

VIII.—Vestiges of Partitive Apposition in Latin Syntax

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

PRELIMINARY REMARKS¹

What I am, for convenience, calling partitive apposition in the following study is really something wider than the term implies. It is the setting side by side in the same case of two substantives

¹ Bibliographical data are to be interpreted as follows. *ALL* = *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik*. Behaghel = Otto Behaghel, *Deutsche Syntax*; 4 vols. (Heidelberg 1923–32). Benfey = Theodor Benfey, *Handbuch der Sanskritsprache*; 2 vols. (Leipzig 1852–54). Bennett = Charles E. Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*; 2 vols. (Boston 1910–14). Brugmann, *Grund.* = Karl Brugmann and Berthold Delbrück, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*; 2nd ed., 5 vols. (Strassburg 1893–1916). Buck = Carl Darling Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*; 4th impr. (Chicago 1948). Delbrück, *Allind. Synt.* = B. Delbrück, *Allindische Syntax* (Halle 1888). Delbrück, *Grund.*: see Brugmann. Ernout and Thomas = Alfred Ernout and François Thomas, *Syntaxe latine* (Paris 1951). Fowler = *The Menæchmi of Plautus*, ed. by Harold North Fowler (Chicago 1916). Friedrich, *El.* = Johannes Friedrich, *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*; 2 vols. (Heidelberg 1940–46). Friedrich, *Vert.* = Johannes Friedrich, *Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache*; 2 vols. (Leipzig 1926–30). Gildersleeve and Lodge = B. L. Gildersleeve and Gonzalez Lodge, *Latin Grammar*; 3rd ed. (Boston 1894). Hahn, *Coordination* = E. Adelaide Hahn, *Coordination of Non-Coordinate Elements in Vergil* (New York 1930). Hirt, *IG* = Hermann Hirt, *Indogermanische Grammatik*; 7 vols. (Heidelberg 1921–37). Hofmann = Manu Leumann and Joh. Bapt. Hofmann, *Stolz-Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik*; 5th ed. (Munich 1928). *IF* = *Indogermanische Forschungen*. *KZ* = *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*. Lane = George M. Lane, *A Latin Grammar*; rev. ed. (New York 1926). Lindsay = W. M. Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus* (Oxford 1907). Lodge = Gonzalez Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum*; 2 vols. (Leipzig 1904–33). Meillet and Vendryes = A. Meillet and J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*; 2nd ed. (Paris 1927). Merrill = *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura*, ed. by William Augustus Merrill (New York 1907). Monroe = D. B. Monroe, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*; 2nd ed. (Oxford 1891). Munro = *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura*, ed. by H. A. J. Munro; 4th ed., 3 vols. (London 1886). Otto = Clemens Otto, *De Epexegeseos in Latinorum Scriptis Usu* (Münster 1912). Roby = Henry John Roby, *Grammar of the Latin Language*; 5th ed., 2 vols. (London 1887). Schwyzler = Eduard Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik*; 2 vols., 2nd vol. compl. and ed. by Albert Debrunner (Munich 1934–50). Sommer, *AU* = Ferdinand Sommer, *Die Ahhijawā-Urkunden* (Munich 1932). Sommer, *Bil.* = Ferdinand Sommer and Adam Falkenstein, *Die hethitisch-akkadische Bilingue des Hattušili I (Labarna II)* (Munich 1938). Sonnenschein = *T. Macci Plauti Rudens*, ed. by Edward A. Sonnenschein (Oxford 1901). Sturtevant, *Chr.* = Edgar H. Sturtevant and George Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy* (Philadelphia 1935). Sturtevant, *HG* = Edgar H. Sturtevant (and E. Adelaide Hahn), *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language*; vol. 1, rev. ed. (New Haven 1951). Wagner = P.

which are not of equal scope.² One may really be a literal, physical part of the other, as in the case of a group and an individual or an individual and a part of his body; or the connection may be that of part and whole in a more figurative or abstract sense, as in the case of an individual and one of his qualities; or the relationship may be something still more tenuous and intangible, as in the case of an entity of some sort and an action for which the entity serves as either agent or recipient.

Such collocations must date from a very early period of the language, antedating the establishment of the genitive case as the normal adnominal modifier. The genitive replacing the noun of wider scope³ in what I am calling partitive apposition may be any one of several types.⁴ In instances of literal partitive apposition in the strict sense of the term, it would of course normally be what we call a partitive genitive, one "denoting a whole of which a part is taken"; but it would be rather a possessive genitive with a noun denoting a quality,⁵ a subjective or objective genitive with a noun

Terenti Comoediae, ed. by Wilhelm Wagner; 3rd ed. (Cambridge 1892). Warmington = *Remains of Old Latin*, ed. and transl. by E. H. Warmington; 4 vols. (Cambridge and London 1935-40). Whitney = William Dwight Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*; 2nd ed., 5th issue (Cambridge 1923). *ZA* = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und verwandte Gebiete*. References are to pages. Citations of Cato's Fragments are from Jordan, of Ennius from Vahlen (2nd ed.), of Lucilius from Marx, of Pacuvius from Ribbeck. Citations from Homer, Plautus, and Terence usually omit the author's name. Quotations give only enough words to make clear the sense and the syntax, with no indication of omissions.

² When two such substantives are connected by 'and' instead of being placed in apposition, we get the phenomenon known as hendiadys. That this is a bad name, since there are really present two distinct, even though not strictly coordinate, notions, I endeavored to prove long ago (*CW* 15.193-97).

³ Such replacement by a genitive of the noun denoting the whole is theoretically possible in every pair of substantives in partitive apposition (for some actual examples, see notes 76 and 90), even though at times this would render redundant a possessive adjective accompanying the noun denoting the part (see note 52). In practice, however, the general structure of the sentence in which the phrase occurs may demand some other substitution; this happens particularly often when the appositives denote a person and a part of his body. Sometimes in such instances the general construction calls rather for a dative of reference than for a genitive (cf. note 49); and sometimes the sense demands the retention in its original case of the noun denoting the person, and the shift to some other case of the noun denoting the body-part, which may become a genitive or ablative of quality (as in Vergil, *Aen.* 2.348-49 and 5.729-30, cited in note 51; so, too, of inanimate objects, *Ecl.* 2.3 and 9.9, cited in note 75).

⁴ Cf. further on this, notes 8, 32, and 82.

⁵ The genitive with a part of the body might also be viewed as possessive rather than partitive.

denoting an action.⁶ However, such categorizing on our part is a mere refinement; a genitive is a genitive! If in a wide sense we choose to say, as a matter of convenience in nomenclature, that a quality which a person possesses, or an action of which a person serves as agent or recipient, is a part of that person, then if the person is denoted by a genitive noun and the quality or action is denoted by a second noun which the genitive modifies, the genitive is in its fundamental meaning partitive, even though we may prefer to classify it as possessive, subjective, or objective.⁷ Presumably all that the genitive was originally, was simply a substantive that modified another substantive, in any type of relationship whatsoever; and the precise category that we assign to any particular genitive often depends merely on our interpretation or — still more perilous — on our translation.⁸ But even earlier than the use of the genitive for a substantive modifying another one was undoubtedly, as I have said, the use of the same case for the modifying noun as for the noun modified.⁹ And if they were not coextensive in

⁶ Either is possible, because verbal nouns are actually voiceless. The genitive is called subjective if it represents the agent of the action denoted by the verbal noun, as in Cato, *Agr.* 22.3 *vecturam boum*; objective if it represents the recipient, as in *As.* 432 *vectura olivi*. But actually the meaning is simply the act of carrying in relation either to oxen (which do the carrying) or to oil (which is carried). Cf. further note 82.

⁷ However, this does not mean that the different types of genitive remained semantically identical. That they did not is proved by the variation in the pronominal forms that replaced genitive nouns: e.g., in the first plural, some part of the adjective *noster* for a possessive or subjective genitive, the pronoun *nostri* for an objective genitive, and the pronoun *nostrum* for a partitive genitive.

⁸ For instance, in Vergil, *Ed.* 1.15 *spem gregis*, it is possible to classify the genitive *gregis* as partitive (the kids are the most promising element in the flock), as subjective (the flock centers its hopes in its younger generation), or as objective (the younger generation presents the prospects of a flock in future years). In *Aen.* 4.274 *spes Iuli*, *Iuli* may have either the second or the third of these values. Doubtless in the exquisitely sensitive, subtle, and suggestive language of Vergil, the overtones of more than one construction are present at one and the same time; these are lost to us if we insist on a single answer, hard and fast, black or white. Gray's line in the *Elegy* "And all the air a solemn stillness holds," is to me all the lovelier because I am not quite sure which noun is subject and which is object, and I get the effects of both possibilities. But the consideration, and the attempted settling, of problems like these, are the business of philology rather than of linguistics. Grammatically, as I have said, a genitive is a genitive.

⁹ Note that the final element met most often in both nominative singular (the general case of the noun; cf. Ernout and Thomas 11) of animate nouns and genitive singular is *-s* (in Hittite, nominative and genitive of *-o-* stem animate nouns are always identical). Note too that in many types of noun compounds, the modifying noun simply has the stem form or, in modern languages, the general form (English preserves this usage when it says *Romance Language Department* with *Language* in the singular,

scope, this involves what we may call "partitive apposition."¹⁰

I believe that insufficient attention has been paid to partitive apposition as a factor in the development of various syntactic usages. Two facts in regard to it are evident: (1) it is by no means limited to the Indo-European languages;¹¹ (2) in the Indo-European, or, as I prefer to say, Indo-Hittite group, it was much commoner at an early date than later. We find numerous examples in Hittite, with every case represented. Hittite scholars have not failed to call attention to the usage in the course of articles¹² and commentaries,¹³ and Friedrich devotes to it almost a page of his grammar;¹⁴ but it needs a unified and extended study.¹⁵ Examples are likewise met, though not quite so frequently, in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, and have been duly catalogued.¹⁶ However, I think the approach of scholars has frequently been wrong, inasmuch as they usually fail to present the phenomenon of partitive apposition as an independent and universal one that has no connection with any particular gram-

and when it writes *Teachers College* without an apostrophe after the *s*). Also, in the "bahuvrihi" type of compound common in many languages (seen in English in such fairy-tale names as *Goldy-Locks* and *Red Riding-Hood*), an attribute of the person, usually a detail of physical make-up or of costume, accompanied by a modifier of its own, is used as identical with the person. I see no reason for tracing this usage to a "nominal sentence," as is done by Biese and Hirt (see note 56).

¹⁰ The noun of greater scope would normally precede the noun in partitive apposition with it, and this order was preserved to a considerable extent in Latin, although naturally — in view of the freedom of the Latin word order — this was not invariably the case. Cf. notes 65, 68, and 75.

¹¹ For instance, it is a feature of Arabic, which, under the name of *Badal*, has received careful study by Arabic scholars. See Littmann, *IF* 35.244–46.

¹² See Friedrich, *ZA* 1.175 and 2.47; Sturtevant, *Language* 8.2.

¹³ See especially Friedrich, *Verl.* 1.31 note 5, 43–45, 178; 2.24, 142–43; Sommer, *AU* 29–31, 53; *Bil.* 106; Sturtevant, *Chr.* 93, 98, 168, 171, 195.

¹⁴ Friedrich, *El.* 1.69–70.

¹⁵ This I hope to make and publish elsewhere.

