

The Strategy and Chronology of the Development of Future and Perfect Tense Auxiliaries in Latin

Harm Pinkster

In this Paper I will deal with the evolution of periphrastic active future and PERFECTUM¹ forms replacing the classical Latin synthetic forms. My main claim is that the best known survivors in the Romance languages (with *habere* 'to have') both go back to earlier Latin constructions of *habere* + Object, with a Praedicativum (or: secondary object) denoting future and anterior properties as an expansion of the Object. As to chronology, contrary to current opinion, I believe that the evolution started quite early for both types involved. The structure of my paper is as follows: I start with a few observations on the structure of the classical Latin tense system. Then I discuss the development of the future and perfect tense auxiliary *habere*. Thirdly, I attempt to demonstrate which factors contributed to these developments and what must have been the chronology of these developments. As an appendix I add a few remarks on *stare* ('to stand') and *tenere* ('to hold') and their evolution into auxiliaries.

1. The classical Latin tense system

The classical Latin tense system is a two-dimensional system. By this I mean that a Latin tense form does not only contain information as to the location of a certain event in present, past, or future time, but also indicates whether the event is anterior, simultaneous or posterior with respect to one of these reference points (present, past, or future). In other words, the system may be called a combination of 'deictic' tense and 'phasal' aspect.² By using the (tempus praeteritum) imperfectum, for example, a Latin author locates an event in the past, indicating that it occurred simultaneously with other events

going on at that past moment. By using the perfectum an author indicates that an event took place before the present, that is before the speech moment; the plusquamperfectum, finally, indicates that an event took place before a certain moment in the past. Examples are (1 a – c). Details about the system can be found in Pinkster (1983; 1984: ch. 11):

- (1) a. *ibam* ad forum ‘I was on my way to the forum’ – imperfectum
 b. *ii* ad forum ‘I went to the forum’ – perfectum
 c. *ieram* ad forum ‘I had gone to the forum’ – plusquamperfectum

The forms of the INFECTUM system in the classical period are simple, synthetic, forms; *ibam* in (1 a) is an example. The same holds for the active PERFECTUM forms. Periphrastic, or analytic, forms are found in the passive PERFECTUM and in the PERFECTUM system of so-called deponent verbs (verbs which only have passive morphology). Examples are (2 a) and (2 b), respectively:

- (2) a. *laudatus eram* ‘I had been praised’ – plusquamperfectum
 b. *profectus eram* ‘I had left’ – plusquamperfectum

The forms consist of a participle expressing anteriority and a finite form of *esse* ‘to be’. Moreover, periphrastic forms are used for the future infinitive (3 a), as a substitute for a non-existing simple future subjunctive form (3 b), and as an alternative for the normal simple future form (3 c and d).

- (3) a. *dico me Marcum laudaturum esse* ‘I say that I am going to praise Marcus’ – future infinitive
 b. *facturusne operae pretium sim ... nec satis scio ...* ‘Whether I am likely to accomplish anything worthy of the labour I do not know (Liv. 1, praef. 1)
 c. *bellum scripturus sum quod populus Romanus cum Iugurtha ... gessit* ‘I propose to write of the war which the people of Rome waged with Iugurtha’ (Sal. *Iug.* 5,1)
 d. *homo est qui est futurus* ‘he too is a man who is yet to be born’ (Tert. *Apol.* 9,8)

Again, the periphrastic forms consist of a participle, this time expressing posteriority, and a finite or infinite form of *esse*. Notice that, in principle, the entire range of forms of *esse* is available, yielding examples like *laudaturus eram* ‘I was going to praise’. Notice, too,

that the verb *esse* is used both for passive and active periphrastic forms, the deponent PERFECTUM being an intermediate category.³

The Romance verbal paradigms differ from those of classical Latin most conspicuously with respect to the active future and active PERFECTUM forms. The Latin synthetic forms have been replaced by periphrastic forms or by new synthetic forms derived from an intermediate periphrastic stage, ultimately going back to Latin expressions with *habere* ‘to have’. There are other periphrastic forms in one or more of the Romance languages. An example of a periphrastic future form is Rum. *voi cânta* ‘I will sing’. This expression is etymologically related to Lat. *volo cantare* ‘I want to sing’. However, there are no traces of a future tense auxiliary use of the modal verb *velle* (or of any other modal verb) in Latin, so the Rumanian development is independent of the situation in Latin (Pinkster 1985). The Portuguese PERFECTUM forms with *ter* (going back to Lat. *tenere* ‘to hold’) have also developed independently of the Latin verb *tenere* (see below). My paper will concentrate, therefore, on the development of *habere* into a future tense and PERFECTUM tenses auxiliary in the period between classical Latin and the Romance languages. I will deal with future and PERFECTUM forms separately.

Before proceeding to a discussion of these forms it will be useful to explain briefly what I understand by ‘auxiliary’, particularly, ‘temporal auxiliary’, and, as a consequence, what I understand by ‘development of *habere* into a temporal auxiliary’. *Habere* in its normal classical ‘full’ meaning (‘to have’) has a specific predicate frame (or: ‘argument structure’, cf. Goossens, this volume), i. e., it imposes selection restrictions on its arguments. It has developed into an auxiliary when it no longer has an argument structure of its own. Instead, the combination of the *habere* form and the form of other verbal lexemes has the same argument structure, or: imposes the same selection restrictions, as the simple forms of that verbal lexeme. The development, therefore, can be regarded as a widening of selection restrictions on the part of *habere*.⁴

2. The development of *habere* as an auxiliary verb

There is a wealth of articles and books on the development of *habere* as an auxiliary verb. I will not discuss all the details here but confine

myself to those aspects which seem to be ...
of the strategy involved in the development of *habere* as an ...
I will start with a few remarks on *habere* + perfect passive participle
(PPP) constructions, which are regarded as forerunners of Romance
PERFECTUM forms. Then I will discuss *habere* in its construction
with an infinitive, which is regarded as the forerunner of most
Romance future forms.

2.1. *habere* + perfectum passive participle

In the PERFECTUM system of French and Italian, forms going
back to Lat. *habere* are used as auxiliary verbs. The classical Latin
indicative active perfect form developed into a 'passé simple' —
French — and 'passato remoto' — Italian — (on this development
cf. Harris 1982). There is no disagreement among linguists that the
Romance expressions go back to earlier Latin constructions in which
habere governed its own nominal Object, which was expanded with
a perfect passive participle in the function of Praedicativum, or
secondary predicate, formally agreeing with the Object constituent.
In French and Italian the Object constituent no longer depends on
the successor of *habere* but on the combination of former *habere*
and former perfect passive participle. The development may be described
as a process of 'Gliederungsverschiebung' or 'reanalysis' (cf. Ramat
1982, Vincent 1982):

- (4) *habere* + (Object + participle) → (*habere* + participle) +
Object

Praedicativa are widely used in Latin. They are not confined to
arguments, although the majority is, in fact, of this kind.⁵ They may
belong to various lexical categories, e. g., adjectives, participles and
preposition phrases. They indicate the property, more precisely the
state, in which the referent of the argument to
be involved at the time indicated
with perfect

- and quod
(6) qui eum *vinctum* habebat
XII Tab 3,4)
(7) id est, ut ait Naevius 'Hemisphaerium ubi conca<vo> caerulo
septum stat' 'that is, as Naevius says's "Where land's semicir-
cle lies, fenced by the azure vault"' (Varro *L. L.* 7,7)

In these examples the argument is bound by selection restrictions
both with respect to the main predicate and to the Praedicativum.
This is obvious from the fact that the Praedicativa can be deleted
without making the remainder of the sentences ungrammatical; more-
over, the relationship between the argument and the Praedicativum
may be paraphrased in a construction with *esse*, for example:

- (5') tu irretitus esses
(6') is *vinctus* erit
(7') haemisphaerium saeptum est

The Praedicativum denotes a property of the Object which is due to
a former action or process in which it was involved. The verbs
involved belong to the terminative (or resultative) class (cf. Pinkster
(1983) on this notion).

