



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### The pragmatics of 'at least': saltem, utique, dumtaxat, certe

Risselada, R.

**DOI**

[10.4000/pallas.3680](https://doi.org/10.4000/pallas.3680)

**Publication date**

2016

**Document Version**

Other version

**Published in**

Pallas

**License**

CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to publication](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Risselada, R. (2016). The pragmatics of 'at least': saltem, utique, dumtaxat, certe. *Pallas*, 102, 191-199. <https://doi.org/10.4000/pallas.3680>

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

# Pallas

Revue d'études antiques

102 | 2016

Études de linguistique latine I

La pragmatique

## The pragmatics of 'at least': *Saltem, utique, dumtaxat, certe*



La pragmatique d'« au moins » : *saltem, utique, dumtaxat et certe*

RODIE RISSELADA

p. 191-199

<https://doi.org/10.4000/pallas.3680>

### Résumés

English Français

Dictionaries and translations create the impression that there is an overlap in the meaning of the Latin particles *saltem*, *utique*, *dumtaxat*, and *certe*, which all seem to express, in some of their uses, the equivalent of English 'at least'. However, an analysis in terms of focus particles and scalarity reveals that this overlap is only superficial. Whereas *saltem* and *certe* (in some of its uses) can indeed be analysed as scalar particles expressing a medium value, *utique* and *dumtaxat* are non-scalar, expressing an inclusive maximal and a restrictive minimal value, respectively.

Dictionnaires et traductions donnent souvent l'impression que la signification des particules *saltem*, *utique*, *dumtaxat* et *certe* se recouvre, parce qu'elles peuvent toutes exprimer, dans certains contextes, le sens d'« au moins ». Cependant, une analyse détaillée révèle que la ressemblance entre ces emplois n'est que superficielle. Seules les particules *saltem* et (dans certains contextes) *certe* peuvent être analysées comme particules vraiment scalaires, tandis que *utique* et *dumtaxat* sont des particules non-scalaires : *utique* a une valeur dite « inclusive », *dumtaxat* est « restrictif ».

### Entrées d'index



**Mots-clés :** particule, focus, scalarité, valeur inclusive, valeur restrictive

**Keywords:** particle, focus, scalarity, inclusive value, restrictive value

## Texte intégral

# 1. Introduction

- 1 In Latin we find a number of so-called focus particles that seem to be used to indicate a relatively low ranking on a scale of expectation and can be translated in English by means of ‘at least’ or ‘at any rate’: *saltem*, *utique*, *dumtaxat*, and – in some of its uses – *certe*. Thus, in examples (1)-(4) these particles could be analysed as evoking a comparison with higher ranking alternatives, which are either explicitly listed (in 1, 2, and 4) or implied (in 3); the element in the scope of these particles is presented as more realistic.<sup>1</sup>

*Quam ob rem obsecro te, mi Tite, eripe hunc mihi dolorem aut minue saltem.* (Cic. Att. 9, (1) 6, 5)

‘So, my dear Titus, I implore you, rid me of this pain or *saltem* relieve it.’<sup>2</sup>

*Velim ante possis; si minus, utique simul simus cum Brutus veniet in Tusculanum.* (Cic. Att. 13, 4, 2)

(2) ‘I wish you could manage it before, but if not, let us *utique* be together when Brutus comes to Tusculum.’

*Temptavi enim imitari Demosthenen semper tuum, Calvum nuper meum, dumtaxat figuris orationis.* (Plin. Epist. 1, 2, 2)

(3) ‘I have tried to model myself on Demosthenes, as you always do, and lately on my favourite Calvus, *dumtaxat* in figures of speech.’

*Varus imperium se habere dicebat; fascis certe habebat.* (Cic. Lig. 22)

(4) Varus maintained that the authority was accredited to himself; *certe* he was in possession of the symbols of power.’

- 2 In this paper, I will offer a contrastive analysis of these four particles, which aims at demonstrating how they differ, in spite of their apparent similarity, in their orientation and scalar implications. My starting point will be the analysis of *saltem* as a scalar particle proposed by Bortolussi and Sznajder (2001). They convincingly claim that *saltem* is a scalar particle that is used to focalize items whose referents are less preferable, but more feasible than alternatives to which they are explicitly (as in ex. 1) or implicitly compared. Scalar uses of *certe* are briefly discussed by Schrickx (2011, p. 214-220), while the differences between *saltem* and the scalar uses of *certe* has been discussed in Bertocchi (1998 and 1999).<sup>3</sup> *Utique* and *dumtaxat*, on the other hand, have not received much attention.<sup>4</sup> First of all, however, I will say a few words about focus particles and scalar focus particles more in general, basing myself largely on the seminal discussion in König (1991).

