1. The so-called ablativus qualitatis is used in our Latin grammars as a label for three distinct construction types of noun phrases in the ablative. The following examples illustrate these three construction types:

(1) sed ut Aristoteles, vir summo ingenio, scientia, copia ... dicere docere etiam coepit adulescentes ... ('but just as Aristotle, a man of supreme genius, knowledge and fertility of speech began like him to teach the young to speak', Cic. Tusc. 1, 7)

(2) (a) (Britanni) capilloque sunt promisso ('the Britons wear long hair', Caes. Gal. 5, 14, 3)

(b) nuntiant se ... eum ... cognovisse paratissimo animo ut ... ('they announce that they recognized that he was most ready to ...', Cic. Phil. 13, 13).

(3) (a) eodem (scil.: vultu) semper se vidisse exeaunte domo et revertentem ('Xanthippe said she saw him going out and returning home with his countenance always unchanged', Tusc. 3, 31)

(b) nescioquis eccum incedit ornatu quidem thalassico ('someone or other is striding up - and in sailor's togs!', Plt. Mi. 1282).

More examples in K.-St. I, 454-7; Sz. 70; 119; Bennett (1914: 317-25); Edwards (1900); Vandvik (1942); Weihenmajer (1891: 9-10). In (1) the ablative noun phrase summo ingenio, scientia, copia has the function of Attribute with respect to its Head vir. In (2, a) the ablative noun phrase (hence NP) functions as a Subject Complement, in (2, b) as an Object Complement. The construction type exemplified by (3) is the one that I will discuss in this paper. It differs from the examples in (2) because the NP in the ablative is an optional constituent ('satellite') in the sentence, that is if it is omitted, the remaining sentence is still grammatical. The NP's in (2), on the other hand, are obligatory constituents (on the notions 'optional', 'obligatory' cf. Happ (1976)
and Pinkster (1972: 71-82)).

By way of comparison I like to call attention to the so-called genitivus qualitatis that occurs in the same range of constructions: word group level (4), copulative and related constructions (5) and sentences with other predicates (6).

(4) trium litterarum homo ('five letter man', PIt. AuZ. 325)
(5) dulcem et facetum festivique sermonis ... Socratem accepimus ('history tells us, Socrates was fascinating and witty, a genial conversationalist', Cic. Off. 1, 108)
(6) (a) cum annorum octoginta ... in Aegyptum iisset ('he came to Egypt when he was 80 years old', Nepos Ages 8, 2)
(b) redis mutatae frontis ('back you come ... with altered brow', Hor. Sat. 2, 8, 84).

It is not my intention to deal with the relationship between the genitive and the ablative in these construction types in general (see Sz., l.c. and Vandvik (1942)). The NP's in the genitive in (6) are relevant to this paper because they resemble the ones in the ablative in (3) in that they are optional constituents.

Our grammars seem to overlook the distinction made here between (2, a) and (3). K.-St. mention my example (3, a) as an instance of the occasional use of the ablativus qualitatis 'mit anderen Verben' (: I, 456) by the side of (2, b). Similarly Sz., who hints at examples like (3, b) in his paragraph on the ablativus absolutus (: 138), mentions as examples of the occasional use of the ablativus qualitatis 'bei anderen Verben' only verbs of type (2, b).

The treatment of the examples of the genitive in (6) is not very clear either. K.-St. (I, 457) mention both examples as an instance of the genitivus qualitatis in relation with an unexpressed Agent ('auf das im Verbum liegende Subjekt bezogen'). Sz. (: 70) mentions (6, a; b) as examples of a genitivus qualitatis without an explicit Head ('ohne Beziehungswort'). However, these instances of the genitive differ from the illustrations in Sz. (: 119) of the use of the ablativus qualitatis 'ohne Beziehungswort'. The latter are, in fact, instances of so-called substantival use:
Both *iuniores* and *emeritis etiam stipendiis* function as Subject of *praesto fuere*. An example of an ablativus qualitatis in the function Object is offered by *Vitr. 8, 3, 143*). That is, there is some confusion about the difference between type (1) and (3 (= 6)) as well.