From the earliest period onward, however, there are very similar
examples which seem to have the same structure as (5)–(7), but
which differ with respect to the omissibility of the Praedicativum, for
example *cinctum* in (8) quoted in TLL, sv. *habere* 2425,33 ff. as a case
of 'predicative' use:

- (8) (Flamines) ... caput *cinctum* habebant filo 'The *flamines* had
their hair girt with a woollen fillet' (Varro *L. L.* 5,84)

Yet, in practice, sentences may be ambiguous as to the kind of
analysis required and one might conceive specific contexts in which
the participle can be omitted. In most cases like (8), however, the
past participle cannot really be omitted. *habebat caput* 'he had a
head' is so evidently true that it is pointless, just as pointless in fact
as saying **mihi est caput* (lit. 'to me is a head' — 'I have a head');
mihi est caput cinctum filo is, of course, all right.⁷ *cinctum* is closely
with *habebat* and one might, therefore, prefer labelling

cinctum in (8) an (obligatory) Object complement⁸ (cf. Ramat (1982: 369)). *habere* in (8) would thus be described as a three – place predicate in the same way as *reddere* in (9):

- (9) *totam vitam periculosam reddemus* ‘we shall fill life with danger’ (Cic. *Ver.* II, 138)

In most cases, however, the Praedicativum is omissible from the grammatical point of view.

Whereas the origin of the expression is undisputed, disagreement exists with respect to the question whether there are examples of *habere* as a PERFECTUM tense auxiliary in Latin, and whether there is a continuous development from the ‘classical’ examples to late Latin (cf. Pinkster 1983: 293–294). Szantyr (1965: 319–320) is very definite about this. ‘Die vollständige Gleichsetzung mit dem präsentischen Perfekt⁹ ist erst spätlateinisch, auch im 3. Jh. sind das einfache Perf. und die *habeo*-Umschreibungen noch klar geschieden [example (10) below]; voll ausgebildet erscheint diese erst im 6. Jh. bei Greg. Tur.’. As an example he gives (11).

- (10) ‘... sive quid in id flumen ripamve eius *immissum habes* ... restituas’ ... iubetur autem is qui *factum vel immissum habet* restituere quod habet ... haec verba ‘*factum habes*’ vel ‘*immissum habes*’ ostendunt non eum teneri qui fecit vel immisit, sed qui *factum immissum habet* ‘or if you have an extension into this river or the shore, you should restore it’. However, the one who possesses a construct or an extension is ordered to restore what he has in the original state. The formulation “you have something constructed” and “you have something extended into” shows that not the one who actually made the construct or the extension is responsible, but the present owner’ (Ulp. *Dig.* 43,12,1,202)
- (11) *episcopum ... invitatum habes* ‘you have invited the bishop’ (Greg. Tur. *Vit. patr.* 3,1)

Example (10) does indeed convincingly prove that in the beginning of the third century the construction of *habere* with a Praedicativum still existed, which nobody would probably deny, and it is also a precious piece of native speaker linguistic analysis which proves that at the time the normal perfect differed from the *habere* + Praedicativum construction. It does not prove, however, that all the

cases of *habere* + PPP that have been collected have the characteristics mentioned above, which are, briefly:

- (i) the participle denotes a property of the second argument of *habere* which is due to a previous action;
- (ii) the second argument is bound by selection restrictions to the predicate *habere*;
- (iii) *habere* with a participle may occur in all constructions in which it might appear without the participle.

I have critically re-examined the cases assembled by Bulhart¹⁰ and a number of cases not recorded in the TLL, because I did not think it very likely that the first undisputable example of a periphrastic perfect form should pop up more than 700 years after the time in which the *habere* + Praedicativum construction was already in full use. Consider the following facts:

- (a) periphrastic forms are fully operational throughout Latin for passive PERFECTUM forms: *laudatus sum* ‘I have been praised’, etc.
- (b) periphrastic forms are also fully operational throughout Latin for PERFECTUM forms of deponent verbs: *profectus sum* ‘I have left’, etc.¹¹

Notice that the emergence of active periphrastic forms would, so to speak, settle the balance again. In this connection it is relevant that there are a few examples of intransitive active predicates with ‘ungrammatical’ perfect forms with *esse* – precluding the normal Romance situation for a number of intransitive verbs (Meyer-Lübke 1899: 312 ff., Vincent 1982):

- (12) *sorores una die obitae sunt* ‘the sisters died on the same day’ (CIL VI, 17633)

for which compare Väänänen (1981: 145), who also mentions *processi sunt* ‘they went’ and *deventi essent* ‘they came’. Bulhart, conversely, quotes one late example of a perfect form of a deponent transitive verb with *habere*: *admiratus habeo* ‘I have admired’ (TLL s. v. 2427: 36 f.).¹²

Happ (1967), following Thielmann (1885 b) and Benveniste (1962), suggested that in absence of new evidence it would be wise to assume that in the archaic and classical periods the Praedicativum type was productive, with a few cases which might be regarded as periphrastic

perfect forms. This period would be followed by one in which the construction is no longer productive and only a few stereotypical expressions can be found, to regain new force from the time of Gregory of Tours onward. Thielmann's account, which inspired Happ, is very suggestive: he speaks of 'desolate landscape' (1885 b: 540) because so few interesting new combinations of *habere* and perfect passive participles are found and because of the low frequency. I had no opportunity to go through the texts between Livy and Gregory in order to check Thielmann's summary and Bulhart's selection and will confine myself to a comment on Szantyr's account (which is different from and criticized by Happ). However, such an examination of *all* the instances is necessary; unfortunately, Thielmann's suggestions kept others from studying the *habeo* + PPP construction afresh in detail.

Expressions consisting of *habere* + NP acc. + PPP can be found with *habere* in any tense form, in the indicative, imperative or subjunctive mood. An example is (13) from Cato, who has several:

- (13) *focum purum circumversum cotidie, priusquam cubitum eat, habeat ... cibum tibi et familiae curet uti coctum habeat* 'She must clean and tidy the hearth every night before she goes to bed ... She must keep a supply of cooked food on hand for you and the servants' (Cato *RR* 143,2)

The Loeb translation brings out very clearly the implication of *coctum habeat*: she must take care that at a certain moment the food is ready. In other words, at some moment there must be available *cibus coctus* (as opposed to *cibus crudus* 'raw food'). The coordination of *purum* and *circumversum* also makes it clear that at some moment the hearth must be clean and 'swept around', that is, it must have been submitted to an action of *circumverrere* 'to sweep around' as a result of which its condition must have been changed. *circumversus* denotes a resulting property of the *focus* just as *coctus* is a resulting property of *cibus*. It has been observed that, at least initially, most of the predicates in the construction are of the *coquere*-type, i. e., they denote two-place activities that imply a change in the Object, mostly resulting in a (new) state — that is, most predicates refer to terminative (or: resultative) states of affairs. Examples are *vincire* 'to bind', *claudere* 'to close', *scribere* 'to register' (Lucot 1940). (A different type are 'perception' and 'cognition' predicates like *cognoscere* 'to learn' where no change in the Object is implied but rather the Agent profits from

the action — see below.) It appears that in the majority of the examples assembled by Bulhart the Subject of *habere* is the same as the implied Agent of the PPP, as in the above examples. This need not be so, however. Consider, apart from Bulhart's examples 2426,75 ff., ex. (14):

- (14) *qui habet curam peregrinorum deputatam* '(a monk) who has received the task of taking care of foreign visitors' (Cassian. *Inst.* 4,7 — A. D. 426)

It will be clear that only in the case of identity of Subject and Agent there may be reason to assume that the expression is a periphrastic perfect form.

