

## The Plural of aliquis

By W. S. WATT,

King's College, Aberdeen (Scotland)

### [A] In verse

Bertil Axelson (*Unpoetische Wörter*, 74) points out how rare in Latin poetry are expressions for 'some', like *aliquot*, *non nulli*, and *complures*. He does not deal with the plural of *aliquis*, but it too is rarer than a study of the material in *Thes. L. L.* would lead one to believe; in particular the statement (i. 1608.62) 'pronomina non vitatur poetis' does not apply to the plural.

I give below what I believe to be a complete list<sup>1)</sup> of all occurrences of plural forms in Latin poets down to Juvenal. I separate the adjectival from the substantival use, because here again the *Thes.* article is misleading in stating (ib. 38) '(pluralis) passim tam subst. quam adi.'

1. *Adjectival*. Neither the nominative masculine nor any forms of the genitive, dative, or ablative occur. The remaining four forms are found as follows:

	<i>aliquae</i>	<i>aliquos</i>	<i>aliquas</i>	<i>aliqua</i>
Plautus	<i>Rud.</i> 553	<i>Men.</i> 950 <i>Pseud.</i> 283 (?), 321 <i>Truc.</i> 872	<i>Merc.</i> 560	—
Terence	—	<i>Eun.</i> 149 <i>Phorm.</i> 312 (?)	—	—
Lucretius	—	—	5.17	—
Virgil	<i>Ecl.</i> 6.60	—	<i>Aen.</i> 6.719	—
Tibullus	—	—	2.6.50	—
Ovid	—	<i>Epist.</i> 12.80 (?) <i>Fast.</i> 6.366 <i>Met.</i> 4.588, 15.757	<i>Pont.</i> 3.3.33 <i>Met.</i> 4.445	—
Manilius	—	—	5.650	—
<i>Ciris</i>	—	331	—	—
Phaedrus	3. prol. 8, epil. 15	—	—	—
Seneca	—	<i>Med.</i> 921	<i>Epigr.</i> 19.5 (i, p. 317 Riese)	—
Juvenal	—	2.149	—	6.15

<sup>1)</sup> I ignore the following corrupt passages: Plaut. *Most.* 358, *Persa* 759 a, *Poen.* 127; Lucil. 1118 M. = 1126 K. I also ignore unimportant manuscript variations.

This gives a total of 26 instances, of which I have marked three with a query. These three are not without interest:

1. Plaut. *Pseud.* 283 *aliquos hos dies*. Here *aliquos* is an emendation of Mueller; the manuscripts, followed by both Leo and Lindsay, read *aliquot*. The emendation is supported by the remarkable fact that the only three other instances of *aliquos* in Plautus are likewise with *dies*: *Men.* 950 *aliquos viginti dies*; *Pseud.* 321 *hos sex dies aliquos modo*; *Truc.* 872 *hos dies aliquos*.

2. Ter. *Phorm.* 312f. *aliquos . . . amicos*. The manuscripts vary between *aliquos* and *aliquot*. The former is supported by the only other instance of *aliquos* in Terence, which is likewise with *amicos*.

3. Ovid, *Epist.* 12.79f.

*per triplicis vultus arcanaque sacra Dianae  
et si forte aliquos gens habet ista deos.*

Here *alios* is an obvious emendation, made already by Micyllus (1563) and approved by Heinsius 'vel sine assensu veterum librorum'; it is very tempting (as Palmer's alternative suggestion *aequos* is not).

It is worth noting that, in the whole of this body of literature, there is one solitary occurrence of the neuter *aliqua*.

2. *Substantival*. A maximum of eight instances can be adduced: *aliqui*. Ovid, *Pont.* 3.2.5.

*aliquos*. Virgil, *Aen.* 6.664; Ovid, *Pont.* 2.7.53; Seneca, *Herc. O.* 638.

*aliquas*. Ovid, *Trist.* 5.14.8.

*aliqua*. Ovid, *Trist.* 1.2.55; Val. Fl. 5.670.

*aliquibus* (abl.). Plautus, *Epid.* 334.

Of these eight no fewer than five can be queried.

1 and 2. The two instances from Ovid, *Pont.* are very similar to each other:

*Pont.* 3.2.5f.

*cumque labent aliqui iactataque vela relinquunt,  
tu lacerae remanes ancora sola rati.*

*Pont.* 2.7.53f.

*adiuvat in duris aliquos praesentia rebus:  
obruit hoc absens vasta procella caput.*

In both cases the paradosis is *aliqu-*. In the former, *alii* is a manuscript variant which, if it had equally good support, would

deserve the preference. In the latter, the variants *aliquem* and *aliquid* can be ignored, as can Heinsius' conjecture *aliquā*; the obvious alternative is again *alios*, which used to be commonly read.

