

(or Nom.) with Infin. as well as the Abl. or Gen. Absolutus could also be expressed in the form of a subordinate clause, either a *quod*-, *quia*- complement clause, in the former case, or the respective adverbial clause, in the latter case. Whereas in Greek the two options, one nominal and the other non-nominal, were rather well-balanced, in Classical Latin the Acc. or Nomin. with Infin. became in the written language the only possible construction after the *verba dicendi, putandi* and *sentiendi* for one or two centuries at least –with even the Abl. Absolute becoming a very favourite means of linguistic expression in the written form of Classical and Late Latin for quite a number of centuries.

On the other hand, in colloquial Latin, which was getting close to the initial stage of separate Romance languages, both the above nominal constructions were gradually abandoned, without direct remnants (or productive examples) in the Romance languages of an Acc. (or Nom.) with Infin. construction after the *verba dicendi* proper and only with a limited number of some participial, syntactically “absolute” constructions with either a high literary or a purely idiomatic shade –whose linguistically more general and genetically rather indifferent character seems to follow from the fact that the Romance constructions such as the Spanish “terminada la guerra, el rey murió” or “una vez abierta la puerta, entraron en casa” have their counterparts also in non-Romance languages, e.g. in English (e.g., “all things considered, ...”, in German, or even in Old Czech etc.

Such examples of Classical Latin –so to say– syntactical excessiveness, which were later abandoned and are in the area of Romance languages practically non-existent or maybe somewhat marginal, seem to have been even more common in Classical Latin. Let us mention, for example, the frequent use of gerundive in Classical Latin, another old Latin nominal construction with a semantic shade of necessity, which, however, was soon gradually replaced by the new modal verb *debere*, or the obligatorily used conjunctive mood in indirect questions, later abandoned as well, or the intricate complex of the so-called “second” dependence system in Latin, not surviving the formation of the Romance languages.

This Romance outcome seems to be due to the pragmatism of the Late Latin colloquial speech, but what remains remarkable is the fact that the Classical Latin apparently struck, at the time of its greatest flowering, a syntactically quite pretentious path, which could not be later kept up, for practical reasons, under the changed conditions. I may be wrong to say this, but I think that there was something in Coleman’s title “The Rise and Fall of Absolute Constructions in Latin”, I would like only to change it a little, for the purpose of my paper, into “The Rise and Fall of some Latin Nominal, i.e. Infinitival and Participial Constructions”.

MENAECHMVS QVIDAM. INDEFINITES AND PROPER NOUNS IN CLASSICAL AND LATE LATIN

Alessandra BERTOCCHI - Mirka MARALDI
University of Bologna, Italy

The purpose of this paper is to give an analysis of the relation between a proper noun and the use of an indefinite connected to it. Our suggestion is that the use of the indefinite is different depending on the particular use in which the proper noun occurs. To this aim, different uses of proper nouns can be described which are classifiable according to two main groups, the referential and the metaphorical use. We will show that *quidam* is prevalently found with proper nouns in the referential use, while *aliquis* is found prevalently with proper nouns in the metaphorical use.

1. The referential use

The referential use of the proper noun is the most common and usually found. Its function is that of referring to the individual who bears the relevant name, as in (1):

(1) *si cuius Romanus Archias legibus non esset* (Cic.Arch.25)

2. The metaphorical use

Proper nouns are used metaphorically when their function is not (or not exclusively) that of referring. While a proper noun refers to a single individual, the main property of its metaphorical use is that of involving a double reference¹. See for example:

(2) *nam M. Luculli uxorem Memmius suis sacris initiauit. Menelaus aegre id passus diuortium fecit. Quamquam ille pastor Idaeus Menelaum solum contempserat, hic noster Paris tam Menelaum quam Agamemnonem liberum non putauit* (Cic.Att.1,18,3)

¹ Cf. VALLAT, D., “Les noms propres métaphoriques: aspects référentiels et sémantiques”, BOLKESTEIN, M. et al. (edd.), *Theory and Description in Latin Linguistics*, Amsterdam 2002, 405-419.

where the name Paris evokes its first referent (the son of Priamus) and, at the same time, applies to a second referent (in this case, Memmius).

Two features of the metaphorical use become immediately clear, which appear to be strictly intertwined, one depending on the other: a. this use can be defined as predicative², since the proper name used metaphorically evokes a cluster of properties which the referent of the proper name prototypically represents; b. this referent is notorious and his fame may come from history, mythology, literature or art. Only notorious names allow the metaphorical use, because shared knowledge between speaker and hearer is needed in order to obtain that the metaphor is interpreted. If the speaker and his addressee do not share certain cultural knowledge the metaphor remains inoperative.³

2.1 Syntactic distinctions between referential and metaphorical uses

There are also syntactically relevant differences between referential and metaphorical use of proper nouns. In modern languages, while a referential proper noun is not used with the article, a singular proper noun used metaphorically is generally⁴ accompanied by a determinant (the indefinite or definite article) and/or by different types of expansion.

The lack of the article in Latin makes the Latin facts somewhat different from modern languages. As to expansions,⁵ there are certainly many corresponding cases between Latin and modern languages:

- (3) a. *ostendam hanc Palatinam Medeam eamque migrationem huic adulescenti causam siue malorum omnium siue potius sermonum fuisse* (Cic.Cael.18)
 b. *Curribus Automedon lentisque erat aptus habentis, /Tiphys in Hemonia puppe magister erat:/me Venus artificem tenero praefuit Amori ;/Tiphys et Automedon dicar Amoris ego* (Ou.ars 1,5)

² Cf. ORLANDINI, A., *Il riferimento del nome*, Bologna 1995.