Now, Bulhart rarely gives criteria for assigning examples to the Praedicativum type or to the periphrastic PERFECTUM type and, as a consequence, one may argue about details of his classification. As an example where I would disagree with Bulhart, take Augustine's sermon on the biblical expression *Amen dico vobis ... et capilli capitis vestri omnes numerati sunt* (*Matth.* 10,30)¹³ (example 15 a), quoted by Bulhart as an example of a periphrastic perfect (TLL, 2453, 17–18):

- (15) a. *nam et capillos nostros ipse utique creavit et numeratos habet* 'for he has certainly created our hairs and has them counted' (*Serm.* 62,10,15)
 b. *grande profundum est ipse homo, cuius etiam capillos tu, domine, numeratos habes et non minuuntur in te* 'man is a great deep, whose very hairs thou numberedst, O Lord, and they are not lost in thy sight' (*Conf.* 4,14)

Bulhart's reason may have been the coordination of *creavit* and *numeratos habet* in (15 a) — a criterion he seems to depend on elsewhere — or it is just because it is not easy to imagine what are *capilli numerati* ('hairs that as a result of the action of *numerare* now have the property of being numbered'), that is, it seems to lack characteristic (i) mentioned above (p. 199). However, the quotation from Matthew clearly proves that what Augustine intends is 'numbered hairs', just as we have 'numbered copies of books', etc. However, with respect to characteristic (ii) the examples (15) are deviant. It is not true that *dominus capillos habet*: it is the combination *numeratos habet* that makes sense. However, this entire argument leans heavily upon the acceptability of English equivalents. There are, as I showed,

more examples of *habere* + Obj. + adj. where characteristic (ii) is absent, where it is also the combination of *habere* and adjective that makes sense and, of course, the question of equivalence to perfect tense forms is irrelevant. Apart from example (8) and the cases mentioned in TLL 2424,42 ff. compare (16):

- (16) multi ... dei *habuerunt* Caesarem *iratum* 'many gods have felt Caesar's wrath' (Tert. *Apol.* 29,3)

So, concluding, I would say that although *numeravit* instead of *numeratos habet* would yield an acceptable and even grammatical Latin sentence in (15), it would not convey the message intended by Augustine. I discuss one other example of Bulhart's where I cannot accept his analysis (which seems to be accepted by Ramat 1982: 369):

- (17) (Romulus) et ipse ... urbem condidit auspicato et ... cooptavit augures, et *habuit* plebem in clientelas principum *discriptam* 'he not only took the auspices himself when he founded the city but also chose augurs. He also divided the plebeians up among the prominent citizens' (Cic. *Rep.* 2,16)

Bulhart takes *habuit ... discriptam* as an example of the ('logical') perfect and the Loeb translation translates it in the same way as the preceding perfect forms *condidit* and *cooptavit* as one of a succession of actions. Arnobius may have had this text in mind when he wrote (18) – between A. D. 303 and 310:

- (18) numquid enim quinque in classes *habetis* populum *distributum*, vestri ut olim habuere maiores 'do you indeed have the people distributed into five classes, as your ancestors once had?' (Arn. 2,67 – translation Roberts-Donaldson 1895)

I think Bulhart's analysis is wrong, as is the Loeb translation – whereas the Arnobius translation is correct. First, a *plebs discripta in clientelas* is perfectly understandable (characteristic (i)) and whereas characteristic (ii) is absent, characteristic (iii) is relevant: it is a perfect form *habuit*, correct as are *condidit* and *cooptavit*, and not a present form *habet*: 'he had them divided' or: 'he caused them to be divided'. Several cases where *habere* itself is in the perfect (or fut. exact.) form should be skipped in Bulhart's collection.

It is now time to turn to examples where Bulhart, in my opinion, is right. His description of these examples is plausible in a number of cases where the PPP belongs to a predicate which cannot easily

be conceived of as referring to a change in its Object (or the creation of its Object) or where the action implied by the PPP is specified in some way. In both cases the PPP does not simply indicate a property of the Object (that is: characteristic (i) is not present). It can also be proved in certain cases.

(i) Bulhart's description is plausible in instances like (19)–(21) where the action is specified.

- (19) dicam de istis graecis suo loco, Marce fili, quid Athenis *exquisitum habeam* 'I will say about those Greeks, my son Marcus, in due place what I have found out in Athens' (Cato *ad fil.* frg. 1)
- (20) quantum ... tironi sit committendum nimium saepe *expertum habemus* 'how far recruits are to be relied upon experience has taught us only too often' (Plancus apud Cic. *Fam.* 10,24,3)
- (21) si *habent* etiam cum daemonibus *initam* societatem 'they have even made a deal with demons' (Aug. *doctr. christ.* 2,39,58)

Examples (22) and (23) below have PPP's which cannot easily be understood as states resulting from actions. (22) is mentioned in Szantyr as a bold ('kühn') example in Livy; (23) is mentioned by Thielmann (1885 b: 537–538).

- (22) necdum omnia in quae coniurarunt *edita facinora habent* 'they have not yet revealed all the crimes to which they have conspired' (Livy 39,16,3)
- (23) si miles qui *habebat* iam *factum* testamentum aliud fecisset 'if a soldier who had already made a testament would have made another one' (Ulp. *Org.* 29,1,19)

One might regard examples like *factum habuerit* below as evidence for the degree to which the basic construction *habet factum* was already familiar (example 23 above).

- (24) item placuit ut quisquis mensib<us> contin<uis se>x non paritaverit et ei humanitus acciderit, eius ratio funeris non habebitur, etiamsi <tes>tamentum *factum habuerit* 'The collegium also decided that whosoever has not settled up during six months and human fate has befallen him, no account will be taken of his funeral, even if he has made a testament' (CIL 14,2112 – Lanuvium A. D. 133)

In this example some sort of 'Tempusverschiebung' may be noticed that is well-known in passive forms. Another instance is

- (25) *si iam arborem satam habueris, sillam ... serito* 'if you have already planted the tree, sow a squill' (Colum. 5,10,16)

(Notice, however, that these cases contain the *futurum exactum*, which is often equivalent to a *futurum simplex*.)

(ii) There are a few examples of *habere* + PPP where an appropriate Object governed by *habere* is lacking altogether. These cases prove that *habere* is a mere auxiliary.

- (26) *quem ad modum de ea re supra scriptum habemus* 'as we have written above on the matter' (Vitr. 9,1,14)

- (27) *quamvis praeceptum habeamus, <ut> ...* 'though we have already given instructions that ...' (Colum. 12,52,3)

In (26) an Object is lacking altogether: in (27) the sentential complement introduced by *<ut>* can only be understood as depending on *praeceptum*, not on *habeamus*.

Examples like (28) are close although *satis* might be called some sort of Object:

- (28) *quae cum ita sint, de Caesare satis hoc tempore dictum habeo* 'in the circumstances I shall regard what I have said of Gaius Caesar as sufficient at present' (Cic. *Phil.* 5,52)¹⁴

Notice that the examples (26)–(28) contain participles of verbs of communication. The sentential Objects governed by these verbs cannot be understood as Objects of *habere*.

It is now time to return to the perception and cognition verbs briefly mentioned above. Examples are (29) and (30):

- (29) *cum cognitum habeas quod sit summi rectoris ... numen* 'when you realize the will of the supreme lord' (Cic. *Fin.* 4,11)

- (30) *auditum habemus quod* 'we have heard that ...' (Vulg. *Gal.* 1,23 – Gk. ἀκούοντες ἦσαν)

Cases like (29) and (30) with an embedded predication as Object of the complex *habere* + PPP are frequent from Cicero onwards. In such cases too, the sentential Object cannot be understood as the Object of *habere* alone, as is possible in cases with a nominal Object such as (31):

- (31) *haberem a Furnio nostro tua penitus consilia cognita* 'I had been made thoroughly acquainted with your purposes by our friend Furnius' (Cic. *Fam.* 10,12,1)

Hence it is in this type of expression that the amalgamation of *habere* and PPP into a complex form develops first. We will see that, in the case of the development of *habere* + inf., it is also the expression with a verb governing a sentential Object that occurs first.

In view of the examples discussed so far Szantyr's position seems to be too strict. Apart from the cognition verbs there are other cases where the relation between the participle and the verb *habere* is closer than in the case of normal Praedicativa. Also, we encounter adverbial expressions which can best be understood as specifying the combination of *habere* and participle. Our literary evidence in later Latin may not show much variation and may be essentially the same as in the classical period. However, this does not prove that in everyday speech the construction of *habere* + participle was not less restricted than in the literary sources. Happ (1967) has shown that the construction is not found in the more colloquial parts of Plautus' comedies. It is not restricted to Cicero's letters (which are more colloquial than his other works). Petronius has no examples of the construction at all (Petersmann 1977: 189). Still, this does not prove that the periphrastic expression had no support in colloquial Latin, as Happ wants us to believe. On the contrary, the support for the early periphrastic-like expressions is constituted by the normal Praedicativum constructions, which abound in the literature.

