

After volition: Latin *volo* and the addressee of speech

Francesca Dell’Oro (University of Neuchâtel)

francesca.delloro@unine.ch

The pathways of grammaticalization from volition to non-volition have received less attention than those from the (core) modal domains of necessity and possibility to post-modality (cf. Narrog 2012: 9). While it is a matter of debate whether it properly belongs to the domain of modality (cf. Nuyts 2016: 37 with further references), the domain of volition remains closest to that of (core) modality. Therefore, an investigation of volition and its developments is not only relevant in its own right, but can lead to a better understanding of core modality. In this paper I focus on the following non-volitional diachronic developments of the Latin verb *volo* ‘I want’ originally featuring the second person singular of this verb:

- 1) the focus-marking clitic particle *sis* (cf. Dickey 2019),
- 2) the disjunctive conjunction *vel* ‘or’,
- 3) concessive markers such as the subordinating conjunction *quamvis* ‘although’ (cf. Fruyt 2004: 305–308),
- 4) (free-choice) indefinite markers such as the pronoun *quivis* ‘anybody’ (cf. Haspelmath 1997: 133–135) and
- 5) the negation marker *noli* used in prohibitive constructions (cf. Aikhenvald 2010: in particular 353–354, Cormany 2012).

Though the diachronic results could appear somewhat disparate at first sight, it is possible to find a unitary explanation based on the common origin of all these (more or less) grammaticalised forms. In fact, they all originally share the fact of addressing directly the speech recipient, while interacting with or clearly trying to act on them and their volitional and intentional disposition (for the difference between volition and intention, cf. Matthews 1991). The different results are mostly due to the different forms, ways and contexts in which this interaction takes place.

After having presented the historical diachronic development of the five above-mentioned cases and compare them to the development of some other non-volitional uses of Latin *volo* (cf. Marongiu and Dell’Oro 2021 for a diachronic overview), I discuss how the five

above-mentioned non-volitional uses could have emerged in Latin and show how similar strategies are also found cross-linguistically. Finally, I will discuss the specificity of the Latin case. In fact—to my knowledge—, while each of the above-mentioned developments is also attested cross-linguistically, it is rare to observe so many different developments in the same language.

Acknowledgements

This work stems from the research project [A World of Possibilities. Modal pathways over an extra-long period of time: the diachrony of modality in the Latin language](#) (WoPoss) founded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (N° P00P1_176778) and housed at the University of Neuchâtel.

Selected references

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Imperatives and commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cormany, Edward. 2012. *Velle*-type prohibitions in Latin. The rise and fall of a morphosyntactic conspiracy. In A. van Kemenade, N. de Haas. *Historical linguistics 2009*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 355–371.
- Dell’Oro, in preparation. The Latin verb *volo* and its non-volitional developments.
- Dickey, Eleanor. 2019. When please ceases to be polite. The use of *sis* in early Latin. *Journal of historical pragmatics* 20(2): 204–224.
- Fruyt, Michèle. 2004. Some cases of grammaticalisation in Latin: subordinating conjunctions, concessivity and modal lexemes. *Classica et Mediaevalia* 55: 301–322.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. *Indefinite pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marongiu, Paola and Dell’Oro, Francesca (2021). “[volo](#)”. v.1.0. WoPoss. <https://woposs.unine.ch/maps/map-volo.php>
- Matthews, Richard. 1991. *Words and worlds: on the linguistic analysis of modality*. Frankfurt am Main–New York: Peter Lang.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2012. *Modality, subjectivity, and semantic change: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2016. Analyses of the Modal Meanings. In Nuyts, J. and van der Auwera, J., eds, *The Oxford handbook of modality and mood*. Oxford University Press: Oxford: 31–49.