

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.