## 2. Focus particles

- 3 In his comparative study of focus particles, König makes a number of useful distinctions, of which I repeat here only the ones relevant for our present purpose:<sup>5</sup>

- 4 Focus particles, like *even* or *only*, do not only mark the elements in their scope as having focus, but usually ‘evoke’ a set of alternatives for the element in their scope that are relevant in the context. Thus, *only* in ‘only John went home’ evokes a set of alternative persons who did not go home (e.g. Peter, or John’s wife). The alternatives that are evoked by the use of focus particles are either included or excluded, depending



on the meaning of the particle. When focus particles are used to include the set of evoked alternatives, they are so-called “additive particles” (e.g. *also*, *even*, *in particular*; Latin *quoque*, *etiam*); when the alternatives are excluded, we speak of “restrictive particles” (e.g. *only*, *just*, *exactly*; Latin *tantum*, *modo*).

- 5 Secondly, focus particles may or may not impose a scalar ranking on the element in their scope in relation to the alternatives evoked, even when these alternatives are not intrinsically ordered. Examples of scalar focus particles are *even*, *just* and Latin *modo*, *etiam*. Non-scalar particles are e.g. *also*, *only*, and Latin *quoque*, *tantum*. Scalar particles evaluate their scope as ranking either higher or lower on a relevant scale than the alternatives that are evoked. Thus, in a sentence like ‘even John went home’, *even* indicates not only that the alternative persons evoked went home as well, but also that ‘John’ ranks higher than all others on the scale involved, and that his position on this scale implies that if he went home, the others went as well. Focus particles like *even* (or Latin *etiam*) therefore indicate a “maximal scalar value”. On the other hand, *just* (like Latin *modo*) indicates a “minimal scalar value”, as we can see in a sentence like ‘Just John went home’, because the use of *just* implies that all others, who are ranking higher on a scale of whom one would have expected to go home, did not go. <sup>6</sup> English *only* and Latin *tantum*, on the other hand, do evoke alternatives, but do not impose scalar ranking in terms of expectations.
- 6 The various distinctions made above are summarized in table 1<sup>7</sup>.

**Table 1: Minimal and maximal values of scalar and non-scalar focus particles**

	non-scalar	scalar	value
<b>inclusive</b>	<i>also</i>	<i>even – etiam</i>	maximal
<b>restrictive</b>	<i>only</i>	<i>just – modo</i>	minimal

### 3. Medium value: *saltem* and *certe*

- 7 Some focus particles, however, do not evaluate their scope as either maximal or minimal, but as having a “medium value”, and here *at least* comes in. When we say ‘at least John went home’, *at least* indicates that not all alternative persons evoked went home, but some probably did; John occupies neither a maximal nor a minimal position on the scale evoked.
- 8 In the case of a medium value, the focus of attention can be either on what is included (and, hence, ranks lower on a positive scale) or on what is excluded (and ranks higher on a positive scale). As Bortolussi and Sznajder have shown, following Bertocchi (1998), this is exactly the difference between *saltem* and *certe*. They claim that ‘*certe X*’ means ‘at least X, but possibly more than X’, which includes and confirms lower ranking alternatives, while ‘*saltem X*’ means ‘not more than X but at least X’, which excludes higher ranking alternatives. *Saltem* does not indicate that its scope has the minimal value but that it has a lower value than alternatives that may be preferable, but are not feasible. In addition, they stress that by means of *certe* the speaker commits himself in assertive speech acts to the inclusion of the lower ranking alternatives up to the medium value, while *saltem* is often used in non-factive environments (directives, wishes, questions, counterfactuals, etc.).<sup>8</sup> Table 2 summarizes the medium value as well.