2.2. *habere* + infinitive

The origin of the future periphrastic forms with *habere* is much more a matter of scholarly dispute. In this paper I will give the main points of the development of *habere* from a full verb into a future tense auxiliary. Details will be discussed elsewhere (Pinkster 1985). In contradistinction to what we saw in the case of *habere* + PPP, there is a tendency to date the origin of the development quite early. The first attested example of *habere* governing an infinitive is found as early as 80 B. C. in Cicero's oration *S. Rosc.*:

- (32) multos ferro, multos veneno (occidit); *habeo etiam dicere quem ... de ponte in Tiberim deiecerit* 'many he killed by the dagger, many by poison. I can even give you an example of one man whom the threw from the bridge into the Tiber' (Cic. *S. Rosc.* 100)

This example is usually paraphrased as more or less equivalent to the modal verb *posse* 'can'. Notice that the verb governed by *habere* is a verb of communication. In fact, this is the case in many of the early examples. The construction of *habere* + infinitive is found with some frequency in the Christian author Tertullian (second half of the second century A. D.).¹⁵ He is also credited with the first examples of the construction without a modal nuance, although, personally, I did not find many examples of that kind. (33) may be one:

- (33) *reputo enim non esse dignas passiones huius temporis ad futuram gloriam, quae in nos habet revelari* 'I reckon that the sufferings of this time are not worthy of the future glory that will be revealed to us' (Tert. *Resurr.* 40: 84,16, cf. *Scorp.* 13: 175,5)

Still, here, too, a modal nuance ('is bound to') seems to be present. There are more convincing cases in later authors, e. g., (34) from Augustine and (35) — a very late inscription:

- (34) *aliquando Christiani non erunt et idola rursus coli habent* 'some time there will be no Christians anymore and idols will be cultivated again' (Aug. *Serm.* 40,1)
- (35) *cod estis fui et quod sum essere abetis* 'what you are I was and what I am you will be' (Inscr. Christ. Diehl 3865 — Rome 7th (?) century)

Notice, in (34), the coordination of the normal classical synthetic future form *erunt* and *coli habent*. That *habere* was interpreted by the Romans themselves as referring to the future (though not necessarily as equivalent to a future tense auxiliary) appears from a statement of the grammarian Sacerdos (second half third century A. D.):

- (36) *tempora sunt tria, praesens, praeteritum ... et futurum. quidam tempus praesens esse negant, dicentes res aut factas esse aut habere fieri* 'there are three tenses, present, past and future. Some people deny the existence of a present tense,

saying that things either have happened or will happen' (Sacerdos in: G. L. VI, 432,12)

The auxiliarisation process can be illustrated quite clearly. The early examples, with the exception of a few cases like (32), show *habere* in combination with two-place (active) verbs. An example is (37):

- (37) *de ... somniis quid habemus dicere* 'what can we tell about dreams?' (Cic. *Acad.* 2,136)

quid can be understood as the Object of both *habemus* and *dicere*. (38) and (39) are examples of a passive infinitive (and inanimate Subject) and a one-place (intransitive) infinitive, respectively:

- (38) *utrum per i quaedam habeant dici an per u* 'whether certain words should be pronounced with *i* or with *u*' (Vel. G. L. 7,49,20 — ca. A. D. 100)
- (39) *quod esset venturus et pati haberet* 'that he would come and suffer' (Tert. *adv. Iud.* 8)

As we see, *habere* loses its own selection restrictions and becomes part of a complex expression which has the selection restrictions of the infinitive. Once again, one might call the process one of 'reanalysis' (cf. Ramat 1982).

As far as the internal structure of the expression is concerned we can follow the auxiliarisation process quite precisely. It must be borne in mind, however, that during the entire period the *habere* element of the expression is used with complete freedom as far as tense and mood are concerned. (40) is an example of a future tense form of *habere*:

- (40) *aut si de eis dictum qui in adventu dei ... deputari habebunt, quid faciant ...* 'or if it is said about those who will be destined upon the arrival of the Lord, what can they do' (Tert. *adv. Marc.* 5,20)

As a consequence, the actually attested *habere* + infinitive expressions cover a range of meanings that is much wider than the range of meanings covered by the regular verbal paradigm (cf. Vincent, this

volume). Another well-known example is (41), some sort of future in the past quite appropriate in predication contexts:

- (41) Nazareus *vocari habebat* secundum prophetiam 'he was to call himself N. according to the prophecy' (Tert. *adv. Marc.* 4,8)

Also, we find cases which are best paraphrased by one of the modal verbs *debere* 'must' and *posse* 'can' alongside cases which seem to lack any modal nuance. (42) is an example of a 'must' interpretation, again in the future tense, from the fifth or sixth century grammarian Pompeius:

- (42) illa enim ita *habebis declinare* 'you will have to inflect these in the following way' (Pomp. *Gramm.* V, 186,13).

Finally, it ought to be realized that the classical synthetic future forms as well as the classical periphrastic expression with *-urus* continued to be the normal forms. So we can observe the widening of selection restrictions of *habere* and we can interpret many cases of *habere* + infinitive as referring to a future event, but in our texts *habere* has not developed into a future tense auxiliary. I have pointed out elsewhere (Pinkster 1985) that *habere* + infinitive is not synonymous with any modal verb either, although in certain contexts it could be substituted by one of the modal verbs.

The most remarkable element in the development of *habere* is the very emergence of the construction with an infinitive. It has been explained in various ways (cf. Coleman 1971; Leumann 1962, *inter alios*). The most plausible explanation, to my mind, is the following. There exist, from early Latin onward, constructions of *habere* which are often labeled purpose constructions, but which in fact do not strictly express purpose. One type consists of *habere* + Object + Praedicativum, the Praedicativum function in this case being filled by a gerundivum. Examples are (43) and (44):

- (43) *ibi agrum de nostro patre colendum habebat* 'he rented land there under my father', lit: 'he had land to cultivate' (Ter. *Ph.* 364)
- (44) *aedem habuit tuendam* 'he had a house to look after' (Cic. *Ver.* II, 1,130)

In this construction the Object of *habere* is also the Patient of the action denoted by the gerundivum. The construction is found with a

range of verbs, for example *dare* 'to give' in *dare aquam bibendam* 'to give water to drink'. As always (Bolkestein 1981) the gerundivum has a non-factive, i. e., future oriented, meaning.¹⁶ It has been observed (*inter alios* by Blümel (1979: 89–90); Ramat (1982: 368), in a slightly different way) that just as with *dare* the gerundivum could be replaced by an infinitive (*dare aquam bibere* 'to give water to drink') the infinitive became an alternative for the gerundivum with *habere*. Notice that in example (44) the interpretation is one of obligation or necessity, whereas in the first one (43) it is not (cf. K.-St. I, 731–2; TLL s. v. *habere* 2422,59 ff.; also Szantyr (1965: 320) opposing Kuryłowicz (1931)).

Another type of *habere* + Object + a non-factive, i. e. future-oriented expansion is constituted by instances like (45) and (46) (cf. Coleman 1971: 216):

- (45) *quid habes quod possis (!) dicere quam ob rem ... cuiquam anteponare* 'what good reason can you produce for being preferred to anyone?' (Cic. *Div. Caec.* 59)
- (46) *haec habui de amicitia quae dicerem* 'this is all that I had to say about friendship' (Cic. *Amic.* 104)

Here, we have a relative clause with a finite verb in the subjunctive, typically the non-factive mood in Latin (such clauses are also labeled purpose clauses, incorrectly so). Finally Rosén (1981: 137–138) has drawn attention to future-oriented constructions of *habere* + verbal noun, like *iter habere* 'to be about to go' (Plt. *Rud.* 1242).

Returning now to our earliest example ((32)) of *habeo dicere* one may observe that there existed a solid background for the use of *habere* in future-oriented contexts. It is likely that Cicero used the infinitive after the model of *dare* + Object + infinitive. Example (47 a) would be a precise parallel of (43) and (44); (47 b) might serve as an alternative:

- (47) a. *quid habes dicendum?* 'what do you have to say?'
b. *quid habes dicere?* 'what do you have to say?'

One might even say that in the first attested example Cicero was in a sense invited to use the infinitive since the *habere* + Object + gerundivum construction is less suitable when *dicere* governs a sentential Object. It can hardly be accidental that our initial examples contain *dicere*. We do possess examples of the type *habere* + *dicendum* (gerundivum) + a sentential Object, be it only from Seneca Rhetor (for example *Contr.* 9,5,1) onward.