³ As is also demonstrated, among other things, by the problems of interpretation and translation from a language to another of metaphoric proper nouns, which are discussed by PODEUR, J., *Nomi in azione*, Napoli 1999, 190-204.

⁴ This limitation is given in consideration of metaphoric statements as: "Arpagone ha detto di no!" (cf. PODEUR, J., *l.c.*, 191) or "Ha parlato Einstein!", that are examples of metaphors *in absentia*, where the discourse referent (=the second referent) lacks and only the known original referent is expressed.

⁵ On the relation to proper nouns, cf. JONASSON, K., "Les noms propres métaphoriques: construction et interprétation", *Langue française* 92, 1991, 77; VALLAT, D. (2002), *l.c.*, 413.

But in Latin, where the article is lacking, it is also possible to find bare metaphoric proper nouns:

- (4) a. *per ea tempora Mithridates, Ponticus rex, uir neque silendus neque dicendus sine cura, bello acerrimus, uirtute eximius, aliquando fortuna, semper animus maximus, consiliis dux, miles manu, odio in Romanos Hannibal* (Vell.2,18,1)
 b. *Irus et est subito, qui modo Croesus erat* (Ou.trist. 3,7,42)

In (4a) the metaphoric interpretation of *Hannibal* is granted by the context. In (4b), the sentence containing the two metaphoric proper nouns has a generic interpretation, where *Irus* and *Croesus* do not refer to some specific second referent, but are metaphorically related to the classes of the richest and of the poorest persons.

We are particularly concerned with the cases where the second referent is not represented by a specific individual, but by a generic one, that is by an open set of individuals all characterised by the same properties, i.e. the properties of the first referent. As we will see, this generic value of the metaphoric proper noun is the particular meaning in which the indefinite *aliquis* can occur. This generic value is frequently associated with plural proper nouns when metaphorically used:

- (5) a. *Erras, Catule, inquit Antonius, nam egomet in multos iam Phormiones incidi* (Cic.de orat.2,77)
 b. *Multi autem Gnathonum similes cum sint loco, fortuna, forma superiores, horum est adsentatio molesta, cum ad uanitatem accessit auctoritas* (Cic.Lael.94)⁶
 c. *Qui nisi exeunt, nisi pereunt, etiam si Catilina perierit, scitote hoc in re publica seminarium Catilinarum futurum* (Cic.Catil.2,23)⁷

3. The passage from proper to common noun

The loss of individuality of the referent and the acquisition of the features of a universal type make it possible to find proper nouns used as synonyms, since they can be interchanged without any change in meaning. Consider (6):

⁶ For the proverbial use of *Gnatho* cf. FORCELLINI, s.u.: *hinc de quouis parasito per antonomasiam dicitur*.

⁷ The metaphorical uses of *Catilina* are frequent. Some are in the plural: Cic.Att.4,3,3 *omnes Catilinas*; Sen.dial.6,20,5 *M. Cicero si illo tempore, quo Catilinae sicas deuittauit,....concidisset,....*

- (6) a. *Neque me diuitiae mouent, quibus omnis Africanos et Laelios multi uenalicii mercatoresque superarunt* (Cic.orat.232)
 b. *Neque uestis aut caelatum aurum et argentum, quo nostros ueteres Marcellos Maximosque multi eunuchi e Syria Aegyptoque uicerunt* (Cic.orat.232)

where *Africanos et Laelios* in a. and *Marcellos et Maximos* in b. can be taken indifferently as prototypes of austerity in habits. As such, their names can be replaced by one another. The value of *exempla* of this particular use of the plural proper nouns makes them near to common nouns.⁸

But the relation between proper and common noun is complex and opens various problems. Consider for example (7):

- (7) a. *Sint Maecenates, non deerunt, Flacce, Marones Vergiliumque tibi uel tua rura dabunt* (Mart.8,56,5-6)
 b. *uestem purpuream teneris quoque Maecenatibus aptam* (Iuu.12,37)

which shows that even in plural metaphorical uses proper nouns cannot function as common nouns, since their meaning is not codified. As an example of their floating semantic value, compare the value of *Maecenas* in (7a) with the value in (7b). While in (a) it designates a 'protector of artists', in (b) it designates 'an effeminate man'.⁹ For this reason, we agree with Vallat that proper nouns in the metaphorical use differ from common nouns because their meaning is not fixed. Furthermore, according to Vallat (2002) *l.c.*, 415, the metaphorical proper noun stays in-between proper and common noun and does never entirely lexicalize in Latin as happens in modern languages.¹⁰ In fact, according to Vallat, the relation to the first referent is never interrupted, since we must resort to extra-linguistic knowledge in order to understand

etiam tunc felix mori potuit: non uidisset...bella rapinas, tantum Catilinarum. In the singular, see Sidon.*epist.*2.2,1 *iste Catilina saeculi nostri.*

⁸ Cf. VALLAT, D., "Pluriel et nom propre: problèmes de référence", CALBOLI, G. (ed.), *Papers on Grammar IX*,2, Roma 2005, 785-795.

⁹ This semantic distinction is not taken into consideration by MIGLIORINI, B., *Dal nome proprio al nome comune*, Firenze 1927, 145, who assigns to all the examples we quote the same meaning of 'protector of artists'. By consequence, Migliorini considers the name *Maecenas* as lexicalized more than other names.

¹⁰ As an example of accomplished lexicalization, we can cite, in Italian, the term 'sospia' which is a common noun used to define a person which is identical to another one. The term is perfectly intelligible by everyone, included those who ignore the comedies of Plautus and the character of *Sospia* in the *Amphitruo*, or the comedies by Molière and the personage *Sospie*. It is from this latter that the Italian 'sospia' derives.

the metaphoric nouns.¹¹ In our opinion, although the non-accomplished lexicalization is prevailing in Latin, there are however some cases which appear to be instances of the accomplished passage from proper to common noun. Such are the names *Thais*, *Hermaphroditus*, *Ganymedes/Catamitus*.

