

# VU Research Portal

## Lateinische epistemische Partikeln

Schrickx, J.G.

2011

### **document version**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

### **citation for published version (APA)**

Schrickx, J. G. (2011). *Lateinische epistemische Partikeln: Nempe, quippe, scilicet, videlicet und nimirum*.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

### **E-mail address:**

[vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl](mailto:vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl)

## Summary

### Latin epistemic particles. *Nempe, quippe, scilicet, videlicet* and *nimirum*.

This study gives an analysis of some Latin adverbs or particles that play an important role in the interaction between the speaker and the addressee of a discourse, by showing how certain the speaker is, or would like to be thought. The study focuses on the Latin particles *nempe*, *quippe*, *scilicet*, *videlicet* and *nimirum*. It is a continuation of the works of Pinkster (esp. 2004) on Latin adverbs and Kroon (esp. 1995) on particles and discourse analysis in Latin. The first part of the book gives the theoretic background, in the second part the above mentioned Latin adverbs are analyzed and compared with similar Latin adverbs.

### Theoretical background

The linguistic model on which the analyses are based is taken from Kroon (1995) and the Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008), as far as relevant. Important for my study is the idea of different hierarchic levels in a discourse and the subdivision of a discourse in communicative units called ‘moves’ and ‘acts’.

The word ‘particle’ is rather vague, but can be useful when we talk about indeclinable function words. For *nempe* and *quippe* I prefer ‘discourse marker’ to specify their function in the discourse, for *scilicet*, *videlicet* and *nimirum* ‘commitment marker’ to specify their function as giving the speaker's commitment to the content of what he or she is saying. Traditionally they are called ‘modal adverbs’ or ‘modal particles’, but like Nuyts (2005, 2006) I prefer ‘commitment’ or ‘attitudinal categories’ for modality. Like Nuyts I do not distinguish between objective and subjective modality, which are vague categories and should not be confused with the notion of performativity. A modal adverb or particle is always performative, as it is always giving the commitment of the speaker in the moment of speaking. Exceptions, as we will see, are ironic contexts and some interrogative sentences.

Another problem is the question whether a particle has only one function/ meaning or more and how they are related. I take a more or less minimalistic position: a word has only one primal meaning/ function, other meanings/ functions are related to this one. Possibly in a later stadium a word could develop a new primal meaning/ function, not or only slightly related to the first one. A good way to show the related meanings/ functions are semantic maps, as developed for English certainty adverbs by Simon-Vandenberg & Aijmer (2007). I will adapt their map of English certainty adverbs for Latin commitment markers.

‘We only say we are certain when we are not’ (Halliday 1985, 340) is slightly exaggerated, but focuses our attention on another important issue: why are we saying that we are committed to the content of what we are saying? Shouldn't this be self evident? Theories of ‘appraisal’ (White, 2003; Martin & White, 2005) and ‘politeness’ (Brown & Levinson 1987; Kerbrat-Orecchioni, 1997; Watts, 2003) can give us useful ideas for an answer. The argumentative situation in which the speaker and addressee are involved can give us important clues here.

### Analysis

The corpus on which my analyses are based is the totality of Latin texts between ca. 200 BC and 200 AD, with Apuleius as the last author. The data are taken from the ‘Zettelarchiv’ of the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae and from the electronic database LLT. Statistic analyses are based on the corpus as a whole, more detailed analyses on a representative selection.

*Nempe* is a discourse marker on the so called ‘interactional’ level of discourse, where the interaction between speaker and addressee is defined. With *nempe* the speaker appeals on the addressee to give his commitment to the content. The speaker does not give his own commitment – that is why it cannot be called a commitment marker – but gives the responsibility of the content to the addressee. Often it also has a connective function.

*Quippe* is a discourse marker on the ‘presentational’ level of discourse, where the speaker presents the organization of the discourse. It is typical in monological contexts. With *quippe* the speaker shows that the upcoming unit of discourse is closely related to the one before and gives a clarification or explanation of it.

*Scilicet* and *videlicet* are both evidential commitment markers – the commitment is based on evidence – and have a comparable origin (from a form of *scire/videre* and *licet*). There are however important differences: *scilicet* shows that the evidence is based on expectation (‘as is to be expected’, ‘of course’) and is strongly directed towards the addressee, *videlicet* shows that the evidence is inferable from the context or reasonable (‘clearly’) and is not directed towards the addressee. The differences are shown by the different contexts in which they occur, of which the most important are: *scilicet* often appears with a verb in the first person, *videlicet* hardly ever and only when it is ironically used; *scilicet* can be combined with a future form of the verb in the second person, to mitigate an appeal to the addressee, *videlicet* not. Like all commitment markers *scilicet* and *videlicet* should be performative, that is they should give the commitment of the speaker at the moment of speaking. Exceptions are questions which are used ironically, and other ironical contexts. In these cases the speaker gives – ironically – not his own commitment, but that of the addressee. Strictly speaking one should no longer call them commitment markers in these cases; that is why Nuyts has proposed calling them ‘speech act modifiers’ in such cases. The speaker uses *scilicet* to appeal to the addressee and to show solidarity with him; it can be used for ‘positive politeness’. *Videlicet* cannot be used for these purposes; with this marker speakers show that they have good evidence for what they are saying and do not need to appeal to the addressee.

Like *scilicet* and *videlicet*, *nimirum* is a commitment marker, but not specially based on evidentiality. With *nimirum* the speaker shows that doubt is not necessary. A fruitful comparison with *scilicet* and *videlicet* can be made with ‘translation networks’ as developed by Simon-Vandenberg & Aijmer (2007).

A short discussion of other Latin commitment markers, especially *certe/certo*, *plane*, *profecto*, *sane*, *sine dubio* and *vero*, shows us the properties of Latin commitment markers in general. It is also possible to draw a semantic map of commitment markers and show the individual use of each commitment marker in the overall domain of commitment.

With this study the less well investigated domain of Latin modal particles or commitment markers is made much clearer with the help of modern linguistic theories and

analyses of comparable particles in modern languages at the one hand and statistic analyses and comparisons with other Latin particles on the other. *Nempe* and *quippe*, which seem often to be taken together with modal particles, are shown to be discourse markers; *scilicet* and *videlicet* are commitment markers based on evidentiality, *scilicet* moreover on self-evidence; *nimirum* is a commitment marker with the function of showing that there is no need for doubt. But not only for the field of Latin linguistics is this study useful, the corpus based results can also be valuable for general theories of modality and commitment.