3. The strategy and chronology of the developments

As I have suggested above, the process of auxiliarisation was essentially the same in both developments. Both in the case of the PERFECTUM forms and in the case of the future forms the origin lies in *habere* + Object + Praedicativum constructions. The Praedicativum constituent is a passive perfect participle indicating a property of the Object resulting from an anterior action in which it was involved in the case of the PERFECTUM forms; it is a (passive future) gerundivum indicating a posterior property of the Object in the case of the future forms; the active present infinitive could be used as an alternative for the gerundivum.¹⁷ The assumption of the Praedicativum as a channel for auxiliarisation is more complicated in the case of the future forms than for the PERFECTUM forms. Still it is more plausible than the assumption of Greek influence or the influence of modal verbs which one can find in the manuals. We have no examples of modal verbs developing into future tense auxiliaries in Latin. The assumption is also attractive because it enables us to set up the following neat parallelism:

- | | |
|--|---|
| (48) a. habeo cibum coctum
'I have food which has
been cooked' | c. habeo cibum coquendum
'I have food which has to
be cooked' |
| b. cibus coctus est
'the food has been cook-
ed and, as a consequence,
is cooked' | d. cibus coquendus est
'the food has to be cook-
ed, is to be cooked' |

(48 a) and (48 c) are both composed of a present tense form and an expansion expressing phasal aspect (anterior or posterior, resp.).

The preceding description of the way in which the development took place does not explain why it took place. I will turn to this question now. One of the causes for the change in the tense system that is often mentioned in the literature is the fact that in late Latin /b/ and /v/ merged so that the distinction between, for example, future *laudabit* 'he will praise' and PERFECTUM forms such as perfect *laudavit* 'he praised' disappeared and new forms became necessary. The phenomenon has been documented recently by Barberino (1978). Typical examples illustrating the merging of the two phonemes are readings in the inscriptions like *davit* for *dabit* 'he will give' and *requiebit* for *requievit* 'he rested'. The phenomenon is not

equally discernible in all parts of the empire. The earliest inscriptions date from the first century A.D. (Barberino 1978: 159). Given the fact that our literary sources for the development of auxiliary *habere* are from a still earlier date, both in the case of *habere* + PPP and *habere* + infinitive one might at the most assume that the syntactic and semantic development was reinforced by the phonetic development.¹⁸

Another explanation one finds in the literature is based on the assumption of a general drift in the Romance languages towards analyticity. However, this assumption has less support in this domain of morphology than elsewhere. Periphrastic future forms already existed in the classical period (and continued during the entire period) and the general assumption does not explain why these forms were replaced by other periphrastic forms. Moreover, the most frequently used form of the PERFECTUM system, viz. the perfect, was not replaced at all: in French and Italian it still exists, be it with a much more restricted meaning than it had in the classical period (see below).

As to the development of periphrastic future forms, this has been related to the fact that the Latin future system, as in most languages, may be called 'defective' if compared with the system of past tenses: there is, for example, no synthetic future subjunctive form (cf. Müller 1964: 78, Ultan 1978: 90 ff.). Such gaps in the paradigm can be filled by ad hoc choosing an appropriate expression, or by more or less regular substitutes. *Facturus sim* in (3 b) may be regarded as a regular substitute. The future in the past example (41) may be another one. Eventually a language might end up with a future paradigm consisting of old synthetic forms and new analytic forms developed from conventionalized substitutes. In this situation the new forms might contribute to the formation of other analytic forms to serve as alternatives for or even as replacements of the old synthetic forms; in other words: the substitute forms might contribute to the creation of new periphrastic forms in the strict sense of the word (see for the distinction between 'substitute' and 'periphrasis' Werner (1980: 222); for such a development in Khotanese see Emmerick, this volume). In fact, the success of *habere* as a future tense auxiliary is often described along these lines, viz. as being due to its frequent use as a passive-future-in-the-past substitute, as in example (41) (cf. Herman 1975: 76, Löfstedt 1933: 70–71). This explanation raises several questions, for example about its statistical validity and about the extent to which the nature of our texts determines the frequency of these expressions.

Here, I will only draw attention to the fact that in the Romance languages there is no connection between *habere* and passive. Instead, the classical Latin passive futurum exactum with *esse* (*laudatus erit* 'he will have been praised') came into use as a passive future. Apart from my doubts about the effect of substitutes on a paradigm in general, this is an argument against this type of explanation in the case of the development of *habere*.

The three explanations discussed so far have in common that the development is ascribed to an external cause. However, whatever external causes may have contributed to the development, there must be an internal cause as well. There must have been some overlap in meaning and/or use between the old forms and the new ones on the basis of which the new forms could take over the functions of the old ones. This overlap can be shown quite easily in the case of the new PERFECTUM forms. The expression (48 a) contains the same tense and aspect elements as the classical – synthetic – expression (49).

(48) a. *habeo cibum coctum* 'I have the food cooked'

(49) *coxi cibum* 'I cooked the food'

The distribution of these elements over the constituents of the sentences is different, but in certain circumstances *coxi cibum* could be interpreted as 'and as a consequence the food is now cooked (and no longer raw): *cibus coctus est*' (= 48 b). Such a result interpretation is especially possible with terminative (or: resultative) verbs (Pinkster 1983: 280 ff.). In specific contexts both the *habere* + PPP and the normal perfect may be used, and the choice is one of style. A good example is (50):

(50) *quod me hortaris ut absolvam, habeo absolutum suave, – mihi quidem ut videtur – epos ad Caesarem* 'as to you urging me to finish my job, I have now finished my epic to Caesar, and a charming one it is in my opinion' (Cic. *Q. fr.* 3,9,6)

The two expression types could be interpreted in the same way only in present contexts, not in narrative contexts, that is in only one of the two contexts in which the normal perfect could be used. When the restrictions on the type of verbs allowed with *habere* became less strict, the new expression could take over the function of the normal perfect in present contexts, which at the same time meant the special-

isation of the normal perfect into a narrative past tense. In terms of Dik's distinction (this volume) of 'drag-chain' and 'push-chain' I interpret the development as one of push-chain. A representative of the drag-chain interpretation is Serbat (1980).

So we see that in present contexts with certain verbs both the normal perfect and the *habere* + Object + PPP construction were available. In section 2.1. two factors have been mentioned which contributed to the reanalysis of the construction, viz., on the one hand, Objects referring to inalienable things (body parts, etc.) in the case of the *habere* + PPP construction, and, on the other hand, verbs of communication and cognition, governing sentential Objects, for both developments of *habere*. It would be nice to be able to present an illustration of the overlap of normal futures and *habere* + infinitive constructions along the same lines as I did for *habere* + PPP. Our data show that there is an increase of the use of *habere* + infinitive to refer to future situations without modal overtones and it may have been used as a circumlocutionary expression precisely because it was not just a modal verb (because of its 'große modale Spannweite', in Müller's terms (1964: 72)). The difficulty results from the fact that the normal future forms were replaced completely, and in a very short period too. However, the general picture will have been the same: the *habere* + infinitive construction did not develop into a periphrastic future because the synthetic forms disappeared, but it was available when the synthetic forms disappeared.

The introduction of the *habere* constructions had certain advantages, so to speak, for the verbal paradigm as a whole. The active PERFECTUM was remodelled in a transparent way along the same lines as the passive (active following the passive, cf. Emmerick, this volume). The 'deviant' use of *esse* for the periphrastic active future forms disappeared and *habere* became the typical active auxiliary.

As to the chronology of the developments described above, it will be clear from what I said so far that I am in favour of an early date for both constructions involved. It is difficult to appreciate the fact that there is not much variation in the *habere* + PPP expressions after (roughly) Cicero and that there is not much variation in the *habere* + infinitive construction after Tertullian. The best explanation for the lack of variation is to be found in the educational system. The Christian authors, too, stuck to standard Latin (which is not necessarily Ciceronian Latin), unless they had a good reason to deviate. Merks (1939: 103–110), for example, shows that Cyprian is

more formal in his tractates than in his letters, which explains that we find the *habere*-construction only once in his tractates. Dokkum showed, as early as 1900, that Augustine sticks much closer to classical usage before his conversion than afterwards (compare also Perrochat 1932: 154–155). Such data suggest that in substandard Latin *habere* + infinitive was much more frequent than in our texts. The same may be the case for *habere* + PPP, but I have no data on that construction.

An early date for the *habere* + infinitive construction is desirable for two reasons. The first one is that a common Latin ancestor might explain why the same track has been followed by a number of Romance languages in forming a new future. The other one is that we need an early date to explain the early appearance of the new synthetic Romance forms. The first attested example of this is traditionally *daras* 'you will give' in Fredegar's chronicle (early 7th century), and recently Stimm (1977) has argued for an earlier date on the basis of the form *pussediravit* 'shall possess' in an inscription on a late 6th century Merovingian buckle.¹⁹ Those forms not only presuppose that the *habere* + infinitive construction had been stabilized as a future form, but also that it had amalgamated, and that in a specific order, viz. with *habere* following the infinitive. I am glad that I may leave this to solve for my colleagues in Romance linguistics.

