

## Résumés – Abstracts

<i>Conférences plénierées / Keynote speeches</i> .....	2
Agnès Celle: Mirative extensions in the postmodal domain.....	2
Martin Becker: How to describe and analyze the evolutionary tendencies of mood in Romance? Postmodality, regrammatication, harmony or something else? .....	3
Heiko Narrog: Modal meanings become discourse-oriented .....	5
<i>Panel 1</i> .....	6
Sune Gregersen: From possibility to preference: The history of Danish <i>gide</i> 'be able to, feel like'... ..	6
Ting-Shiu Lin: From a modal verb to an intensifying adverb: Evolution of the Chinese word <i>kěyǐ</i> ....	7
Francesca Dell'Oro: After volition: Latin <i>volo</i> and the addressee of speech .....	9
Chris A. Smith: Diachronic shift in two modal evaluative adjective types: A comparison between the highly successful <i>-able</i> and the quasi-dormant <i>-some</i> suffixation patterns .....	10
<i>Panel 2</i> .....	12
Chloé Tahar: Grammaticalization in a harmonic environment: The case of expletive negation in French.....	12
Marco Favaro: The adverbial marking of postmodal categories and illocutionary modification: Italian <i>pure</i> 'also' between additive semantics and functional expansions .....	13
Helena Bermúdez-Sabel, Paola Marongiu & Francesca Dell'Oro: Premodal, modal and postmodal: a corpus-based study of the polyfunctionality of Latin modal markers .....	15
Patrick Caudal: The negative vs. positive facets of demodality: How can we account for deep differences between European and Australian languages?.....	17
<i>Panel 3</i> .....	19
Bastien Poreau: De la nécessité à l'incrédulité : analyse énonciative d'un prédicat modal du russe contemporain .....	19
Pierre Larrivée: From modality to sources of evidence .....	21
Tanja Mortelmans: A contrastive study of the postmodal (reportative) function of three (semantically related) markers: German <i>sollen</i> + INF, Dutch <i>zou</i> + INF and the French conditionnel .....	22
Ezra la Roi: Paths out of counterfactuality: evidence from Ancient Greek diachrony.....	24
<i>Panel 4</i> .....	25
Outi Duvallon & Rea Peltola: Correlative verb reduplication as a modal and narrative resource....	25
Benoît Leclercq: The post-modal grammaticalization of concessive <i>may</i> and <i>might</i> .....	27
Corinne Rossari, Cyrielle Montrichard, Claudia Ricci & Linda Sanvido: <i>Pouvoir</i> et <i>peut-être</i> : approche textométrique de leur valeur post-modale de concession.....	28
Evelyne Oppermann-Marsaux: « Je (le) veux bien » : de l'expression de la modalité boulique au développement d'un marqueur concessif .....	30

Agnès Celle (Paris 7, CLILLAC-ARP)

### Mirative extensions in the postmodal domain

The aim of this paper is to offer a semantic-pragmatic account of the postmodal uses of *should* and *would*. Arguably, *should* and *would* are related to the postmodal domain in so far as both modal auxiliaries have become associated with certain complement clauses:

- (1) I found it a bit odd that a sensible girl should write about them in that - that romantic way.  
BNC
- (2) It was odd that she would have her own servant, Isabel mused vaguely. BNC

As proposed by Van der Auwera and Plungian (1998), complement clauses are part of the environments where postmodal meaning may derive from epistemic or deontic necessity. In the postmodal domain, the epistemic or deontic necessity meaning associated with these modals comes into conflict with a factual context (Celle 2018). I argue that this produces mirative extensions.

According to Larreya (2015), what underlies the use of both *would* and *should* in factual contexts is "a posteriori modalisation", which may turn out to be either constative or evaluative. I take evaluative modalisation to rely on the common ground, and constative modalisation to be evidence-based. I argue that this distinction is crucial to the structuring of the postmodal domain. It allows unifying and explaining various uses of *would* and *should* in complement clauses and beyond. For instance, in equative structures, *would* is reported to express the speaker's high level of confidence in the truth of the proposition (Ward, Birner, and Kaplan 2003):

- (3) A: Who's the British woman over there?  
B: That would be J.K. Rowling. (Ward et al. 2003: 71)

As pointed out by Ward et al., the speaker has objective verifiable evidence for the truth of the proposition. I argue that *would*, in contrast to *should*, is used to mark discourse-new information. *Would* signals the speaker's awareness that the information update they propose is not self-evident. Therefore, the speaker may possibly anticipate the addressee's reluctance to accept this update (Celle 2012).

This raises theoretical questions regarding the meaning contribution of *should* and *would* in the postmodal domain. Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 187) view "emotive" *should* as conveying "low degree modality, i.e. with little discernible modal meaning of its own" and *would* in the context of (3) as a marker of tentativeness (p. 200). The complement clause position may give the impression that the meaning of the modal is blurred given that the evaluation expressed by the main predicate is foregrounded. However, I argue that the contribution of *should* and *would* respectively is not similar in (1) and (2). In (3), *should* is not interchangeable with *would*. Likewise, the use of postmodal *should* and *would* in open interrogatives points to their differences. :

- (4) 'Why were you offended? Even if you think me the most immoral bastard ever to walk the face of the earth, why would you react so personally? And why would you have set out to humiliate me?' BNC
- (5) 'It is unfortunate for you that you brazenly appear at all.' 'Why should you say that?' BNC

The event is profiled as predictable with *would* (4), as uncontrolled and fatal with *should* (5). This suggests that the original necessity meaning is retained, albeit at a representational level. In line with Arigne (2017), I argue that the mirative meaning is used as a "built-in foundation", which allows the speaker to achieve discursive cohesion. This accounts for the use of *should* and *would* in specific discursive constructions that presuppose the factual status of a proposition (such as complement clauses and open interrogatives). This intrinsic meaning difference also explains why *would* is admissible in equative constructions, in contrast to *should*, which cannot convey abductive inferencing on the basis of evidence.

## References

- Arigne, Viviane. 2017. 'From Mirativity to Argumentation: A Case of Discursive Mirativity'. Review of Cognitive Linguistics 15 (2): 438–59. <https://doi.org/10.1075/rcl.15.2.06ari>.
- Celle, Agnès. 2012. 'Epistemic "Would": A Marker of Modal Remoteness'. Faits de Langues, Ultériorité dans le passé, valeurs modales, conditionnel, 40: 149–56.
- . 2018. 'Epistemic Evaluation in Factual Contexts in English'. In Epistemic Modalities and Evidentiality in Cross-Linguistic Perspective, edited by Zlatka Guentchéva, 22–51. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110572261-002>.
- Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316423530>.
- Larreya, Paul. 2015. 'Modalisations a priori et a posteriori : le cas de would'. Anglophonia. French Journal of English Linguistics, no. 19 (October). <https://doi.org/10.4000/anglophonia.457>.
- Van Der Auwera, Johan, and Vladimir A. Plungian. 1998. 'Modality's Semantic Map'. Linguistic Typology 2 (1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.1998.2.1.79>.
- Ward, Gregory, Betty J. Birner, and Jeffrey P. Kaplan. 2003. 'A Pragmatic Analysis of the Epistemic Would Construction in English'. In Modality in Contemporary English, edited by Roberta Facchinetto, Frank Palmer, and Manfred Krug. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110895339.71>.

Martin Becker (Cologne)

## How to describe and analyze the evolutionary tendencies of mood in Romance? Postmodality, regrammation, harmony or something else?

My talk focuses on the basic question of how we can account for the dynamics of change in the mood systems of Romance.