¹⁶ See e.g. for all three languages Brugmann, *Grund.* 2.2.633–34; for Indic and Greek, Delbrück, *Grund.* 3.385; for Greek specifically, Schwyzler 2.81; for Latin specifically, Hofmann, *Lat. Gr.* 384, 392, 630, and *IF* 42.81–86; also Landgraf, *ALL* 10.215–16. Examples from Germanic (both Old Germanic and Modern High German) are also cited: see Brugmann, *Grund.* 2.2.633 and *IF* 27.129; Behaghel 1.698–99; Blümel, *IF* 34.285–95; Hofmann, *IF* 42.84 note 3. The idiom seems alien to English, but I recall from some former newspaper feature in "Bronx" dialect — I think written by Milt Gross and entitled *Nize Baby* — an amusing example, "Get away from the front from the horse from the head." I have always cherished the memory of this, but unfortunately when I read it I did not realize its importance as exemplifying an ancient and widespread form of expression, and accordingly preserved no bibliographical data. Incidentally the passage exemplifies the double type — involving three terms — seen also in the Greek and Latin passages cited in note 50, as well as in the Latin expressions of locality quoted by Hofmann, *IF* 42.86.

matical case. Thus in their discussions¹⁷ Brugmann, Delbrück, and Schwyzler all introduce it under the category of the accusative, though to be sure in connection with the topic of the accusative Brugmann does recognize the existence of partitive apposition in other cases, and Schwyzler does give a cross-reference to a footnote (189 note 5) in which he takes cognizance of the existence of partitive apposition in the dative. Hofmann similarly takes up the question under the head of the accusative in two different places (384 and 385), in the earlier one adding misplaced instances of the dative as a sort of appendage; but he does at least deal with the construction elsewhere (630) as a feature in its own right irrespective of case.¹⁸

The best treatment of the subject of partitive apposition in Latin that I know is also by Hofmann, in an article that appeared in 1924.¹⁹ He gives examples of partitive apposition involving the nominative (85–86), the dative (84–85), the accusative (81–84), the ablative (85), and prepositional phrases (85).²⁰ This article is extremely interesting, and furnishes an excellent starting-point for a study of the construction. But in general he confines himself to the presentation of actual clear-cut examples of partitive apposition; it is not his purpose or his concern to trace vestiges of its influence in quite different constructions.²¹ This I think has not hitherto been done by any one; I shall attempt to make a beginning of it here.²²

¹⁷ Loc. cit. note 16.

¹⁸ Friedrich also groups instances of the *schêma kath' holon kai meros* in various cases; but I think he too errs in his approach in that he classes partitive apposition under the head of the genitive because it is a substitute therefor "nach unserer Auffassung" (similarly Hofmann 392), whereas the later introduction of a genitive in place of the appositive has nothing to do with the original usage, and also in that he defines the *schêma* as the use with one verb of two objects, whereas the appositives do not need to be objects of a verb or indeed to have anything to do with a verb at all.

¹⁹ J. B. Hofmann, "Syntaktische Gliederungsverschiebungen im Lateinischen infolge Erstarrung ursprünglich appositioneller Verhältnisse," *IF* 42.75–87 (see especially 81–86).

²⁰ For the genitive he gives an example from Homer, *Il.* 15.76 (85), and one from the New Testament, *Marc.* 5.30 (84 note 3). (Other examples from Homer are listed by Blümel, *IF* 44.262.) Latin he says (85) has no instances of this case, unless we recognize vestiges of it in *Capt.* 852 and 1008 (on these see below, 114–15).

²¹ An exception is his comment on the *lucis tuendi* construction, cited in note 20.

²² One type that was common at an early date I shall not treat, because so far as I can see it disappeared without trace. This is the placing in apposition of terms denoting respectively an object and its size or the like, as in Cato, *Agr.* 12.1 oletum agri iugera CCXL (for other instances, see Otto 7–9).

I. SHIFT FROM APPOSITIVE CONSTRUCTION TO GENITIVE CONSTRUCTION

A. Appositional Genitive

In the first place, when the appositive was replaced by the partitive genitive,²³ which to us seems so much more natural and logical, although obviously the ancients — at least the most ancient ancients — did not feel about it as we do, a kind of hyperurbanism or over-correction may have taken place. It is well known that as *decem milia passus*²⁴ became *decem milia passuum*, and *multi homines* became, at least optionally, *multi hominum*, another change was sometimes introduced, and *cuncti homines* and *omnes homines* became occasionally *cuncti hominum* and *omnes hominum*,²⁵ precisely like our English *all of the men* for *all the men*. But I venture to suggest that even more far-reaching results took place; to wit, that *urbs Roma* became *urbs Romae*,²⁶ *flumen Rhenus* became *flumen Rheni*,²⁷ *mons Capitolinus* became *mons Capitolini*,²⁸ and *nomen Marcus* became *nomen Marci*.²⁹ Thus we at least have a possible explanation for the appositional genitive, which does not usually surprise us because we use it too, but which is really a very strange construction.³⁰

²³ The two constructions must have existed side by side for a while. So in Hittite, we find variant readings: *CH* §§ 11, 12, 13, 14 apposition, but in the similar section §15 genitive; § 168 apposition in the main tablet (*KBo* 6.12) but genitive in the duplicate (6.13); similar variations in two copies of *Al. A* 4.45 (on this see Friedrich, *Vert.* 1.44–45).

²⁴ Still met occasionally in the classical period, e.g. Nepos, *Milt.* 4.2 (cf. Hofmann 630).

²⁵ As Ovid, *Met.* 4.631 *hominum cunctos*. For other examples see Hofmann 391.

²⁶ Cf. Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* 7.13.3 *oppidum Avaricum* vs. the anonymous *Bell. Afr.* 36.2 *ex oppido Thysdrae*; Cicero, *Att.* 5.18.1 in *oppido Antiochiae* (the vulgate reading; amended in some texts); and Vergil, *Aen.* 1.247 *urbem Patavi*.

²⁷ An early example, *Silari ad flumen*, is met in Lucilius 126 in a thoroughly prosaic setting (the satire constituting book 3, on his trip to southern Italy, imitated by Horace, *Serm.* 1.5). But in general the usage is Augustan (or later) and (at least at first) poetical. We meet it in Vergil, *Aen.* 6.659 *Eridani amnis* and 7.714 *flumen Himellae*. So too of lakes and springs: *Aen.* 1.244 *fontem Timavi*, also Livy (whose style was much influenced by Vergil's) 24.12.4 *lacum Avernae*.

²⁸ The genitive with names of mountains, like that with names of rivers (cf. note 27), seems to be mainly poetical. Caesar, who uses geographical terms repeatedly, never employs the appositional genitive for either; contrast e.g. *Bell. Gall.* 1.6.1 *inter montem Iuram et flumen Rhodanum* with the Vergilian passages cited in note 27 and with *Aen.* 8.231 *Aventini montem*. It is possible that Vergil is imitating the Greek usage (for which see Schwyzler 2.121–22).

²⁹ Cf. Livy 40.54.9 *sub nomine Flaminini*; Cicero, *Fin.* 2.24.78 *nomen amicitiae*.

³⁰ The genitive in *lacum Averni* (Livy 24.12.4), *fontem Timavi* (*Aen.* 1.244), etc.

There are a number of colloquial expressions that are usually classed with the appositional genitive.³¹ Actually, they seem to me to fall into two distinct groups: (1) *Poen.* 273 *monstrum mulieris*, *Pers.* 204 *deliciae pueri*, Cicero, *Fam.* 5.8.2 *quaedam pestes hominum*; (2) *Mil.* 1434 *scelus viri*, *As.* 473 *flagitium hominis*. All in my opinion stem from appositional locutions; but in the first group we have complete equivalence (the *mulier* is a *monstrum*, the *puer* is a pet or *deliciae*, the *homines* are *pestes*), whereas in the second group we have partitive apposition (a trait of the *vir* is *scelus*, a trait of the *homo* is *flagitium*). The first group then belongs with *urbs Romae* and *nomen Marci* in that the appositive has been replaced by a genitive that does not logically belong there; yet there is a difference, for in *urbs Romae* it is the more specific member of the pair that has gone into the genitive, whereas in *monstrum mulieris* it is the more generic member (this particular *urbs* is *Roma*, but this particular *mulier* is a *monstrum*). This would seem to indicate that when one of two appositives was replaced by a genitive, it did not seem to matter much which one it was; at all events what was done in colloquial language was the reverse of what was done in literary language.

B. Hypallage

On the other hand, *scelus viri* is actually more regular than *monstrum mulieris*, for the *scelus* is really a part, a quality, of the *vir*, and so we can think of *viri* as in origin a partitive genitive, though later it might seem rather to be a possessive.³² Thus *vir scelus*, 'a man (his) crime' i.e. a man in whom crime played a large part, as we might say a man all crime, quite logically became *viri scelus*, with the word denoting the whole changed to a partitive genitive. But what is not logical is that *viri scelus* is used not in the sense of *scelus* but of *vir*; note that in the whole passage, *Mil.* 1434–35 *scelus viri* Palaestrio, is me in hanc inlexit fraudem, *Palaestrio* and *is* are in apposition with *scelus* and not with *viri*. We might perhaps rather have expected an inversion of the locution in the opposite sense, not *scelus viri* but *vir sceleris*, only of course this is not idiomatic Latin;

has been explained as referring to the tutelary deity or genius (see Wunsch, *RhM* 69.130–33, accepted by Hofmann 394 and by Ernout and Thomas 36). This might account for *urbem Patavi*, but cannot explain *arbor fici* or *nomen amicitiae*.

³¹ See e.g. Lane 215, Gildersleeve and Lodge 231; they are treated separately by Ernout and Thomas 40.

³² As I have already pointed out, the precise category to which we choose to assign the genitive is not of significance.

we would need *vir scelestus* or *vir magni sceleris*. But this picking out a salient quality and substituting it for the entire person of whom it is actually only a single part is extremely vivid; once more it implies that the man is all crime, is nothing but crime (like the man in Catullus 13.14 who will pray to be 'all nose'). And it is a substitution of precisely this sort, though seemingly a colloquial tournure in its origin, that in the hands of a great poet became great poetry, under the form of the familiar and famous Vergilian hypallage,³³ as in *Georg.* 3.68 *durae inclementia mortis*, *Aen.* 4.88–89 *minae murorum ingentes*, 10.496 *immania pondera baltei*, sometimes with an adjective substituted for the genitive, as in *Georg.* 1.56 *croceos odores*. In some of these passages, we actually can reverse the cases;³⁴ for instance, such an expression as *rapiens immania pondera baltei* (10.496) we may assume represents an original use of partitive apposition, *rapiens balteum, immania pondera*, which with the shift of one member of the appositive pair would literally have become *rapiens balteum immanium ponderum* instead of the more poetical form employed by Vergil.

