

Overview of workshops

International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics 2027. Leiden/Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

In this document:

- ***Building Blended Worlds***, organised by Merlijn Breunese (Leiden University and University of Amsterdam) on Tuesday, June 8 2027.
- ***The Grammar of Latin Verse: Word Order between Syntax, Pragmatics, and Prosody***, organised by Brian Cluyse (Trinity College Dublin), Łukasz Berger (Adam Mickiewicz University), Boris Kayachev (Trinity College Dublin) on Tuesday, June 8 2027.
- ***Qualitative and quantitative approaches to Latin lexical semantic variation and change***, organised by Barbara McGillivray and Andrea Farina (King's College London) on Thursday, June 10 2027.
- ***Textual analyses of person***, organised by Silvia Pieroni (Università per Stranieri di Siena) and Paolo Poccetti (Università di Roma 'Tor Vergata') on Thursday, June 10 2027.
- ***The Historical Pragmatics of Particles in Latin***, organised by Ezra la Roi (Ghent University), Rodie Risselada (University of Amsterdam) and Josine Schrickx (Thesaurus Linguae Latinae) on Friday, June 11 2027.

Workshop: “Building Blended Worlds”

Date: Tuesday, June 8 2027

Organiser: Dr. Merlijn Breunesse (Leiden University and University of Amsterdam)

In case of questions about this workshop, please contact: m.r.e.breunesse@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Several works of Latin literature present us with worlds that are simultaneously Roman and Greek (see, e.g., Moore 1998, ch. 3 for Plautine comedy; Graverini 2023 for Vergil’s *Eclogues* and Apuleius’s *Metamorphoses*; see also Williams 1968, ch. 5). This workshop will explore the linguistic, stylistic, and narratological devices through which such ‘blended’ worlds, which incorporate elements of two (or more) other, ‘constitutive’, worlds, are constructed in Latin texts. These constitutive worlds, with their own spatiotemporal setting, inhabitants, and internal logic, may be taken from previous texts or literary traditions, but may also be (conceptualizations of) our actual world. In the above-mentioned texts, the blended worlds foreground and exploit the geographical and cultural differences between their constitutive worlds, but other worlds can be imagined in which, for instance, distinct temporal frames or even (features of) individual literary worlds, like that of Homer’s *Odyssey* or Theocritus’ *Idylls*, get blended. In drama, blending can be achieved through spatial, temporal, and person deixis. For instance, the adverb *hic* ‘here’ in Plautus’ comedies can refer to the fictional Greek setting *and* to Rome, while simultaneously canceling (at least momentarily) the distinction between the two, thus referring to the blended world (Breunesse 2023; see Graverini 2023, p. 237 for a similar observation about deixis in Vergil’s *Eclogues*). To get a better understanding of the construction of blended worlds across authors, literary genres, and media, I invite abstracts on questions such as:

- Through what linguistic, stylistic, and/or narratological devices are blended worlds constructed? Are these devices different across media (written text, performance, etc.), and if so, why?
- Which elements of the constitutive worlds are maintained in the blended world and which are left out? How does this affect the spatiotemporal setting, inhabitants, and internal logic of the blended world?
- Why do authors construct blended worlds? Do they, like Plautus, do so in part to achieve originality in a literary tradition? Or does the blending serve, for instance, to thematize issues of cultural identity or to challenge concepts of space and time?

Suggested reading

This workshop call combines insights from media studies and narratology on the construction of imaginary worlds and from cognitive studies on blending. A useful and brief introduction to Conceptual Blending Theory (originally developed by Fauconnier and Turner [2002]) that also discusses the potential and pitfalls of applying this theory to literature can be found in Hartner (2025). Wolf (2012, esp. ch. 1 and 5) insightfully discusses the concept of imaginary worlds and how they are constructed.

Breunese, M. (2023). *Haec urbs est Thebae*: Proximal Deixis in the Prologue to Plautus' *Amphitruo*. *Mnemosyne*, 76(2), 230–257.

Fauconnier, G. & Turner, M. (2002). *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*. New York: Basic Books.

Graverini, L. (2023). Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, Vergil's *Eclogues*, and the Varying Challenges of Greek Genres. In B. Dufallo & R. A. Faber (eds.), *Comparing Roman Hellenisms in Italy* (pp. 224–246). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Hartner, M. (2025). Blending and Literature. In J. Alber & R. Schneider (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Literature and Cognitive Studies* (pp. 138–153). New York: Routledge.

