¹⁰ Of the authorities whom I have cited (above, note 3), only Hofmann suggests the possibility that the construction had more than one point of departure.

kind"; and *HT* 626 *meministin me gravidam* may mean either "do you remember me as being pregnant?" or "do you remember that I was pregnant?"

But sometimes the meaning can be "that" only. This is more likely to be true with verbs of hearing than with verbs of seeing, for there is often little difference between seeing something happening and seeing that something is happening, but frequently to hear that something is happening is not at all the same as to hear it happening; and still more with a past participle, one can hear that something has been done, whereas actual auditory perception would hardly be possible. Thus in *Most.* 629 *faenus creditum audio*, the meaning can only be "I hear that" etc.

Now we have a predicative relation clearly established between an accusative noun and its adjectival or participial modifier, but we have not explained the presence of the infinitive as a copula or a predicate.

I suggest that now at last we may turn to the verbs of allowing or suffering. These verbs, as we have seen, take an infinitive, as *Poen.* 696 *potes esse te pati in lepido loco*. We very frequently find them combined with an accusative and a predicatively used past participle, e.g., in *Stich.* 132 *vosne ego patiar cum mendicis nuptas viris?*, *Phorm.* 304 *egon illam cum illo ut patiar nuptam unum diem?* Since I can cite no parallel instance of a present participle or a non-participial adjective so used,¹¹ it may be that in each of the foregoing examples we have not a participle¹² but an infinitive without a copula.¹³ This is rendered particularly probable by a passage in which the form is coordinated with an infinitive, *Merc.* 785-6 *nec pol ego patiar seic me nuptam tam male measque in aedis seic scorta obductarier*. There are also numerous sets of instances in which the example containing a past participle seems precisely parallel with a similar example containing a past infinitive, or even a present infinitive; a few of these follow. *Merc.* 251 *abductam illam aegre pati*, and *Poen.* 1071 *quo privatum med*

¹¹ I do find two rather odd examples of a predicatively used adverb with a verb of allowing, *Men.* 559 *egone me patiar frustra in matrimonio?* and *Ep.* 518 *eamne ego sinam inpune?*, the latter followed directly by the familiar infinitive construction, 519-20 *sinam me inpune inrisum esse*.

¹² Bennett, however, specifically classes the passage from *Stich.* as an example of a participle used in the predicate, though he generally treats such forms as infinitives. See Charles E. Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin* (Boston 1910-14) 1.438.

¹³ On this possibility see below, p. 127.

aegre patior; vs. *Bacch.* 492 aegre patitur gnatum esse corruptum tuom. *Mil.* 396 neque me quidem patiar probri falso inpune insinuatam; vs. *Ep.* 519–20 perdam potius quam sinam me inpune inrisum esse, and 327–8 numquam inridere nos illum inultum sinam. *Capt.* 205 and 206a solutos sinat; vs. *Ep.* 724 numquam me solvi sinam. Cato, *Agr.* 110 sinito biduum oblitum dolium, and 113.1 vinum in dolia indito, sinito dies XV operata; vs. 105.2 biennium in sole sinito positum esse, and 105.1 sinito muriam fieri.

But it makes no difference whether, e.g., *abductam* in *Merc.* 251 is in origin simply a participle, or an infinitive exactly parallel, except for the lack of a copula, to *esse corruptum* in *Bacch.* 492. In either case the Roman could readily interpret *abductam* as *abductam esse* — and the connecting link between verbs of allowing and verbs of perceiving is in place. For in exactly the same way in *Cist.* 298 video te tactum toxico, *tactum* can be taken as representing *tactum esse*, etc. Any of the passages quoted above in which the predicate modifier is a past participle, as in *Stich.* 308 oclusam ianuam video or *Most.* 629 faenus creditum audio, or in which it is a non-participial adjective, as in *Trin.* 740 dicant te benignum or *HT* 626 meministin me gravidam, can of course be treated in just this way. And so we find plenty of parallel examples with *esse* employed, for example: with past participles, *Trin.* 109 videt protractum esse se, *Ep.* 563–4 audiui illam esse captam; with adjectives, *Merc.* 220 aspicit te timidum esse, and *Amph.* 911 audiui te esse iratam; with nouns, *As.* 352 dico me esse atriensem, and 926 uxorem me esse meministi tuam.

Analogy then sets up a new line of development. Once the present infinitive *esse* is firmly entrenched, so that to represent *es irata* we can say (as in *Amph.* 911) *audiui te esse iratam*, we can go a step further, and in order to represent *Ulixes fuit* (or *erat*) *audax*, we can say (as in *Bacch.* 949) *Ulixem audiui fuisse audacem*.