4. Appendix: *tenere* and *stare* + Praedicativum

I add a few remarks on two other verbs which are important in the history of the Romance languages. My observations are based on a complete investigation of all the material in the files of the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, in co-operation with Caroline Kroon. Our conclusion is that there are no forerunners of the later Romance developments in the Latin texts.

4.1. *tenere*

The history of *tenere* in its construction with an Object and a PPP, functioning as a Praedicativum, looks very much like that of *habere*,

yielding a periphrastic PERFECTUM expression in contemporary Portuguese (and Spanish). However, in our texts, the construction is found much less often than the *habere* + PPP construction.²⁰ Constructions of *tenere* + Object + adjective are also very rare. The construction almost invariably has the meaning 'to keep someone/something in a certain physical/psychic condition', as illustrated by ex. (5) above. This description holds for the entire Latinity, the first case on record being Pl. *Poe.* 720, the latest record we encountered in the files of the TLL being (51). As an example of a 'psychic' condition take (52). There are also occasional examples where the implied Agent of the PPP is not identical with the Subject of *tenere* ((53)).

- (51) *fixum tene* ... quod loquor 'keep fixed in your memory what I say' (Greg. M. 2,35,6 – A. D. 593)
- (52) et quoniam bene *persuasum tenebat* ea ... sine vitali et rationali creatura non fieri 'and because he was verily persuaded that those actions could not be performed but by a vital and a rational creature' (Aug. *Conf.* 7,19)
- (53) cum ab summo *traditum teneamus* ... 'since we have been taught by the greatest teacher that ...' (Arn. 2,32)

Notice that in (52) and (53) there is no nominal Object of *tenere* (as is the case, sometimes, with *cognitum habere*, etc.).

The low frequency of *tenere* + PPP as compared with *habere* + PPP need not surprise us since the meaning of *tenere* is only partly similar to that of *habere*.²¹ I showed that among the instances of *habere* + PPP a class of expressions can be distinguished that make sense only if *habere* and the PPP are taken as a unit. There are no examples of this kind in the material of *tenere*, still less examples of periphrastic PERFECTUM expressions with *tenere*. This development must be dated much later. However, the fact that *tenere* + PPP constructions are found proves the continuity of this type of Praedicativum construction, which we also find for *habere*.

4.2. *stare*

In the Romance languages forms of the old Latin paradigm *esse* 'to be' and forms which go back to the Latin paradigm *stare* 'to stand'

sometimes supplement each other in the same paradigm. In Span./Port. *ser* and *estar* exist alongside each other, dividing – so to speak – among themselves the uses of the copula/auxiliary/existential verb ‘to be’ of other Romance languages.²² It has been noted that *stare* is one of the ‘occasional competitors’ of *esse*. Szantyr (1965: 395) quotes the – late – example (54):

- (54) *lapis ... ibi fixus stat* ‘there stands a stone fixed in the ground’ (*Per. Aeth.* 2,2)

stare has drawn the attention already in the Roman grammatical tradition, because from its beginning remarkable instances can be found in Latin poetry. Thus Nonius (392,1) observes that *stare* can mean ‘to be full’, quoting (55) as an example:

- (55) *interea stat* sentibus pectus ‘meanwhile his thoughts are a standing mass of thorns’ (Lucil. 213 M = 221 Kr.)

Related expressions are known from Lucretius and others and *stare* seems to have become a more expressive alternative for *esse*.²³ I give one example from Horace, which Bo in his lexicon classifies – prosaically – as equivalent to *esse*:

- (56) *stetit* urna paulum sicca ‘for a little while the jar stood dry’ (Hor. C. 3,11,22)

Servius explains a few instances of *stat* in Vergil as equivalent to *est*. It is, of course, attractive to assume that poetry drew on colloquial Latin (so Woytek (1970: 87, n. 108))²⁴, in view of the Romance development, but our evidence for the early and classical period is very scanty and we will see to what extent the Romance development can already be traced in our texts. I will successively discuss instances of *stare* used more or less as a copula (i), existential for locative use (ii) and occurrence with perfect passive participles (iii).

(i) *stare* more or less used as a copula

We found in the TLL files roughly 40 items of *stare* in the texts from Apuleius onward which might be regarded as candidates for one of the three uses mentioned above. Copulative use can be considered in about 1/3 of the instances, most of them with a predicative adjective. Among these are instances where the combination of the Subject and *stare* alone might be grammatical – outside its context, that is. There

are, however, also instances where this is not possible. I give a few examples to illustrate the point, starting with a ‘classical’ one:

- (57) *propter quam tota Mycenis infamis stupro stat* Pelopea domus ‘because of whom in Mycenae shame has been brought over the entire house of Pelops by her adultery’ (Prop. 3,19,19–20)²⁵
- (58) *neutrum dicimus altero esse minorem sive maiorem ... sed stare* ambo ex pari magna, ex pari sublimia, ... ‘we do not say that the one is less or more important than the other, but that both are equally great and noble’ (Tert. *adv. Hermog.* 7,3)
- (59) (leo) *simulavit se medicum esse coepitque stare familiaris* ‘the lion simulated to be a doctor and played the old acquaintance’ (Romulus *Fab.* 52,2 r. v. – between A. D. 350 and 500)

Whereas in (57) *stare* alone could be understood as ‘continue (to exist)’ or ‘endure’ (OLD s. v. 17), this is less attractive in (58), although elsewhere Tertullian uses *stare* in this sense. It is impossible in (59). (59) is, in fact, the most extreme example in the entire material.²⁶

(ii) *stare* more or less used as an existential or locative verb

There are practically no purely existential examples, but (60) below may be one:

- (60) *perrexit in Aegyptum et stetit* ibi usque ad obitum Herodis ‘he went on to Egypt and stayed there until the death of Herodes’ (Itala *Matth.* 2,15 – *erat* Vulg.; ἦν in Greek)²⁷

Tertullian has a number of examples where one is tempted to identify *stare* with existential *esse*, but where the aspect ‘to endure’, ‘remain stable’ may be assumed just as well. At any rate in most of the examples a purely local meaning is excluded, many of the Subject constituents denoting abstract properties. For the ‘remain’ interpretation consider Evans’ (1972) translation of (61):

- (61) *si summi magni felicitas et sublimitas et integritas stabit* in deo Marcionis, *stabit* aequae in nostro ‘if the felicity and sublimity and integrity of supreme greatness is to stand firm in Marcion’s god, no less will it stand in ours’ (Tert. *adv. Marc.* 1,7,6)²⁸

(iii) *stare* + PPP

stare is found with present, future and perfect participles, and in most of the instances the normal Praedicativum interpretation is perfectly possible. Two excellent examples for one in search of auxiliary use of *stare* date, in fact, from poetry in the classical period, of which (62) is certainly the most difficult one:

- (62) cui si *stet* <totus> terrai traditus orbis 'si la terre entière était devenue sa propriété' (Varro *Men.* 126, transl. Cèbe)²⁹
 (63) tanta *stat praedita* (natura mundi) culpa 'so great are the flaws with which it ('the nature of the world') stands beset' (Lucr. 2,81 transl. Bailey)³⁰

I add the three cases from the later period that seem to be relevant:

- (64) *stetit fixa* sententia 'his resolution stood firm' (Ammian. 15,8,3)
 (65) *stat* argumento duplici fides *nixa* 'The belief is firmly based upon a double argument' (Paneg. Naz. 15, p. 168,29 Bae.)
 (66) si talis aderit pastor, paene *perdita stat* (plebs) 'if such will be the shepherd, the people is almost lost' (Comm. *Instr.* 2,28,10 – 3rd century (?))