**Table 2: Minimal, maximal, and medium values of scalar and non-scalar focus particles**



	non-scalar	scalar	value
<b>inclusive</b>	<i>also</i>	<i>even – etiam</i>	maximal
<b>inclusive</b>		<i>at least – certe</i>	medium
<b>restrictive</b>		<i>at least – saltem</i>	medium
<b>restrictive</b>	<i>only</i>	<i>just – modo</i>	minimal

9 Examples (5), (6), (7), and (8=1) illustrate the different medium values of *certe* and *saltem* quite nicely, since the inclusive nature of *certe* and the restrictive nature of *saltem* is in each case indicated by an alternative that is explicitly expressed in the preceding context:

- (5) *Eandem multis naturam aut certe similem habere berulli videntur.* (Plin. *Nat.* 37, 76)  
 'Many people consider the nature of beryls to be identical, or at least similar.'<sup>9</sup>

*Nam lupi, forsitan confertae iventutis strepitu vel certe nimia luce flammaram deterriti, uel etiam aliorum grassantes, nulli contra nos aditum tulerunt ac ne procul saltem<sup>10</sup> ulli comparuerant.* (Apul. *Met.* 8, 16, 7)

- (6) 'That fear, however, turned out to be utterly imaginary, and we suffered it all in vain; we fell into a much worse trap. Perhaps the wolves were frightened off by the noise from the crowded pack of young men, or at least by the intense light of the flames; or maybe they were simply on the prowl somewhere else. In any case none approached us, and we never even saw one in the distance.'

*Hoc nescio an Romanum fuerit inventum; certe etiam nomen non habet vetustum.* (Plin. *Nat.* 34, 15)

- (7) 'This (i.e. covering a statue with gold) was perhaps a Roman invention, but it certainly has a name of no long standing at Rome.'

*Quam ob rem obsecro te, mi Tite, eripe hunc mihi dolorem aut minue saltem.* (Cic. *Att.*

- (8) 9,6,5)  
 'So, my dear Titus, I implore you, rid me of this pain or at any rate relieve it.'

10 In addition to illustrating more in general the scalar values of *saltem* and *certe*, these examples also make clear that the scalar relations involved need not be based on semantics, as is the case with *eandem* and *similem* in (5), but may also be – and actually are far more often – of a pragmatic nature, as was observed by Fauconnier (1975). Pragmatic scales are based on pragmatic inferences from the specific context. Thus, the scale evoked by *certe* in (6) concerns 'things wolves are expected to be afraid of', and in (7) the two qualifications are related in terms of a scale of relative age.

11 The analysis, based on König, Bertocchi, Bortolussi and Sznajder, of the various characteristics of *saltem* and *certe* as marking a scalar medium value, will now help us to understand *utique* and *dumtaxat*.

## 4. Non-scalar focus particles: *dumtaxat* and *utique*

12 Let us start with *dumtaxat*, which is relatively straightforward. Example (9=3), repeated here, gives the impression that its function is similar to either *certe*, asserting the various ways in which Pliny imitates Demosthenes and including all lower values up to and including the *figuris orationis*, or limiting his attempts to imitate Demosthenes to the figures of speech, excluding higher ranking forms of imitation. The latter seems to



be suggested by the Loeb translation ‘though only’ quoted here:

*Temptavi enim imitari Demosthenen semper tuum, Calvum nuper meum, dumtaxat figuris orationis.* (Plin. *Epist.* 1, 2, 2)

- (9) ‘I have tried to model myself on Demosthenes, as you always do, and lately on my favourite Calvus, though only in figures of speech.’

- 13 However, as many other examples make clear, *dumtaxat* is usually not scalar at all, and does not impose a scalar ranking on the alternatives evoked. Instead, it is a non-scalar restrictive focus particle, very much like English ‘only’ and Latin *tantum* discussed earlier. A first indication is the fact that it actually correlates quite regularly with these two, cf. (10):

*Nam Theopompus, ante quem nemo mentionem habuit, urbem dumtaxat a Gallis captam dixit, Clitarchus ab eo proximus legationem tantum ad Alexandrum missam.* (Plin. *Nat.* 3, 57)

- (10) ‘For Theopompus, before whom nobody mentioned them, merely states that Rome was taken by the Gauls, and Clitarchus, the next after him, only that an embassy was sent to Alexander.’

- 14 A further indication is found in examples such as (11), where the exclusion of alternatives evoked is explicitly non-scalar (*de ceteris rebus*).