But must the verb always be the copula? Or can genuine predicative verbs be used as well? If *fuit* becomes *fuisse*, may not *cepit* become *cepisse*? Thus we have *Rud.* 987–8 piscatorem vidisti piscem cepisse?

The ultimate development of the future infinitive was doubtless parallel to that of the past. Whatever the origin of the form in *-turum* may have been,¹⁴ it surely came to be interpreted as the

¹⁴ Among various suggestions as to this, the one most widely accepted is perhaps that of Postgate, *CR* 5 (1891) 301, *IF* 4 (1894) 252–8, *CR* 18 (1904) 450–6, to the effect

masculine accusative singular (or neuter nominative-accusative singular) of an adjectival form corresponding for the future active to the form in *-tum* for the past passive. It is true that a few passages preserve what seems to have been an earlier indeclinable use of the formation,¹⁵ as *Cas.* 670–1 *deieravit occisurum eum*, *ib.* 692–3 *te occisurum ait*, *Truc.* 400 *bona sua me habiturum* (all in reference

that the form in *-turum* was itself a periphrastic infinitive (composed of a locative in *-lu* and the present infinitive **esom* > **erum* cognate with Oscan *ezum* Umbrian *erom*). But the arguments against this of Leumann and Hofmann (above, note 3) 342 and 577, respectively, seem to be cogent; and I far prefer the view of Buck (above, note 4) 307, that the form was in origin not an infinitive but a participle, being allied in formation to such adjectives as *maturus* (just as the past participle and the gerundive were allied to such adjectives as *honestus* and *rotundus*, respectively; on the latter see the author, *TAPA* 74.279 note 46 and 280 note 54).

¹⁵ The usage is discussed by Gellius (1.7.1–15) and by Priscian (*GLK* 2.475–6). Priscian (475) calls the form in *-um* a neuter participle; Gellius, followed by Postgate (see above, note 14), pronounces it an “indefinite” like the Greek infinitive (6–8), but fails to comment on the addition of *esse* in one of his examples, from Valerius Antias (cited in 10). Gellius cites, in addition to Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5.167 (a disputed passage which serves as the point of departure of his whole discussion), *Cas.* 693, and five other passages known to us only from him: one each from G. Gracchus, Valerius Antias (already referred to), and Laberius, and two from Quadrigarius. Priscian cites an example apiece, all otherwise unknown, from Cato, Lucilius, and Sulla. Postgate has three lists, similar to one another but not identical (none wholly accurate), in *CR* 5.301, *IF* 4.254, and *CR* 18.453, respectively, in which he brings the total up to twenty, sixteen with the *-turum* form alone, four with *-turum esse*. To the ten instances given by Gellius and Priscian he adds the following: two more from Plautus (*Cas.* 671 and *Truc.* 400), one from Varro (*RR* 1.68), one from Sallust (*Jug.* 104.4; this should be 100.4), and six from laws (four from *CIL* 1.197.18, one from *ib.* 25, one from 1.198.45). Hofmann (above, note 3) adds a further group of possible examples from Golden and Silver Latin (577), one from *Bell. Hisp.* (13.3), two from Livy (8.38.3, which I cannot locate, and 26.45.5), one from Curtius Rufus (9.1.2).

The foregoing list is less impressive than it at first appears. Archaizers like Varro and Sallust, and still more later writers, of course have nothing to tell us that is of weight in regard to the genesis of the construction. Postgate's four examples from *CIL* 1.197.18 are really just a single one — and that one is *not* an example at all! It is true that the verb, *iouranto* (17), is plural; but the subject, provided in 15, is a succession of singular nouns, dic(tator), co(n)s(ul), pr(aetor), mag(ister) eq(uitum), cens(or), etc. The oath runs (18–9): *sese quae ex hac lege oportebit facturum, neque sese advorsum h(ance) l(egem) facturum scientem d(olo) m(al)o, neque sese facturum neque intercessurum etc. etc.* (the italicized words are suppletions). Each official must have sworn separately, in his own person; i.e., he said *faciam* not *faciemus*. This is absolutely proved by the singular *scientem*, which Postgate evidently overlooked. 1.197.25 is just like this, except that it has *facturum esse* instead of *facturum*. In 1.198 there is no example at all, either in the line cited by Postgate or elsewhere. Thus our list of passages from early Latin is reduced to three examples from Plautus and to eight that are known to us only from Gellius or Priscian; concerning these eight the lack of context prevents us from being able to judge for ourselves, but there is always the possibility that Gellius and Priscian may have slipped up just as Postgate did.