II. CLEAR INSTANCES OF PARTITIVE APPPOSITION

The syntactic usage known as the appositional genitive, and the particular form here under discussion of the stylistic device known as hypallage, if really outgrowths of partitive apposition, are due to an illogical resolution of the original appositional pair. The appositional genitive, though mainly confined to certain types of words,³⁵ might theoretically have developed from any variety of partitive apposition. On the other hand hypallage as a stylistic device seems confined principally, in this special manifestation of it, to instances of the apposition of a person and a quality of that person. Similarly in many of the constructions that may have stemmed from partitive apposition, it is not so much the case of the appositives,

³³ Hypallage of course occurs in many forms in many poets in many languages. It seems especially common in Sophocles, whose style in many respects resembles Vergil's. A striking English example is Swinburne's "Bind on thy sandals, O thou most fleet,/Over the splendour and speed of thy feet" (*Atalanta in Calydon*); and for the equating of an entity and one of its qualities, much as in partitive apposition, we may compare Poe's "To the glory that was Greece,/And the grandeur that was Rome" (*To Helen*).

³⁴ I have purposely selected here passages in all of which the noun of quality is made coordinate with a second noun, usually concrete, just as *scelus* is in apposition with *Palaestrio* in *Mil.* 1434–35; see my discussion of this feature of Vergilian style in *Coordination* 204–8. Cf. further, on the possible reversal of the cases, note 51 below.

³⁵ Those denoting geographical entities, as in most of the examples cited; those meaning 'word' or 'name,' as *vox, verbum, nomen; genus; causa*.

whole and part, as the meaning of the part, that had an influence on the syntactical use that eventually developed.

A. Combination of Group and Individual

1. Peculiarity of Agreement

One fairly common type of partitive apposition is the combination of a noun denoting a group of persons and a noun — or, with particular frequency, an indefinite pronoun³⁶ — denoting one (or more) of the individuals that make up the group.³⁷ Often the first member is a plural and the second a singular. When such a phrase serves, as words denoting persons frequently do, as subject of a verb, the verb may agree with the singular rather than with the plural. This was undoubtedly commoner at an early date, when partitive apposition was still in frequent use, than later.³⁸

An interesting example is from the very early *SC de Bacch.* (*CIL* I².581.19–20): *Homines plous Voinvorsei virei atque mulieres sacra ne quisquam fecise velet, neve inter ibei virei plous duobus, mulieribus plous tribus arfuisse velent.* Ernout and Thomas (107) cite the variation *velet/velent* as evidence of greater liberty of agreement, representing “un état ancien où les mots de la phrase étaient dans un rapport moins strict de dépendance”; but actually the agreement of *velet* with *quisquam* is perfectly natural, and it is rather the placing of *quisquam* in apposition with *homines* that merits notice.³⁹

Not dissimilar is the use of a singular indefinite in combination with a plural verb, with which it has the same relation as it would

³⁶ Cf. for this type of apposition in Hittite *Tel.* 1.9 *nu DUMU.MEŠ-ŠU ku-is-sa pa-iz-zi* ‘his sons each one goes,’ *Hatt.* 4.54–55 *na-at A-NA AB.BA.ḪIA Ū-UL ku-e-da-ni-ik-ki up-pi-ir* ‘this they had given to my ancestors not to any one (of them)’ i.e. ‘this they had given to none of my ancestors,’ *Kup.* § 27.A.35 *a-pi-e-ma ku-is-ki* ‘they each one’; in Greek *Il.* 7.175 *οἱ δὲ κληῖρον ἐσημύναντο ἕκαστος*, and the examples quoted in note 50.

³⁷ The reverse phenomenon is also met: the combination in apposition of a plural word denoting a number of individuals, and a collective denoting a certain group of the total number of individuals, e.g. *Capit.* 232 *maxuma pars morem hunc homines habent, Mil.* 93–94 *meretrices maiorem partem videas.*

³⁸ There are numerous examples in Hittite: e.g. *Tel.* 1.9, quoted in note 36; *Hatt.* 2.37 *ERĪN.MEŠ-az-ma-mu 1 LŪ-ya GAM-an Ū-UL e-es-ta* ‘troops one man was not with me’ i.e. ‘of troops (or as to troops) there was not a single man with me’; similarly with the relative, *Instr. for Temple Officials* 3.13–14 *ku-i-e-es LŪ.MEŠSANGA nu-za ku-is ŠA KĀ É DINGIR-LIM e-es-du* ‘whoever (are) priests, let one be (the official) of the temple door.’

³⁹ The passage is correctly classed by Hofmann (630) as an example of partitive apposition.

with *nos*, *vos*, or *ei* were these employed as subject of the verb. As examples we may cite *Amph.* 1071 *neque nostrum quisquam sensimus*,⁴⁰ *Men.* 1119 *uter eratis, tun an ille, maior?*,⁴¹ *Ep.* 212 *filios suos quisque visunt*.⁴² Particularly common is the use with the imperative seen in *Ep.* 399 *exite huc aliquis*.⁴³

B. Combination of Individual and Part of His Body

1. Accusatives

Probably the commonest type of partitive apposition is the apposition of nouns denoting respectively a person and part of his body.⁴⁴ Here from the nature of the case, certain constructions are not very likely to occur. The person noun might readily be the subject of a verb, but less readily the body-part noun,⁴⁵ and the body-part noun might readily denote means or specification, but less readily the person noun; hence we shall not find many nominatives or ablatives.⁴⁶ If the genitive occurs,⁴⁷ it would not be easily recognized, for we would probably interpret the person noun as a

⁴⁰ This is a little different from the other instances, because of the presence of the partitive genitive *nostrum*, which in a sense is redundant. Perhaps we have here a contamination of *neque quisquam sensimus* (partitive apposition pure and simple) and *neque nostrum quisquam sensit* (the thoroughly logical form).

⁴¹ Here *tun an ille* adds an additional definition a little like *nostrum* in *Amph.* 1071 (cf. note 40). With its addition, the apposition really ceases to be strictly partitive, and becomes rather what I would call distributive (see note 52).

⁴² For additional examples, see Hofmann, *IF* 42.86.

⁴³ Vergil, *Aen.* 4.625 *exoriare aliquis ultor*, which Ernout and Thomas (108) compare with *Ep.* 399, is not really like it, since here the verb is singular and only one person, not one out of a group, is involved.

⁴⁴ Instances abound in Hittite. I cite just a few. (1) For dative, *Al. A* 4.45 *nu-kán A-NA DUTU-ŠI ŠU-i an-da a-as-su lu-ú-lu a-ú* 'in his Majesty in (his) hand see good fortune' i.e. 'under his Majesty's protection enjoy good fortune.' (2) For accusative, *KUB* 26.69.7.8-9 *nu-wa-za Na-na-ya-an gi-nu-wa e-ip-pu-un* 'I clasped Nanayas (his) knees' i.e. 'I clasped Nanayas's knees.' (3) For ablative, *KUB* 6.45.1.30-31 *na-at-mu-kán UN-az KA +U-az sa-ra-a ú-iz-zi-be* 'these (words) come to me from the man from (his) mouth' i.e. 'these (words) come to me from the man's mouth.'

⁴⁵ The rarity of inanimate entities as subjects has been assumed (plausibly, in my opinion) to be the basic reason for the lack of a special nominative case-form in neuter nouns. See e.g. Meillet and Vendryes 491.

⁴⁶ We do find the ablative in Hittite (cf. note 44), because this language does not syntactically differentiate agent (person) and means (thing). Hofmann (*IF* 42.85) lists a Latin example in which the two ablatives both signify means, denoting respectively a larger part of the body and a smaller part — or parts — of it, *Mil.* 204 *dextera digitis rationem computat*.

⁴⁷ Note that Hofmann (*IF* 42.85) denies the occurrence anywhere of the genitive in partitive apposition; cf. above, note 20. I know no certain instance from Hittite either.

possessive genitive modifying the body-part noun.⁴⁸ Similarly in the dative, the person noun might be construed as a dative of reference denoting the person who possesses the body-part;⁴⁹ but some sure instances do occur, as *Cas.* 337 *quis mihi subveniet tergo aut capiti aut cruribus?*⁵⁰ But above all we may expect accusatives, used in such a way that either the whole alone or the part alone might be object of the verb.⁵¹ Though the construction is not nearly so common in early Latin as in early Greek, we find it in several places in Plautus:⁵² *Men.* 858–59 *hunc senem dedolabo*

⁴⁸ I would suggest as an instance *Amph.* 108 *usuramque eius corporis cepit sibi* and 1135–36 *Alcumenae usuram corporis cepi*. A similar example of the ambiguous type in Greek is *Il.* 22.451 *αἰδοίης ἐκυρῆς ὅπως ἔκλυον*.

⁴⁹ Like *Caesari* in *Bell. Gall.* 1.312 *sese Caesari ad pedes proiecerunt*. The same ambiguity is met in some Hittite instances, e.g. *Ann.* 1.10–14 *nu-us-sa-an A-NA EN SISKUR A-NA GİR.MEŠ-ŠU ŠU.MEŠ-ŠU SĪG ha-ma-an-ki* 'she binds wool upon the sacrificer upon his feet (and) his hands' or 'upon the sacrificer's feet (and) hands'; cf. on this ambiguous type Friedrich, *Vert.* 1.45. *Il.* 11.11–12 might be similarly regarded, but Schwyzler (2.189 note 5) classes it as an instance of partitive apposition; for reasons for agreeing with him, see note 50.

⁵⁰ Cf. *Il.* 11.11–12 *Ἀχαιοῖσιν δὲ μέγα σθένος ἔμβαλ' ἐκάστω καρδίῃ*. The latter is a particularly interesting passage because it constitutes a *double* example of partitive apposition: group and individual in *Ἀχαιοῖσιν* and *ἐκάστω*, individual and body-part in *ἐκάστω* and *καρδίῃ*. It might be suggested that we have here an instance of the ambiguous type commented on in note 49, with *Ἀχαιοῖσιν* a dative of reference; but an argument against this is the exactly parallel example of two-fold partitive apposition with accusatives instead of datives, *Il.* 7.215 = 20.44 *Τρῶας δὲ τρόμος αἰνὸς ὑπήλυθε γυῖα ἕκαστον*. (On these double forms cf. note 16.)

⁵¹ Such accusatives are most common with verbs of striking, wounding, etc. Quite different is the use of the accusative in such an example of partitive apposition as *Aen.* 5.729–30 *lectos iuvenes, fortissima corda, defer in Italiam*; here only the noun of the whole (*iuvenes*) serves as object of the verb, and the noun of the part with its modifier (*fortissima corda*) would logically be replaced by a genitive or ablative of quality. In other words, the accusatives here are used precisely like the vocatives in 2.348–49 *iuvenes, fortissima pectora*. Such examples represent the type of partitive apposition which in Vergil frequently resulted in hypallage, as in, e.g., *Aen.* 11.215–17 *cara sororum pectora maerentem exsecrantur bellum*, as well as the passages referred to in note 34. (On this particular example and others of a similar character, see Hahn, *Coordination* 200–202.)