In the first part of my talk, I am going to present different approaches concerning the evolution of mood in complement clauses. As we will see, these approaches are linked to a certain understanding of what the function(s) of mood is in the domain of complement clauses. The debate on the topic has not only intrigued scholars devoted to the study of Romance languages but also linguists who attempted to characterize the development of mood in the history of Latin (see e.g. Handford 1947, Calboli 2002, and Magni 2010).

Several mechanisms have been invoked in order to account for the changes under discussion:

Grammaticalization, mainly in the vein of Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994, has been identified as the all-encompassing key mechanism. Other scholars have dwelled on more specific (sub-) processes, such as “generalization” and “desemantization” or have put forward a modified account of the developmental paths under the label of “regrammation” (Lindschouw 2011). The notion of “postmodality” has also been raised in the debate but it has been applied first and foremost with regard to semantic shifts of modal verbs from their epistemic or deontic core values to concessive and futurate readings. In a variationist and usage-based perspective, Poplack et al. (2018) have analyzed recent trends in the usage of mood in terms of “conventionalization” and “lexical routinization”. However, all these approaches understand the function of mood in complement clauses in a very restricted way, e.g. as “harmony” (i.e., as a kind of “mood concord”) or as markers of “realis” vs. “irrealis” opposition. These characterizations not only fall short in covering all contexts of mood selection but, what is more, do not allow to motivate the developments in the different modal domains from a diachronic perspective. Therefore, in the second part of my talk, I intend to demonstrate that recent formal approaches to modality and mood, especially the works of Kratzer, Giorgi & Pianesi (1997), and Portner (2017) offer the right degree of abstraction and the appropriate grain-size for analyzing the dynamics and evolution of mood in the domain of complement clauses. Especially, the notions of “modal base” (i.e. domains of modality) and “ordering” (i.e. the ordering of alternatives, cf. e.g. Villalta 2005) are helpful for motivating the role of mood and, what is more, the diachronic trends of evolution in the domain of complement clauses.

Based on selected modal domains, I will try to convey some insights into the underlying trends and mechanisms that are relevant for the developments in the domain of complement clauses in Romance.

## References

- Becker, Martin (2022): „Le système et le développement des modes dans les langues romanes et ses dynamiques en diachronie“. In: Gerda, Haoler / Silvie Mutet (eds.): *Manuel des modes et modalités*. (Manuals of Romance Linguistics, vol. 29), De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin u.a., 351-384.
- Bybee, Joan/Perkins, Revere/Pagliuca, William (1994): *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Calboli, Gualtiero (2002): “Moods and tenses in declarative clauses: At the origin of the Acl construction.” In: Gualtiero Calboli (ed.), *Papers on Grammar* 8, 69–89. Rome: Herder.
- Giorgi, A. & Pianesi, F. (1997). *Tense and aspect: from semantics to morphosyntax*. New York et al.: Oxford University Press.
- Handford, Stanley A. (1947): *The Latin Subjunctive: Its Usage and Development from Plautus to Tacitus*. London: Methuen.
- Kratzer, Angelika (1991): Modality. In A. von Stechow and D. Wunderlich (eds.), *Semantics: An international handbook of contemporary research*, 7. Berlin: De Gruyter. 639-650.
- Lindschouw, Jan (2011), *Étude des modes dans le système concessif en français du 16e au 20<sup>e</sup> siècle et en espagnol moderne* (Études romanes 61), Copenhagen, Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Magni, Elisabetta (2010), Mood and Modality, in: Philip Baldi/Pierluigi Cuzzolin (edd.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, vol. 2, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, 193–275.
- Poplack, Shana et al. (2018): “Variation and grammaticalization in Romance: a cross-linguistic Study of the subjunctive”. *Probus* 2013/25(1), 139-195.
- Portner, Paul (2017): *Mood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Villalta, Elisabeth (2005): *A Comparative Semantics for the Subjunctive Mood in Spanish*, in: Camps, Joaquim/Wiltshire, Caroline R. (edd.), *Romance syntax, semantics and L2 acquisition. Selected*

papers from the 30th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Gainesville, Florida, February 2000, Benjamins, 227-242.

Heiko Narrog (University of Tohoku)

### **Modal meanings become discourse-oriented**

Van der Auwera & Plungian's (1998) map of possibility and necessity paths offers a re-arrangement of Bybee et al. (1994)'s data on grammaticalization paths in the domain of modality along two dimensions: First, this is necessity vs. possibility, and second pre-modal vs. modal vs. post-modal. It is important to realize that these two parameters are not intrinsically given in Bybee et al. (1994)'s data. The data only provide the directionalities as such. The parameters imposed on them are to some extent arbitrary, as any alternative parameters would be.

In this presentation I will argue for a different interpretation of the data. First, with respect to the pre-modal/modal/post-modal distinction, I will point out that most of the "post-modal" functions are in fact (still) modal. In this sense, a distinction modal vs. non-modal would seem more accurate or appropriate than pre-modal/modal/post-modal. Secondly, I will point out that a parameter of volitive (i.e., deontic and boulomaic) vs. non-volitive (i.e., situational, intrinsic, epistemic) modality is more relevant to grammaticalization paths than possibility vs. necessity. Lastly, I will point out that the overall direction of change is not towards "non-modal" but an increase in discourse-orientation (Narrog 2012, Narrog & Heine 2021). Discourse-orientation includes subjectification and intersubjectification at earlier stages, but at the late stages in the development of modal meaning, dubbed as "post-modal" in van der Auwera & Plungian (1998), it signifies shift toward meanings that contribute to the construction of discourse, a tendency that is not meaningfully covered by the traditional term "subjectification".

### References

- Bybee, Joan & Perkins, Revere & Pagliuca, William. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.  
Narrog, Heiko. 2012. *Modality, subjectivity, and semantic change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
Narrog, Heiko & Bernd Heine. 2021. *Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
van der Auwera, Johan & Plungian, Vladimir A. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2, 79–124.

## Panel 1

Sune Gregersen (Copenhagen)

### From possibility to preference: The history of Danish *gide* ‘be able to, feel like’

This paper will present a diachronic case study of an older Germanic modal verb which seems to have left the notional field of modality, namely Danish *gide* ‘feel like’. As van der Auwera et al. (2009: 288) note, this verb is the cognate of the Icelandic modal verb *geta* ‘be able to’ and used to express participant-internal possibility in earlier Danish. In the modern language, however, *gide* expresses personal preference or disposition, as illustrated in (1):

- (1) Present-day Danish

Jeg **gider** ikke læse lingvistik i\_dag.  
I GIDE.PRS not read.INF linguistics today  
'I don't feel like studying linguistics today.'  
(Brandt 1999: 48)

Compare the present-day meaning to the use of *gide* as a possibility modal in medieval texts, as in (2), from a medical handbook:

- (2) Early Middle Danish, c. 1300

Thæt dugh(aer) oc thæm th(aer) æi **gitæ** souæt  
that benefit.PRS.SG also them REL not GIDE.PRS.PL sleep.PTCP  
'This [i.e. poppy seeds] also benefits people who cannot sleep.'  
(tekstnet.dk, HarpS. 39v)

The development of this verb would thus appear to be an instance of ‘demodalization’ in the sense of van der Auwera & Plungian (1998), but its history has so far not been investigated in any detail. The existing literature on the Danish modals mainly focusses on the modern language (e.g. Brandt 1999; Boye 2001; Hansen & Heltoft 2011: Ch. 6). The recent historical syntactic work by Heltoft & Nielsen (2019a, 2019b) also discusses the development of the modal verbs, but the history of *gide* is not covered. However, as van der Auwera et al. (2009: 288) stress, ‘we need detailed historical work’ to understand the steps by which linguistic items may enter or exit the field of modality.