3.1 *Thais*

Thais is the name of the meretrix in the comedy *Eunuchus* by Terence and there the name is of course used referentially.¹² It is used metaphorically by Ovid, however, to refer to the character who typically plays a role related to erotic love, as opposed to *Andromache*, who is also metaphorically used to represent conjugal love:¹³

- (8) *Quis feret Andromaches peragentem Thaida partes?
 Peccat, in Andromache Thaida quisquis agat* (Ou.rem.383)¹⁴

In Ovid the name *Thais* is also used as a metonym of erotism:

- (9) *Thais in arte mea est: lasciuiua libera nostra est; nil mihi cum uitta;
 Thais in arte mea est* (Ou.rem.385)

¹¹ A clear case of uncompleted lexicalization is given by Cicero explicitly in *de orat.*2,265 *ut cum Sex. Titius se Cassandram esse diceret* where 'Cassandra' could be interpreted as the prototype of prophets who are not believed, even in the absence of a relation with the historical or mythological personage. But what Cicero immediately adjoins: '*multos*' *inquit Antonius 'possum tuos Aiaces Oileos nominare'* requires the relation to the first referent to be restored. As to the name *Titius*, it is frequently used in juridical language as 'paradigmatischer Name' (see PAULY-WISSOWA, *s.u.*), as for example in Gaius *inst.*: *Titius heres esto*. It is probably from this use that the Italian common noun 'un tizio' (an unspecified person) derives.

¹² Also referentially the name *Thais* is used by Cicero, who cites a passage by Terence. Cf. Ter. *Eun.*391 *magnas uero agere gratias Thais mihi? Ingentes* and Cic.*Lael.*98 *magnas uero agere gratias Thais mihi? Satis erat respondere: 'magnas', 'ingentes' inquit.* Cicero's passage is quoted by Dante *Inf.*18.135 *Ho io grazie grandi apo te? Anzi maravigliose!*

¹³ It is by making reference to the name *Andromache* that VALLAT, D. (2002), *l.c.*, 415 suggests that even in the metaphorical use proper nouns cannot function as common nouns, their meaning not being fixed. In fact in Mart.3,76,4 *cum possis Hecaben, non potes Andromachen!* *Andromache* designates a 'femme jeune' while in Iuu.6.502-504 *tot premit ordinibus, tot adhuc conpagibus altum/ aedificat caput: Andromachen a fronte uidebis;/ post minor est, credas aliam* *Andromache* is a 'femme de grande taille'. In the example by Ovid which is cited, the name *Andromache* has yet another meaning.

¹⁴ The case of actors personifying certain characters is interesting. For example, in Cic. *Q. Rosc.*20 *nam Ballionem illum improbissimum et periurissimum lenonem cum agit, agit Chaeream* the referents are three: Roscius, the actor who plays the role of Ballio who, in his turn, represents Fannius Chaerea.

While *Thais* is a proper noun in Classical Latin, it is used in Medieval Latin as a common noun by Johannes de Garlandia who uses it as a synonym for *meretrix*:

- (10) *Est meretrix, scortum, thais, lupa, capra, chimera* (Johannes de Garlandia, *Synonima*)

3.2 Hermaphroditus

The name is used referentially by the authors who tell the myth of Hermaphroditus, as Ovid and Hyginus:

- (11) a. *Hermaphroditus ait: 'nato date munera uestro
Et pater et genetrix, amborum nomen habenti...'* (Ov.*met.*4,380)
b. *Atlantius Mercurii et Veneris filius qui Hermaphroditus dictus est* (Hyg.*fab.*271,2)

However a metaphorical use which is near to a common noun is already found in Titinius:

- (12) *Quasi hermaphroditus fimbriatum frontem gestas feminae* (Titin.*tog.*115)¹⁵

The common noun *hermaphroditus* derives from a proper name designating a mythological personage, and it denotes all those who are bisexual. This use is found frequently in Pliny who gives some explanation of the phenomenon, and also in Justinian's *Digesta*, where legal problems are faced concerning *testamenta* in relation to hermaphrodites' rights. See (13) and (14):

- (13) *Gignuntur et utriusque sexus quos hermaphroditos uocamus, olim androgynos uocatos et in prodigiis habitos, nunc uero in deliciis* (Plin.*nat.*7,34)
(14) *Hermaphroditus plane, si in eo uirilia preualebunt, postumum heredem instituere poterit* (Iust.*dig.*28,2,6)

¹⁵ Cf. DAVIAULT, A. (ed.), *Comoedia Togata. Fragments*, Paris 1981, 125: 'Hermaphrodite, premier exemple...Ce personnage, à qui une coiffure trop féminine vaut une comparaison moqueuse avec le dieu double... Dans la *Palliata*, c'est le personnage du soldat qui porte les cheveux longs, arrangés d'une façon exotique et risible (See Plaut.*Mil.*64, 768, 923).'