Williams, G. (1968). *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Wolf, M. J. P. (2012). *Building Imaginary Worlds: The Theory and History of Subcreation*. New York: Routledge.

Workshop: “The Grammar of Latin Verse: Word Order between Syntax, Pragmatics, and Prosody”

Date: Tuesday, June 8 2027

Organisers: Brian Cluyse (Trinity College Dublin), Łukasz Berger (Adam Mickiewicz University), Boris Kayachev (Trinity College Dublin)

In case of questions about this workshop, please contact: cluyseb@tcd.ie

In recent years, poetry has been reconceptualised as a prosodically stylised form of language, shaped by metrical constraints while also permitting syntactic and pragmatic phenomena not typically available in non-metrical contexts (Fortson 2008; Devine & Stephens 2024; see also Gunkel & Hackstein 2017). This perspective has found support in a growing body of studies on the word order of Latin poetry, which have identified several core features of poetic syntax (Mayer & Adams 1999; Fortson 2008; Ferri 2011; Dainotti, Hasegawa & Harrison 2024; Devine & Stephens 2024).

While certain aspects of poetic word order, such as discontinuous phrases (Pearce 1966a,b; Conrad 1990), have been studied extensively for decades, many others remain only superficially described, and their syntactic and interpretative properties are still poorly understood. In particular, the role of pragmatics and prosody in shaping poetic word order has only recently begun to receive sustained attention from a linguistic perspective (see Kayachev & Chahoud 2025). Ongoing research has examined the effects of metrical and syntactic positions (Dainotti 2015; Smith 2021; Hasegawa 2024), the influence of rhythm on constituent placement (Zimmermann 2009; see also Blankenborg 2015), the pragmatic/semantic motivations for word order variation (de Melo 2010; Spevak 2010; Bortolussi 2016; Halla-aho 2018; Devine & Stephens 2024; Verano fthc.), and the interaction between word order and the prosodic organisation of the verse (Bertrand 2023; Allan 2025a, b).

These developments raise a number of broader questions concerning the nature of word order in Latin poetry. How can the study of individual word order phenomena contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the syntax, pragmatics, and prosody of Latin verse? To what extent does poetic word order reflect syntactic, pragmatic, and prosodic principles that diverge from those operating in non-metrical texts? Finally, can similarities and differences between word order configurations in metrical versus non-metrical texts be accounted for within a unified explanatory framework?

Building on these questions, this workshop is devoted to the study of word order in Latin metrical texts, with particular attention to its interaction with semantics, pragmatics, prosody, and

metrical structure. We welcome contributions that address word order from a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives, including synchronic and diachronic approaches, and that focus on individual authors and genres as well as on comparative corpora. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to:

- Word order phenomena that are characteristic of or particularly frequent in poetry (e.g., enjambment, poetic formulae, golden verse, repetition)
- The relationship between metrical structure (colometry, versification) and word order
- Positional effects within the verse (e.g., verse-initial, verse-final, post-caesural placement) and the structures associated with such positions
- Variation in word order across authors, genres, or metrical forms
- The role of pragmatics, prosody and (oral) performance in motivating poetic word order
- Comparative case-studies of word order configurations in metrical and non-metrical texts
- Recurrent word order configurations as stylistic or genre-specific features
- Word order as evidence for syntactic constituency, information structure, or prosodic phrasing in poetry