*Ad ea quae scripsisti commodius equidem possem de singulis ad te rebus scribere si M. Tullius, scriba meus, adesset. A quo mihi exploratum est in rationibus dumtaxat referendis (de ceteris rebus adfirmare non possum) nihil eum fecisse scientem quod esset contra aut rem aut existimationem tuam.* (Cic. *Fam.* 5, 20, 1)

- (11) ‘It would be easier for me to reply to your letter in detail if my Secretary, M. Tullius, were here. As to him, I am fully assured that so far as the rendering of accounts goes (on other matters I cannot speak for certain) he has not intentionally done anything contrary to your financial interest or reputation.’

- 15 Finally, in those examples with *dumtaxat* in which a scalar ranking does seem to be involved, this ranking is either an inherent, semantically determined scalar order that is not evoked or imposed by *dumtaxat* (cf. ex. (12), where the length of a period is involved), or the evoked alternative is part of a binary opposition instead of a scale. In the latter case the alternative is often introduced by e.g. *quidem* (for which see e.g. Kroon, 2005; 2011), as in (13).

*ut [...] pleraque senatus auctoritate et instituto ac more gererentur, atque uti consules potestatem haberent tempore dumtaxat annuam genere ipso ac iure regiam...* (Cic. *Rep.* 2, 56)

- (12) ‘practically everything being done by the authority of the senate and in accordance with its established customs, and that the consuls held a power which, though only of one year’s duration, was truly regal in general character and in legal sanction...’

*... cum is inimicus qui ad meam perniciem vocem suam communibus hostibus praeuisset spiritu dumtaxat viveret, re quidem infra omnes mortuos amandatus esset.* (Cic. *P. red. ad Quir.* 10)

- (13) ‘... while that enemy of mine who had lent his voice to the foes of the state to work my downfall lived indeed, in the sense that breath was yet in his body but in truth he had been removed to a lower depth than all the dead.’

- 16 Finally, I want to discuss an example in which *dumtaxat* is often interpreted as being interchangeable with *saltem*, the whole phrase meaning ‘preferably longer but at least / at any rate until May 6’.<sup>11</sup> The context makes clear, however, that Cicero wants to get away as soon as possible, because he is bothered and disturbed by his talkative neighbours. *Dumtaxat* therefore means ‘only’ here, as is explained in the next sentence *vide enim...* Moreover, *dumtaxat* is not scalar here, either, because it does not evoke a comparison with alternatives that are lower or higher on a scale of expectation. If *saltem* was used here, Cicero would evoke higher ranking alternatives, that were more



feasible but not realistic. But if a comparison is at stake here at all, it is with *statim*; the alternative of a longer stay is simply and straightforwardly rejected.<sup>12</sup>

- Quo me vertam? Statim mehercule Arpinum irem, ni te in Formiano commodissime expectari viderem, dumtaxat ad prid. Non. Mai. Vide enim quibus hominibus aures sint deditae meae.* (Cic. Att. 2, 14, 2)
- (14) ‘Where is a man to turn? I would go to Arpinum right away upon my word, only it’s clearly most convenient for me to expect you at Formiae – up to 6 May that is, no longer, for look at the kind of people I am condemned to listen to!’

- 17 Let us now turn to the last particle that in some of its uses is taken as another ‘at least’ equivalent, viz. *utique*. Thus, e.g. the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* lists example (15=2) under the heading of ‘at least’. In this particular case, the addition of *si minus* may have been taken as an indication that, as in instances with *saltem*, the preceding clause (*velim ante possis*) presents a preferred, higher ranking alternative, and that in the *si minus* clause the scope of *utique* is presented as less desirable, but more feasible. In fact, nothing in the context of the example prevents such a reading. Moreover, a second similarity seems to be that with *utique*, as with *saltem*, we relatively often find directives and wishes, rather than assertions.

- Velim ante possis; si minus, utique simul simul cum Brutus veniet in Tusculanum. Magni interest mea una nos esse.* (Cic. Att. 13, 4, 2)
- (15) ‘I wish you could manage it before, but if not, let us at any rate be together when Brutus comes to Tusculum. It is of great importance to me that we should both be there.’