3.3 Ganymedes, Catamitus

The proper noun Ganymedes is found both in a referential and in a metaphorical use. Of this latter use, an example is given in (15):

- (15) *Tu Gaetulum Ganymedem respice cum sities* (Iuu.5.59)

where, as is the custom with metaphorical names, the adjective *Gaetulum* syntactically agrees with the first referent (Ganymedes), but semantically it refers to the second referent, someone who has some relationship with the object of this satire by Juvenal.¹⁶

Its Latin correspondent, *Catamitus*,¹⁷ is used referentially, as in (16):

- (16) *tabulam pictam in pariete, ubi aquila Catameitum raperet aut ubi Venus Adoneum* (Plaut.*Men.*144)

or metaphorically, as in (17):

- (17) *aut Iouis Elysii tu Catamitus eris* (Auson.250,8)

If the relation to the first referent is still evident here, it is less evident in the following examples:

- (18) a. *quasi uero de facie tua, Catamite, dixerim* (Cic.*or.frg.*B29)
b. *Ergo, ut te catamitum, nec opinato cum te ostendisses, praeter spem mulier aspiceret, idcirco urbem terrore nocturno, Italiam multorum dierum metum perturbasti* (Cic.*Phil.*2,77)

where the interpretation of 'catamitus', used here by Cicero as an offence, seems to be possible also independently of the interpretation of the first referent. A complete semantic autonomy seems to be reached in other examples, where 'catamitus' is used as a common noun, meaning *puer delicatus, amasius*:¹⁸

¹⁶ The value of the expansion of metaphorical nouns has been underlined by VALLAT, D. (2002), *l.c.*, 413-414. In this respect, GARY-PRIEUR, M.-N., *Grammaire du nom propre*, Paris 1994, speaks of a counterfactual value of the first referent, created by the expansion. As we will see, also the use of expansions such as the indefinite pronouns may be analyzed as giving place to counterfactuality.

¹⁷ Cf. Seru. *Aen.*1,1,28 *Sane hic Ganymedes Latine Catamitus dicitur* and Paul. Fest. 18,44 *Catamitum pro Ganymede dixerunt, qui fuit Iouis concubinus*.

¹⁸ *Catamitus* seems to be used as a common noun also in Mart. Cap. *nupt.*4,344 *si homines diui-*

- (19) a. *Modo tamen ideo ait 'sparge marite nuces' ut eum culparet infamiae: nam meritorii pueri, id est catamiti, quibus licenter utebantur antiqui, recedentes a turpi seruitio nuces spargebant* (Seru.ecl.8,29)
 b. *Nam inter duodecim catamitos totidemque puellas accubare solitus erat* (Ps.Aur.Vict.epit.1,22)

4. Indefinites with proper nouns

4.1 *Aliquis*

The indefinites in combination with a proper noun that we will analyze here are *aliquis* and *quidam*.

Aliquis is a specific indefinite pronoun, while *quidam* is not only specific, but also known to the speaker.¹⁹ The criteria distinguishing specific from non-specific expressions are that only with specific expressions does the speaker presuppose the existence and unique identifiability of the referent.²⁰ See, for example:

- (20) a. *Iam ergo aliquis Oppianicum gratis condemnauit* (Cic.Cluent.113)
 b. *ita, quem ad modum in senatu semper est aliquis, qui interpretem postulet, sic isti nobis cum interprete audiendi sunt* (Cic.fin.5,89)

While *aliquis* is specific in most cases, *quis* is always non-specific. It is in fact found in irrealis contexts, as questions and conditional protases, because the referents of indefinites in interrogative and conditional clauses are to be considered only as virtual or possible:

- (21) a. *ecquis id dixerit?* (Cic.Tusc.1,87)
 b. *si quis uere aestimare uelit* (Liu.6,11,3)

In an analysis of Latin indefinites,²¹ we have shown that the two criteria of 'presupposition of existence' and 'unique identifiability' do not always

das in masculos et feminas, item masculos in pueros, adulescentes et senes, item pueros in infantes et loquentes, item puerum si uelis diuidere in Catamitum aut alium quempiam certae personae puerum, non est genus, quod iam ad indiuiduum peruenit, even if the specific mention that 'catamitus' is not a gender seems to contrast with our idea that the passage from proper to common noun passes through the designation of a class.

¹⁹ The distinction between *quidam* and *aliquis*, for some aspects, reminds us of the French difference between *un certain* and *un quelconque* highlighted by JAYEZ, J.; TOVENA, L. M., "Determiners and (Un)certainly", *SALT* 2002.

²⁰ See HASPELMATH, M., *Indefinite pronouns*, Oxford 1997, 38.

hold together. Certain Latin uses of the indefinite require that between the cases of specific reference, characterised by the properties [+presupposition of existence, +unique identifiability] (most cases of *aliquis*), and the cases of non-specific reference, i.e. [-presupposition of existence, -unique identifiability] (all cases of *quis*) cases are also found where the referent of the indefinite is given as existing, but it is not uniquely identifiable [+presupposition of existence, -unique identifiability] (some instances of *aliquis*).

When used with a proper noun *aliquis* has the same intermediate value between specific and non-specific that it has, for example, in conditional clauses.²² If we compare cases of *quis* + a proper noun with cases of *aliquis* + a proper noun, we see that *quis* maintains its value of indefinite whose referent is not uniquely identifiable and not even presupposed as existing, as in (22):

- (22) *illud si quis patricius, si quis –quod illi uolunt inuidiosius esse– Claudius diceret: 'aut omnia accipite, aut nihil fero', quis uestrum, Quirites, ferret?* (Liu.6,40,13)

On the contrary, the referent of *aliquis* is presupposed as existing, as shown in (23):

- (23) *cui? Neminem nominabo: putate tum Phormioni alicui, tum Gnatoni, tum etiam Ballioni* (Cic.Phil.2,15)

It is, however, not uniquely identifiable, because the referents may be more than one only: the function of *aliquis* is that of underlying that the set is open to all those who share the same properties. The second referent is not represented by a specific individual, but by a generic one, that is by an open set of individuals all characterised by the same properties: in this instance it is that of being parasites like Phormio. *Aliquis* makes the proper noun simi-

²¹ See BERTOCCHI, A.; MARALDI, M., "Indefinite pronouns in conditional clauses", CALBOLI, G. (ed.), *Papers on Grammar IX*, 1, Roma 2005, 453-466.