In this paper I will provide such a description of the history of *gide* from c. 1300 to the twentieth century. The data were drawn from a self-compiled corpus of texts, most of them from the online repositories ADL, renæssancesprog.dk, and tekstnet.dk. The concordances were annotated with various linguistic and extralinguistic features, such as tense, polarity, text type, and the form and meaning of both *gide* and its complement. The discussion will focus mainly on the semantic development and the possible reasons for the change from possibility to disposition and preference. However, a number of formal changes will also be addressed, most importantly *gide*’s changing complementation pattern: as shown in (1)–(2), Present-day Danish *gide* takes an infinitival complement (*læse* ‘read.INF’), whereas in Middle Danish it generally combined with a participle (*souæt* ‘sleep.PTCP’). This makes Present-day Danish *gide* syntactically more similar to the ‘core’ modal verbs, even if its semantic development has gone from modal to post-modal. The possible reasons for this apparent discrepancy will also be discussed.

## Data sources

ADL = *Arkiv for Dansk Litteratur* [Archive of Danish Literature], version 3.0. Copenhagen: Det Kgl. Bibliotek & Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. <https://tekster.kb.dk/adl>

KorpusDK [Corpus of Present-day Danish]. Copenhagen: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. <https://ordnet.dk/korpusdk/>

renæssancesprog.dk = *Renæssancens sprog i Danmark* [The language of the Renaissance in Denmark]. Copenhagen: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. <http://renæssancesprog.dk>

tekstnet.dk = *Tekster fra Danmarks middelalder og renæssance 1100-1550* [Texts from the Danish Middle Ages and Renaissance, 1100–1550]. Copenhagen: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab. <https://tekstnet.dk/>

## References

- Boye, Kasper. 2001. The force-dynamic core meaning of Danish modal verbs. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensis* 33(1). 19–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03740463.2001.10412194>
- Brandt, Søren. 1999. *Modal verbs in Danish* (Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Copenhague 30). Copenhagen: Reitzel.
- Hansen, Erik & Lars Heltoft. 2011. *Grammatik over det Danske Sprog* [Grammar of the Danish language]. 3 vols. Copenhagen: Det Danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab.
- Heltoft, Lars & Marita Akhøj Nielsen. 2019a. Fra gammeldansk til nutidsdansk [From Old Danish to Modern Danish]. In Ebba Hjorth et al. (red.), *Dansk Sproghistorie 3: Bøjning og bygning*, 129–225. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Heltoft, Lars & Marita Akhøj Nielsen. 2019b. Modalverbernes udvikling [The development of the modal verbs]. Online appendix to Heltoft & Nielsen (2019a). <https://www.danskspohistorie.dk/74/>
- van der Auwera, Johan & Vladimir A. Plungian. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2. 79–124. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lity.1998.2.1.79>
- van der Auwera, Johan, Petar Kehayov & Alice Vittrant. 2009. Acquisitive modals. In Lotte Hogeweg, Helen de Hoop & Andrej Malchukov (eds.), *Cross-linguistic semantics of tense, aspect and modality* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 148), 271–302. Amsterdam: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.148.11auw>

Ting-Shiu Lin (Lyon 2)

## From a modal verb to an intensifying adverb: Evolution of the Chinese word *kěyǐ*

The Chinese word *kěyǐ*, usually translated as “can” or “may” in English, is a modal of possibility mainly used to indicate permission (1a) or circumstantial possibilities (1b) in contemporary Mandarin (cf., Alleton, 1984; Sparvoli, 2015).

- (1) a. *Nǐ kěyǐ jìn-lai le.*  
you KEYI enter-come SFP.  
'You can/may come in.'
- b. *Wǒ jīntiān yǒukòngr, kěyǐ qù kàn yéye.*  
I today have-free-time, KEYI go watch grandpa.

'I'm free today. I can go to visit grandpa.'

The verb *kěyǐ* appeared before 203 B.C. and could be used to denote permission, circumstantial possibilities, and the participant's ability in classical Chinese (Kang & Wang, 2018; Li, 2017). Since the 18th century, *kěyǐ* can also be used as a predicative adjective which means "fine," "ok," or "good enough" (2). In contemporary Mandarin, *kěyǐ* can further be employed as an intensifying adverb placed after the main verb of the sentence (3). However, since previous research paid little attention to the non-modal uses of *kěyǐ*, it is not clear what relationship (if there is any) exists between the modal and postmodal meanings of this word.

- (2) *Zhè piān wénzhāng hái kěyǐ.*

this Cl. article still KEYI

'This article is not bad.'

- (3) *Tiānqì rè de kěyǐ.*

weather hot DE KEYI

'The weather is so hot.'

This paper investigates the modal and postmodal functions of *kěyǐ* and argues that the postmodal meanings of this word are derived from its deontic usage. In fact, *kěyǐ* is the only modal of possibility in Chinese that can be used to express permission, which, according to Sparvoli (2015), is the core function of this modal verb. According to Lu (2004), the permission-denoting function of *kěyǐ* has given rise to the following usages: to give advice (4a), to make proposal (4b), and to indicate that something is worth our attention or worth doing (4c). We hypothesize that from the "worth-doing" meaning, *kěyǐ* further developed an adjectival usage expressing "ok, fine" (2) and then an adverbial function indicating high intensity (3).

- (4) a. *Nǐ kěyǐ zuò shísi lù gōngjiāochē lái wǒ jiā.*

you KEYI sit fourteen route bus come I home

'You can take bus 14 to come to my place.'

- b. *Wǒmen jīntiān wǎnshàng kěyǐ yìqǐ chīfàn.*

we today night KEYI together eat:meal

'We can eat together tonight.'

- c. *Zhè ge zhǎnlǎn kěyǐ kàn-kan.*

this Cl. exhibition KEYI watch-watch

'This exhibition is worth seeing.'

The semantic evolution of *kěyǐ* is quite different from that of its synonym *néng*, with which it is interchangeable when denoting circumstantial possibilities. The primary use of *néng* in contemporary Mandarin is to indicate the participant's ability, and it can also be used to express epistemic possibilities in some contexts. In contrast, *kěyǐ* does not have any epistemic usage and can be used to relate to the participant's ability only in a limited way, but it has developed two postmodal meanings after a demodalization process that *néng* has yet gone through.

## Selected references

- Alleton, V. (1984). *Les auxiliaires de mode en chinois contemporain* [Modal auxiliaries in contemporary Chinese]. Paris: Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme.

- Kang, Z., & Wang, J. (2018). *Gudai hanyu “keyi” de lishi yanbian luekao* [Study on the diachronic evolution of *keyi* in classical Chinese]. *Liaoning Shifan Daxue Xuebao* [Journal of Liaoning Normal University], 41(2), 110-114.
- Li, M. (2017). *Hanyu zhudongci de lishi yanbian yanjiu* [Study on the historical change of Chinese auxiliary verbs]. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- Lu, X. (2004). *Xiandai hanyu jiben zhudongci yuyi yanjiu* [Study on the semantics of modal verbs in contemporary Mandarin]. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press.
- Sparvoli, C. (2015). Modals and negation: A semantic explanation of the modal suppletion strategy in Chinese. *Chinese as a Second Language Research*, 4(2), 163-194.

Francesca Dell’Oro (Neuchâtel)

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

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.

Chris A. Smith (Caen, CRISCO)

### **Diachronic shift in two modal evaluative adjective types: A comparison between the highly successful *-able* and the quasi-dormant *-some* suffixation patterns**

This paper deals with modality expressed by adjectives, on the lexis cline of the lexico-grammatical continuum (Halliday 1991). We focus our attention on the contrasting life cycles of deverbal-*able* adjectives and *-some* adjectives in English. These competing suffixes *-some* and *-able* (*jokesome/jokable, winsome/winnable, fearsome* “that should be feared”) are both capable of characterising modal meanings relating to necessity, possibility and/or of obligation as well as passive/active interpretations (‘intended for X/ tendency to V’). Along with Van Linden (2012: 2) and Nuyts, Byloo, and Diepeveen (2005, 2010), we view deontic modality as a qualificational category

expressing attitudinal assessments while “obligation and permission are illocutionary notions including directive speech acts.”