- 18 However, when we turn to a number of comparable instances in Cicero’s letters, we observe that often the importance of the scope of *utique* is stressed, what seems to be an indication of merely focusing, i.e. a singling out, rather than evoking more preferable but less feasible alternatives. Some examples are (16) and (17), which, again, both are directives:

- Velim tamen si quid est de Antoni adventu quod audieris scribas ad me et, quoniam huc non venis, cenae apud nos utique prid. Kal. Cave aliter facias. Cura ut valeas.* (Cic. Att. 2, 2, 3)
- (16) ‘Still, if you get any news about Antonius’ arrival I should be obliged if you would write to me; and as you are not coming here, dine with us by all means on the 29th. Don’t do otherwise, and take good care of yourself.’<sup>13</sup>

- Sed ante quam proficiscare, utique explicatum sit illud HS XX<sup>et</sup> DCCCC; hoc velim in maximis rebus et maxime necessariis habeas, ut quod auctore te velle coepi adiutore adsequar.* Cic. Att. 5, 5, 2)
- (17) ‘But before you leave do without fail get that matter of the 20,000 and the 800,000 straightened out. I should be grateful if you would look on it as something really important and urgent, so that what I came to want with your prompting I may achieve with your assistance.’

- 19 Whereas the expressions of urgency are not totally incompatible with a meaning of ‘at least’, the ‘mere focussing’ is often found in binary (and therefore not scalar) constellations, as in the following example, which occurs in a speech:

- (‘And consider, tribunes how wide is the difference between my view and yours.’) *Vos, etiamsi tunc faciendum non fuerit, nunc utique faciendum putatis: ego contra – nec id mirati sitis priusquam quale sit audieritis –, etiamsi tum migrandum fuisset incolumi tota urbe, nunc has ruinas relinquendas non censerem.* (Liv. 5, 53, 3)
- (18) ‘You think that even if then it ought not to have been done, yet now at any rate it ought; I on the contrary – and be not astonished at this, till you have heard what my meaning is –, even if it had been right to migrate then, with the City all intact, should not think it right to abandon these ruins now.’



However, the strongest evidence for a non-scalar value of *utique* comes from examples like (19), where the idiomatic *si quando umquam* ‘if ever’ makes clear that the

alternatives for the scope of *utique* need no scalar ranking, or cannot be ordered at all; cf. also *patria* as an unordered set of people in (20).

- Agitatum etiam in consilio est, ut, si quando umquam severo ullum imperio bellum administratum esset, tunc utique disciplina militaris ad priscos redigeretur mores.* (Liv. 8, 6, 14)
- (19) ‘It was also urged in the council that if ever any war had been conducted with stern authority, now was the occasion of all others for recalling military discipline to its ancient courses.’

- Nec nunc me, ut redirem, mea voluntas mutata, sed vestra fortuna perpulit; quippe, ut in sua sede maneret patria, id agebatur, non ut ego utique in patria essem.* (Liv. 5, 51, 1)
- (20) ‘Nor have I now been induced to do so by any change in my desires, but by the alteration in your fortunes. For the issue was this, that my countrymen should abide in their own home, not that I, at any or all costs, should be with my countrymen.’

- 21 The scope of *utique* is evaluated as having a maximal value - however, not as the extreme of a scale but as a single maximum among a not necessarily ordered set of alternatives. When there is some sort of scale involved, the set of alternatives often form a series (rather than a scale), with the scope of *utique* as a climax, cf. *in primis ... deinde ... utique postremis mensibus* in (21):

- (‘The plebs were tranquil, but the younger patricians began to insult them.’) *Ubi tribuni auxilio humilioribus essent, in primis parum proderat; deinde ne ipsi quidem inviolati erant, utique postremis mensibus, cum et per coitiones potentiorum iniuria fieret et vis potestatis omnis aliquanto posteriore anni parte languidior ferme esset.* (Liv. 3, 65, 8)
- (21) ‘When the tribunes attempted to assist the lowly, at first their services were of little effect; and later they did not even escape violence themselves, especially in the last months of their term, since not only were wrongs committed through cabals of the more powerful, but the effectiveness of every magistrate rather languished, as a rule, in the latter part of the year.’