²² It is on the basis of the plural usage of proper nouns that LONGOBARDI, G., "Reference and Proper Names: A Theory of N-Movement in Syntax and Logical Form", *Linguistic Inquiry* 25, 1994, 647 proposes the introduction of a third possibility between the specific/non-specific reading. According to him, the bare occurrences of plural proper names have a generic reading (e.g. 'Marys are usually nice girls, according to my experience'), corresponding to Haspelmath's non-specific case, while they acquire a definite specific reading by taking the article, as in 'I visited the (two) Marys yesterday'. There are however also cases of bare plural names, where the referent is given as existing but is not uniquely identifiable (these are called by Longobardi cases of existential reading), as for example: 'During my visit to the U.S. I met Marys everywhere'.

lar to a common noun, as shown by (24), where the proper name *Catilina* is equated to the common nouns *gladiator* and *latro*:

- (24) *in aliquem credo hoc gladiatorem aut latronem aut Catilinam esse conlatum, non in eum qui ne quid tale in re publica fieri posset effecerit* (Cic.Phil.14,14)

The generic value that *aliquis* has when used with a metaphorical proper noun is near to the properties of a free choice indefinite: specifically, *aliquis* plus a proper noun expresses non-identification and indifference or lack of concern.²³

The generic value characterizes all the cases of *aliquis* with a proper noun metaphorically used:

- (25) a. *sed dixit consularem disertum, uicinum consulis, sibi dixisse Ahalam Seruilium aliquem aut Brutum opus esse reperiri* (Cic.Att.2,24,3)
 b. *sed in illo genere sit sane Pacideianus aliquis hoc animo, ut narrat Lucilius* (Cic.Tusc. 4,48)
 c. *semper habe Pyladen aliquem, qui curet Oresten* (Ou.rem.589)

It is with proper nouns used metaphorically that *aliquis* is prevailingly, if not exclusively, found. Also in the few referential cases, *aliquis* preserves its generic value. Consider for example (26):

- (26) *Gaiium istum, quem repentinum speculatorem fuisse dicis, ostendam in lautumias Syracusis a te esse coniectum, neque id solum ex litteris ostendam Syracusanorum, ne possis dicere me, quia sit aliqui in litteris Gaiius, hoc fingere et eligere nomen, ut hunc illum esse possim dicere.*

²³ In this way, *aliquis* has the same properties that JAYEZ, J.; TOVENA, L. M., *l.c.*, assign to 'un N quelconque' in French. That *aliquis* may have in some cases the value of 'un quiconque' is illustrated also by examples with common nouns, as for example: Cic.parad.1,14 *Tu, cum tibi siue deus siue mater, ut ita dicam, uerum omnium natura dederit animum, quo nihil est praestantius neque diuinius, sic te ipse abicies atque prosternes, ut nihil inter te atque inter quadripedem aliquam putes interesse?* This is also the value of *unus aliquis*. Cf. HOFMANN, J. B.; SZANTYR A., *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, München 1965, 211: "Soll die Zahlangebe nur als eine ungefähre gekennzeichnet werden, dann wird *aliquis* hinzugesetzt." The value of approximation that *aliquis* confers to a cardinal number is a value of indifference with *unus*. Compare for example: *Rhet.Her.4,5,8 quare unius alicuius esse similem satis habebit* which Calboli translates: 'quindi riterrà sufficiente somigliare a uno solo qualsiasi' (Cornificio, *Retorica ad Erennio*, trad. ital. di G. CALBOLI, Bologna 1969) or Plaut.*Truc.102 oenus eorum aliquis* ('uno qualsivoglia di loro' in the translation by Paratore. Cf. *Plauto, Tutte le Commedie*, a cura di E. PARATORE, Roma 1976).

sed ad arbitrium tuum testis dabo qui istum ipsum Syracusis abs te in lautumias coniectum esse dicant (Cic.Verr.II 5,164)

The name *Gaius* is used referentially, but *aliquis* does not have a uniquely identifiable referent, even if there is only one *Gaius* according to Cicero. The use of *aliquis* alludes to the fact that in Verres' deceitful intent there can be more than one *Gaius*. In this way he has an argument with which to accuse Cicero of using a misunderstanding about the identity of the referent of the proper noun to his own advantage.

There is only one example where *aliquis* + proper noun has a specific value:

- (27) *Fando aliquem Hippolytum uestras si contigit aures credulitate patris, sceleratae fraude nouercae occubuisse neci, mirabere, uixque probabo, sed tamen ille ego sum* (Ou.met.15,497)

In this case *aliquis* is perfectly equal to *quidam*: its referent is presupposed as existing, it is uniquely identified and it is known to the speaker (*Hippolytus*, the referent himself). As with *quidam*, the role of the indefinite is that of making the referent of the proper noun less definite.

In Late Latin the use of *aliquis* becomes more generalized and is also found in contexts where in Classical Latin different indefinites would be found. For example it is used also in the place of *quisquam*:²⁴

- (28) *nec inter doctos aliquis error existit* (Veg.mil.2,23)

In spite of its more generalized use, however, we have found no example of *aliquis* with a proper noun in Late Latin. There are instead many instances of *quidam*.

4.2. *Quidam*

In general, the indefinite *quidam* is used when the referent is presupposed as existing, uniquely identifiable and known to the speaker.²⁵ These features (+specific, +known) are found both in the pronominal and in the adjectival function of *quidam*:

²⁴ In this case it does not have the value that grammars assign to *aliquis* in negative contexts, that of indicating a certain quantity (e.g. *sine aliquo timore* in the place of *sine ullo timore*).