We assume *-some* and *-able* adjectives belong to a constructional network of adjectives denoting modal categories to varying degrees (obligation, possibility, necessity) and capable of expressing dynamic, deontic or epistemic meanings (Van Linden 2012). Over time, *-able* derivatives have dominated the semantic space, and *-some* derivation has become quasi dormant (Smith 2020). The contrasting life cycles of these two morphological patterns could be accounted for in part by active/passive ambivalence of *Vsome* adjectives as suggested in Smith (2020). Assuming that language is a complex adaptive system where multiple processes affect change in combinatoric manner, the question remains of how the expression of adjectival modality distributes within the network. Can premodal or postmodal stages be a factor in the differentiation between trajectories?

We use a corpus-based distributional analysis to trace the compared usage of several adjective pairs in EHBC (the English Historical Book Collection) and COHA (the Corpus of Historical American). The aim is to identify if changes in usage may have led to different conventionalisations between *Vsome* and *Vable* adjectives. In line with diachronic usage-based cognitive and constructional linguistics, we assume change is both emergent (continuous and ongoing) and gradual (micro steps). 3 underlying questions are considered:

- 1) How is semantic change tracked? (demotivation-remotivation cycle, subjectification)
- 2) What micro changes can be identified as markers of pre or postmodality (conventionalisation: collocational changes, pragmatic changes, routinisation)?
- 3) How do micro changes affect reconfigurations within a constructional family?

## References

- Halliday, Michael A. K. 1991. Corpus studies and probabilistic grammar. In Karin Aijmer & Bengt Altenberg (eds.), *English corpus linguistics: Studies in honour of Jan Svartvik*. Harlow: Longman, 30– 43.
- Kjellmer Göran 1986, “Legible but not readable: On the semantics of English adjectives in *-ble*”, *Studio Neophilologica* 1, 11-38.
- Nuyts Jan, van der Auwera Johan. 2016. *The Oxford handbook of modality and mood*. Oxford: Oxford university Press.
- Smith, Chris A. 2020. A case study of *-some* and *-able* derivatives in OED3: examining the diachronic output and productivity of two competing adjectival suffixes. *La sémantique lexicale diachronique, Lexis* [Online], 16, 2020.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2019. Constructional pattern-development in language change. In Beatrix Busse & Ruth Moehlig-Falke (eds.). *Patterns in Language and Linguistic*. Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter: 125-156.
- Van Linden, An. 2012. Modal Adjectives English Deontic and Evaluative Constructions in Synchrony and Diachrony. Berlin : De Gruyter.
- Ziegeler, Debra. 2004. Redefining unidirectionality: Is there life after modality? In Fischer, Olga & Norde, Muriel & Perridon, Harry (eds.), *Up and Down the Cline*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 115–135.

## Corpora

English Historical Book Collection, EHBC.

*Panel 2*

Chloé Tahar (Institut Jean Nicod, CNRS/ENS/EHESS/PSL)

**Grammaticalization in a harmonic environment: The case of expletive negation in French**

Introduction: Expletive negation – a negation marker that does not receive a negative interpretation in the scope of certain predicates – is an enigmatic element in French and across languages. In synchrony, it appears difficult to determine (i) whether the set of heterogeneous predicates in whose subordinate clause it appears (attitude verbs, connectives, comparative adverb) form a natural class, and (ii) whether it contributes semantic content and if so, which. Thus, it is quite natural that this abstract seeks for a diachronic explanation of this phenomenon. This abstract argues that expletive negation is a postmodal marker ([van der Auwera and Plungian, 1998]), which results from the grammaticalization of the Latin prohibitive negation. I identify three stages in the development of subordinate clauses with expletive negation: (1) the embedding of negative imperatives under harmonic attitude verbs in Latin (i.e. ; verbs expressing a negative preference), (2) the postmodal reanalysis of prohibitive negation (which turns ‘expletive’) in the complement of harmonic verbs by early Old French, (3) the generalization of expletive negation to new syntactic contexts (adverbial connectives), starting in the 17th century.

(1) Modal Concord: Latin prohibitive negation is a modal negation specialized in the construction of negative imperatives. In Latin, negative imperatives may be embedded under the class of priority attitudes, which express deontic (e.g., *impero*, ‘I order’) and prohibitive (*prohibeo*, ‘I forbid’) or bouleptic (*opto*, ‘I wish’) and apprehensive (*metuo*, ‘I fear’) modality, see [Mari and Tahar, 2020]. When the negative imperative is embedded under an attitude verb of negative priority, as in (1), prohibitive negation participates in a relation of modal concord (see [Lyons, 1977]; [Bybee et al., 1994]; [Zeilstra, 2007]; [Huitink, 2012]; [Giannakidou and Mari, 2018]) with the matrix verb, as both contribute together to the expression of a single modal meaning of dispreference.

(1) [[[<sub>VP</sub> *Prohibeo* [<sub>ForceP</sub> *ne p*]]]]

(2) Postmodal reanalysis: Contrarily to approaches that assume that expletive negation results from the reanalysis of the standard negation marker as a polarity item (see [Breitbarth, 2009], see also [Greco, 2022]), I defend that, from Old French onwards, the expletive *ne* is descendant of prohibitive *ne*, while the regular negation *ne* (which later turns into *ne ... pas*) descends from another item. The negation marker which continues Latin prohibitive negation turns into a quasi-automatic concomitant of complement clauses embedded under attitude verbs of negative priority. This is mostly due to syntactic reanalysis, as a hypotactic system of complementation develops. Speakers gradually perceive the semantic contribution of the grammaticalized prohibitive negation as a “weak reflection” (see [Bybee et al., 1994]) of the meaning of the matrix verb.

(2) [[[<sub>VP</sub> *Je crains* [<sub>CP</sub> *que* [<sub>MoodP</sub> *ne* [<sub>IP</sub> *p*]]]]]]]

(3) Généralisation: Based on distributional evidence from the corpus Frantext, I show that, starting in the 17th century, the use of expletive negation generalizes to a new syntactic context : that of adverbial clauses. In particular, the expletive negation becomes productive with the exceptive connective *à moins que* ('unless') and, to a lesser extent, with the prospective connective *avant que* ('before'). I propose that expletive negation becomes productive with these contexts due to the fact that they both convey (context-dependent) inferences of negative preference (see also [Tahar, 2022]). Besides, by the 17th century, Jespersen's cycle reaches its Stage II in French, as regular negation becomes obligatorily bipartite, which has the consequence that the simple negative marker *ne* is functionally specialized as an expletive negation, allowing it to regain productivity.

(3) [[[<sub>AdvP</sub> à moins [<sub>CP</sub> que [<sub>MoodP</sub> *ne* [<sub>IP</sub> *p* ]]]]]]

## Références

- [Breitbarth, 2009] Breitbarth, A. (2009). A hybrid approach to Jespersen's cycle in West Germanic. *The journal of comparative German linguistics*, 12 :81–114.
- [Bybee et al., 1994] Bybee, J., Perkins, R., and Pagliuca, W. (1994). *Evolution of Grammar : Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press.
- [Giannakidou and Mari, 2018] Giannakidou, A. and Mari, A. (2018). The semantic roots of positive polarity : epistemic modal verbs and adverbs in Greek and Italian. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 41(6) :623–664.
- [Greco, 2022] Greco, M. (2022). From Latin to Modern Italian : Some Notes on Negation. *Languages*, 7(1).
- [Huitink, 2012] Huitink, J. (2012). Modal concord : a case study of Dutch. *Journal of Semantics*, 29(3) : 403–437. [Lyons, 1977] Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
- [Mari and Tahar, 2020] Mari, A. and Tahar, C. (2020). Negative priorities : evidence from prohibitive and expletive negation. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, number 24.
- [Tahar, 2022] Tahar, C. (2022). Apprehensive and frustrative uses of before. In *Semantic and Linguistic Theory*.
- [van der Auwera and Plungian, 1998] van der Auwera, J. and Plungian, V. (1998). Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology*, (2)1 :79–124.
- [Zeilstra, 2007] Zeijlstra, H. (2007). Modal concord. In *Semantic and Linguistic Theory*, pages 317–332.