- 22 Finally, there is an interesting cluster of very similar examples in Livy’s first decade containing phrases like (22), where *utique* is combined with a form of *alter*:

- (22) *ut / ne consulum utique alter ex plebe crearetur / fieret / fieri ...*<sup>14</sup>

- 23 The phrase *consulum utique alter* is usually translated by ‘at least one of the consuls’, i.e. as though *utique* were a scalar particle with medium value. I prefer, on the other hand, to translate as ‘one of the consuls, by all means / under all circumstances / at any rate’; an interpretation in terms of ‘at least’ would suggest the possibility that both consuls would be plebeian, which as far as I know never was at issue in the Early Republic. My interpretation seems to be confirmed by an instance like (23), where it is the right of the patricians to name both consuls instead of only one that is clearly at stake:

- An aliter rogat qui utique alterum ex plebe fieri consulem iubet nec duos patricios creandi potestatem vobis permittit ?* (Liv. 6, 40, 16)
- (23) ‘For can aught else be his meaning, when he commands that in any case one consul be chosen from the plebs, and deprives you of the power to name two patricians?’

## 5. Conclusion

- 24 By way of conclusion, Table 3 lists all parameters that have been discussed in this paper.



**Table 3: Summarizing *saltem*, *certe*, *dumtaxat*, and *utique***

	non-scalar	scalar	value
<b>inclusive</b>	also – <i>quoque</i>	even – <i>etiam</i>	maximal
<b>inclusive</b>	by all means – <i>utique</i>		maximal
<b>inclusive</b>		at least – <i>certe</i>	medium
<b>restrictive</b>		at least – <i>saltem</i>	medium
<b>restrictive</b>	only – <i>tantum, dumtaxat</i>	just – <i>modo</i>	minimal

25 As we can see here, the difference between the alleged synonyms can be captured effectively in terms of scalarity, in combination with the opposition between “inclusiveness” and “restrictiveness”, and the various values implied. The combination of parameters defines a basis semantic value for the particles involved, which in various contexts may lead to different interpretations (and translations). More research is needed to elaborate on these (and related) focus particles, but I do hope that this first step has shown that the idea of synonymy and at the same time opposite ‘meanings’ per particle as we find in dictionaries are beside the point.

## Bibliographie

BERTOCCHI, A., 1998, Scalar predicates and adversative correlatives, in B. García-Hernández (ed.), *Estudios de lingüística latina I*, Madrid, p. 155-168.

BERTOCCHI, A., 1999, *Ipse*, un intensifieur, *Lalies* 19, p. 153-162.

BERTOCCHI, A., 2002, The expression of exclusiveness by *nisi*, *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 8, p. 25-42.

DOI : 10.1515/joll.2002.8.1.25

BERTOCCHI, A. and MARALDI, M., 2012, La scalarité: application à certains phénomènes de la langue latine, *Revue de Linguistique Latine du Centre Alfred Ernout De lingua Latina* 8 (revue en ligne).

BORTOLUSSI, B. and SZNAJDER, L., 2001, Syntaxe et interprétation de *saltem*, *Papers on Grammar* 7, p. 35-59.

DOI : 10.1515/joll.2001.7.1.35

FAUCONNIER, G., 1975, Pragmatic scales and logical structure, *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, p. 353-375.

GAST, V. and Van der AUWERA, J., 2011, Scalar additive operators in the languages of Europe, *Language* 87, 2-54.

KÖNIG, E., 1991, *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*. London.

KROON, C., 2005, The relationship between grammar and discourse. Evidence from the Latin particle *quidem*, in G. Calboli (ed.), *Papers on Grammar* 9 (2), *Latina Lingua!*, Rome, p. 577-590.

DOI : 10.1515/joll.2005.9.2.577

KROON, C., 2011, Latin particles and the grammar of discourse, in J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, Malden, p. 176-195.

ORLANDINI, A., 1999, *Etiam, quoque, ne ... quidem*: adverbos d’annoncé et adverbos d’annonciation, *Lalies* 19, 143-152.

ORLANDINI, A., 2001, *Négation et argumentation en latin*. Louvain.

RISSELADA, R., 1994, *Modo* and *sane*, or what to do with particles in Latin directives, in J. Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, p. 319-343.

PFRENZINGER, A., 1919, *Die partikel utique*. Dissertation, Würzburg.

SCHRICKX, J., 2011, *Lateinische Modalpartikeln. Nempe, quippe, scilicet, videlicet und nimirum*. Leiden.