to a woman); but, whatever these isolated instances may suggest to the scholar of today about the history of the form,¹⁶ their message was surely lost to the Romans of Plautus' day, who had come to employ the form in *-turum* just like the form in *-tum*. Thus it normally varies for the feminine, whether it is used in direct agreement with the substantive, as in *Rud.* 1186 *credebam praedam eventuram*, or as a predicate adjective with the copula *esse*, as in *Cas.* 552-3 *dixit suam uxorem hanc arcessituram esse*. It also varies for the plural, either masculine, as in *Merc.* 746 *nos confido onustos redituros domum* (without *esse*), or feminine, as in *And.* 173-4 *nuptias futuras esse audivit*. And so we are surely justified in similarly interpreting as specifically masculine the ambiguous form in *-turum* when we meet it either without *esse* as in *Men.* 1043 *ait se mihi adlaturum marsuppium*, or with *esse* as in *As.* 611 *minitaris te vitam esse amissurum*.¹⁷ And consequently we may assume, I am sure, that in all these instances the form in *-turum* is a participle like the one in *-tum*, and the form in *-turum esse* is an infinitive generated by the participle like the one in *-tum esse*.

As for the future passive infinitive, such as we have in *Curc.* 490-1 *memento promisisse te mihi omne argentum redditum iri*, this, though it really corresponded to an active in *-tum ire*, such as we have in *Pers.* 318 *sine ire pastum*, must have come to be accepted as corresponding to an active in *-turum esse*, and to have been used as a parallel for this in the construction with subject-accusative¹⁸ as elsewhere. It was perhaps the rarity of the locution that preserved the invariability of the form in *-tum*, as in *Hec.* 39-40 *rumor venit datum iri gladiatores* and *And.* 177 *audierat non datum iri filio uxorem suo*; yet the fact that it *was* preserved *may* be an argument against the view that the form in *-turum* in the future active infinitive was also originally invariable.¹⁹

¹⁶ I am not sure that they are significant. We have already observed (in note 15) that they are far from numerous; and such as they are, they might be not a survival at all but an aberrant by-product of the invariable *-tum* form of the future passive.

¹⁷ Those who hold the view (referred to above, note 14) that the form was originally an infinitive of course agree that its change to a participle is proved just as clearly by its combination with *esse* as by a change to a form in *-am* or *-os* to show gender or number.

¹⁸ This accusative may have originally been, as stated by Hofmann (above, note 3) 601, object of the supine, not subject of the infinitive; but that it had become subject of the entire periphrasis is proved by an example with a finite verb, Cato, *Orat.* 54 (Jordan) in *hac contumelia quae mihi factum itur*.

¹⁹ Cf. above, notes 15 and 16.

Perhaps the last of all the original predicative forms to fall into line — and the one type that never did fall completely into line — was the type in which the predicate modifier is a present participle, which Latin idiom does not permit to be combined with *esse*.²⁰ Possibly this was the last stronghold of the participle that fell before the encroachments of the infinitive. But fall it did.

There are some cases where Plautus seems to distinguish in meaning between the participle and the infinitive, in either one of two ways. (1) He tends to use the infinitive where the meaning is "perceive that," as in *Rud.* 1021–2 *inspectavi procul te hunc habere*; and the participle where the meaning is "perceive some one doing something," as in *As.* 878 *accubantem tuum virum conspexeris*. But some examples are of the ambiguous type, as *Amph.* 128 *vorsari crebro hic quom viderent me domi*, where the meaning may be "when they saw me coming and going" or "when they saw that I was coming and going." (2) He tends to use the infinitive for a punctual act and the participle for a durative one. A good example of this distinction is provided by *Mil.* 275 *hic illam vidit osculantem, quantum hunc audiui loqui*, where the participle and infinitive differ from each other precisely as do their English translations, "he saw her *kissing*" and "I heard him *say*." We may also note in close juxtaposition the participle in *Cist.* 546–7 *ex hisce aedibus vidi exeuntem mulierem* "I saw a woman *leaving* this house" and *ib.* 549–50 *eam viderim erilem nostram filiam sustollere* "I saw her *pick up* our mistress' daughter." Other similar instances of this use of the infinitive are *Amph.* 752 *audivistin me dicere*? "did you hear me say?", *Cist.* 170 *eampse audistis confiterier* "you heard her admit"; possibly also three passages referring to stage performances, *Amph.* 151–2 *spectantibus Iovem et Mercurium facere hic histrioniam* "for those watching Jupiter and Mercury take (rather than taking) part," *Rud.* 1249–50 *spectavi comicos dicta dicere*, *Amph.* 41–3 *alios in tragoediis vidi commemorare*, though in these three passages the infinitives come closer to participles; at all events none of them is the "that" type like *Most.* 727 *percepi super his rebus nostris te loqui*.