⁵² The first is the most certain instance (although Fowler in his edition, failing to recognize a normal Plautine construction, calls it an anacoluthon perhaps "intended to represent the wanderings of insanity," and compares *ib.* 853–55, where, however, there may be a lacuna). The second and third examples, regularly cited as instances of partitive apposition, rather exemplify what (as I have already said in note 41 on *Men.* 1119) I prefer to call distributive apposition, in which we find placed in apposition not the whole and one (or several) of its parts but the whole and the sum of all its parts. In the first of these two passages, the addition of *hac* (= *a dextra*) and *ab laeva* in combination with *latus* sums up all — or, rather, both — possibilities of a place where the speaker can stab himself; he is not talking about his *side* as opposed to other parts of his body but about the *right side* or the *left side* of his body taken as a single unit. In the second passage, the phrase *caput atque aetatem*, i.e. 'body and soul,' sums up the

viscera, *Cist.* 641 *utrum hac me feriam an ab laeva latus?*, *Rud.* 1345–46 *ut te Venus eradicet caput atque aetatem tuam*, and (with a clause replacing the second accusative noun) *Rud.* 1008–9 *te exurgebo quidquid umoris tibist.* The tournure reappears in Vergil, as *Aen.* 10.698–99 *Latagum saxo occupat os faciemque adversam*, and 12.270–76 *hasta horum unum transadigit costas*; but here it is probably not an inheritance from the Plautine period but rather a borrowing from Homer,⁵³ e.g. *Il.* 4.501–2 *τόν ῥ' Ὀδυσσεὺς βάλε δουρὶ κόρσῃν.*

a. Accusative of Specification

The Greek usage, of which examples abound,⁵⁴ had wide effects. In the active, the person noun and the body-part noun are alike accusative; in the middle, at least where it is equivalent to a reflexive, logically the person noun is nominative and the body-part noun is accusative, the apposition being with the implied reflexive object; in the passive, logically both person noun and body-part noun should be alike nominative, but probably a misunderstanding of the nature of the accusative in the active and above all in the middle induced the use of the accusative here too,⁵⁵ as in *Il.* 5.284. Eventually the original force of the accusative was lost completely, and with middle and passive verbs, especially with participles, it came to denote, or at least — what was about the same thing — to seem to denote, specification;⁵⁶ with this sense it spread from transitive verbs to intransitive ones, as in *Il.* 3.210, and from participles

whole man as in *Rud.* 375 *vae capiti atque aetati tuae* (cf. the example quoted by Blümel, *IF* 34.294, from Freytag's *Soll und Haben*: "Er hat furchtbar gelitten, seine Seele wie sein Körper"). Less logical is *Rud.* 486 *Neptunus credat sese atque aetatem suam*; this involves the coordination of whole and part, and so is closer to partitive apposition.— Another detail removing *Rud.* 1345–46 as well as the parallels just cited for it from partitive apposition in its primitive form is the presence with the appositive of the possessive adjective; *tuam* repeats *te*, and hence, were *te* to be replaced by the "partitive" or possessive genitive, would be redundant (see the comment, in note 40, on the use of the genitive *nostrum*). Cf. the possessives in *Trin.* 313 (again with a form of *aetas*), *Capt.* 371, and ib. 520 (pointed out in notes 71, 70, and 75 respectively).

⁵³ Cf. note 64.

⁵⁴ E.g. *Il.* 5.55–56 and 79–80, 7.14–16, 11.240 and 248–50, 20.401–2; cf. Schwyzler 2.81. Words denoting the mind or soul (often termed the "heart") are of course susceptible to precisely the same constructions as are those denoting physical parts of the body, e. g. *Il.* 1.362, 3.438, 6.355, 23.46–47, *Od.* 14.178. So too ΖΙ 'heart' or 'soul' in Hittite.

⁵⁵ Another influence at work may have been the ambiguous form of the neuter, as in *Il.* 3.31, 9.9, *Od.* 10.247.

⁵⁶ The view that the accusative of specification stems from partitive apposition goes back to Brugmann, *IF* 27.121–51. It has been accepted by some scholars (e.g.

to adjectives, as in 1.58 and 3.227;⁵⁷ and the development of the so-called "Greek accusative"⁵⁸ was complete.

The usage is certainly not a natural normal construction in Latin.⁵⁹ Only two possible examples of it are cited from early Latin,⁶⁰ Ennius, *Ann.* 400 *succincti corda machaeris* and Cato, *Orig.* 1.18 *togae parte caput velati*. The example from Ennius may itself be a Grecism, but the one from Cato is hard to explain.⁶¹ Perhaps both are to be viewed as remnants of the time when the past participle, in origin simply an adjective in *-to-*, was still voiceless.⁶² Possibly the use of the accusative with the participles *succincti* and *velati* is due to some sort of confusion with the accusative met with *indutus*, a participle of similar meaning (as in *Men.* 511–12 and 514–15 *indutum pallam*), even though this accusative denotes not a part of the body but an article of apparel or other equipment.⁶³

Schwyzler 2.84), rejected by others (e.g. Monro 135). Brugmann's most vigorous antagonist was Blümel, who published four articles in *IF* (33.1–85, 34.285–95, 44.249–63, 53.104–8) in opposition to Brugmann's thesis and in defense of his own, that the accusative of specification comes from a local accusative. Sommer (ib. 46.27–43) shares this view, but in other respects he and Blümel are in violent opposition. Still other explanations have been offered by Kieckers, *IF* 30.361–66, Havers, *Glotta* 13.171–89, and Biese, *Arctos* 2.89–114; a view similar to Biese's, which appeared in 1931, had been expressed by Hirt, *IG* 4.39 (1928), and was reiterated by him later, *IG* 7.22–23 (1937), but neither one seems aware of the work of the other. I myself had independently reached the same view as Brugmann, but my line of argument is not quite the same as his; I have sketched it rapidly here, and hope to elaborate on it elsewhere, since a detailed consideration of a problem of Greek syntax would take us too far afield in an article dealing primarily with Latin.

⁵⁷ It was not strictly limited to parts of the body, but also included kindred entities closely connected with the individual, such as his size (as in *Od.* 11.312), his name (as in Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.2.23), or his race (as in *Od.* 15.267).

⁵⁸ Some recognize two varieties of the *accusativus Graecus*, the "object of the middle voice" and the "accusative of specification" (of course the accusative with an adjective can be fitted only into the second category); but I see little point in separating them.

⁵⁹ In the extended study of the Greek accusative of specification that, as I have just said (note 56), I hope to publish elsewhere, I plan to include a detailed treatment of the construction in Latin also.

⁶⁰ Landgraf, *ALL* 10.218. He lists two others as well, *Pseud.* 785 *qui manus gravior siet* (209) and Ennius, *Ann.* 311 *perculsi pectora Poeni* (215); but the former he himself later retracted (ib. 376) in the light of a superior interpretation, and the latter is probably spurious (cf. Hofmann 379, Warmington 1.448).

⁶¹ It might be suggested that these really are examples of the accusative of specification, and that in Latin as in Greek this is to be traced back to the double accusative in partitive apposition; but there are not enough instances of either usage in early Latin to warrant any such theory.

⁶² Note the active use at all periods of *cenatus* and *iuratus*. Cf. too the occasional active use of the gerundive in early Latin, mentioned in note 121.

⁶³ This accusative too is often called a Greek accusative, but wrongly so, I am sure. Its occurrence in Umbrian (*Tab. Ig.* VI.B.49) proves that the usage is Italic and there-

At all events, whatever explanation we decide to give for these two early passages, the Greek accusative as it finally appeared in the Roman poets of the Golden Age, occasionally in Catullus and Lucretius and frequently in Vergil and Ovid, was rightly named, for it was surely not an inheritance from early Latin but an imitation of Greek.⁶⁴ None the less, the usage may be described as a vestige in Latin of the original use of the double accusative in partitive apposition, even though acquired in a roundabout way.

2. Datives

It has already been said that instances of partitive apposition of person and body-part are met in the dative as well as in the accusative; and one such, *Cas.* 337, has been cited. A much less positive instance is *Curc.* 486 *linguae moderandum est mihi*; here there is a very strong chance that the substantive denoting the person is a dative of reference (the special type badly termed dative of agent), and the word order favors this, since in partitive apposition the whole generally, and naturally, precedes the part.⁶⁵ From corporal parts of the human being to his *animus* is only a step,⁶⁶ especially as the *animus* too is sometimes used in a strictly physical sense, *animo*⁶⁷ *malest* with a dative being a stereotyped phrase meaning that so-and-so is sick. Here again the dative denoting the possessor may well be a dative of reference; note that, though the dative denoting the person precedes *animo* in *Amph.* 1057–58 *vae miserae mihi animo malest*, it follows it in *Mil.* 1331–32 *animo male factum est huic miserae*;⁶⁸ so too in *Pseud.* 952–53 *animo malest aedibus*, but there the order may be determined on other grounds, since the joke involved in applying to a house an expression usually confined to human beings is enhanced by saving the word for ‘house’ till the

fore certainly not a borrowing from Greek. Moreover, the accusative is a direct object of the verb (which may be active or, as in the Umbrian passage, deponent), and not an accusative of specification.

⁶⁴ We have already noted that the same is true of Vergil’s use of the double accusative construction (part and whole).

⁶⁵ This matter of word order has already been pointed out (note 10).

⁶⁶ Cf. note 54.

⁶⁷ Of course there is also the possibility in regard to *animo* (as well as in regard to some of the other words here treated as datives) that it is rather an ablative, but this seems to me unlikely, and I note that Lodge classes it without question as a dative in all the occurrences that I have cited.

⁶⁸ On the possible significance of word order, see note 10.

end — 'an attack of sickness has seized — the house.'⁶⁹ The same question arises in regard to *animo* with purely incorporeal connotations in *Stich.* 524 si tibi nullast aegritudo animo obviam, and to *ingenio* in *Capt.* 371 tute tibi tuopte ingenio prodes plurimum.⁷⁰

C. Combination of Individual and Quality or Action

Trin. 313 istaec ego mi semper habui aetati integumentum meae is similar to the foregoing if *aetati* here has the meaning of 'personality,' 'being,' almost 'soul,' that it often has in Plautus;⁷¹ if, as seems probable, it has rather the more literal meaning of 'youth,' we have passed from parts of the body (including extensions into the region of mind or soul) to another category, that of the purely abstract noun. Here again nominatives are unlikely and genitives would be ambiguous and therefore unrecognizable; accusatives do not seem to occur, but there are several instances of datives and most of these seem certain examples of partitive apposition, since a dative of reference to designate the person involved would be less likely with an abstract noun than with a part of the body.⁷² In some cases the abstract noun denotes a quality, as perhaps in *Trin.* 313 (just cited),⁷³ and certainly in *Bacch.* 1083 nolo desidiaei dare ludum; in others, an action, or, rather, the result of action, as in *Rud.* 426 tibi operam ludo et deliciae dabo,⁷⁴ *Capt.* 520 nec mendaciis mihi mantellum est meis,⁷⁵ and *Bacch.* 439 magistro desinebat esse dicto oboediens.⁷⁶

⁶⁹ Note that in the preceding sentence, the ambiguous *aedes hiscunt* (952) 'the house is gaping,' which paves the way for the statement that the house is sick (cf. the climax *evomunt* in 953), the subject *aedes* has its normal position at the beginning.

⁷⁰ On the possessive *tuo*, cf. note 52.

⁷¹ Cf. the passages cited in note 52. As in them, here too *aetati* has an accompanying possessive.

⁷² Cf. note 49. However, there is some doubt about one of the passages to be cited, *Rud.* 426; see notes 74 and 77.

⁷³ Unless we choose to call it a period of time: *aetas*, like *youth* in English, is a term with many connotations.

⁷⁴ This example however is susceptible of a different interpretation. See below, note 77.