²⁵ Cf. HASPELMATH, M., *l.c.*, 45.

- (29) a. *amat mulier quaedam quendam* (Plaut.Mil.1016)
 b. *fuit olim quidam senex mercator; nauim is fregit apud Andrum insulam* (Ter.And.221-222)
 c. *Nam proficiscens de Tharso perueni ad quandam ciuitatem supra mare adhuc Ciliciae, que appellatur Ponpeiopolim* (Peregr.Aeth.23,1)

When used in the plural form, *quidam* preserves its features as in the first occurrence of the example (30a):

- (30) a. *In alimoniis, si sunt plures nati, ut quidam faciunt, sequendum ut quosdam subducas* (Varro rust.2,1,24)

where *quidam* is intended as referring to entities presupposed as existing and uniquely identifiable by the speaker, or as in many other late examples:

- b. *et peruenientes ad monasteria quedam susceperunt nos ibi satis humanae* (Peregr.Aeth.3,1)
 c. *Sunt quidam heretici, ut manichei et gnostici et nicolaitae et alii, qui de beato dauid audent dicere quod christi propheta domini non fuerit* (Filastr.129,1)
 d. *Adserebant enim quidam et caelum ardentem se uidisse* (Greg.Tur. Franc.5,41)

where the existence and unique identifiability of the referent is supported by some features characterizing the sentences of occurrence, which are all, in any case, assertive statements. In (30b), for example, the fact that the speaker herself refers to monasteries that she has previously visited grants us that these places are well-known (at least to her). In (30c) *quidam* occurs within a presentational sentence.²⁶ As suggested by Rosén (*l.c.*, 728) the presence of *quidam* can be intended to express some degree of ‘familiarity’ of the speaker with the newly presented entities. This suggestion finds particular evidence in (30c), where the referents of the subject modified by *quidam* are partially specified by the *ut*-phrase.

As shown by the example (30a), however, in the plural form, *quidam* can also refer to a quantity notion: here the second occurrence *quosdam* is interpreted with a quantitative reading as equivalent to ‘a certain number of them’, ‘some of them’, a reading which becomes frequent from Livy on-

²⁶ Cf. ROSÉN, H., “Latin presentational sentences”, GARCÍA-HERNÁNDEZ, B. (ed.), *Estudios de lingüística latina*, Madrid 1998, 723-742.

wards. This interpretation becomes normal when *quidam* is correlated with other items expressing number or amount, as in (31) or (32):

- (31) *non sane multa mutauit, sed tamen quaedam* (Cic.Att.13,21a,1)
 (32) a. *Multi palam, quidam, in quibus minus speciosa criminatio erat futura, clam interfecti* (Liu.1,54,9)
 b. *Quidam enim relinquunt omnia, multi autem etiam possidendo, renuntiant, quia sic ad usum possessa retinent, ut eis ex desiderio non succumbant* (Greg.M.in Ezech. 2,3,479)

In (31) the occurrence of *quidam* within the second member of a concessive correlative construction whose first member contains the mid-scalar quantifier *multa*²⁷ greatly supports the interpretation of *quidam* as a mid-scalar quantifier as well. They are different quantitatively, but have the same positive orientation, towards the great quantity. The presence of *multi* in (32a) and (32b) favours an analogous interpretation.

A most interesting function of *quidam* is its use as a term which underlines approximation (‘hedge’). As a hedge, *quidam* is found to modify adjectives and abstract nouns; in this last case it often occurs within comparative phrases prevalingly introduced by *quasi*:

- (33) a. *Nec uero deus ipse...alio modo intellegi potest nisi mens soluta quaedam et libera* (Cic.Tusc. 1,66)
 b. *nascitur ex adsiduitate laborum animorum hebetatio quaedam et languor* (Sen.dial.9,17,5)
 c. *Est bene constitutae ciuitatis quasi alumna quaedam eloquentia* (Cic.Brut.45)
 d. *cum non adstant quod inspiratio diuini spiritus est quaedam gratia* (Filastr.8,4)

In (33) the addition of *quidam* has the effect of expressing approximation to the quality or notion involved, or approximation of the comparison.²⁸

²⁷ Cf. HORN, L. H., *On the semantic properties of logical operators in English*, PhD dissertation, 1972, 61. This term signifies that *multa* occupies the middle of a scale from maximal to minimal quantity (all-most-many-several-few-none). In some languages mid-scalar quantifiers are formally similar to indefinite pronouns: so in English *some* can be either a mid-scalar quantifier or an indefinite pronoun.

²⁸ To consider *quidam* as a hedge, i.e. as an expression “whose job is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy” (cf. LAKOFF, G., “Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts”, *CLS* 8, 183-228) avoids falling into the trap of assigning two different and opposite

The frequent metaphorical type exemplified by (33c) is found rarely in cases where the metaphor does not concern a common, but a proper noun.

4.2.1 *Quidam* with proper nouns

Though the use of *quidam* accompanying a proper noun is not at all marginal, no mention is generally made about it in traditional grammars, the reason being perhaps that this use contrasts with the explanation commonly suggested that *quidam* is used when the speaker cannot or does not want to name the referent. On the contrary, examples of this combination are very frequent, with different semantic and pragmatic results depending on the type of the co-occurring proper noun, as we will see. Typical instances of the combination of *quidam* with a proper noun are the passages in (34):

- (34) a. ME. *Quis is homost?* MA. *Menaechmus quidam* (Plaut.*Men.*650)
 b. *Erat Pipa quaedam* (Cic.*Verr.*II 5,81)
 c. *uoluisti enim in suo genere unum quemque quasi quendam esse Roscium* (Cic.*de orat.*1,258)

In both (34a) and (34b) the proper noun has a referential function, while in (34c) it is used metaphorically. The addition of *quidam* obtains different effects in relationship with the different function (referential or metaphorical) of the proper noun.