Suggested reading

- Allan, Rutger. 2025a. Caesurae, cola, and Discourse Acts: A Functional Discourse Grammar approach to Homeric colometry. In Jesús de la Villa, Araceli Striano & Rodrigo Verano (eds.), *Advances in Ancient Greek Linguistics*, 609–625. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Allan, Rutger. 2025b. Hyperbaton and Homeric colometry: A first exploration. In Klaas Bentein & Metin Bağrıaçık (eds.), *From Greece to Cappadocia: Ancient and Modern Greek Language Studies in Honour of Mark Janse*, 15–39. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bertrand, Nicolas. 2023. When phonology outranks syntax: Postponed relative pronouns in Pindar. *Glossa* 8(1). 1–41.
- Blankenborg, Ronald J.J. 2015. *Audible Punctuation. Performative Pause in Homeric Prosody*. Radboud University PhD Dissertation.
- Bortolussi, Bernard. 2016. L'ordre des constituants en poésie: verbe initial chez Ovide. In Paolo Poccetti (ed.), *Latinitatis Rationes: Descriptive and Historical Accounts for the Latin Language*, 603–620. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Conrad, Carl. 1990. *From Epic to Lyric: A Study in the History of Traditional Word-Order in Greek and Latin Poetry*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Dainotti, Paolo. 2015. *Word Order and Expressiveness in the Aeneid*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Dainotti, Paolo, Alexandre P. Hasegawa & Stephen Harrison (eds.). 2024. *Style in Latin Poetry*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Devine, Andrew M. & Laurence D. Stephens. 2024. *Latin Elegiac Verse: A Theory of Very Free Word Order*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ferri, Rolando. 2011. The language of Latin epic and lyric poetry. In James Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, 344–366. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Fortson, Benjamin W. 2008. *Language and Rhythm in Plautus: Synchronic and Diachronic Studies*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Gunkel, Dieter & Olav Hackstein. 2017. *Language and Meter*. Leiden: Brill.
- Halla-aho, Hilla. 2018. *Left Dislocation in Latin Topics and Syntax in Republican Latin*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hasegawa, Alexandre P. 2024. Iconic word order in Horace's Odes. In Paolo Dainotti, Alexandre P. Hasegawa & Stephen Harrison (eds.), *Style in Latin Poetry*, 149–168. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kayachev, Boris & Anna Chahoud. 2025. Poetry, Prosody and Pragmatics: Linguistic Insights from/on Verse in Indo-European Traditions [Workshop]. 19–20 June 2025. Dublin, Ireland.
- Mayer, Roland & James Noel Adams (eds.). 1999. *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Melo, Wolfgang David Cirilo de. 2010. Possessive pronouns in Plautus. In Eleanor Dickey & Anna Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, 71–99. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pearce, T. E. V. 1966a. The enclosing word order in the Latin hexameter I. *The Classical Quarterly* 16(1). 140–171.
- Pearce, T. E. V. 1966b. The enclosing word order in the Latin hexameter II. *The Classical Quarterly* 16(2). 298–320.
- Smith, Joseph Andrew. 2021. Modular Clause Composition in Plautus: Evidence of Poet and Actors at Work on the Play. *Mnemosyne* 75(5). 811–852.
- Spevak, Olga. 2010. *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Verano, Rodrigo. fthc. Special syntax and the language of Homer: Patterns of non-progression in discourse. In Raymond F. Jr. Person (ed.), *The Special Grammar of Traditional Literature: Studies Building upon Albert Lord's Special Grammar*. Boston/Leiden: Brill.
- Zimmermann, Philippe. 2009. *Rythme métrique et rythme rhétorique dans la poésie lyrique d'Horace. Recherches sur une poétique du sens*. Université Rennes 2 (Université européenne de Bretagne) Thèse de Doctorat.

Workshop: “Qualitative and quantitative approaches to Latin lexical semantic variation and change”

Date: Thursday, June 10 2027

Organisers: Barbara McGillivray and Andrea Farina (King’s College London)

In case of questions about this workshop, please contact: barbara.mcgillivray@kcl.ac.uk

Latin lexical semantics has a long and distinguished tradition grounded in philological and lexicographical research. Landmark reference works such as the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* continue to shape our understanding of the semantic structure of Latin across its long history, and sustained attention to polysemy, semantic extension, synonymy, metaphor, and lexical fields has illuminated numerous aspects of Latin usage across its many periods and registers.

A consistent theme in this research is the centrality of context. Variation across genres, registers, and communicative settings has long been recognised as essential to interpreting Latin word meanings (Cuzzolin 2014), and philological work has demonstrated how semantic tendencies are tied to literary tradition, technical precision, stylistic choice, and cultural change (Adams 2013; Haverling 2012). Studies of technical sublanguages — legal, medical, and scientific — have further shown that semantic development often proceeds differently within distinct textual traditions (Langslow 2000; Powell 2011; Roelli 2021). The study of lexical fields has similarly revealed how individual meanings shift in relation to neighbouring items, reflecting broader reorganisations within the lexicon (e.g. Fruyt 1994; Torrego 2020). These philological and lexicographical traditions remain indispensable for interpreting meaning within its historical and textual environment.