The construction types in which the ablativus qualitatis occurs may be visualized in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>level</th>
<th>syntactic function</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wordgroup</td>
<td>Attribute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentence</td>
<td>Subject/Object</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>Subject/Object Complement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optional</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I will try to show that the ablativi qualitatis in ex. (3) fulfil the syntactic function Praedicativum.

2. Our grammars deal with individual examples like (3) in various ways. They seem to be unanimous in deriving the ablativus qualitatis diachronically from the Instrumental of attendant circumstances (cf. Lofstedt 1942: 153 ff.; Sz.: 117). They are also unanimous in stressing the difficulty to decide with respect to individual cases of a noun phrase what label to put on it: ablativus qualitatis, ablativus modi, ablativus of attendant
circumstances or ablativus absolutus (cf., for example, Kroll 1962: 51-2; Sz.: 115; 117; 138). A few examples:

(8) operto capitulo calidum bibunt, tristes atque ebrioli incentudent ('muffling their wretched heads and taking hot drinks, then stalking along grave of face and half seas over', Plt. Curc. 293-4)

(9) invocat deos immortales ut sibi auxilium ferant manibus puris capite operto ('she called on the immortal gods to help her with clean washed hands and covered head', Amph. 1093-4)

(10) amborum uxores noctu Troiad exibant capitibus opertis flentes ambae abeuntes lacrimis cum multis ('the wives of both were passing out from Troy by night; their heads were veiled and both were weeping many tears, as they went away', Naev. Pun. 5-7 W.)

operto capitulo in (8) is called an abl. qual. by Bennett (193194). operto capite in (9) is called an abl. absolutus by Bennett (1368) and Sz. (137-8). K.-St. (:I, 771) mention (10) in the context of the abl. absolutus. Notice that Bennett (1303) calls manibus puris in (9) an ablative of attendant circumstance although it is juxtaposed by the side of capite operto. The NP's with the lexeme caput all refer to a temporary characteristic of the Subject constituents in the sentence. I see no reason why they should be labeled differently. As for the different treatment of manibus puris and the other NP's, this might be explained by assuming that manus are some sort of accessory element in the action of invocare (cf. Liv. 35, 31, 13, but also Plt. Amph. 25 velatis manibus orant). In the context, however, it is puris that is really important, just as in the cases with caput the Attributes are essential5). Whatever the merit of individual explanations, it is clear, firstly, that all explanations imply that the ablativus qualitatis of the type under discussion as far as its syntactic function is concerned is regarded as one out of a range of Adverbials (or: Adjuncts) and, secondly, that criteria are lacking. I will come back to the syntactic function of these constituents shortly. By way of illustration of the lack of criteria I confine myself to one passage in Caesar, Gal.
noster primo integris viribus fortiter repugnare ... sed
hoc superari quod diuturnitate pugnae hostes defessi proelio
excedebant, alii integris viribus succedebant ('at first the
Roman troops repelled them gallantly with strength unimpaired
... but they were at a disadvantage, because when any of the
enemy, wearied by the long continuance of the battle, re-
tired from the fighting line, others with strength unimpaired
would step into their places', Caes. Gal. 3, 4, 2-3)

Meusel (a.l.) observes 'solange ihre Kräfte noch Frisch waren'.
Dagegen Par. 3 derselbe Ausdruck ablativus qualitatis'. The reason
for Meusel's translation of the first integris viribus may be that
the validity of integris viribus is restricted by primo; the
second occurrence of integris viribus is perhaps regarded as an
abl. qualitatis on account of its parallelism with defessi in
the preceding clause. However, we can only guess. (It is, of
course, not my intention to suggest that identical noun phrases
necessarily fulfil the same syntactic and/or semantic function
in the sentence (the meaning of the predicate and other consti-
tuents in the sentence are also important)), but only that if
differences are postulated, they should be based on the appli-
cation of clear criteria.)

3. The common element of the ablativus qualitatis in its dif-
ferent syntactic functions and the reason why these different
uses are dealt with together in our grammars is, of course, its
meaning. The ablativus qualitatis is said to denote the mental or
physical condition or state of the constituent to which it
belongs, for example the Head constituent of the NP in which the
ablativus functions as Attribute (vir in ex. (1)) or the Subject
of the sentence (nescioquis in (3, b)).