4.2.2 Referential proper nouns: *Quidam* de-definitizes the proper noun

In (34a) and (34b), where the name itself identifies the referent, *quidam* produces the effect of ‘de-definitizing’ the proper noun: *Menaechmus quidam*, *Pipa quaedam* are interpreted as “a person (otherwise not qualified) by the name of Pipa, or Menaechmus (whose identity and other qualities are

values to *quidam*, which would be a contradiction. As suggested by KÜHNER, R.; STEGMANN, C., *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 3. Auflage durchgesehen von A. Thierfelder, Leverkusen 1955, 643, for example, *quidam* should have a strengthening value in (33a) and a weakening value in (33b) and (33c). Actually, *quidam* has uniquely a meaning of approximation and it is the combination of this value with different adjectives that may sometimes produce a strengthening of the quality involved. Compare, for example, Plaut.*Pseud.*1218 *rufus quidam* with Cic.*de off.* 2,38 *mirifica quaedam*. In both, *quidam* expresses approximation of the quality in question: *rufus quidam* signifies “reddish” and *mirifica quaedam* can be translated as “marvellous, so to say (in a way that can’t be said)”. Only in this case, where the adjective denotes a very high degree, may the whole expression be interpreted with an enriched value (= “indicibilmente meravigliosa” [‘ineffably marvellous’]) (cf. FERRARINO, P., *Cumque e i compositi di que*, Bologna 1942, 110-113).

trivial)”, as suggested by Rosén (*l.c.*, 729). There is an apparent contradiction in the fact of precisely naming a person and at the same time of de-definitizing this name. From our analysis it turns out that the choice of accompanying *quidam* to a proper noun almost always has some pragmatic reasons, corresponding to different speaker’s intentions. The more frequent function of this de-definitization is to underline that the referent of the proper noun does not have a great notoriety and, more specifically, that it is unknown to the addressee. This normally happens with plus or minus unknown persons, as in (35):

- (35) *Interim Argilius quidam adolescentulus, quem puerum Pausanias amore uenerio dilexerat* (Nep.*Paus.*4,1)

It may rarely happen that the name is not unknown at all, as in (34a) and (34b) or in (36):

- (36) *Sed et in illa religiosissima urbe Aeneadarum piorum est Iuppiter quidam quem ludis suis humano sanguine proluunt* (Tert.*Apol.*9,5)

In these cases the addition of *quidam* seems to be used to obtain depreciative or ironical nuances. For example in (34b) *Pipa quaedam* strongly contrasts with the fame surrounding this woman, a fame mentioned by Cicero himself (*de qua muliere plurimi uersus ... tota Sicilia percelebrantur*); in (36), by adding *quidam* to the name *Iuppiter*, universally well-known, Tertullianus places the father of all the gods on a par with other minor divinities.

In the much less frequent occurrences where the proper noun is used metaphorically and not referentially, *quidam* serves to express the value of a ‘hedge’.

4.2.3 Metaphorical proper nouns: *quidam* behaves as a ‘hedge’

The instances of this use are very few: we pass from the Ciceronian example (34c) to the example (37) of *Historia Augusta*:

- (37) *cum occidisset Perennem, appellatus Felix, inter plurimas caedes multorum ciuium quasi quidam nouus Sylla* (Hist.*Aug. Comm.* 8,1)

In (34c), Roscius represents the prototype of a very great actor with excellent dramatic qualities. He is the unique and inimitable model for anyone wanting to excel in his own art, and for this reason he can be equalled only

in an approximate way. In (37) the presence of *nouus* unequivocally suggests the metaphorical interpretation of the proper noun: *nouus Sylla*, in fact, has the emperor *Commodus* as its referent. *Commodus* was named *Felix* after the well-known dictator *Sylla*, and for this reason he could be metaphorically defined as a new *Sylla*. This metaphor, that without a hedge could be seen as excessive, is mitigated by the presence of *quidam*.

Summarizing: *quidam* accompanying a proper noun has substantially two values:

- a) a de-definitizing value: *Argilius quidam* 'a certain Argilius';
- b) a 'hedge' value: *quidam nouus Sylla* 'a kind of new Sylla'

The two values are in complementary distribution since they are related to the status of notoriety of the proper noun involved. Firstly, *quidam* = 'a certain' is normally applied to names whose referents are not very notorious (even if some degree of knowledge or familiarity has to be admitted), except rare cases (*Iuppiter quidam*) where irony or sarcasm are in play. Secondly, *quidam* = 'a kind of' is only applied to metaphorical proper nouns whose referents are well-known to the linguistic community. In the metaphorical function both the first referent and the second referent of the proper noun are specific and uniquely identifiable.

4.2.4 *Quidam*+ proper noun in Late Latin

Cases of *quidam* with referential proper nouns are found in all the stages of Latin. Some late examples are given in (38):²⁹

- (38) a. *post mortem Herodis nihil exspectato Caesare Simo quidam regium nomen inuaserat* (Tac.hist.5,9,2)
- b. *et Eunus quidam ergastularius seruus ductauit in Sicilia fugitiuos* (Amm. 14,11,33)
- c. *A Treueris uero legati in Spaniam mittebantur, ex quibus Artemius quidam admirabilis sapientiae atque pulchritudinis et prima aetate florens, ui februm est correptus* (Greg.Tur.Franc.1,46)

²⁹ In Gellius an example is found where *quispiam* is with a proper noun instead of the expected *quidam*: *Cum Pyrrus rex in terra Italia esset et unam atque alteram pugnans prospere pugnasset satisque agerent Romani et pleraque Italia ad regem descuisset, tum Ambraciensis quispiam Timochares, regis Pyrrhi amicus* (Gell. 3,8,1). It has to be noted that in Gellius *quispiam* is generally used as an equivalent of *quidam*.