3. Virgil, *Aen.* 6.664 *quique sui memores aliquos fecere merendo*. Here again the paradosis is *aliquos*, with *alios* as a less well attested variant; this is perhaps the best known case of the variation between the two words in Latin poetry. Although the majority of editors have followed the paradosis, there have always been some who have preferred *alios* on grounds of meaning.

4 and 5. We come now to the two apparent instances of the neuter *aliqua*. Both are corrupt:

Ovid, *Trist.* 1.2.51ff.

*nec letum timeo; genus est miserabile leti.*  
*demite naufragium, mors mihi munus erit.*  
*est aliquid fatove suo ferrove cadentem*  
*in solida moriens ponere corpus humo,*  
*et mandare suis aliqua, et sperare sepulcrum,*  
*et non aequoreis piscibus esse cibum.*

The poet is in imminent danger of shipwreck; he fears not death itself but death at sea, because he will be deprived of burial. To understand *mandare* 'von den letztwilligen Verfügungen Sterbender'<sup>2</sup>) is to introduce a complete irrelevancy. To follow this with *et sperare sepulcrum* is ridiculous; as if the poet cannot rely on his beloved kith and kin, to whom he has just imparted his dying wishes, to give him a decent burial, but only *hopes* they will. The vulgate *aliqua et* must be wrong. The true reading stands in the apparatus of modern texts: *aliquid*, not the object of *mandare* but in anaphora with *est aliquid* in 53. 'It is worth much, when one dies a natural death or falls in battle, to lay one's dying body on *terra firma* and entrust it (the object of *mandare* is *corpus*) to one's kith and kin for burial (that is what happens when one dies a natural death); it is also worth much to hope for burial (either by one's own side or even by the enemy, when one dies in battle).' There are other examples in the *Tristia* of the sense of a couplet being carried on to the caesura of the following hexameter, e.g. 3.11.71, 4.10.117, 5.2.27.

<sup>2</sup>) G. Luck (Heidelberg, 1967ff.), *ad loc.*

Val. Fl. 5.670ff.

*fas aliquae nequeat sic femina. coeperat ardens  
hic iterum alternis Mavors insurgere dictis.  
excipit hinc contra pater et sic voce coercet.*

No one has made acceptable sense of 670, although many have tried. Some scholars<sup>3)</sup> have been prepared to stomach *aliquae* as a neuter plural, although elsewhere it is attested only at Pliny, *Nat.* 17.219 (where Mayhoff emends to *aliqua*). Sudhaus suggested *aliqua et*; although he has been followed by some editors; *et* is merely a poor space-filler. One cannot rely on this passage as providing the solitary example of substantival *aliqua* found in classical poetry; if any form of *aliquis* is genuine here, the singular *aliquid* (first proposed by Pius in 1519) would be a safer correction.

### [B] In prose

The only form which calls for comment is the neuter *aliqua*. It does not occur in Caesar, Sallust, Petronius. In some authors (including some of the most important) instances are comparatively rare; see table below. In a few they are quite frequent.

	ALIQUA	with noun	with adj. or part.	alone
	Cicero	5	5 <sup>4)</sup>	4(?)
	Varro	1	—	—
	Livy	4	1	—
	Tacitus	1 <sup>5)</sup>	1	1
	Pliny, <i>Epist.</i>	3	1	5
	Suetonius	—	—	1

<sup>3)</sup> E.g. Madvig (*Adv. crit.* ii, 146) and Leo (*G.G.A.* 1897, 969 = *Kl. Schr.* ii, 240). I agree with Leo that *femina* cannot be used of Minerva either by the poet or by Minerva herself, but must be put into the mouth of Mars. This rules out Madvig's *mas aliquae nequeat, si femina!*, which is unattractive also for other reasons (outside Plautus the nominative *mas* appears to occur in verse only at Laevius frg. 26 Morel and at *Lydia* 35). Whatever one reads in the first half of the line, I suggest as a possibility for the second half '*sic femina* —!' *coeperat ardens*; Jupiter interrupts Mars' indignant exclamation before he can utter more than two words.

<sup>4)</sup> I ignore *Orat.* 178, where all modern editors except Friedrich read *productiona alia* (not *aliqua*).

<sup>5)</sup> *Agr.* 38.1 *miscere in vicem consilia aliqua*, where *aliqua* was deleted by Classen and Wölfflin as an erroneous anticipation of the following *aliquando*; perhaps rightly.