The growth of large, digitally accessible Latin corpora and lexicographic resources has more recently opened new possibilities for investigating semantic variation and change at scale. Repositories such as the Corpus Corporum (Roelli 2014) and lemmatised corpora developed through projects like LASLA, together with interoperable lexical resources such as Latin WordNet (Litta et al. 2023), now provide an empirical base broad enough to revisit long-standing questions through distributional and corpus-based methods (McGillivray & Kilgariff 2013). Initial studies applying such methods to Latin suggest that quantitative approaches can identify patterns of semantic shift and lexical diffusion that are less visible within individual texts or traditions (Eger & Mehler 2016; McGillivray & Nowak 2025). Crucially, however, Latin’s diachronic breadth, its varying registers, its complex manuscript transmission, and the longstanding coexistence of L1 and L2 usage all require that quantitative evidence be assessed and interpreted within the rigorous philological standards that have long guided the field.

This workshop brings together qualitative and quantitative perspectives on Latin lexical semantics, with the aim of developing a more integrated methodological dialogue. Central questions include: how is semantic variation distributed across text types and registers? How do lexical fields evolve across Latin's many historical periods? How do semantic innovations arise and become established in different communities of use? And how may different forms of evidence — philological, corpus-based, and computational — together enrich our understanding of Latin word meaning? We welcome contributions that engage deeply with any of these questions, whether from a traditional philological standpoint, a digital or computational perspective, or at the intersection of all.

Suggested reading

- Adams, J. N. (2013). *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cuzzolin, P. (2014). A short note on the notion of register in Latin: on the interplay between register, diastratic variety, and communicative intention. *Journal of Latin Linguistics*, 13(2): 197–210.
- Eger, S. & Mehler, A. (2016). “On the linearity of semantic change.” In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Berlin, Germany* (pp. 52–58). Association for Computational Linguistics
- Fruyt, M. (1994). “Typologie des cas de synonymie.” In C. Moussy (ed.), *Les problèmes de la synonymie en latin*, 25–46. Paris: PUPS.
- Haverling, G. (2012). “Literary Late Latin and the Development of the Spoken Language.” In M. Leiwo et al. (eds.), *Variation and Change in Greek and Latin*. Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens.
- Herman, J. (2000). *Vulgar Latin* (Translated by Roger Wright). The Pennsylvania State University.
- Langslow, D. R. (2000). *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire*. Oxford University Press.
- Leonhardt, J. (2013). *Latin: Story of a World Language*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Litta, E., Pedonese, G. & Franzini, G. (2023). *latinWordnet-revision v1.5*. Zenodo.
- McGillivray, B. & Kilgariff, A. (2013). “Tools for historical corpus research, and a corpus of Latin”. In P. Bennett, M. Durrell, S. Scheible, R. J. Whitt (Eds.), *New Methods in Historical Corpus Linguistics*. Tübingen: Narr.
- McGillivray, B., & Nowak, K. (2025). “Tracing the semantic change of socio-political terms from Classical to early Medieval Latin with computational methods.” In G. Galdi, S. Aerts, & A. Papini (Eds.), *Varietate delectamur: Multifarious Approaches to Synchronic and Diachronic Variation in Latin*. Brepols.
- Minozzi, S. (2010). The Latin WordNet project. In Anreiter, Peter & Kienpointner, Manfred (Eds.), *Latin linguistics today: Akten des 15. Internationalen Kolloquiums zur Lateinischen*

- Linguistik*, Innsbruck, 4.-9. April 2009 (pp. 707–716). Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Powell, J. G. F. (2011). “Legal Latin.” In J. Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Roelli, P. (2014). The Corpus Corporum, a New Open Latin Text Repository and Tool. *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi (ALMA)*: Bulletin Du Cange (72): 289–304.
- Roelli, P. (2021). Latin as the Language of Science and Learning. De Gruyter.
- Torrego, E. (2020). “The expression of knowledge in Latin: *cognosco*, *nosco*, *scio*, *nescio* and *ignore*”. In van Gils, L., Kroon, C. & Risselada, R. (Eds). *Lemmata Linguistica Latina, Volume II Clause and Discourse* (pp. 20–47). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.