(64) is clearly the extension of the familiar expression *stat sententia* (OLD s. v. 18). (65) may be compared with an expression like (67):

- (67) proprio enim argumento laus ista *nititur* 'that reputation is based on an argument of his own' (Val. Max. 4,3,2)

and in that case *stat nixa* (65) might be considered as an 'assertive' perfect form alongside *nititur*. Alternatively, one may compare the use of *stare* 'to be based upon' in (66):

- (68) omnis spes Danaum et coepti fiducia belli Palladis auxiliis semper *stetit* 'All the hope of the Danaans and their confidence in beginning the war ever stayed on the help of Pallas' (Verg. *A.* 2,162–63)

(66) allows no such explanation, but a simple equation with *est* is still not necessary, because the poet may have been inspired by our example from Lucretius (63).³¹

It will be clear, then, that there are only slight indications for *stare* developing into *esse*. The copulative cases are actually the only real ones. One may, on the basis of these ca. ten copulative cases, assume

that the development started here and that the development of the auxiliary function came much later. The development of the existential meaning can be thought of as independent of the other two. See Pountain (1982) on the history of *essere* and *stare* in Romance languages and the differences between the two verbs. In view of this, the 'poetic' cases referred to in the beginning of this section can better be regarded as poetic extensions of the 'normal' meaning of *stare* to add the aspect of unalterability or continuity.³²

Notes

1. I use capitals to distinguish the tempus perfectum from the PERFECTUM subsystem of the Latin verbal paradigm, which comprises the perfectum, plusquamperfectum and futurum exactum; PERFECTUM in this sense is opposed to INFECTUM.
2. For the notion 'phasal aspect' cf. Dik (this volume).
3. For periphrastic expressions formed by the gerundivum and a form of *esse* as substitutes for passive future forms in late Latin see Odelstierna (1926); Szantyr (1965: 312–313).
4. In the Latin manuals auxiliaries are not defined very precisely. Szantyr (1965: 346) speaks about 'Hilfsverben' on the one hand – to which he seems to assign the forms of *esse* in periphrastic tense forms like *factus est* and 'sogenannten Hilfsverben', which are divided into three subcategories: (a) 'Verba des Wollens und Strebens'; (b) 'Verba des Könnens und der Möglichkeit' und (c) *debere*. The defining characteristic is that they occur with infinitives as their complement. K.-St. (I, 667 ff.) discuss auxiliaries in a chapter entitled 'Infinitiv als Ergänzung unselbständiger Verben und Wortverbindungen'. According to them, the so-called 'Hilfsverben' may also behave as autonomous verbs with 'full verbal meaning'. Apart from the classes which can be found in Szantyr they distinguish two more classes, viz. verbs of mental activity (e.g., *cogitare* and *audere*) and so-called phasal verbs (*incipere*, *pergere*; also *solere*). In the linguistic literature of the last 20 years or so the question concerning the defining characteristics of auxiliary verbs on the one hand and 'full' verbs on the other has received lively attention. A discussion of the criteria can be found in Happ (1976), Letoublon (1984), Majór (1974), Palmer (1965; 1979) and elsewhere.
5. Cf. Pinkster (1984: ch. 8); on Praedicativa in general cf. Plank (1985).
6. The same construction is found with a wide range of verbs, including *gerere*, *attinere*, *possidere* (cf. Arts 1927: 76–77).
7. For the parallelism between transitive *habere* and intransitive *mihi esse* expressions see Thielmann (1885 b: 380). Kuryłowicz (1931) stressed the same point, for which he is criticized by Szantyr (1965: 320) – I cannot see why. See also Löfstedt (1963) and Vincent (1982: 80).
8. Notice also that the rendering 'keep' for *habere* is less suitable here. TLL 2426,28 paraphrases 'praevalente notione possidendi' and this certainly holds for some of the instances.

9. By no means a minor problem is the fact that it is not clear what Szantyr means by 'präsentisches Perfekt', although he defines the notion on p. 318. However, some of his examples belong rather to what he calls 'aoristisches Perfekt'. I will simplify the point and examine whether a 'normal' perfect could have been used as well, as Bulhart seems to do in his TLL article.
10. TLL s. v. *habere*; 2425,33 ff.; 2429,69 ff.; 2432,18 ff.; 2452,67 ff. The TLL article is much less complete for *habeo* + PPP than for *habeo* + infinitive as far as the postclassical period is concerned.
11. For this 'proportional' argument cf. Harris (1978: 132 ff.), Garcia Hernández (1980: 320), and Kiss (1982: 9–14).
12. He also refers to the problematic case *nixus laevo in femine habet laevam manum* (Pl. *Mil.* 203), where the Loeb translation reads: 'Rests his left hand on his left thigh'.
13. The Greek text has: ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἠριθμημένα εἰσίν. See on this example the excellent analysis of Benveniste (1962).
14. Pl. *Persa* 214 *satis iam dictum habeo* 'I have said enough', looks similar: Woytek (1970), however, thinks that the Agent of *dictum* is not identical with the Subject of *habeo*. There is no proof for either opinion.
15. Caroline Kroon collected ca. 120 instances.
16. See also note 3 for a parallel expression of the gerundivum with *esse*.
17. On the use of the active present infinitive with 'future' reference in general see Perrochat (1932).
18. I leave out of account possible objections against the assumption of a phonetic explanation of the development of the tense system of the following type: (a) the distinction *b/v* existed only in part of the paradigm; (b) If the merger had some influence, why replace both the PERFECTUM and the future?
19. Notice that in late Latin the gerundivum is also used as an equivalent of a future participle and that in combination with *esse* the gerundive also serves as a substitute of the passive future infinitive and finite forms (cf. Odelstierna 1926; Szantyr 1965: 312–313, 374).
20. We did no systematic counting but I reckon that the total number of *tenere* + predicative PPP or adjective is at most 125 examples, 25 of which later than the first century A.D. Cicero, Seneca and Augustine are relatively well represented in the material. This makes me curious about the *habere* + PPP construction in the later two authors.
21. There are a few cases where Gk. ἔχω is translated by *teneo* in the Itala, by *habeo* in the Vulgata (*Ap.* 6,2; 8,3).
22. Ernout (1954: 20 ff.) observes that Latin initial *s* + occlusive tends to develop into *es* + occl. or *is-* + occl. So we find *iscripta* and *estatis*. Therefore, *sto* and *exsto* may have coalesced into *esto*, compare Fr. *j'étais*, It. *stato*, Span. *estar*. For copular use of *exstare* compare Lucr. 4,893 *exstat mobilis (aer)* 'it is always quick to move'. I leave this out of account.
23. Compare Löfstedt (1912: 182–183).
24. Woytek refers to Vergil *A.* 1,646 and Servius' comment '*stat modo est*' and 3,210; in the latter case Williams (1972) speaks of 'geographical use of the verb'. Woytek also refers to Cicero's *qui domi stare non poterant* 'who could not stay at home' (*Flac.* 14).

25. The passage is, of course, not entirely clear, but the interpretation can be supported by 3,22,22 *potentes stamus*.
26. Other postclassical examples are Ammian. 31,15,13 *superior stetit*; Apul. *Met.* 11,27 *in ambiguo stetit*; Avien. *Ar.* 1184 *digna stetit*; Comm. *Apol.* 925 *stat maturum* (?); Cypr. Gall. *Ex.* 452 *stat tutius*; Itala Deut. 21,8 *uti ne stet sanguis innocuus* (ἵνα μὴ γένηται); Tert. *Anim.* 21,7 (*immobile stabit*).
27. Two examples from the Panegyricus Nazarii Constantino Augusto dictus deserve mention: *quamvis ... gloriatur penes se sanctitatis famam stetitisse* 'although it prides itself that only at that time the reputation of integrity existed' (Paneg. IV (X), 15,1, cf. IV (X), 23,4 – A.D. 321).
28. Cf. *adv. Marc.* 1,21; 4,12; *Scorp.* 10; *Idol.* 24 (?). Compare also Aug. *Civ.* 11,11; 20,8; *Epist.* 140,14; Salon. *In Eccles.* 997 A.
29. Nonius 392,1 ff. gives (59) also as an example of 'plenum est'. Cèbe in his commentary (1977: 582–583) observes: 'la substitution de *esse* à *stare* ... est due à la volonté de mettre fortement et concrètement en évidence la notion d'état acquis, que ne dégagent pas assez les périphrases forgées au moyen du verbe *esse*, verbe plat et dévalué'. This is true, but Cèbe's own translation is plain enough not to bring out the poetic purpose at all. The fact that Nonius discusses it is an indication of its abnormality.
30. One may compare *finita simul generatim tempora rebus stare* 'that (we see) at the same time fixed seasons ordained for all things' (Lucr. 1,564).
31. Editors tend to emend (*totast* Hanssen, *nutat* Dombart), but I see no reason for that.
32. Several friends helped me by reading a preliminary version of this paper and giving their comments. I mention with deep gratitude A. Machtelt Bolkestein (as always), Daan den Hengst, Hotze Mulder, Christian Touratier, and above all Caroline Kroon. Part of the research was made possible by ZWO (Dutch Organization for Pure Research).