Marco Favaro (Universidade de Lisboa)

## **The adverbial marking of postmodal categories and illocutionary modification: Italian *pure* 'also' between additive semantics and functional expansions**

Postmodal functions may involve non-verbal categories: adverbs are a case in point (Abraham & Leiss 2012; Narrog 2012). In this respect, the Italian adverb *pure* 'also' displays a wide range of functions which spans from its prototypical use as a focus adverb (marker of information structure) to secondary uses which fall within the domains of postmodality, illocutionary modification and speech-act marking. Building upon the model of modality elaborated by Narrog (2012), this paper addresses the upper

border separating modal and postmodal categories – investigating the complex relationship between (post-)modal categories such as conjecture and concession, the marking of specific illocutions and illocutionary modification (illocutionary-force modification and speech-specification in an interpersonal perspective). Drawing on synchronic and diachronic corpus data, this paper shows how the additive semantics of *pure* lends itself to cover different functions in the postmodal domain, it describes the nature of different sub-categories marked by this adverb and it highlights patterns of semantic change.

As a marker of illocutionary modification (Hengeveld 2004), *pure* appears both in directive speech acts (1), where it gives a directive the specific character of an invitation or permission, and in declarative sentences expressing assertions (2), where it gives the assertion a counter-expectational flavor and contributes to emphasize the illocutionary force.

- (1) *va bene si accomodi, comodatevi pure*  
go-PRS.3SG well REFL seat-SBJV.3SG seat-IMP-2PL also  
'All right have a set, have a seat please'
- (2) *deve pure esserci una soluzione!*  
must-PRS.3SG also be-INF a solution  
'There must be a solution!'

Moreover, this adverb appears in contexts where other (post-)modal functions play a major role: *pure* represents a frequent collocate of conjectural (3) and concessive uses (4) of the Italian future tense (Squartini 2012).

- (3) *chiaramente sta frazione c'avrà pure un nome suppongo*  
obviously this village have-FUT.3SG also a name guess-PRS-1SG  
'Obviously this village has a name I guess'
- (4) *il professor paolino sarà pure trasparente*  
the professor paolino be-FUT-3SG also honest  
*ma è anche adultero*  
but be-PRS.3SG also adulterer  
'It may be true that professor paolino is honest, but he is also an adulterer'

Finally, the adverb can appear in contexts where, together with the subjunctive mood, it encodes optative and hortative illocutions (5).

- (5) *sì no vabbè eh diciamolo pure senza vergogna*  
yes no well uh say-PRS.1PL also without shame  
'Yeah no well uh let's say it without shame'

On the one hand, these data will be assessed to discuss in detail the contiguity between (post-)modal categories and illocutionary modification. On the other hand, they will be reappraised to shed new light on the functional domain of additivity, that typological works have shown to be closely related to epistemic modality, concessivity and discourse coherence (Forker 2016; Faller 2020). The results provide a better understanding of the internal structure of the postmodal domain and especially of illocutionary modification, both in terms of the range of functions which can be subsumed under this category and its position in a layered model of grammar.

## References

- Abraham, Werner & Elisabeth Leiss (eds.). 2012. *Modality and Theory of Mind Elements across Languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter
- Faller, Martina. 2020. The many functions of Cuzco Quechua =pas: implications for the semantic map of additivity. *Glossa* 5(1): 34.
- Forker, Diana. 2016. Toward a typology for additive markers. *Lingua* 180: 69–100.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 2004. Mood and modality. In Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann & Joachim Mugdan (eds.), *Morphology: A Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation*, vol. 2, 1190–202. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2012. *Modality, subjectivity, and semantic change. A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Squartini, Mario. 2012. Evidentiality in interaction: The concessive use of the Italian Future between grammar and discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44(15): 2116–2128.

Helena Bermúdez-Sabel, Paola Marongiu, Francesca Dell’Oro (Neuchâtel)

### Premodal, modal and postmodal: a corpus-based study of the polyfunctionality of Latin modal markers

Though some Latin modal markers—such as modal verbs and particles—have received close attention (cf. Bolkestein 1980; Magni 2005; 2010; Moussy 2008; Schrickx 2011), a comprehensive corpus-based approach of Latin modality is still missing. In particular, a thorough outlook on modality can only be achieved by working with a corpus that specifically targets the representation of the complexity of the Latin diasystem (Coseriu 1969). This is the main goal of the project WoPoss (short for *A World of Possibilities. Modal pathways over an extra-long period of time: the diachrony of modality in the Latin language*). After briefly presenting the WoPoss corpus, we will focus on the annotated occurrences of non-modal meanings conveyed by the modal markers in our corpus.

Our project relies on a fine-grained linguistic annotation that includes the description of modal passages by identifying and analysing their different components: the modal marker, its scope, the participant(s) in the state of affairs, and the modal relation between the marker and its scope. Our theoretical framework is heavily influenced by Nuysts (2016) and the project MODAL (Ghia et al. 2016). A predefined list of lexical modal markers is systematically annotated (Dell’Oro 2022). Our annotation scheme also accounts for their non-modal occurrences, specifically describing the premodal and postmodal uses (van der Auwera and Plungian 1998). Moreover, it also covers non-literal (rhetorical and pragmatic) uses of modal markers. The complexity of our annotation scheme enables us to perform complex queries by combining multiple parameters. All modal and non-modal meanings are also represented in the form of interactive diachronic visualisations (Marongiu and Dell’Oro 2022). These visualisations offer a comprehensive overview of their modal, premodal, postmodal and non-modal meanings, providing an accurate chronological reference for their emergence.

After presenting how our methodology allows us to address multiple research questions concerning modality, we will tackle the polyfunctionality of some lexical items and morphological suffixes that convey modal or non-modal meanings depending on the context.

Although the semantic change that motivates the emergence of modal and postmodal meanings follows well-known grammaticalisation paths (van der Auwera and Plungian 1998), the study of semantic distribution can offer a valuable insight about this process. For instance, one of the most polyfunctional markers attested in our corpus is the impersonal verb *licet* which can convey dynamic, deontic, epistemic and, as a conjunction, also postmodal (concession) readings—it should be noted that reference lexicographic resources such as the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 1900–) do not list meanings or passages that could be interpreted as epistemic, according to our framework. Our preliminary results show that the epistemic meaning of *licet* is by far the less frequent reading. This shows how concession senses may emerge from readings other than epistemic, complementing the trends observed for other languages (e.g. Traugott and Dasher 2001, 115; Beijering 2011). Our work will provide the comparison between the dictionary-based results and the semantic distribution of the meanings as attested in the corpus.

We argue that a corpus-based approach, built upon a multi-layered, fine-grained linguistic annotation, is a solid means to arrive at far-reaching results concerning the evolution and semantic distribution of premodal, modal, and postmodal meanings.

#### Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF N° P00P1\_176778) and it is led by Francesca Dell’Oro at the University of Neuchâtel.