Workshop: “Textual analyses of person”

Date: Thursday, June 10 2027

Organisers: Silvia Pieroni (Università per Stranieri di Siena), Paolo Poccetti (Università di Roma ‘Tor Vergata’)

In case of questions about this workshop, please contact: silvia.pieroni@unistrasi.it

As a grammatical category, person is at the heart of all human expression and linguistic formalisation. For this reason, it has been at the centre of linguistic and philosophical thought since antiquity.

In modern linguistics, Benveniste (1946, 1956, 1958, 1970) recognised its pivotal role in the theoretical framework of linguistic subjectivity. Person is indeed crucial to the distinction between *énonciation* and *énoncé*, and between the enunciative situations of dialogue and narration. The relationships that mutually bind these constitutive aspects of language have important cognitive and narratological implications, in relation to the participants’ roles and the speaker’s attitude. Among the deictic functions of language, person is the shifter par excellence (in the sense of Jakobson, 1957), as it constitutes the essential role exchange.

Person plays a key role in defining the basic illocutionary force of any linguistic act, in conjunction with other fundamental verb categories, such as tense, mood, aspect and voice. These combinations can affect verbal semantics, the type of modality, and the performativity of a linguistic act. As is well known, the performative function of certain verbs is realised only in the first person of the present indicative, whereas the epistemic and deontic values do not exhibit the same kind of constraint. As for semantics, the first person of a verb expressing fear or volition can function as a *verbum putandi* (with different moods used in different contexts and languages: e.g. the indicative in English *I am afraid it is raining* versus the subjunctive in Latin *nolim eum esse domi*). Negation also has different perlocutionary effects depending on verbal person (e.g. *nolo facere* versus *noli facere*).

On the other hand, person interacts with nominal categories such as gender and number, often in a manner which is by no means obvious. For instance, the interplay between person and number in personal pronouns differs drastically from the variation in number in common nouns. The first-person plural of the personal pronoun may or may not include the addressee and, in some contexts, it may function as a singular with a different argumentative force (e.g. *pluralis maiestatis* or *modestiae*) or perform pragmatic and diaphasic functions such as politeness or formality.

By contrast, person also defines impersonal uses, which include singular non-persons with meteorological predicates (e.g. *pluit*) and plural third persons with generic value (e.g. *dicunt*); the latter should be compared with so-called generic uses of the second person (e.g. *crederes*) (like English *you* ‘somebody, one’).

In addition, person serves to express the speaker’s commitment to, and agreement (or disagreement) with what is uttered, as well as their disengagement, distancing, or caution. Adopting person markers establishes intersubjective relationships, whereas avoiding personal forms when addressing someone may be a way of refusing interaction.

Eventually, its role in the syntactic organisation of sentences and the hierarchisation of various types of direct and indirect speech is equally important. Here, the polyphony of persons can provide clarification or, conversely, create ambiguity; it can establish enunciative associations or dissociations.

Person is pervasive in language, primarily manifesting in personal pronouns, verbal inflection and possessive pronouns. However, relations of person within an utterance context are also expressed by demonstratives (both deictic and anaphoric), and in a yet different way, by indefinite pronouns expressing a dual relation (e.g. *alter, uter, neuter*). Person therefore plays a fundamental role in defining and identifying the subjects involved in an utterance.

Against this general background, which only touches on the main aspects of a much broader theoretical reflection, the workshop aims to investigate the role of person as a textual function, thus taking a less conventional standpoint. The purpose is to observe person in its various manifestations as a constructive element of textual architecture (i.e., of Latin texts of any period or genre), and as a creative means of discursive realities not necessarily coinciding with – and in any case not depending on – factual realities. We will therefore highlight role alternations, their enunciative effects, their semantic and pragmatic implications, including those of cohesion markers. The workshop welcomes synchronic and diachronic perspectives, as well as sociolinguistic and contrastive considerations.

Here follow some possible avenues of research within the textual focus adopted:

- The use of personal pronouns in unexpected contexts;
- Shifts in person for the same referent;
- Interactions between person, definite and indefinite reference;
- Interactions between person and number (e.g. the use of the plural for the singular and remnants of the dual);

- Non-person, impersonal strategies, generic quantifiers and their different textual functions;
- Person as a deictic category and its correlation with other deictic elements (e.g. tense, demonstratives, or lexical elements).
- Interactions between person and verbal categories (tense, aspect, mood and voice) and their implications at the utterance level;
- The relationship between person and semantic classes of verbs (e.g. *verba dicendi*, *putandi* and *timendi*);
- The role of person in relation to *verba dicendi* with respect to affirmation, assent and enunciative dissociation;
- The distribution of persons in relation to speech acts;
- The use of person in direct and indirect speech and intermediate forms between the two;
- Person in verbs of state and motion and related grammaticalization phenomena;
- Textual cohesion markers in relation to person;
- Interaction between person, basic illocutionary force and modality;
- Ancient reflection on the concept of person, focusing on the Latin grammatical tradition.