We may further contrast *Bacch.* 292 *vident nos stare* "they see

²⁰ It is strange that this type never developed. We have the makings of it in *Curc.* 292 *quos semper videas bibentes esse in thermopolio*, where, however, we probably must view the predicate as *esse in thermopolio*, with *bibentes* modifying *quos* but not forming a periphrasis with *esse*.

us stand still, they see us stop," where the infinitive designates a single act; and *Bacch.* 451 quem astantem video ante ostium and 978 Priamum astantem eccum ante portam video, where the participles designate an action in its continuity. But the distinction is not consistently maintained, for in the latter sense we also occasionally find the infinitive,²¹ as in *Men.* 632-3 te hic ante aedis vidi astare, *Merc.* 807-8 video Syram astare ante aedis, *Rud.* 309 eccos video astare. And we seem to have the infinitive and the participle used as equivalents in close juxtaposition in *Mil.* 242-5 si concriminatus sit meu' conservos eam vidisse cum alieno *osculari*, eam arguam vidisse conservom meum cum suo amatore *osculantem*.

As further examples of the apparent interchangeability of the participle and the infinitive, we may note the following. (1) Examples with participles: *Cist.* 546-7 (quoted two paragraphs back), *Merc.* 961 exeuntem filium video meum, *Hec.* 806-7 Bacchidem ab nostro adfne exeuntem video. (2) Examples with infinitives: *Ep.* 208 ire vidi milites plenis viis, *Rud.* 43 eam vidit ire e ludo fidicinio domum, *Trin.* 622 generum nostrum ire eccillum video, *Most.* 1120-1 eccum video huc incedere Callidamatem, *Ad.* 361 eccum Syrum ire video, *And.* 580 eccumh video ipsum exire. In the last four the use of *eccillum* or *eccum* seems to make it particularly clear that we see some one going, not see that he is going. Ennius, *Ann.* 387 (Vahlen) quom aspiciunt hostes accedere, and Accius 289 (Ribbeck) Amfilocum huc vadere cerno, are probably similar, but the lack of context prohibits absolute certainty; they might also be the "that" type. *And.* 363-4 intro ire neminem video, exire neminem is surely, unless a pedant protests that we cannot "see nobody," to be rendered not "I see *that* nobody is going in, nobody is going out," but either "I see nobody go in, nobody go out" (punctual) or "I see nobody going in, nobody going out" (durative). Similarly the following *matronam nullam in aedibus* represents the vivid "I see no *matrona* in the house" rather than "I see that there is no *matrona* in the house."

On the other hand, we once more with *audio* have *only* the "that"

²¹ This type of expression seems never to have become common; but I think it is a mistake to view it as specifically an *early* form that gave way in later Latin to the participle, as does Ashmore, to judge by his note on *Ad.* 361 in his edition of Terence (New York 1910). Rather this particular use of the infinitive in place of the participle failed to maintain itself, the cause or result being that a convenient mode of differentiating between two distinct meanings was provided by the infinitive vs. the participle with verbs of sensual perception; cf. Hofmann (above, note 3) 605.

type, for instance in *And.* 474–5 ante ostium me audivit stare, which of course must mean “she heard that I was standing outside the door,” not “she heard me standing.” (We cannot hear a purely visible action, though we sometimes see a primarily audible one, as in *Rud.* 1249–50 spectavi dicere and *Amph.* 41–3 vidi commemorare, both cited above, three paragraphs back.)

The present passive infinitive must have developed on the model of the present active; but naturally, since there was no corresponding participle, it acquired wider scope. Thus while in *As.* 162 magis istuc percipimus lingua dici quam factis fore we probably have a “that” type, in *Bacch.* 279–80 lembum conspikor exornarier and *Cas.* 40–1 conspikatust puellam exponi we probably do not; here, while the passive infinitive may correspond to the active infinitive in *Curc.* 595 med hunc habere conspikatast anulum, it more probably corresponds to the participle in *Ep.* 435 quem huc advenientem conspikor. The infinitive is probably durative in *Rud.* 67 video virginem asportarier, punctual in *Mil.* 538–9 numquam hominem quemquam ludificarier magis facete vidi. However, there is perhaps a tendency to express punctual action in the passive by the perfect rather than the present, especially by the perfect participle — whether we view this as a participle or an infinitive. Which brings us back to our starting-point.