#### Bibliographic references

- Auwera, Johan van der, and Vladimir A. Plungian. 1998. “Modality’s Semantic Map.” *Linguistic Typology* 2 (1): 79–124.
- Beijering, Karin. 2011. “Semantic Change and Grammaticalization: The Development of Modal and Postmodal Meanings in Mainland Scandinavian *må*, *måtte* and *måste*.” *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 34 (2): 105–32. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586511000138>.
- Bolkestein, A. Machtelt. 1980. *Problems in the Description of Modal Verbs: An Investigation of Latin*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1969. *Einführung in die strukturelle Linguistik*. Tübingen: Romanisches Seminar der Universität.
- Dell’Oro, Francesca. 2022. “WoPoss Guidelines for Annotation. Revised Version.” Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6417878>.
- Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. 1900–. *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ghia, Elisa, Lennart Kloppenburg, Malvina Nissim, Paola Pietrandrea, and Valerio Cervoni. 2016. “A Construction-Centered Approach to the Annotation of Modality.” In Bunt, Harry (ed.) *Proceedings of the 12th Joint ACL-ISO Workshop on Interoperable Semantic Annotation*. Portoroz: ACL, ISO. 67–74
- Magni, Elisabetta. 2005. “Modality’s Semantic Maps. An Investigation of Some Latin Modal Forms.” *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 9 (1): 325–36. <https://doi.org/10.1515/joll.2005.9.1.325>.
- . 2010. “Mood and Modality.” In *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Constituent Syntax: Adverbial Phrases, Adverbs, Mood, Tense*, edited by Philip Baldi and Pierluigi Cuzzolin, 2:193–275. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 180. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Marongiu, Paola, and Francesca Dell’Oro. 2022. “From Static to Interactive Maps: Drawing Diachronic

- Maps of (Latin) Modality with *Pygmalion*." *Journal of Open Humanities Data* 8(2): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.5334/johd.58>.
- Moussy, Claude. 2008. "Quelques emplois parallèles de *opus* et de *necesse*." *Collection de l'Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l'Antiquité* 1120 (1): 143–52.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2016. "Analyses of the Modal Meanings." In *The Oxford Handbook of Modality and Mood*, edited by Jan Nuyts and Johan van der Auwera. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199591435.013.1>.
- Schrickx, Josine. 2011. *Lateinische Modalpartikeln: nempe, quippe, scilicet, videlicet und nimirum*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, and Richard B. Dasher. 2001. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patrick Caudal (Paris 7, CNRS)

### **The negative vs. positive facets of demodality: How can we account for deep differences between European and Australian languages?**

This talk will give further substance to the claim in (Caudal 2018) that demodality encompasses both positive and negative meanings, respectively associated with 'actuality entailment' (1)/(3) postmodal constructions vs. what I will refer to as 'inactuality entailment' postmodal constructions (2)/(4), sometimes realized by separately conventionalized constructions or complex morphological markings ('postmodal' being here meant in (van der Auwera & Plungian 1998)'s sense).

- (1) Dieu a voulu qu'il survive à la guerre.  
 God have.3sg.PR want.PP that.he survive-3sg.SUBJ.PR to the war  
 'God willed it that he should survive the war (= God willed it, and he survived).'
- (2) Il a voulu ouvrir la porte.  
 He have.3sg.PR want.PP open-INF the door  
 'He (vainly) tried to open the door.'
- (3) Il a pu ouvrir la porte.  
 He have.3sg.PR be.able-PP open-INF the door  
 'He managed to open the door.'
- (4) Il n'a pas pu ouvrir la porte.  
 He NEG.have.3sg.PR NEG be.able-PP open-INF the door  
 'He (tried and) failed to open the door'.

A brief areal comparative account of demodality across Europe vs. Australia based on a sample of 40 languages (capitalizing on the results of (Caudal 2022a) for its Australian part), will reveal that while SAE languages seem to offer both 'positive' and 'negative' demodal meanings, with a predominance of the former over the latter, Australian languages exclusively grammaticalize or constructionalize negative postmodal meanings – especially so-called avertives (Kuteva et al. 2019), cf. (5)-(6).

- (5) ayana-wu-ni (Iwaidja)  
 1sg>3pl.FRUST-hit-FRUST (TAIM20181114DY@00:04:11) (Author's filedwork)

'I was going to hit them but didn't/nearly hit them'.

- (6) na-buk yimarnek ki-buddu-karlkkangki la. (Kunbarlang)  
i-person CTFCT 3sg.neg-3pl.obj-stalk.irr.pst conj  
kadda-rnay la kadda-bum.  
3pl.nf-see.pst conj 3pl.nf-hit.pst

'He was going to sneak up on them, but they saw him & beat him' (Kapitonov 2019:291)

The core research question addressed in this paper will be – what is the reason behind this typological asymmetry? After identifying distinct, sometimes overlapping development paths for the various categories at stake in both SAE and Australian languages (with avertivity primarily deriving from volitional/proximate aspectuo-modal meanings in Australia), I will hypothesize that the observable differences between Europe and Australia mostly originate in deep differences in the respective types of aspectual systems found in 'Standard Average European' (Haspelmath 1998) (especially Romance and Germanic) vs. Australian languages. In particular, following (Caudal 2022b), I will argue that Australian languages frequently lack combinations of 'strong' perfective aspectual operators with modal operators in their morphology and lexicon, as they tend to only possess aspectually underspecified and/or 'weak' perfective tenses the sense of (Martin 2019) – i.e., past tenses, which even when endowed with perfective meanings, can disregard culminating interpretations, cf. (7), which is an instance of a so-called 'non-culminating accomplishment' (Bar-El, Davis & Matthewson 2006).

- (7) n-alyubaru-nu=ma y-akina yinumaninga akena nara (Anindilyakwa)  
REAL.3M-eat-PST=CTYP MASC-that MASC.food but NEG  
kin-alyubari-na  
IRR.3M>MASC-eat-PST  
'He began to eat the wild apple, but didn't finish it' (Bednall 2019: 206)  
(weak perfective; partitive culmination – event began but failed to culminate)

I will conclude by arguing for the centrality of an aspectual-coercion based origin of demodal meanings in Germanic & Romance (although it is not exclusive – Romanian thus offers an Australian-like, imperfective avertive (Pahonțu forthcoming)), arguing that such instances of aspectual coercion should not be regarded as a matter of mere type-shifting operator à la (de Swart 1998), but as a richer, multi-dimensional type of meaning à la (Gutzmann 2015), combining a non-at-issue modal meaning (formerly at-issue), with an innovative 'actuality entailment', at issue meaning. Of course, such developments are entirely lacking in Australian languages, for want of proper 'strong' perfective grams combining with modal markers.

## References

- Auwera, Johan van der & Vladimir Plungian. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2(1). 79–124.
- Bar-El, Leora, Henry Davis & Lisa Matthewson. 2006. On Non-Culminating Accomplishments. In Leah Bateman & Cherlon Ussery (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 35)*, vol. 1, 87–102. Amherst, MA.: GLSA (Graduate Linguistic Student Association), Department of Linguistics, South College, University of Massachusetts.
- Bednall, James. 2019. *Temporal, aspectual and modal expression in Anindilyakwa, the language of the Groote Eylandt archipelago, Australia*. Canberra / Paris: ANU & Université de Paris-Diderot PhD Thesis.