Proposals addressing other themes are also welcome, with no restrictions on the theoretical approaches chosen. Papers are accepted in all languages permitted at the *Colloquium*.

Suggested reading

Bühler, K., 1934, *Sprachtheorie*, Jena, Fischer.

Benveniste, É., 1946, « Structure des relations de personne dans le verbe, in Id., 1966, 225-236.

Benveniste, É., 1956, La nature des pronoms, in Id., 1966, 251-257.

Benveniste, É., 1958, De la subjectivité dans le langage, in Id., 1966, 258-266.

Benveniste, É., 1966, *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, 1, Paris, Gallimard.

Benveniste, É., 1970, L'appareil formel de l'énonciation, in Id., 1974, *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, 2, Paris, Gallimard, 79-88.

Fruyt, M., 2010, L'emploi de *is*, *hic*, *iste*, *ille*, *ipse* en latin archaïque et classique, «Revue des Études Latines», 87, 44-75.

Fruyt, M., 2010, Deictics and endophors in the Diachrony of Latin, «De lingua Latina. Revue de Linguistique Latine du Centre Alfred Ernout», 5, 1-30.

Jakobson, R., 1957, Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb, in Id., 1971, *Selected Writings*, II, De Hague – Paris, Mouton, 130-147.

Joffre, M. D., 2010, *Ipse* et la personne en latin classique, in *Les représentations linguistiques de la personne*, «Epilogos», 1 <<https://publis-shs.univ-rouen.fr/eriac/656-1.pdf>>

Kroon, C., 2017, Textual Deixis and the 'Anchoring' Use of the Latin Pronoun *hic*, «Mnemosyne», 70/4, 585-612.

- Orlandini, A., 1987, Pour une analyse des pronoms personnels latins: une analyse de *is*, «L'information grammaticale», 34 (juin), 9-14.
- Orlandini, A., 1989, *Hic et iste* chez Plaute: une analyse sémantico-pragmatique, in G. Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin: Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics* (Bologna, 1-5 April 1985), Amsterdam – Philadelphia, Benjamins, 463-484.
- Orlandini, A. & Poccetti, P., 2010, Stratégies discursives de non-interpellation et échecs de l'interpellation dans des dialogues latins, «CORELA - Numéros thématiques | L'interpellation», 8, <<https://journals.openedition.org/corela/1045>>.
- Pieroni, S., 2010, Deixis and anaphora, in P. Baldi & P. Cuzzolin (eds), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. III, Berlin – New York, De Gruyter Mouton, 389-501.
- Pieroni, S., 2014, *Persone e testi. Sulla correlazione tra io e tu, specialmente in latino*, Pisa, Pacini.
- Pieroni, S., 2019, Relazioni di persona nei dimostrativi: *iste* latino, verso il romanzo (con una nota su *ipse*), «Archivio Glottologico Italiano», 104, 61-85
- Pinkster, H., 1986, *Ego, Tu, Nos*. Opmerkingen over het gebruik van subjeetpronomina, in het bijzonder in Cicero *De Oratore* II, «Lampas», 19, 309-322.
- Pinkster, H., 2015, *The Oxford Latin Syntax*, 1. *The Simple Clause*, Oxford, University Press, 81-215.
- Poccetti, P., 2010, Greeting and farewell expressions as evidence for colloquial language: between literary and epigraphical texts, in E. Dickey & A. Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, in honour of J. N. Adams, Cambridge, CUP, 100-126.
- Siewierska, A., 2004 *Person*, Cambridge, UP.