Now in Plautus’ day of course, when a Roman was free *either* to use the adjective or participle in direct predicate relationship with the accusative noun, *or* to insert the copula, if he thought about the matter at all, which is doubtful, he may have thought that the form was the same in either case — that there was no difference between *indotatam* in *Pers.* 391 te indotatam dicas, and *natum esse* in *Men.* 1097 te Syracusis natum esse dixti, etc. Unquestionably, there is justification in calling *indotatam* an infinitive just like *natum esse*, for in the perfect passive system the copula is not essential; even the indicative can do without it. Yet I want to emphasize that *originally* the forms used with verbs of perceiving and saying must have been, in the perfect passive as in the present active, true participles. Only in this way, in my opinion, could the construction of infinitive with subject-accusative have developed.

And here again I turn to Hittite for confirmation, for the early form of the construction can, I think, be recognized there, although so far as I know such recognition has not heretofore taken place. I have noted examples of the direct object with some sort of pred-

icative modifier after precisely the sort of verbs with which we have been concerned, to wit, verbs of seeing, hearing, and saying.

In two parallel texts we find these passages: *KUB* 19.29.4.10-1 ŠEŠ-YA²² GIG-an us-ki-ir and *KBo* 3.4.1.6-7 ŠEŠ-YA ir-ma-an is-ta-ma-as-sir, literally "they saw my brother sick" and "they heard my brother sick." Clearly, these mean, respectively, "they saw that my brother was sick" and "they heard that my brother was sick."

The word in predicative relation need not be an adjective as here. It may be an adverb²³ or an adverbial phrase.²⁴ As an example of the use of an adverb we may cite *KBo* 4.4.4.18 ma-ah-ha-an-ma-mu-kán me-na-ah-ha-an-da a-ú-e-ir. This may mean simply "when they saw me opposite." The adverb *menahhanda* "opposite" may even belong with the verb *auer* "saw" rather than with *-mu* "me." But I think the meaning is rather "when they saw that I was opposite, that I was facing them." As an example of the use of an adverbial phrase, we may cite *KBo* 5.6.3.45-6 nu A-BU-YA ¹Hattu-LÚ-in I-NA KUR ^URU ME-IŠ-RI IŠ-ME "my father heard H. in Egypt," i.e., "my father heard that H. was in Egypt."

For a verb of saying we have two almost identical passages in *KBo* 5.6, namely, 3.11-2 tu-ug-ma-wa DUMU.MEŠ-KA me-ig-ga-us me-mi-is-kán-zi and 4.9-10 DUMU.MEŠ-KA-wa-at-ta me-iq-ga-us me-mi-is-kán-zi. Both of these mean literally "they say your sons to you many," i.e., "they say your sons are many" or "they say you have many sons." The verb *memiskanzi* "say" would not normally take a direct object any more than *dicunt*; but the presence of the predication seems to make it possible — though I am not quite sure whether the predication rests mainly in the dative, *tuk* or *-ta*, which may be used in the predicate as a dative of possession, or whether it rests mainly in the adjective *mekaus* "many." The passage would be in Latin "tibi filios tuos multos dicunt" (but probably Latin would omit either the *tibi* or the *tuos*, since the

²² Here ŠEŠ-YA "my brother" is a suppletion, but a practically certain one in view of its presence in the parallel passage; and in any case there can be no doubt about the construction of the accusative GIG-an (which is just another way of writing *ir-ma-an* "sick").

²³ We have already observed (note 11) the predicative use in Latin of an adverb with a verb of allowing.

²⁴ Cf. the use with *video* of *matronam nullam in aedibus* in *And.* 364, already discussed above.

combination, though natural in Hittite for emphasis, seems redundant in other languages).

It is of interest to compare with this last pair of Hittite examples a similar passage in Latin, *HT* 181 *huic filium scis esse*? Here the infinitive is present; indeed, where the predication is expressed by a dative of possession, Latin could hardly do without the copula. But the starting-point of the Terence passage must have been, if my thesis is right, *huic filium scis*, with the dative of possession corresponding to the predicate adjectives in the other Latin examples; and for this the Hittite offers a perfect parallel.