- Caudal, Patrick. 2018. Demodality: profiling a novel category at the tense/aspect – modality divide. Presented at the 13th International Conference on Tense, Aspect, Modality and Evidentiality (Chronos 13), Université de Neuchâtel.
- Caudal, Patrick. 2022a. Avertive/frustrative markers in Australian languages: blurring the boundaries between aspectuo-temporal and modal meanings. In Kasia M. Jaszczolt (ed.), *Understanding Human Time* (Oxford Studies of Time in Language and Thought), 22. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caudal, Patrick. 2022b. Culmination/telicity and event delineation in Australian Languages: phonology, morphosyntax, semantics and pragmatics. In Nora Boneh, Daniel Harbour, Ora Matushansky & Isabelle Roy (eds.), *Building on Babel's Rubble*. Saint Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Gutzmann, Daniel. 2015. *Use-Conditional Meaning: Studies in Multidimensional Semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1998. How young is standard average european? *Language Sciences* 20(3)(3). 271–287.
- Kapitonov, Ivan. 2019. *A grammar of Kunbarlang*. Melbourne: The University of Melbourne. <http://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/handle/11343/225743> (1 November, 2020).
- Kuteva, Tania, Bas Aarts, Gergana Popova & Anvita Abbi. 2019. The grammar of ‘non-realization.’ *Studies in Language* 43(4). 850–895. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.18044.kut>.
- Martin, Fabienne. 2019. Non-culminating accomplishments. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 13(8). 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12346>.
- Pahonțu, Beatrice. forthcoming. *Périphrases progressives/proximatives et avertivité en roumain*. Université de Paris / Universitatea din București PhD Thesis.
- Swart, Henriëtte de. 1998. Aspect Shift and Coercion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16(2). 347–385.

### *Panel 3*

Bastien Poreau (INALCO, SeDyL)

#### **De la nécessité à l’incrédulité : analyse énonciative d’un prédicat modal du russe contemporain**

Le russe possède de nombreux prédicats modaux de natures très diverses (tant sur le plan morphosyntaxique, que sémantique). Dans cette présentation, j’analyserai un prédicat modal non-verbal, « *nado* » (« falloir, être nécessaire »), qui permet d’introduire un procès à valider (représenté par un infinitif) et dont le potentiel agent, s’il est exprimé dans la phrase, apparaît au datif :

- 1) (Vam.<sub>2pl.dat</sub>) *nado skazat'*, dire *čto-nibud'* quelque-chose  
Il (vous) faut dire quelque chose.

Par ailleurs, *nado* peut également être accompagné de la particule énonciative *že*. Cette particule enclitique du russe permet d’exprimer diverses valeurs énonciatives selon le terme avec lequel elle se combine et le contexte de l’énonciation (allant de valeurs argumentatives, jusqu’à des valeurs exclamatives :

- 2) – *Kuda ty sobiraes'sja idti ? U.chez tebja.2sg.gen že.part temperatura.température.nom*  
[Vasiliyeva, 1972, p. 55]

– Où crois-tu aller ? Je te rappelle que tu as de la fièvre.

- 3) Oh, artist.artiste.nom že.part !  
Oh, mais quel artiste !

L'énoncé en 2) présente la valeur argumentative, le locuteur vient signifier que, au vu de l'état de l'interlocuteur (malade), il n'est pas question pour lui de sortir comme il l'avait envisagé. L'énoncé 3) illustre la valeur de surprise, d'incrédulité, le locuteur indiquant par-là « qu'il n'en revient pas » de voir un tel artiste. D. Paillard (1987) décrit le sens de *že* comme « une impossible sortie d'un domaine de référence préexistant ». Qu'en est-il lorsque *že* se combine avec le prédicat *nado* ?

La locution *nado že* va avoir différentes valeurs d'emplois qui varient notamment en fonction du type de procès qu'elle introduit. Ses emplois vont ainsi de l'expression d'une nécessité renforcée, lorsque l'infinitif est un procès à valider :

- 4) *Nado že skazat'.dire čto-nibud'.quelque-chose*  
« il faut bien/quand-même dire quelque chose »)

qui introduit un procès devant être validé, où l'énoncé a sa pleine valeur modale, l'expression d'une nécessité renforcée par *že* ; elle se retrouve employée également, non pas pour introduire un procès qu'il est nécessaire de valider, mais pour revenir sur un événement déjà passé. L'énoncé a alors une valeur de jugement :

- 5) *Nado že byt' ètre.inf takim.tel.inst idiotom\_idiot.inst !*  
‘Faut vraiment le faire pour être aussi bête !

Remarquons que, dans cette traduction, le modal *falloir* en français permet également d'exprimer ce type de nuance non-modale, comme le fait *nado že* en russe.

Enfin, un troisième emploi sera présenté et concerne les énoncés où *nado že* est employé sans infinitif exprimé. Dans cette configuration la valeur modale de nécessité ou d'obligation est totalement effacée, le locuteur exprime son incrédulité en rapport avec le contexte direct de l'énonciation :

- 6) *Nado že!*  
Ça alors ! / Incroyable !

Me basant sur un corpus d'exemples attestés et contextualisés du russe (tous traduits en français et glosés), je montrerai les différentes valeurs d'emploi de *nado že* et expliquerai comment la sémantique du modal *nado* permet d'exprimer des nuances de sens *a priori* si différentes.

## Références bibliographiques

- Benveniste, É. 1966. Problèmes de linguistique générale 1. Paris : Gallimard.
- Bonnot,C & Kodzasov,S.V.1998.Semantičeskoe var'irovanie diskursivnyx slov i ego vlijanie na linearizaciju i intonirovanie (na primere častic ŽE i VED') (« La variation sémantique des mots du discours et son influence sur l'ordre linéaire et l'intonation (sur l'exemple des particules ŽE et VED'»), Diskursivnye slova russkogo jazyka: opyt kontekstno-semantičeskogo opisanija. Moskva: Metatekst. 382-443.ŠŠ
- Culioli, A. 1999. Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation. Formalisation et opérations de repérage. Tome 2. Paris : Ophrys.

- Guiraud-Weber, M. 1984. Les propositions sans nominatif en russe moderne. Paris: Institut d'Études slaves.
- Paillard, D. 1985. À propos de l'alternance imperfectif/perfectif après l'auxiliaire modal nado. Atti del colloquio Lingue slave e lingue romanze : un confronto. Firenze, 25-26 gennaio 1985 (« Actes du colloque "Langues slaves et langues romanes : une comparaison, Florence, 25-26 janvier 1985»). Firenze : ETS editrice. 155-170.
- Paillard, D. 1987. Že ou la sortie impossible. Immédiateté, reprise, évidence, questionnement. Les particules énonciatives en russe contemporain (2). Paris : Institut d'études slaves et Université Paris 7. 173-225.

Pierre Larrivée (Caen, CRISCO)

### **From modality to sources of evidence**

One of the objectives of linguistic studies is to map the regular connections between interpretations. Such mapping allows one to delimitate proximities between (potentially primitive) categories of language and probe the reasons for such proximities. For instance, indefinites often become negative items, but prepositions typically don't, because indefinites, but not generally prepositions, can come to be restricted to negative environments.

In this talk, I am looking at two grammatical phenomena where a marker that has to do with modality is found to take on a differential interpretation. Negation can be considered as one type of modality in the sense that it provides an assessment of the existence of a predication (Hagège 1982: 86). The rejection of a predication is not always the immediate interpretation of the clausal negative marker, as in negative interrogatives (NI).

(1) G Isn't this a shame?

NI have three properties.

- (2) a. It implies that the speaker is committed to p;  
 b. The polarity of the answer is expected to be positive;  
 c. The speaker seeks a confirmation that p is the case.

Generally, analyses seek to take out the negative (in a high scopal position) (Krifka 2017; Romero and Han 2002, Ladd 1981), but the empirical rationale for such a move is generally not provided. An analysis that preserves the value of negation is one proposed by Larrivée and Mari (2020) by which the negative and the positive propositional contents are attributed to different sources of evidence. The negative in (1) is analysed as attributed to the Hearer, suggesting that the questions arises because the Hearer is treated as though not adhering to p; the propositional contents is thus inferred to remain under the belief of the Speaker. Hearer and Speaker are syntactic instantiations located in a high position in the CP, à la Speas and Tenny (2003) (where Speaker is encompassed under the representation Other).