⁷⁵ On the use of the possessive, cf. note 52. The word order here, with the noun denoting the "whole" interpolated between the noun denoting the "part" and its modifier, may seem to be contrary to what we should expect in an appositional expression. However, cf. Vergil, *Ecl.* 3.3 infelix o semper, oves, pecus; *Georg.* 4.168 ignavum fucos pecus, ib. 246 dirum tiniae genus. (To be sure, these Vergilian passages are not perfect parallels, since it is by no means necessary to regard them as examples of *partitive* apposition; indeed, were *oves*, *fucos*, and *tiniae* replaced by genitives, as they well might be, we would probably class them as appositional rather than partitive.) The reverse order is met in *Ecl.* 2.3 densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos and 9.9 veteres, iam fracta cacumina, fagos, where the words denoting the part are encased between those denoting

All of these are included by Hofmann (*IF* 42.84) in his list of datives in partitive apposition.

III. REMOTE MANIFESTATIONS OF PARTITIVE APPPOSITION

A. Combination of Concrete Noun and Action Noun Denoting Purpose

1. Double Dative

In contradistinction to the group of pairs of datives just taken up, in all of which the two nouns either were clearly in apposition with each other, or at least (in the case of *Rud.* 426) might be so interpreted, we meet much more often pairs of datives in which the two nouns set side by side seem to us to have only the most remote connection, so that at first thought we might be inclined to deny that they can in any way exemplify apposition. None the less, they have some inherent connection.⁷⁷ One of them is regularly a concrete noun denoting a person;⁷⁸ and the other is regularly an

the whole. Cf. the passage with the partitive genitive, *Aen.* 3.274 *Leucatae nimbose cacumina montis*.

⁷⁶ This last seems a particularly common form of expression. To the example cited by Hofmann may be added *Pers.* 378 *futura es dicto oboediens patri?*, 836 *te mihi dicto audientem esse addeceat*, *Amph.* 989 *ego sum Iovi dicto audiens*. However, contrast the last passage with the one following it almost directly, 991 *eius dicto, imperio sum audiens*, in which the partitive apposition is replaced by the genitive construction (cf. note 3). Here the use of the genitive *eius* rather than the dative *ei* may be partially due to a tendency to avoid *three* datives in a row; or it may be a means of obtaining emphasis, since the non-appositional use perhaps gives the pronoun more of a standing, so to speak, in its own right as a parallel for the preceding nominative and accusative (note the preceding clauses, *pater vocat me*, *eum sequor*), whereas in the earlier line, 989, the use of Jupiter's name (*Iovi*), here employed for the first time in this particular speech, is sufficiently impressive no matter what its case or construction.

⁷⁷ This is proved by the fact that two datives of the sort — one a dative of reference and the other a dative of purpose — are joined by *et* in *Trin.* 181 *neque hasce emi mihi nec usurae meae*. If they are sufficiently parallel to be coordinated in this way, they are sufficiently parallel to be viewed, when without *et*, as in apposition. — The connection is also proved by the difficulty in classifying *Rud.* 426 (commented on in note 74). The passage belongs here if we view it as exemplifying the double dative; Bennett (2.172) so classes it. On the other hand Hofmann (*IF* 42.84–85) lists it as an example of partitive apposition; Sonnenschein in his edition of the *Rud.* (ad loc.) says it might be either. If we have the simple type of partitive apposition, the meaning is 'I shall pay attention to you, (your) sport and pleasure'; if we have the "double dative," 'I shall pay attention to you for the purpose of (your) sport and pleasure.' This shows clearly how close to each other the two types really come, the first being a much more obvious descendant than the second of what must have been their common ancestor.

⁷⁸ Occasionally we meet a noun designating some other type of living creature, as in *Truc.* 646 *ut bubus glandem prandio depromerem*.

abstract noun,⁷⁹ in some way connected with the person either as (a) affecting him or (b) manifested by him. The abstract noun may represent a quality or an action;⁸⁰ at times it is hard to decide between the two.⁸¹ If the abstract noun represents a quality, the concrete noun corresponds to it as does a possessive genitive to the word modified; if, as is much commoner, the abstract noun represents an action or at least contains some notion of action, the concrete noun corresponds to it as does either (a) a subjective or possessive genitive or (b) an objective genitive⁸² to the word modified, or as does either (a) a subject or (b) an object⁸³ to the verb.

Some of the nouns of action are actual parts of the verbal system, gerunds or supines; to these I shall revert later. I shall say here merely that, as we shall see, they occur in a number of different cases; hence we must not by any means think that the type of collocation that I am now considering was originally limited to the dative. However, in the demonstrable indubitable examples of the construction actually met in Latin, the abstract noun always denotes a purpose in its relation to the concrete noun; and, as purpose is represented by the dative, we find this type of pairing confined in Latin to the dative, in the particular construction regularly designated the "double dative."

⁷⁹ Occasionally we meet a noun that might be called concrete, as *prandio* in *Truc.* 646 (quoted in note 78) and *iaientaculo* in *Curc.* 73 *te antepones Veneri iaientaculo?*; yet those in the passages cited are really close to nouns of action, since they mean simply 'for eating' rather than 'for a lunch' or 'for a breakfast.' It should be noted that of all the datives of purpose specified by Bennett (2.171) as denoting a concrete object, these are the only ones that are used in combination with the dative of reference (respectively *bubus* and *Veneri*). It is surely significant that we never meet in this construction two dative nouns denoting utterly disparate concrete objects; such nouns could hardly be in the relationship of apposition, even partitive.

⁸⁰ Such verbal nouns usually denote action in process rather than the result of action (as do *dicto* and *mendaciis* in the examples cited just above). But the distinction is a tenuous one; cf. note 82 for a possible example here too of result of action.

⁸¹ E.g. in *Amph.* 492-93 *nemo id probro ducet Alcumenae*, *probro* may be interpreted either as 'lewdness' (quality), or as 'shameful deed' (action) or 'shame, disgrace' (result of action, state). Cf. further note 82.

⁸² Once more this may be a matter merely of interpretation; thus in *Amph.* 492-93 (cited in note 81), *Alcumenae* corresponds to a subjective genitive if *probro* means 'shameful deed' (action), to a subjective or possessive genitive if it means 'lewdness' (quality), to an objective genitive if it means 'disgrace' (result of action).

⁸³ Here it is easier to decide, because there is actually a formal test: if we replace the noun of action by the verb to which it corresponds, the concrete noun will become (a) nominative or (b) accusative (or possibly dative or ablative, if the verb is not transitive; cf. notes 89 and 94). This distinction has an important bearing on certain further syntactical features of Latin; I shall have more to say of it later on.

This usage is definitely restricted. It is mainly confined (1) to verbs of being, as in *Men.* 761 *haec res mihi curaest*; and (2) to verbs with the general notion of giving, assigning, or deeming. These verbs may be either (a) active, as in *Mil.* 1350 *ne quis tibi hoc vitio vortat*, and *Amph.* 492–93 *nemo id probro ducet Alcumenae*; or (b) passive, as in *Amph.* 534 *pateram, quae dono mi data est*, and *And.* 331 *postulare id gratiae adponi sibi*. With the copula, as in (1), and with transitive verbs used passively, as in (2b), the dative is closely related to the subject; with transitive verbs used actively, as in (2a), to the object. Indeed, it can interchange with a predicate noun⁸⁴ in the nominative⁸⁵ or accusative: in the former case we may find the dative and the nominative used side by side, as in *Poen.* 145 *si tibi lubido est aut voluptati* and *Truc.* 466 *id illi morbo, id illi senio, ea illi miserae miseriast*, or the nominative and dative used almost interchangeably, as in *Ep.* 33 *erit illi illa res honori* vs. *Trin.* 697 *is est honos homini pudico*; in the latter case, the dative similarly may be replaced by an accusative, as in *Capt.* 432–33 *cogitato meam esse vitam hic pro te positam pignori* vs. 938–39 *servom, quem hic reliqueram pignus pro me*. None the less, there seems to be a strong tendency to keep the dative of purpose alongside of the dative of reference rather than to change it to a different case — which perhaps points to a sort of lingering on of the much closer connection that must have originally existed between the two datives.⁸⁶

It has already been said (three paragraphs back) of double datives that when the concrete noun is accompanied by a verbal noun, the former is related to the latter as either the subject or the object is to the corresponding verb. This flexibility is due to the

⁸⁴ In the case of one particular dative, *frugi*, its use as a dative (not necessarily combined with a second dative) equivalent to a predicate nominative, as in *As.* 498 *frugi tamen sum*, or to a predicate accusative, as in *Cas.* 562 *(eum) quom aspicias tristem, frugi censeas*, has led to its development into an indeclinable adjective, probably at first in combination with a predicate noun, as in *Ep.* 693 *frugi es tu homo*, but later functioning in any case, as in *Trin.* 1018 *cum frugi hominibus*. — Incidentally, a similar development was followed by the Latin infinitive. At first a dative or locative (the two were probably originally sandhi variations of a single case, which we may call the dative) expressing purpose, it became an indeclinable noun used in any case, preferably the nominative or accusative. Cf. note 141.

⁸⁵ The interchange of the dative of purpose and the predicate nominative is pointed out by Lindsay 19 and Bennett 2.177; cf. the present writer, *TAPA* 74.289 note 94.

⁸⁶ That such a connection existed is also indicated by the following sampling: of the 178 passages from early Latin quoted by Bennett (2.171–77) containing examples of the dative of purpose, 88, or only one less than half, also contain a dative of reference.

fact that the verbal noun, unlike the finite forms of the verb, is voiceless;⁸⁷ hence its agent and recipient were not formally distinguished any more than a subjective and an objective genitive.⁸⁸ When the verb to which the verbal noun corresponds is intransitive, obviously the only relationship that the concrete noun can bear to it is that of subject; and if it were replaced by a genitive, the genitive would be of the subjective type. This I shall call Type I. When the verb to which the verbal noun corresponds is transitive,⁸⁹ the concrete noun usually represents the recipient of the action, i.e. bears to the verbal noun the relationship of object; and if it were replaced by a genitive, the genitive would be of the objective type.⁹⁰ In such a case the agent of the action, i.e. the noun related to the verbal noun in the manner of the subject, is the substantive to which the verbal noun is in quasi-predicative relation,⁹¹ namely, either (a) the subject of the main verb (if the latter is a copula or a passive) or (b) the object of the main verb (if the latter is an active transitive). This I shall call Type II. Contrast: Type I, *Most.* 1086–87 *servos pollicitust dare suos mihi quaestioni* (the dative *mihi* represents the agent, and there is no recipient;⁹² finite form, *ego quaero*⁹³): Type II, *Most.* 922 *ne quid captioni mihi sit* (*quid* represents the agent, and the dative *mihi* the recipient; finite form, *aliquid me capit*). But with verbal nouns corresponding to transi-

⁸⁷ Even the Latin infinitives must have been voiceless originally, though the *-e* forms were eventually specialized as actives and the *-i* forms as passives (I have already discussed this, with examples, in *TAPA* 74.300–302). In Greek and Latin, to be sure, the infinitives had acquired special forms denoting voice; this may be connected with the fact that in precisely these languages the infinitive has become a substitute for finite forms (in indirect discourse). Cf. below, 121–22.

⁸⁸ Cf. notes 6 and 82.

⁸⁹ Or at least is accompanied by some case — accusative, dative, or even ablative — denoting in some way the recipient of the action (cf. notes 83 and 94). With verbal nouns and adjectives the distinction is not so sharp as with finite verbs; on this see *TAPA* 74.292–93 and notes 112 and 113.