References

- ARTS, M. R. 1927. The syntax of the Confessions of Saint Augustine. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University.
- BARBERINO, JOSEPH LOUIS. 1978. The evolution of the Latin /b/ – /v/ merger. Chapel Hill: North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures.
- BENVENISTE, ÉMILE. 1962. Hittite et indoeuropéen. Paris.
- BENVENISTE, ÉMILE. 1966. 'Être' et 'avoir' dans leurs fonctions linguistiques. BSL 55. 1960. 113–124, reprinted in: Problèmes de linguistique générale, 1966. 187–207.
- BLÜMEL, WOLFGANG. 1979. Zur historischen Morphosyntax der Verbalabstrakta im Lateinischen. Glotta 57. 77–125.
- BOLKESTEIN, A. MACHTELT. 1980. Problems in the description of modal verbs. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- BOLKESTEIN, A. MACHTELT. 1981. Factivity as a condition on an expression rule in Latin: The underlying representation of the 'ab urbe condita' construction in Latin, in: Predication and expression in Functional Grammar, ed. by A. Machelt Bolkestein et al., 205–233. London: Academic Press.

- COLEMAN, ROBERT. 1971. The origin and development of Latin *habeo* + infinitive. *Cl. Q.* 21.215–232.
- DOKKUM, T. 1900. De constructionis analyticae vice acc. c. inf. fungentis usu apud Augustinum. Diss. Groningen.
- ERNOUT, ALFRED. 1954. Exsto et les composés latins en *ex-*. *BSL* 50.18–28.
- FLEISCHMAN, SUZANNE. 1982. The future in thought and language. Diachronic evidence from Romance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GARCÍA HERNÁNDEZ, BENJAMÍN. 1980. El desarrollo de la expresión analítica en latín vulgar. *Plantamiento general. Revista española de lingüística* 10.307–330.
- HAPP, HEINZ. 1967. Die lateinische Umgangssprache und die Kunstsprache des Plautus. *Glotta* 45.60–104.
- HAPP, HEINZ. 1976. Grundfragen einer Dependenzgrammatik des Lateinischen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- HARRIS, MARTIN B. 1978. The evolution of French syntax. London: Longman.
- HARRIS, MARTIN B. 1982. The 'Past Simple' and 'Present Perfect' in Romance, in: *Studies in the Romance Verb*, ed. by Nigel Vincent & Martin B. Harris, 42–70. London: Croom Helm.
- HERMAN, JÓZSEF. 1975. *Le Latin Vulgaire*. 3rd edn. Paris: P. U. F.
- KISS, SÁNDOR. 1982. Tendances évolutives de la syntaxe verbale en Latin tardif. Debrecen: *Studia Romanica, Series Linguistica, Fasc. IV*.
- KÜHNER, R. – C. STEGMANN. 1912. Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Satzlehre. Hannover: Hahn. 2 vols. [Repr.: Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft].
- KURYŁOWICZ, JERZY. 1931. Les temps composés en roman. *Prace Filologiczne* 15.448–453 (repr. in Kuryłowicz 1960: 104–108).
- KURYŁOWICZ, JERZY. 1960. *Esquisses Linguistiques I*. München: Fink.
- LETOUBLON, FRANÇOISE. 1984. Il vient de pleuvoir, il va faire beau: Verbes de mouvement et auxiliaires. *ZfrSpr.* 94.25–41.
- LEUMANN, MANU. 1962. Lateinisch *habere* mit Infinitiv. *M. H.* 1965–71.
- LÖFSTEDT, BENGT. 1963. Zum lateinischen possessiven Dativ. *ZVS* 78.64–83.
- LÖFSTEDT, EMIL. 1912. Plautinischer Sprachgebrauch und Verwandtes. *Glotta* 3.171–191.
- LÖFSTEDT, EMIL. 1928, (1942²) 1933. *Syntactica*. Two vols. Lund: Gleerup.
- LUCOT, R. 1940. L'emploi de *habeo* avec le participe en *-to-*, in: *Mél. Ernout*, 247–249. Paris: Klincksieck.
- MAJÓR, DIANA. 1974. The acquisition of modal auxiliaries in the language of children. The Hague: Mouton.
- MERKX, P. A. H. J. 1939. Zur Syntax der Kasus und Tempora in den Traktaten des hl. Cyprian. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt.
- MEYER-LÜBKE, WILHELM. 1899. *Romanische Syntax*. Leipzig: Reisland.
- MÜLLER, BODO. 1964. Das lateinische Futurum und die romanischen Ausdrucksweisen des futurischen Geschehens. *RF* 76.44–97.
- ODELSTIERNA, INGRID. 1926. *Di vi futurali ac finali gerundii et gerundivi latini observationes*. Upsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- PALMER, F. R. 1965. *The English verb*. London: Longman.
- PALMER, F. R. 1979 a. Why auxiliaries are not main verbs. *Lingua* 47.1 – 25.
- PALMER, F. R. 1979 b. Modality and the English modals. London: Longman.

- PERROCHAT, P. 1932. *Recherches sur la Valeur et l'Emploi de l'Infinitif Subordonné en Latin*. Paris: Belles Lettres. [= *Lateinische Syntax und Semantik*. Tübingen: Narr, 1987]
- PETERSMANN, H. 1977. *Petrone's urbane Sprache*. Wien: Akademie.
- PINKSTER, HARM. 1983. Tempus, Aspekt und Aktionsart in Latin. *ANRW* 29/1.270–319.
- PINKSTER, HARM. 1984. *Latijnse Syntaxis en Semantiek*. Amsterdam: Grüner. [= *Lateinische Syntax und Semantik*. Tübingen: Narr, 1987]
- PINKSTER, HARM. 1985. The development of future tense auxiliaries in Latin. *Glotta* 63. 186–208.
- PINKSTER, HARM. Forthcoming. Some methodological remarks on research on future tense auxiliaries in Latin, in: Calboli, G. (ed.).
- PLANK, FRANS. 1985. Prädikativ und Koprädikativ. *ZGL* 13.154–185.
- POUNTAIN, CHRISTOPHER J. 1982. *Essere/stare as a Romance phenomenon*, in: *Studies in the Romance verb*, ed. by Nigel Vincent & Martin B. Harris, 139–160. London: Croom Helm.
- RAMAT, PAOLO. 1982. Ein Beispiel von 'Reanalysis' typologisch betrachtet. *FoL* 16.365–383.
- ROSÉN, HAIM B. 1981. *Studies in the verbal noun of Early Latin*. München: Fink.
- SERBAT, GUY (ed.). 1980. *Le sens du parfait de l'indicatif en latin*. *Civilisations* 1. Special issue.
- STIMM, HELMUT. 1977. Ein neuer früher Beleg des synthetischen Futurs, in: *Festgabe für Julius Wilhelm*, ed. by Hugo Laitenberger. *ZFSL. Beiheft N. F.* 5.40–52.
- SZANTYR, ANTON. 1965. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: Beck.
- THIELMANN, PHILIPP. 1885 a. *Habere mit dem Infinitiv und die Entstehung des romanischen Futurums*. *ALL* 2.157–202.
- THIELMANN, PHILIPP. 1885 b. *Habere mit dem Part. Perf. Pass.* *ALL* 2.372–423; 509–549.
- ULTAN, RUSSELL. 1978. The nature of future tenses, in: *Universals of human language III*, ed. by Joseph Greenberg, 83–123. Stanford: University Press.
- VÄÄNÄNEN, VEIKKO. 1981. *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- VALESIO, PAOLO. 1968. The Romance synthetic future pattern and its first attestations. *Lingua* 20.112–161; 278–307.
- VINCENT, NIGEL. 1982. The development of the auxiliaries *habere* and *esse* in Romance, in: *Studies in the Romance verb*, ed. by Nigel Vincent & Martin B. Harris, 71–96. London: Croom Helm.
- WERNER, EDELTRAUT. 1980. *Die Verbalperiphrase im Mittelfranzösischen. Eine semantisch-syntaktische Analyse*. *Studia Romanica et Linguistica* 11. Frankfurt.
- WILLIAMS, R. D. *The Aeneid of Virgil, books 1–6*. London: St. Martins Press.
- WOYTEK, ERICH. 1970. *Sprachliche Studien zu Varros Menippea*. Wien–Köln: Böhlau.

Harm Pinkster
 Universiteit van Amsterdam
 Klassiek Seminarium
 Oude Turfmarkt 129
 NL-1012 GC Amsterdam