Of the four Ciceronian instances in which *aliqua*, if genuine, could only be substantival (not adjectival), only one (*S. Rosc.* 131 *aliqua animadvertere*) is secure. The other three are

1. *Part.* 30 *trium rerum aliqua consequemur; nam aut magna quaedam proponemus aut necessaria aut coniuncta cum ipsis apud quos res agetur*. No variant is recorded in the editions, but both grammar (the feminine *rerum*) and logic (the triple disjunction) demand *aliquam*.
2. *De orat.* 2.181 *aliqua dicere*. So one branch (M) of the tradition; the other (L) has *aliquid*. That editors are right in adopting the latter is shown by the preference for a singular even where the context seems to call for a plural (cf. *Thes. L. L.* i. 1615.43ff.), e.g. *Phil.* 2.10 *cum mihi . . . et pro me aliquid et in M. Antonium multa dicenda sint*; *Mur.* 65 '*nihil ignoveris*'; *immo aliquid, non omnia*; *Fam.* 4.3.1 *aliquid atque adeo multa addunt*. Contrast Quintilian 9.4.79 *aliqua de his quoque* (sc. *dicam*).
3. *Att.* 14.7.1 *is mihi de Mario et de re p. aliqua quaedam sane pessima*. So the manuscripts. For centuries instead of *aliqua* the vulgate was *alia*, until Orelli in 1845 deleted the word as '*manifestum librarii mendum, qui pro de re publica scripsit de rep. aliqua*' (Boot 1866). Kayser (in Baiter's 1867 edition) proposed to re-instate *aliqua* and to put a comma after it, and he has been followed by all modern editors with the exception of Mueller, who still deleted it for the reason given by Boot. I think he was right.

Among the authors in whom *aliqua* is comparatively frequent are the Elder Pliny<sup>6</sup>) and Quintilian. The latter has about 20 instances of the word used substantivally. I suggest that an unrecognized instance underlies the corruption at 12.10.26 *ita nunc si quis ad eas Demosthenis virtutes quas ille summus orator habuit tamen† quae defuisse ei sive ipsius natura seu lege civitatis videntur adiecerit, ut adfectus concitatus moveat, audiam dicentem 'non fecit hoc Demosthenes'*? The most recent discussion of this passage is by M. Winterbottom<sup>7</sup>), who says 'I am not prepared to put up with *tamen*, and I am very disturbed by [the plural in] *quae . . . videntur* followed by only *one* lack, *ut adfectus . . . moveat*'; he is therefore inclined to adopt *eam* (or *hanc*) for *tamen* and *videtur* for *videntur*.

<sup>6</sup>) See Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre* ii<sup>3</sup>, 481.

<sup>7</sup>) *Problems in Quintilian*, Univ. of London Inst. of Class. Studies, Bulletin Suppl. 25 (1970), 212.

The single change of *tamen* to *aliqua* clears away all difficulties; the *ut* clause is not epexegetic but (I think) final. As for the corruption<sup>8</sup>), as Winterbottom suggests the first letter of *tamen* is a repetition of the last letter of *habuit*; and the last three letters of *aliqua* have dropped out in front of *quae*.

## The Meaning of *interea* in Virgil's *Aeneid*

By T. E. KINSEY, Glasgow

It has been maintained that sometimes in the *Aeneid* the word *interea* is used to introduce an event which follows one just mentioned and that in these instances an appropriate translation is the English phrase 'and now'<sup>1</sup>). In this paper I argue that the word *interea* in the *Aeneid* may always be taken as indicating that the action it introduces is going on either (i) at the same time as events already alluded to or (ii) in the space of time between two such events or (iii) in the space of time between an event already mentioned and the narrator's own position in time and that the translation 'meanwhile' is always appropriate. Certainly the translation 'and now' sometimes gives as good sense as the translation 'meanwhile', but unless the context leaves no alternative to the translation 'and now' in at least one case, it would seem reasonable not to allow it in any. I have collected all the examples from the *Aeneid* which have either been cited by others in support of the meaning 'and now' or which it seems to me might plausibly be so cited and examined them<sup>2</sup>). I am only concerned with the *Aeneid*

<sup>8</sup>) At 10.1.130 *si aliqua (contempsisset)* has been the most generally accepted correction of *simile quam*.

<sup>1</sup>) O. W. Reinmuth in *Vergil's Use of interea, a Study of the Treatment of Contemporaneous Events in Roman Epic* in *AJP* 54 (1933) pp. 323ff. says, 'Sometimes *interea* is clearly emasculated in meaning and expresses nothing more than "now, moreover, and then, likewise, presently etc."' R. Heinze in *Virgils Epische Technik* (ed. 3, Leipzig 1915) p. 388 says *interea* is often to be understood as 'ein lose verknüpfendes "nun"'. Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* s.v., *Oxford Latin Dictionary* s.v. and *TLL* VII. i. 2183 all recognise a use of *interea* in narrative but offer no translations.

<sup>2</sup>) I used M. N. Wetmore, *Index Verborum Vergilianus* (ed. 2, New Haven 1930 — reprinted Hildesheim 1961) and R. A. B. Mynor's text in *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford 1969).