⁹⁰ This is clearly shown by a comparison of *As.* 867 *corruptelae est liberis* and *Ad.* 792–93 *adest corruptela nostrum liberum*. The dative of reference *liberis* has the same relation to the dative of purpose *corruptelae* in the first, as the objective genitive *liberum* has to the predicate nominative *corruptela* in the second (cf. note 3).

⁹¹ By this I mean that, as already noted, it might be replaced by (a) a predicate nominative, or (b) a predicate accusative.

⁹² It must be remembered that the verb *quaero* to which *quaestio* corresponds is in this sense intransitive.

⁹³ In the interest of uniformity, I am presenting all finite forms posited in the present indicative, and in both the actual forms and the posited ones am (contrary to Latin idiom) supplying personal pronouns as subjects where there is no noun to serve in this capacity.

tive verbs there are exceptions: sometimes here as with those corresponding to intransitive verbs the concrete noun represents the agent, i.e. it bears to the verbal noun the relationship of subject, and in that event the subject or the object of the main verb is the recipient of the action. This type, though it may be viewed as a variation of Type I, I shall none the less call Type III. Contrast: Type I, *Poen.* 1217 *gaudio ero vobis* 'I shall be a source of joy to you' (the dative *vobis* represents the agent, and there is no recipient; finite form, *vos gaudetis*); Type II, *Amph.* 1131 *adsum auxilio tibi* 'I am here as a source of help to you' (*ego* represents the agent, and the dative *tibi* represents the recipient; finite form, *ego te iuvo*⁹⁴); Type III, *Trin.* 632 *ut odio esses mihi* 'that you might be a source of hatred to me' (the dative *mihi*, as in Type I, represents the agent, and *tu* represents the recipient; finite form, *ego te odi*).

I have dwelt on this distinction because we shall find it of importance in our treatment of verbal nouns in the following section.⁹⁵

B. Combination of Concrete Noun and Action Noun Belonging to Verb System

We now come to what must be one of the most deeply-buried strata in the pre-history of what I am calling partitive apposition: the combination of a concrete noun and of a noun of action that has become an integral part of the verb system.⁹⁶ The collocation usually belongs to the category that I have just designated Type II, that is, the concrete noun is in the relation of object to the verbal noun; hence the locution is normally possible only with transitive verbs. However, a few instances of Type I or III also occur, which we shall note as we meet them.⁹⁷

In Hittite the occurrence of this idiom has not been generally recognized, but it assuredly exists. Hittite possesses verbal nouns in the genitive⁹⁸ and in the dative case,⁹⁹ and we find them combined

⁹⁴ For convenience, I am selecting a common transitive verb; the etymologically corresponding verb, *auxilior*, would demand *ego tibi auxilior* (cf. notes 83 and 89).

⁹⁵ Cf. note 83, end.

⁹⁶ Such nouns are variously known as infinitives, supines, and gerunds. There is not much logic or consistency in the system of nomenclature. Particularly in Hittite, scholars are regrettably at variance with one another; cf. note 99.

⁹⁷ They are mainly provided by the Latin supine. I shall come to this shortly.

⁹⁸ These end in *-nnas* or in *-was/-mas*, and come from neuter action nouns (*-r/n-*stems) with nominative-accusative in *-tar* or in *-war/-mar*, respectively. The *-tar-nnas* type is etymologically connected with the Latin gerund (see Sturtevant, *HG* 73).

⁹⁹ There are two types of these. The first (universally called infinitives) ends in *-nna* or *-nni*, and is the dative corresponding to the type with nominative in *-tar* and

with concrete nouns in the same case, genitive and dative respectively, as follows: genitive, *KUB* 2.1.2.28 *ZI-as ar-nu-um-ma-as* ^P*KAL-ri* 'to the tutelary deity of the wish, of fulfilling (it)' i.e. 'to the tutelary deity of wish-fulfilment';¹⁰⁰ dative, *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 for the troops, for gathering (them)' i.e. 'to gather the troops.' There is also a verbal noun in *-wan* which in my opinion might conceivably be an accusative;¹⁰¹ it is frequently accompanied by an accusative, as in *Madd.* 1.74 *nam-ma-as-si ar-kam-ma-an pí-d-a-an-ni-wa-an da-a-ir* 'and they began to pay him tribute,' and I think this accusative when present may belong with the supine rather than with the main verb, since the latter does not vary in any way that would indicate a difference between transitive and intransitive force.¹⁰² But the whole question is extremely doubtful and difficult.¹⁰³

In Vedic Sanskrit¹⁰⁴ there are a great many verbal nouns, usually called infinitives, which include root-nouns in the genitive, dative, accusative, ablative (= genitive), and locative;¹⁰⁵ verbal nouns in *-tu-* (cognate with the Latin supine) in the genitive, dative,

genitive in *-nnas* (see note 98). The second type (called infinitives by Sturtevant but supines by others) ends in *-wanzi/-manzi*, and seems to be some sort of extension of the type with nominative in *-war/-mar* and genitive in *-was/-mas* (again see note 98). The two types, though differing in formation, are absolutely parallel in use.

¹⁰⁰ Parallel to this we find (ib. 2.26) *ŠU-an ap-pa-an-na-as* ^P*KAL-ri* 'to the tutelary god of taking a hand' i.e. 'of shaking hands,' with the verbal noun again in the genitive, and the concrete noun as its object in the accusative. This is of course the construction that ultimately replaced the appositional one in most languages, but it is surprising to find a direct object of a verbal noun in Hittite (cf. *TAPA* 74.272 and note 20; also see below, note 107).

¹⁰¹ This form (universally called a supine) is regularly explained as a suffixless dative or locative, but it seems to me that it might also be explained as a neuter accusative corresponding to the datives in *-wanzi* (see note 99).

¹⁰² There is considerable discussion as to what verb we ought to recognize in the auxiliary accompanying the supine, the possibilities being *dai-* 'place' (transitive), perhaps *da-* 'take' (also transitive), and *tiya-* 'take a stand' (usually intransitive). But certainly the question whether an accusative noun is also present has no bearing on the choice of the auxiliary.

¹⁰³ Probably an argument against my suggestion is that the most cogent reason for combining the accusative with the supine and not with the main verb would be a belief that the latter is intransitive (*tiya-*), but in that case the supine would certainly have to be viewed not as object of the main verb but as an expression of purpose, which in Hittite demands the dative (I know of no Hittite parallel for the Latin use of the accusative of purpose as in *nuptum do, venum eo*, etc.), and then we no longer have a combination of two accusatives in the concrete noun and the supine.

¹⁰⁴ I treat the Vedic usage in greater detail in *Language* 29.246-51.

¹⁰⁵ For convenience, I give the cases in the Latin rather than the Sanskrit order.

accusative, and ablative (= genitive); and sporadic datives and perhaps a few locatives of other types of formation. Of these, only the *-tu-* verbal noun persisted into the later language, mainly in the accusative, with a few very rare instances of datives; but in the earlier language the datives by far predominate, as might be expected.

Numerous examples are met in Vedic of the collocation of a concrete noun and a verbal noun in the same case: most of these collocations, naturally, consist of datives, but genitives and ablatives also occur.¹⁰⁶ Scholars commenting on the construction treat it as something anomalous, in which a noun which ought (!) to be in the accusative is attracted or assimilated into the case of the infinitive so as to agree with it; actually, it is the noun that is the main member, standing in the case in which it logically belongs, and the infinitive agrees with the noun as representing an action which the noun receives or, much less often, performs. Nearly all the instances belong to Type II, as *RV* 10.14.12 *asmabhyam drśaye sūryāya punar dātām asum* 'let them give us life again for the sun, for seeing (it)' i.e. 'for seeing the sun'; but in contrast to this is the following example of Type III, *RV* 1.24.8 *cakāra sūryāya panthām anvetavā u* 'he made a path for the sun for following' i.e. 'for the sun to follow.'

As has already been said, the one type of infinitive common in classical Sanskrit is the accusative of the verbal noun in *-tu-*. This very frequently is combined with an accusative noun which is considered its object, and which indeed in some cases, e.g. in its common use with the auxiliary meaning 'can,' presumably can be nothing but its object. However, I venture to suggest that the noun was not originally the object of the infinitive but was the noun with which the infinitive agreed, in the usual sort of Type II collocation. It should be noted that many of the verbs frequently met with the infinitive construction (e.g. those denoting motion and those denoting desire) are verbs which govern a noun in the accusative. Thus the example from the *Atharva-Veda* quoted by Whitney (352), *pāśān vicṛtaṁ vettha sarvān*, and translated by him 'thou

¹⁰⁶ Delbrück in the *Grundriss* (4.470-71) recognizes only datives, although he includes ablatives in his discussion of "Attraction" in *Altind. Synt.* (88-90). Whitney deals with datives in the greatest detail (352), but notes that there are a few instances of ablatives (353). Brugmann, whose treatment seems to me the best, after discussing the construction in general, cites examples of datives, genitives, and ablatives (*Grund.* 2.3.917-19).

knowest how to loosen all bonds,' may have originally had a sense which might be rendered 'thou knowest all bonds, (their) loosening, or 'thou knowest all bonds, how to loosen (them).'¹⁰⁷ Hence we have a reason why in Sanskrit accusative infinitives take direct objects more commonly than infinitives in other cases.

The situation in Vedic is by no means isolated. Brugmann (*Grund.* 2.3.918–19) cites parallels from Avestan¹⁰⁸ for all his instances of "Antizipation" in Sanskrit, datives, genitives, and ablatives. He also finds the construction in Greek,¹⁰⁹ in dative, genitive, and ablative, including the ablative with prepositions (ib. 920–21); and in Lithuanian, in dative¹¹⁰ and genitive (921–22).

1. Gerund : Gerundive

Now we come to Latin. Here the gerund¹¹¹ furnishes a perfect parallel for the Vedic infinitive. We have gerunds in the genitive, dative, accusative, and ablative.¹¹² Indubitable examples of our construction can be cited only in the genitive, but there are plenty

¹⁰⁷ I have said elsewhere (*TAPA* 74.272) that the Hittite verbal noun very rarely takes an object because it is still much more a noun than a verb. But here perhaps we have a still more fundamental reason: the Hittite verbal noun as part of a verb system is usually a genitive or a dative, and therefore the noun accompanying it is more likely to be a genitive or a dative than an accusative (for an exception, see note 100). I have suggested above the bare possibility that the Hittite supine in *-wan* may be an accusative and may have an accompanying accusative of the type that became an object, but have given reasons against this view in note 103.

¹⁰⁸ Delbrück (*Grund.* 4.470) is dubious about Avestan.

¹⁰⁹ These instances I find both interesting and convincing, but of course they are not so obvious as those from other languages, since Greek infinitives, unless accompanied by the article (which those in Brugmann's examples are not), do not vary for case.

¹¹⁰ Two of these are also given by Delbrück, *Grund.* 4.471.

¹¹¹ Not the gerundive, as is thought by Benfey (1.432), by Brugmann (*Grund.* 2.3.918 and 922), and, despite his earlier objection (*KZ* 10.104), by Delbrück (*Grund.* 4.471). On their surprising error in making this comparison, see *Language* 29.247–48.