A more complex example is (39):

- (39) *dicendum est de hominibus liberis crudeliter uerberatis et spoliatis, uno uero etiam occiso; dicendum de filio impio et precum paternarum inmemore; saeuitia et auaritia exprobranda; carnifex quidam Herodes in hac causa constituendus* (Fronto epist.ad M.Caesarem 3,3,3)

The difficulty of this example derives from the fact that not all the editors agree in accepting the insertion of the proper noun *Herodes* in the text. The choice of accepting it or not determines different interpretations of the passage. In some editions *Herodes* is considered to be a gloss and so it is deleted from the text; accordingly, the translation suggested for *quidam* is: 'there is one who must in this trial be made out a murderer'. In Teubner edition *Herodes* is not deleted. In our opinion, the meaning of *quidam* could be here a nuance of approximation, a value of hedge: 'Herodes in this trial must be outlined as a sort of murderer'.

From Sallust onwards there are examples where the formulaic expression *nomine* is added to the combination proper noun + *quidam*, as shown in (40):

- (40) a. *Erat ea tempestate Romae Numida quidam nomine Massiua, Gulussae filius, Massinissae nepos* (Sall.Iug.35,1)
- b. *Nohodares quidam nomine e numero optimatum incursare Mesopotamiam, quotiens copia dederit, ordinatus explorabat nostra sollicite* (Amm.14,3,1)
- c. *Et erat quidam mendicus, nomine lazarus, qui iacebat ante ianuam diuitis, ulceribus plenus* (Greg.M. in euang. 2,40,3)

In these examples *quidam* does not seem to be a de-definitizer of the proper noun. In (40b) where it is used as a pronoun, the meaning of *quidam* is that of singling one out from a set. In the other cases of (40), where *quidam* does not directly modify the proper noun, but applies to animate nouns designating office, provenance, status or to animate nouns of very wide reference, the meaning of *quidam* is very close to that of the indefinite article. These examples might be compared to the passage in (41):

- (41) *Erat unus intus Neruius, nomine Vertico, loco natus honesto, qui a prima obsidione ad Ciceronem perfugerat* (Caes. Gall.5,45,2-3)

which Rosén (*l.c.*, 728) considers to be a case of *unus* possibly lacking the cardinal semantic component of quantifying, while Pinkster,³⁰ with whom we agree, states that the central meaning of *unus*, here too, is that of quantifying and singling one out.

Some evidence that *quidam* could acquire the value of the indefinite article can be found in late examples, such as (42):

- (42) a. *Quidam paterfamilias cum tota domo sua magno hospitalitatis studio seruebat; cumque cotidie ad mensam suam peregrinos susciperet, quodam die peregrinus quidam inter alios uenit, ad mensam ductus est* (Greg.M. in euang. 2,23,2)
 b. *Quadam uero die ex longinquo loco ad uidendum eum quidam rusticus uenit* (Greg.M.dialog. 1,5,32)

where *quidam* is attached to almost each indefinite noun, even in the same sentence. This use seems to be halfway between Apuleius' use (where there is no regularity supporting an eventual value of indefinite article for *quidam*)³¹ and the use that is found in Latin Medieval Aesopian fables (where *quidam* is attached to each indefinite noun like any modern indefinite article).³²

While the referential uses of proper noun + *quidam* are very frequent, no other instance of the metaphorical use has been found besides the example in (37), even though the combination *quasi quidam* plus a common noun is frequently used in late texts:

- (43) a. *duo igitur principes una extiterunt domo, quorum alter sex mensibus, alter uix duobus imperauerunt, quasi quidam interreges inter Aurelianum et Probum* (Hist.Aug.Tac.14,5)
 b. *sed peccata uestra, inquit, quasi quidam in medio murus oppositus, uos et deum diuidunt* (Hier. comm.in Is.16,59,1)
 c. *Quasi enim quidam turbo tempestatis est concitatus spiritus maeroris* (Greg. M. moral. 4,19,2)
 d. *Vox ergo est in mente quasi quidam sonus intellegentiae* (Greg.M. in Ezech.1,8,252)

³⁰ Cf. PINKSTER, H., "Sicut unus pater familias: Opmerking over het gebruik van *ille* en *unus* in verband met de ontwikkeling in de romaanse talen", DEN HENGST, D.; SMOLENAARS, J.J.L. (edd.), *Propemptikon W.J.H.F. Kegel*, Amsterdam 1988, 112-113.

³¹ The value of indefinite article for *quidam* in Apuleius is suggested by GRAUR, A., "Quidam chez Apulée", BIBAUW, J. (ed.), *Hommages à Marcel Renard I* (Collection *Latomus* 101), Brussels 1969, 378-382.

³² Cf. ROSÉN, H., *l.c.*, 730-731.

5. Conclusions

To sum up:

Aliquis is prevailingly found with proper nouns metaphorically used. Its referent is presupposed as existing, but it is not uniquely identifiable. Its value is generic. It is not frequent in Classical Latin. We have found no example in Late Latin (at least, in *TLL* and in *BTL*).

Quidam is prevailingly found with proper nouns referentially used. Its referent is specific and known to the speaker. It has a de-definitizing value. It is frequent both in Classical and in Late Latin. While it has a frequent use with metaphorical common nouns with the value of a hedge both in Classical and in Late Latin, it is rare with metaphoric proper nouns. This holds true for both Classical and Late Latin.