## Notes

1 Example (1) is taken from Bortolussi and Sznajder, 2001, p. 51, but is also listed in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* under meaning 1, ‘at least, at all events, anyhow’. Examples (2) and (3) are also taken from the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, s. v. *utique* meaning 5 ‘certainly, at all events’ and s. v. *dumtaxat* meaning 4 ‘at any rate, at least’, respectively. Example (4) is taken from Schrickx, 2011, p. 217. My own ideas concerning focus particles took shape during an inspiring MA seminar on Latin particles, which I taught at the University of Amsterdam in 2012. I would like to thank the participants, and especially Thomas den Haan and Julius Roos, for their contributions and the fruitful discussions we had.

2 Unless indicated otherwise, translations are taken from Loeb editions; in this first series of examples I have left out the translation of the particle involved.

3 For more general studies on scalar phenomena in the context of Latin particles, cf. Bertocchi and Maraldi, 2012, and Orlandini, 1999. For scalar phenomena in negative contexts, see Orlandini, 2001, esp. chapters 6 and 7.

4 There is a dissertation on *utique* by Pfrenzinger, 1919, which gives extensive lists of uses, but is not very helpful as an analysis. The lemma *dumtaxat* in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* will be briefly referred to below, in footnote 11; the other three particles have not yet been covered by the *Thesaurus*.

5 See in particular chapter 3; cf. furthermore Gast and van der Auwera, 2011.

6 For *modo*, see Risselada, 1994; Bertocchi, 2002.

7 Note that when focus particles are combined with negation, the scales and values are reversed, but in view of limited space, this paper does not deal with the effects of negation on scales, which is extensively discussed by Orlandini, 2001. In note 10, I discuss one example of a negative scale.

8 In view of the fact that the inclusive scalar use of *certe* is not very frequent (e.g. only 21 instances among the 106 tokens of *certe* in Plinius the Elder), this seems to be not a basic meaning, but a particular side effect that obtains only in a specific scalar contextual constellation. This is in line with the basic value of truth commitment that Schrickx, 2011, p. 214-220, claims for *certe*.

9 The translation is my own, adapted from the Loeb translation, which is freer but points in the same direction: ‘Many people consider the nature of beryls be similar, if not identical.’

10 I leave *saltem* out of consideration here, because it is used in a negative context, which reverses the values on the scale involved. As a result of its combination with *ne*, *saltem* here does not exclude alternatives that rank higher on the scale of ‘frightening situations’, but it excludes a situation that is less frightening, namely ‘wolves farther away’, a medium value between ‘no wolves at all’ and ‘wolves coming close’.

11 E.g. in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, s. v. col. 2238, l. 66-67, under the heading *non minus*, which at the head of the lemma is paraphrased as “*minime, certe, saltem, utique, quidem*” (s. v., col. 2236, l. 47-48).

12 Pace Shackleton Bailey, whose translation in the Loeb edition quoted in (14) may suggest a scalar interpretation.

13 I have adapted the translation of *Cenes apud nos utique prid. Kal. Cave aliter facias*. The Loeb translation (by Shackleton Bailey) points in the same direction of urgency, but is not so very literal, and hence less clear about the meaning of *utique*: ‘Don’t fail to dine with us on the 29th. Mind you do.’

14 Cf. e.g. Liv. 6, 35, 5-7; 6, 38, 1; 6, 40, 16 (= ex. 23); 8, 12, 14. A slightly different case involving a consul is Liv. 2, 27, 7, where a scalar ‘at least’ interpretation is also not possible.

## Pour citer cet article

### Référence papier

Rodie Risselada, « The pragmatics of ‘at least’: *Saltem, utique, dumtaxat, certe* », *Pallas*, 102 | 2016, 191-199.

### Référence électronique

Rodie Risselada, « The pragmatics of ‘at least’: *Saltem, utique, dumtaxat, certe* », *Pallas* [En ligne], 102 | 2016, mis en ligne le 20 décembre 2016, consulté le 29 octobre 2021. URL :



<http://journals.openedition.org/pallas/3680> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/pallas.3680>

---

## ***Auteur***

**Rodie Risselada**

Assistant Professor of Latin, University of Amsterdam

[r.risselada@uva.nl](mailto:r.risselada@uva.nl)

---

## ***Droits d'auteur***



Pallas – Revue d'études antiques est mis à disposition selon les termes de la licence Creative Commons Attribution - Pas d'Utilisation Commerciale - Pas de Modification 4.0 International.