Workshop: “The Historical Pragmatics of Particles in Latin”

Date: Friday, June 11 2027

Organisers: Ezra la Roi (Ghent University), Rodie Risselada (University of Amsterdam) and Josine Schrickx (Thesaurus Linguae Latinae)

In case of questions about this workshop, please contact: Ezra.laRoi@UGent.be

In recent years, there have been relatively few studies of particles in Latin. This is surprising for at least three reasons. First of all, our understanding of the pragmatics of Latin has benefited directly from the study of particles in Latin (e.g. Kroon 1995). Second, there are still major gaps in our description of particles, especially for Late Latin. Third and finally, approaches from recent studies of the evolution of other pragmatic markers could be applied to Latin particles as well, in particular historical pragmatic studies of epistemic discourse particles such as *videlicet* (Schrickx 2011), fossilized imperatives such as *em* (Unceta Gómez 2017), or politeness expressions such as *amabo* and *quaeso* (Fedriani 2017; Ghezzi and Molinelli 2014). Therefore, we would like to provide new impetus to research on the historical pragmatics of particles in Latin. We invite contributions to investigate one (or more) of the research questions formulated below:

- Which particles are still in need of description, in particular for later Latin (cf. the bibliography curated by Schrickx)?
- Which criteria can be used to distinguish particles from related parts of speech and/or concepts (e.g. discourse markers, interjections), both synchronically and diachronically?
- Are there differences in the use of Latin particles in different periods or are these the result of differences in genre and/or register?
- What are the evolutionary processes behind the development of ‘particles’ in Latin (e.g. grammaticalization, subjectification, intersubjectification)?

Firstly, we welcome papers that fill a gap in the description of later Latin particle use. The second question asks which specific criteria can be used to differentiate Latin ‘particles’ from other expressions both formally and functionally, either within the same period or across different periods (cf. Risselada 1998 on *sane*)? What can co-occurrence patterns of particles with specific speech acts tell us, such as directives (Risselada 1994) and wishes (la Roi 2022)? The third question addresses the complex question whether there are any substantial differences in the use of particles between different periods. Which factors such as genre, text type, register and idiolect correlate with distributional differences across authors in terms of particles (cf. Schrickx 2011, 41)? The fourth and final question invites us to reconsider the different processes that may have played a role in the diachronic development of Latin particles. Which different processes are

responsible for the development of Latin particles and how do they intersect, such as a combination of grammaticalization and intersubjectification in the category change from imperative to intersubjective particle (cf. la Roi 2022b)?

Suggested reading

- Fedriani, Chiara. 2017. "Quapropter, Quaeso? 'Why, for Pity's Sake?': Questions and the Pragmatic Functions of Quaeso, Obsecro, and Amabo in Plautus." In *Pragmatic Approaches to Latin and Ancient Greek*, edited by Camille Denizot and Olga Spevak, 83-110. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ghezzi, Chiara, and Piera Molinelli. 2014. "Deverbal Pragmatic Markers from Latin to Italian (Lat. Quaeso and It. Prego): The Cyclic Nature of Functional Developments." In *Discourse and Pragmatic Markers from Latin to the Romance Languages*, edited by Chiara Ghezzi and Piera Molinelli, 61-85. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kroon, Caroline. 1995. *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of Nam, Enim, Autem, Vero and At*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2022a. "Insubordination in Archaic and Classical Latin: Commands, Requests, Wishes and Assertives." *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 21 (1): 23-45.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2022b. "Weaving Together the Diverse Threads of Category Change: Intersubjective Ἀμέλει 'of Course' and Imperative Particles in Ancient Greek." *Diachronica* 39 (2): 159-92.
- Risselada, Rodie. 1994. "Modo and Sane, or What to Do with Particles in Latin Directives." In *Linguistic Studies on Latin*, edited by József Herman, 319-43. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Risselada, Rodie. 1998. "The Discourse Functions of Sane: Latin Marker of Agreement in Description, Interaction and Concession." *Journal of Pragmatics* 30 (2): 225-44.
- Schricks, Josine. 2011. *Lateinische Modalpartikeln: nempe, quippe, scilicet, videlicet und nimirum*. Leiden: Brill.
- Schricks, Josine. <https://parerga.hypotheses.org/bibliography-of-latin-particles>
- Unceta Gómez, Luis. 2017. "Grammaticalization, Pragmaticalization... Interjectionalization?: Chapter 4. Discursive and Pragmatic Functions of Latin Em." In *Pragmatic Approaches to Latin and Ancient Greek*, edited by Camille Denizot and Olga Spevak, 63-82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.