There has been some dispute whether the mental or physical
state is a permanent or a temporary one. It has been argued that
the genitivus qualitatis denotes permanent states, whereas the
ablativus qualitatis is said to denote temporary states. However,
as K.-St. (: I, 454-5) observe, the facts are more complicated.
Sz. (: 117) remarks that the ablativus usually denotes a perma-
nent state. This is obviously not true for examples like (3).
The NP's in these examples, on the contrary, denote a condition
of the Subject of the sentence which obtains at the same time
as the event denoted by the predicate. Thus, in (3, a) Xanthippe only commits herself to the statement that Socrates had the same countenance when going out or coming in. In (3, b) and (8) - (10) it is, of course, not implied that the Subjects of these sentences were always wearing the same coat, or always had their heads covered. It is interesting to notice that on the wordgroup level (ex. (1)) an ablautivus qualitatis normally will be understood as denoting a permanent state; the same holds for copulative and related constructions (ex. (2)). This can be proved to some extent by an examination of the types of NP's that are given in the literature as examples of an ablautivus qualitatis either in the function Subject Complement or occurring as a satellite.

It is useful for this purpose to make a distinction between ablautivus qualitatis that are related to constituents denoting human beings and ablautivus related to non-human constituents. Generally speaking the latter category shows less restrictions with respect to the relationship between the ablative constituent and the constituent it belongs to. The Head-noun in an ablautivus qualitatis NP which is related to a human constituent denotes a quality that is 'inalienable', that is, the quality belongs to the person, whether he likes it or not, and the quality cannot be transferred to someone else. Examples are: age, descent, reputation (e.g. laus), parts of the body (e.g. caput), personal appearance (e.g. vultus), character (e.g. animus), personal attributes (e.g. audacia) and finally, clothes. As far as I know the only exception to this statement is the conjecture patre in Cic. Cael. 38, which Austin (a.l.) rightly rejects for other reasons.

With some of the types of Head-nouns mentioned the ablautivus qualitatis NP as a whole may be understood as denoting a temporary quality or condition of the constituent to which it belongs if the noun is modified by an adjective or another Attribute, for example laeto animo, operto capite. As a consequence, such NP's can be found in the construction type under discussion. With other Head-nouns this is impossible, for example nouns denoting descent, age, or reputation. If NP's in the ablative with these nouns nonetheless occur in a sentence they can only be understood in a different way, for example, in the case of nouns denoting age, as a Time Adjunct:
(12) C. Marium *summa senectute* ... senile corpus paludibus oculatusse demersum ('how G. Marius ... in extreme old age hid his aged body beneath the waters of a marsh', Cic. *Sest.* 50)

I take the line that the ablativus qualitatis NP in examples like (3) do, indeed, denote a temporary quality of the Subject of the predicate of the sentence. The ablativus qualitatis in this respect resembles adjectives in the function Praedicativum which also denote the temporary state in which the Subject of the predicate is involved, for example (13)

(13) *ita maestus rediit ut* ('he returned so sorrowful, that ...', Cic. *Phil.* 6, 10)


4. I now come to the syntactic function of the ablativus qualitatis in cases like (3) (cf. fig. 1 on p. 249). A familiar way to establish the syntactic function of a constituent is to investigate by which more or less synonymous expression types it may be substituted and with which constituents it may be coordinated.

Consider out of many the following examples, which may be compared with ex. (3, b), (7) - (10):

(14) *nec satis commode calceati et vestiti id facere possent* ('they could not conveniently do so in their shoes and outdoor dress', Cic. *Cael.* 62)
(15) *(eum regem)* *pilleatum capite raso obviam ire legatis* ('that this king was accustomed to meet envoys with his head shaved, while he wore a freedman's cap', Liv. 45, 44, 19)
(16) *ut ego hodie raso capite calvus capiam pilleum* ('so that I may shave my hair off this very day and stick my bald head in a freedman's cap', Plt. *Amph.* 462)

(Also compare (13) with (3, a))

The most frequent type of expression for non-permanent states of the Subject of the sentence is a participle or adjective in agreement with the Subject. This kind of substitution has, in
fact, been proposed by Happ (1976: 295) and Fugier (1978: 130). Notice, however, that they used the substitution test in order to prove that such adjectives are more or less equivalent to Manner Adjuncts. I have shown elsewhere (Pinkster 1981b) that it is not correct to put such adjectives on a par with adverbs.