¹¹² It is usually said that the nominative is lacking, and that the accusative is confined to prepositional phrases. But these statements are wrong: the forms did exist, though they subsequently disappeared (on this see note 141). In Lucretius 1.111 *poenas timendumst*, *timendum* is certainly a gerund (for numerous parallels, both from Lucretius and from other authors, see Munro or Merrill ad loc.); and if we can say *poenas timendumst*, with nominative gerund, we can also say *Lucretius scripsit poenas timendum esse*, with accusative gerund. (I give a detailed discussion of the nominative-accusative gerund in *TAPA* 74.286–94.) However, these two uses of the gerund do not concern us here, for they would not be involved in the construction under consideration,

of these,¹¹³ and the use not only survived into the classical period but continued to be normal there under certain conditions.¹¹⁴

Plautus, *Capt.* 1008 lucis tuendi copiam.

Ennius, *Scen.* 248 navis inchoandi exordium.

Plautus, *Truc.* 370 tui videndi copia (of a woman).

Terence, *Hec.* 372 eius videndi cupidus (of a woman).

Plautus, *Capt.* 852 nominandi istorum copia.

Terence, *Heaut.* 29 novarum spectandi copiam.

Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* 7.43.2 sui purgandi gratia (of men).

Lucretius 5.1225 poenarum solvendi tempus.

Cicero, *Inv.* 2.2.5 exemplorum eligendi potestas.

For the accusative,¹¹⁵ the evidence is less good than for the genitive, but still some exists. I cite the following.

Plautus, *Cist.* 647–48 hanc certum est non amittere; nam ad me adglutinandum (??) totam decretum est dare.

Plautus, *Poen.* 599 ad hanc rem agundum (?) Philippum est.

Varro, *RR* 1.23.6 alia ad serendum.

Varro, *LL* 9.42 ad discernendum figuras.

Plancus apud Cicero, *Fam.* 10.23.3 ad colligendum se (of men).

The trouble here is that there are only two examples from early Latin, and both of these are doubtful;¹¹⁶ but the second of them seems to me reasonably acceptable. There is no question of the occurrence of the usage in Varro; Hofmann (596) says it began with him; yet we know that it was Varro's tendency to preserve old

¹¹³ For still other examples, see Roby 2.lxxviii, Hofmann 597, Wagner on *Heaut.* 29, Munro on Lucretius 5.1225.

¹¹⁴ Concerning these and the probable reason for them, see *TAPA* 74.283 and note 69.

¹¹⁵ I am of course assuming here as in the case of the accusative infinitive in Sanskrit that the combination of two accusatives represented originally two nouns in apposition, though it had come to be interpreted as a verb form and its object.

¹¹⁶ They are regularly corrected by the editors to the gerundive (*adglutinandam* and *agundam* respectively); but in both cases I would urge that the gerund of the codices be accepted as the *lectio difficilior* were it not for the fact that we can readily see how it might have got in there by a mistake of the copyists. In *Cist.* 648 (in which a man is speaking) it would be very natural in rapid reading or writing to join the *-nd-* form with the preceding *ad me* rather than with *hanc* of the preceding line; and in *Poen.* 599 we actually find *agundum est Philippum est*, suggesting that the copyist's eye somehow ran ahead of his hand and he anticipated the following words. Still, the scribe's error may well have been the insertion of *est* after the *-um* of *agundum* because of the *est* after the *-um* of *Philippum*, rather than the change of the *-am* of *agundam* to *-um est* because of the later occurrence of *-um est* in *Philippum est*; and I am inclined to accept the gerund construction here even if not in *Cist.* 648. For another possible example of the gerund with an accusative noun from early Latin, see note 118.

usages already in existence¹¹⁷ rather than to introduce new ones, and, in view of the fact that the whole movement in the course of time was away from the gerund with object and toward the gerundive, I see no reason to believe that Varro reversed the direction and introduced an innovation in the shape of an accusative with the gerund that had not been used before his day.

On the basis of all these instances, incontestable at least in the case of the genitive, it is surely possible to class with them passages that are ambiguous in form, such as the following.

Genitive.

Plautus, *Amph.* 638 viri potestas videndi.

Plautus, *Capt.* 748 eius conveniundi copiam (of a man).

Dative.

Plautus, *As.* 250 argento comparando fingere fallaciam.

Plautus, *Rud.* 757 optimum operi faciundo.

Accusative.

Plautus, *Bacch.* 338 diviti homini id aurum servandum dedit.

Terence, *Phorm.* 364–65 agrum colendum habebat.

Pacuvius 51 ad stirpem exquirendum.¹¹⁸

Ablative.

Plautus, *As.* 873 opere faciendo lassus.

Terence, *Heaut.* 142–43 opere faciundo sumptum exsercirent.

Terence, *Heaut.* 73 in opere faciundo.

In this second set of examples, however, the concrete noun and the verbal noun look as if they agreed in number and gender as well as in case; and so it is also possible to interpret the latter as a verbal adjective modifying the former, instead of as a verbal noun in apposition with it.¹¹⁹ Since all examples of the gerund belong to Type II,¹²⁰ with the concrete noun as recipient of the action, the

¹¹⁷ Cf. his common employment of the construction exemplified in Lucretius' *poenas timendumst* (dealt with in note 112). The use of the accusative with a gerund is, as Hofmann himself says (ib.), in general either archaic or post-classical; these often amount to the same thing, since many early uses that were dormant in the literary language of the classical period, though perhaps still alive in folk speech, revived at a later period.

¹¹⁸ This is an ambiguous instance if *stirps* here is masculine, as it often is in early Latin, and as Nonius expressly declares it to be in this particular phrase of Pacuvius (which he obviously took as a gerundive). But if *stirps* is feminine here, we of course have a sure case from early Latin of the gerund with an object (cf. note 116).

¹¹⁹ The explanation sketched here of the development of the gerundive I presented in detail in *TAPA* 74.277–98.

¹²⁰ I know of no example of Type I or III. There is no instance of an accompanying appositional noun that serves as the agent of the action expressed by the gerund,

verbal adjective that was developed from the verbal noun has passive force.¹²¹

As is well known, this eventually developed gerundive construction is preferred to the gerund with a direct object. My theory if correct readily accounts for this. The accusative of the concrete noun would have been normal only with the accusative of the gerund, not with the genitive, dative, or ablative. As the use of two nouns in apposition (one a gerund) was replaced by a noun with modifying adjective (gerundive) everywhere in the dative and ablative, and in most places in the genitive, it was natural that this should eventually take place in the accusative also, and it certainly did take place in innumerable examples in which the accusative noun is a feminine or a plural; therefore in the numerous ambiguous instances in which the noun is masculine or neuter singular, we probably must ultimately recognize the gerundive construction also, though, as I have already said, it is quite possible in many instances at least in early Latin to assume that we still have the gerund.

2. Supine

Latin supines have had a development very different from that of Latin gerunds.

The supine seems to function primarily as an adverb:¹²² there are dative,¹²³ accusative, and ablative supines, but no genitives.

whether the gerund is intransitive (this would be Type I) or transitive (this would be Type III). The agent when expressed is always the subject of the main verb. An example with the intransitive gerund is *Amph.* 1006 *voltis auscultando operam dare*. Examples with the transitive gerund are those of the type that we have been studying, e.g. *Truc.* 731 *lamentando pausam fecit filio*; or, with the recipient of the action as object of the gerund, *Ep.* 605 *Epidicum operam quaerendo dabo*. There are also some instances in which the agent is not expressed at all. In these when the gerund is transitive the subject is usually the recipient of the action instead of the agent, as in *Lucretius* 1.312 *anulus in digito subter tenuatur habendo*; here the really voiceless gerund seems passive from our point of view (the finite form would be *anulus habetur*). On the other hand, there are instances in which a recipient of the action is lacking as well as an agent, inevitably with intransitive verbs, as *Men.* 882 *lumbi sedendo dolent*, but also with potentially transitive verbs, as *Phorm.* 1034 *accusando fieri infectum non potest*; here the gerund corresponds to a passive used impersonally (the finite form would be *sedetur, accusatur*). On these usages see *TAPA* 74.276 and 277 note 36.

¹²¹ However, a trace of the voicelessness that must have originally characterized verbal adjectives as well as verbal nouns is seen in the occasional — extremely rare — use of the gerundive in an active sense: *Ep.* 74, *Trin.* 1159 and perhaps 265.

¹²² There are a few adnominal instances, however: see note 124.

¹²³ The dative, strangely, is ignored by many of the grammars. However, the forms of verbal nouns in *-tui* certainly have no less claim to be classed as supines than those in *-tum* or *-tu*; furthermore, some of the latter forms may be datives also, rather

a. Dative

The dative supine, like the dative gerund, is regularly used to express purpose.¹²⁴ Bennett in his list of instances of the dative of purpose or tendency in early Latin (2.171-77) includes twelve datives with the form of supines,¹²⁵ occurring in twenty-two passages; in thirteen of these the supine is combined with a concrete noun also in the dative. A few of these follow.

Mil. 724 amicis usui est.¹²⁶

Rud. 294 hami atque harundines sunt nobis quaestu et cultu.

Heaut. 357 haec res ne utiquam neglectust mihi.

Men. 693 tu me tibi habes despiciatui.

Poen. 1281 me sibi habento scurrae ludificatui.

The difference between the gerund construction and the supine construction is manifest at a glance. The concrete noun combined with the gerund, whatever its case, is always related to it as a recipient, an object (Type II); the concrete noun combined with the dative supine is always related to it as an agent, a subject (Type I or III).¹²⁷ Thus if the supine had generated a participle

than ablatives. Of course I am not urging that every dative of an action noun in *-us* is to be classed as a supine: e.g., it may well be doubted whether *sumptui* should be so taken in *Mil.* 672 tibi tanto sumptui esse mihi molestumst, where it is modified by an adjective, in *Most.* 125 nec sumptus ibi sumptui ducunt esse, where it is combined with the accusative plural of the same verbal noun, or in Cicero, *Verr.* 1.6.16 nemini meus adventus labori aut sumptui fuit, where it is coordinated with *labori*. But in most of the instances from Bennett that I discuss below, and in certain technical locutions such as the agricultural *conditui legere* and the military *receptui canere*, I think what we have is a part of the verb as much as the corresponding case of the gerund or the accepted cases of the supine.

¹²⁴ It is also met, like other datives, with adjectives, as in *Bacch.* 62 istaec lepidia sunt memoratui, and even with nouns, as in Cato, *Agr.* 5.3 satui semen, *Curc.* 578 linteum extersui, Cicero, *Phil.* 13.7.15 receptui signum (cf. Caesar, *Bell. Gall.* 7.47.1 receptui cani). The datives with nouns are almost indeclinable adjectives, like *frugi* (see note 84).

¹²⁵ Possibly they should not all be so classed, however; cf. note 123. The datives are *cultu*, *depeculatui*, *despiciatui*, *frustratui*, *granatui*, *ludificatui*, *neglectu*, *perditui*, *praedatui*, *quaestui*, *sumptui*, *usui*. Roby's list (2.xli-lvi), which covers every period, totals 35.

¹²⁶ The supine *usui* is the one most commonly used. There are ten examples of it, seven of them in combination with a dative of reference.