As for coordination, there are only few examples, which do, however, support a treatment of this type of ablativus qualitatis as Praedicativum. One is (15) above. Other examples are (17) - (19):

(17) *pura mente atque integra* Milonem, nullo scelere imbutum ... Romam revertisse ('that Milo returned to Rome with mind stainless and untarnished, with no taint of crime', Cic. Mil. 61)

(18) te prodire involuto capite, soleatum ('you were emerging with a hood upon your head and slippers upon your feet', Pis. 13)

(19) stare tristis, *turbido vultu*, subductis cum superciliis senes ('there the old men stood, sad, confused, with raised eyebrows', Turpil. com. 169)

5. Conclusion.

In par. 3 I have paid attention to the semantic similarity of adjectives in the function Praedicativum and the type of ablativus qualitatis under discussion. Par. 4 is concerned with the syntactic similarity between these two types of expression. The reader will now realize that, if the empty slot in fig. 1 is filled in the way suggested above, that is, if it is assumed that the ablativus qualitatis fulfils the function Praedicativum there is a complete one-to-one correspondence between the functions an adjective may fulfil and certain types of Noun Phrases in the ablative.
2. Sz. (: 115) also classifies NP's denoting someone's clothes as 'Abl. der äusseren Erscheinungsform'. I follow Bennett, Weihenmajer and others and regard them as not essentially different from other expressions denoting physical or mental state. See below.
3. Another example of a Subject constituent can be found in Tac. H. 2, 35, 1. Heubner (a.l.) rejects both the Tacitean and the Livian case as instances of 'substantival use'. It is, in fact, possible to interpret the Tacitean example as a parallel of my examples (3); I do not see how, in example (7), emeritis ... stipendiis could be taken as an Attribute of the following words pars magna voluntariorum. These words must be understood as an Apposition.
4. Strangely enough, he quotes this sentence as an instance of attributive use of the abl. qual.
5. This appears from the fact that capitulo bibere, etc. without an Attribute, are nonsensical (but see note 10).
6. Cf. Vester (forthcoming) on the role of the predicate in determining the function of a Noun Phrase of the types under discussion.
7. I will use the terms 'condition', 'state', etc. in a very general and non-technical sense.
8. This is not to say that any relationship whatsoever is acceptable. The number of instances is too low to be very positive. Nonetheless I doubt whether the accepted ms. reading quod mihi summo dolore est ('to my great sorrow ...', Cic. Att. 2, 19, 2) is acceptable (instead of dolori).
9. On the wordgroup level we find cases like pedites levi armatura (B. Hisp. 15; Liv. 33, 3, 10); homines emeritis stipendiis (Sall. Jug. 84, 2); Metellus ille honoratis quattuor filiis, Cic. Tusc. 1, 85). Perhaps we should call these lexemes inalienable as well.
10. A noun may be acceptable without an Attribute if it occurs in Focus or Contrast. A good example is Cic. Pis. 23 animo consulem esse oportet, consilio, fide, gravitate, vigilantia, cum ... . For a genitivus qualitatis without an Attribute cf. Sz. (: 70) and Helander (1977: 108-9).
11. Adjectives in the function Praedicativum occur with Objects and other constituents as well. I have no examples of this type of the ablativus qualitatis. I leave this out of account.
12. In (11) integri might be substituted for integris viribus.
13. K.-St. (: I, 234 ff.) and Sz. (: 171 ff.) also speak of 'adjectives instead of adverbs'.
15. Coordination of attributive ablative qualitatis with adjectives is, as is well known, quite frequent. Cf. Sz. (: 118) and Sörböm (1935: 90).
tivum.
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