¹²⁷ Since, strictly speaking, Type III is really a variation in which Type I occurs where we would have expected Type II (because the verbal noun is transitive), the difference between I and III becomes academic in the case of the supine, which apparently *never* exemplifies Type II. Of the instances given above, we might classify as Type I the first, since *utor* is not normally a transitive verb in the literal sense (however, cf. notes 89 and 129), and also the second, since *quaero* and *colo*, though often transitive, are not so used here (cf. further note 129). The only strictly intransitive

agreeing with the concrete noun as I believe the gerund did,¹²⁸ it would have had to be an active one, but this would not provide an adequate or accurate substitute: *Rud.* 294 would become *hami atque harundines sunt nobis quaerentibus et colentibus*, which would hardly be a complete sentence. If we wished to use a *passive* participle (either perfect or gerundive) in place of the supine, it would have to agree with the recipient of the action, if any. In examples of Type I, there is no recipient;¹²⁹ in examples of Type III, the recipient is the subject with copulas or passive verbs, the object with active transitive verbs. Thus we could substitute for our third example *haec res ne utiquam neglecta* (or *neglegenda*) *est mihi*; for our fourth, *tu me tibi habes despicatam*,¹³⁰ and, similarly,¹³¹ for our fifth, *me sibi habento scurrae ludificatum*.

Another difference between the gerund construction and the supine construction is in the relationship between concrete noun and verbal noun. In the gerund construction their association is very close indeed, and their appositional connection is readily made clear by such paraphrases as that given by Buck (310) for *cupiditas belli gerendi*, "desire of war, of the carrying on," or by Hofmann (597) for *argento comparando*, "für das Geld, seine Beschaffung." No one could take *argento comparando* as an example of the double dative construction;¹³² both datives express purpose. But when the dative supine is combined with another dative, they express purpose and reference respectively, and jointly constitute the "double dative."¹³³

supine of the twelve listed in note 125 is *granatui*; and this is not combined with another dative.

¹²⁸ Of course there was no opportunity for its doing so, since it was not ambiguous in form like the gerund.

¹²⁹ In *Rud.* 294 the words *hami atque harundines* do not represent the recipient of the action, but the means by which it is brought about; but in *Mil.* 724 the subject of *est* may be viewed as the recipient of the action (cf. note 127). If we shifted the supine into a finite form, we would have for the first of these *hamis atque harundinibus nos quaerimus et vivimus* (I prefer this to *colimus*, for *cultu* really = *victu*; cf. *Sonnenschein ad loc.*); and for the second *amici eo utuntur*.

¹³⁰ Cf. the actual passage, *Cas.* 189 *vir me habet despicatam*.

¹³¹ The use of a dative supine with *habeo* seems a common idiom. We also find it with *depeculatui* (*Ep.* 520), *frustratui* (*Men.* 695), *perditui et praedatui* (*Cist.* 366).

¹³² But the dative gerund construction and the double dative construction do go back to a common ancestor. I compared the two (*TAPA* 74.282), and in this I was right; but I was wrong in denying that they were manifestations of apposition. This was because I then viewed apposition as a much narrower and more clear-cut phenomenon than I now do.

¹³³ In relation to the difference between the two constructions, cf. the double possibilities in the interpretation of *Rud.* 426, discussed above, note 77.

b. Accusative: Future Passive Infinitive

When we come to the accusative case, we find there is much greater parallelism between gerund and supine. With the accusative supine as with the accusative gerund, the concrete noun is in objective relation to the verbal noun; and I believe the use of the object frequently met with the Latin accusative supine as with its cognate the Sanskrit accusative infinitive in *-tu-* has exactly the same origin, in partitive apposition. Again like the Sanskrit infinitive it is particularly common with verbs of motion, in connection with which the two accusatives must have originally served as expressions of place to which. Instances are not rare;¹³⁴ e.g. *Bacch.* 347 *amicos iit salutatum ad forum*, *Phorm.* 837–38 *ego me ire senibus Sunium dicam ad mercatum ancillulam emptum*.¹³⁵

The last example means literally 'I'll say that I'm going to a maid, to the buying (of her)' i.e. 'that I'm going to buy a maid.' The corresponding passive would be *iri dicam ancillulam emptum* 'I'll say that some one's going to buy a maid';¹³⁶ cf. *Hec.* 39–40 *rumor venit datum iri gladiatores*. In the first stage of this construction, the two accusatives must have been an appositive pair, a concrete noun and a verbal noun, expressing, metaphorically, limit of motion: 'a rumor comes that there is a going to gladiators, to a presentation (of them).' In the second stage, which is the earliest that the grammars recognize (e.g. Hofmann 600–601), the concrete noun became the object of the verbal noun: 'a rumor comes that there is a going to present gladiators.' In the third stage, the verbal noun and the impersonal passive infinitive form a single periphrastic locution, and the concrete noun becomes their subject: 'a rumor comes that gladiators are going to be presented.' The voicelessness of the verbal noun makes possible the shift from a (seemingly) active to a (seemingly) passive meaning of *datum*.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ See the list in Bennett (1.454). He divides it into two parts, one for periphrastic expressions and one for expressions of purpose, but the line is hard to draw; I see little fundamental difference between, e.g., *Aul.* 247 *it petitum gratiam*, in the first part, and *Cas.* 162 *fortunas eo questum*, in the second.

¹³⁵ This passage is particularly interesting because it contains another pair of accusatives in partitive apposition of quite a different type, *Sunium ad mercatum*. The preceding one also has an *ad* phrase. These *ad* phrases express place to which in a much more concrete way than do the supine locutions.

¹³⁶ Just as the passive (or, rather, impersonal) of *eo* 'I'm going' is *itur* 'some one is going.'

¹³⁷ Just as the voicelessness of the verbal noun in the gerund construction made possible the shift from a (seemingly) active meaning of the gerund to a passive one of the gerundive.

But that the development was not complete is indicated by the fact that this invariable supine *datum* was never confused with the passive participle *datum*,¹³⁸ which would be used in such a sentence as *rumor venit gladiatores datos esse* 'a rumor comes that gladiators have been presented.'¹³⁹ Also, the rarity of the construction would seem to indicate that the Romans were deterred from its use either by its anomaly or by its awkwardness.

It is surely significant that of all the Latin supines, dative, accusative, and ablative, the only one that is ever accompanied by an accusative noun — a so-called object — is the accusative.

3. Infinitive

When we come to infinitives, the question naturally arises as to whether in this respect they behave at all like gerunds and supines. In my opinion, the answer is that they do not. It must be remembered that the Latin infinitive originally had only one case, the dative-locative.¹⁴⁰ Later, to be sure, it lost its dative force to a considerable extent and came to be used primarily as a nominative-accusative;¹⁴¹ but neither in its early nor in its later stage did it show any such flexibility as that of the Greek infinitive in assuming various case-functions.¹⁴² Probably more than the infinitive in any other language, the Latin infinitive tended to assume verbal functions, for the sake of which it eventually acquired sharp distinctions

¹³⁸ It may even have induced the occasional use of the invariable form of the future participle in the future active infinitive, as in *Cas.* 692-93 *te occisurum ait* (of a woman). I have offered this explanation elsewhere (*TAPA* 81.124 note 16) as a substitute for Postgate's view that the form in *-urum* is really an infinitive (see *ib.* 122 note 14 and 123 note 15).

¹³⁹ This proposed explanation for the development of the future passive infinitive seems to me clear and simple. But I cannot agree with Bennett (1.454) that expressions like *Cato, Frag.* 63.6-7 (Jordan) in *hac contumelia quae mihi factum itur* "paved the way for the future infinitive in *-um iri*." The *Cato* passage must belong to the final stage of the development, since we have the nominative *quae* and not the accusative *quam* with *factum itur*.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. above, note 84.

¹⁴¹ For other constructions, the gerund was more convenient, thanks to its variable case-endings, and so naturally it came to be preferred when there was occasion for a genitive, a dative, an accusative in a prepositional phrase, or an ablative. Since the infinitive was preferred where there was occasion for a nominative or an accusative object, the gerund eventually gave up these functions (cf. note 112).

¹⁴² Naturally, the definite article was a great aid here, but even without it, Greek infinitives clearly serve as genitives or datives as well as nominatives and accusatives; cf. above, note 109. It should be noted that the Greek language had no other verbal nouns to serve as substitutes or suppletives for the infinitive as Latin did.

of voice and tense,¹⁴³ and to lose nominal functions, for the sake of which sharp distinctions of case would have been needed. It is not strange therefore that there was no tendency to use the infinitive in (partitive) apposition with a concrete noun. On the contrary, there even seems to have been a tendency in the opposite direction, to avoid the collocation of like cases. For instance, the infinitive certainly retained its early dative force in the original use of expressions of ordering and allowing; yet with these it tends to be employed precisely with verbs that govern the accusative, such as *iubeo*, *sino*, *patior*, whereas with verbs of similar meaning that govern the dative, such as *impero* and *permitto*, the infinitive is less likely to be used than the subjunctive.

I therefore do not agree at all with the view of Ernout and Thomas (271-72) that the infinitive with subject-accusative represents an original collocation of two accusatives, both alike objects of the main verb.¹⁴⁴ At the early period when this construction began to develop, the infinitive was still a dative; the same period could not have produced on equal terms on the one hand *iubeo eum venire* and *cogo eum venire*, and on the other hand *sentio eum venire* and *dico eum venire*. Furthermore, we cannot split up *sentio eum venire* into two parts as Ernout and Thomas do and get sense: *sentio eum* is hardly possible, and *sentio venire* still less so; more unthinkable still would be *dico eum* and *dico venire*. The truth is that we can get sense only if we put *eum* and *venire* together in a predicative relation, something which Ernout and Thomas altogether ignore.¹⁴⁵

But in contrast to this one construction in which I do not see any vestige of partitive apposition are the many in which I do.

CONCLUSION

To sum up. I believe that many features of Latin syntax may be traced directly or indirectly to the so-called partitive apposition. I. The shift from the appositional construction to the genitive con-

¹⁴³ Cf. note 87.

¹⁴⁴ Nor do I understand their comparison (ib.) with the two accusatives in *doceo pueros grammaticam*, which are wholly independent of each other.

¹⁴⁵ This predicative relation is accounted for in the explanation that I have offered for the genesis of the construction (*TAPA* 81.117-29). I assume the starting-point to have been the combination of an accusative substantive with a participle in predicate relation to it, the participle later being misinterpreted as an infinitive without *esse*. This would begin with verbs of sensual perception, but with verbs of thinking and saying too the type of expression is not impossible, even at an early period (there are parallels in Hittite; see ib. 127-29).

struction, inducing confusion, created (A) the appositional genitive and (B) hypallage. II. Among clear instances of partitive apposition were (A) the combination of a group and an individual, which occurred mainly in the nominative, leading to seemingly faulty agreement of the verb with its subject; (B) the combination of a person and a part of his body, which occurred (1) mainly in the accusative, leading to the (originally Greek) accusative of specification, and (2) occasionally in the dative; (C) the combination of an individual and a quality or action, which occurred mainly in the dative. III. Among more remote manifestations of partitive apposition were the combination of a concrete noun (A) with a general noun of action, indicating purpose, leading to the double dative construction; (B) with a verbal noun belonging to a verb system, leading to (1) the gerund construction, which generated the gerundive, and (2) the supine construction, which developed (a) in the dative, exemplifying one type of double dative, and (b) in the accusative, which generated the future passive infinitive (not, however, having any bearing on the development of the infinitive with subject-accusative).