(3) [ForceP [Speaker [Other [Neg i [TopP [IntP [FocP [TopP [FinP [IP [p (t i )

The phenomena appears paralleled by the uses of the adverbial marker of possibility right-dislocated in similar "special questions", as illustrated by the following (Nølke 1988).

- (4) Je ne suis pas ton mari, peut-être? (TLFi)  
 1SG NEG be-PR-1S NEG your husband maybe  
 (And) I'm not your husband, maybe?

Sharing the properties in (2), the use can be analyzed with the representation in (3).

- (5) [ForceP [Speaker [Other [ maybe Neg i [TopP [IntP [FocP [TopP [FinP [IP [p (t i )

The treatment rests on the ability for an overt item to be moved to the Other projection, separately from the propositional material. This is presumably why there are no positive versions of NI. But there are positive versions of (4).

- (4) *Je sais, à mon âge, comment je dois me conduire, peut-être!* (BALZAC, E. Grandet, 1834, p.117. TLFi).

That is because there is an overt item to attribute to the Other, which is *peut-être* itself.

There is thus a connection between sentential modality and evidentiality. This can occur in special questions where question-typing can be done by the modality marker, and the connection between these is due to structural reasons. The question that arises for future research is the extent of the markers that can be thus used.

- Hagège, Claude. 1982. La structure des langues. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.  
 Krifka, Manfred. 2017. Negated polarity questions as denegations of assertions. In Kiefer Lee & Manfred Krifka (Eds), Contrastiveness in information structure, alternatives and scalar implicatures. Dordrecht: Springer. 359–398.  
 Ladd, D. Robert. 1981. A first look at the semantics and pragmatics of negative questions and tag questions. Chicago Linguistic Society 17.  
 Larrivée, Pierre and Alda Mari. 2021. Interpreting high negation in Negative Interrogatives : The role of the Other. Linguistics Vanguard.  
 Nølke, Henning, 1988. Peut-être : fonction modale et discursive. Henning Nølke (Ed.), Opérateurs syntaxiques et cohésion discursive dans les langues slaves et romanes. Copenhague : Erhvervsøkonomisk Forlag. 113-123.  
 Romero, Maribel & Chung-Hye Han. 2002. Verum focus in negative yes/no questions and Ladd's ambiguity. SALT XII 204–224.  
 Speas, Peggy & Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. Anna-Maria Di Sciullo (Ed.), Asymmetry in grammar. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 315–343.  
 TLFi.

Tanja Mortelmans (Antwerp)

#### **A contrastive study of the postmodal (reportative) function of three (semantically related) markers: German *sollen* + INF, Dutch *zou* + INF and the French *conditionnel***

In my talk, I want to present the first results of a corpus-based study of three postmodal markers in present-day German, Dutch and French, i.e. GER *sollen*, DUT *zou* and the FR *conditionnel*. They share a number of features, albeit to different extents:

- a) their ancestors (in the case of DUT *zou* and the FR *conditionnel*) expressed modal meanings (participant external/deontic necessity and/or capacity, see Bourouva & Tasmowski (2007) for French, Philippa et al. 2003-2009 for Dutch); present-day German *sollen* still expresses deontic modality in the majority of its uses (Diewald 1999)
- b) The major present-day use of both DUT *zou* and the FR *conditionnel* is the expression of hypotheticality (Harmes 2017, Van De Weerd 2021), most typically in the apodosis of a conditional (FR *conditionnel*), in both the apodosis and protasis of a conditional (DUT *zou*, see Harmes 2017) or in the protasis only (GER *sollte*, with this form only expressing potential hypotheticality).
- c) All three markers can have temporal meaning, expressing futurity/ulteriority in the past. This is the second most frequent usage of the *conditionnel* in present-day French (Van De Weerd 2021) and of *zou* in Dutch (Harmes 2017), whereas it is severely restricted and hence highly infrequent in German (*sollte*).
- d) In present day German, Dutch and French, they can all be used as markers of reportative evidentiality. For German, it is the indicative form *soll* that is used in this function. The developmental path sketched for the development of this reportative meaning is similar, i.e. the reportative meaning is assumed to have developed in contexts of indirect speech, typically with an explicit mentioning of a source in the immediate context (Patard & De Mulder 2012: 34, Diewald 1999: 420-421, Harmes 2017)

What is striking, is the fact that the Dutch and the French markers (*zou* and the *conditionnel*) seem to have more in common than the German one (*sollen*), although the former ones are typologically less related and their grammaticalization status is clearly different (an auxiliary in Dutch, an inflectional suffix in French). The question that I want to raise is whether these differences in similarity between the French/Dutch markers on the one hand and the German marker, on the other, leave traces in the (postmodal) reportative use. More concretely, I will address the question whether a) the status of *sollen* as a straightforward deontic modal verb in German influences the identification and interpretation of the verb in its reportative use and b) whether the status of *zou* and the *conditionnel* as general postmodal markers of hypotheticality and futurity have a bearing on their reportative reading. For one thing, a frequent association with counterfactuality – in the case of the Dutch and French markers - might lead to an increased compatibility with denial readings (“reportative exceptionality”, see AnderBois 2014). For another, the stronger association with rather vague “postmodal” meanings (future in the past, hypotheticality,...) can be expected to negatively impact the interpretation of the item in question, so that speech participants have to rely more strongly on contextual features than in the case of reportative *sollen*. Interpretation problems – leading to ambiguous cases - have been reported in Harmes (2017) for Dutch *zou* and Van de Weerd (2021) for the *conditionnel*. The corpus used will be a newspaper corpus, since reportative markers are typical of journalistic prose.

## References

- AnderBois, Scott. 2014. On the exceptional status of reportative evidentials. Proceedings of SALT 24: 234–254.
- Bourouva, Viara & Liliane Tasmowski. 2007. La préhistoire des futurs romans. Ordres des constituents et sémantique. Cahiers Chronos 19, 25-41.
- Diewald, Gabriele. 1999. Die Modalverben im Deutschen. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

- Harmes, Ingeborg. 2017. A synchronic and diachronic study of the Dutch Auxiliary “Zou(den)”. In: Juana I. Marín-Arrese, Gerda Haßler and Marta Carretero (eds.), *Evidentiality Revisited: Cognitive grammar, functional and discourse-pragmatic perspectives*, 149–169. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Patard, Adeline & Walter De Mulder. 2012. L'évolution des usages du conditionnel en français. *Faits des langues* 40, 29–36.
- Philippa, M., F. Debrabandere, A. Quak, T. Schoonheim en N. van der Sijs (2003–2009). *Etymologisch Woordenboek van het Nederlands*, Amsterdam
- Van de Weerd, Jessica. 2021. Le conditionnel de reprise en français. Une étude de son origine et de son évolution de sens. Thèse de doctorat, Univ. Antwerpen.

Ezra la Roi (Ghent)

### **Paths out of counterfactuality: evidence from Ancient Greek diachrony**

Counterfactuals express state of affairs for which the condition for realization is deemed unrealizable by the speaker in the past, present or future. Cross-linguistically, counterfactuals typically consist of a modal element (e.g. epistemic, deontic modality) and a past element, with the counterfactuality being the result of a semanticized quantity implicature (Van Linden & Verstraete 2008). Historically, counterfactual markers take part in a life-cycle, a phenomenon noted by Dahl (1997) and elaborated into a diachronic typology by Yong (2018). This life-cycle predicts that a counterfactual marker will (i) start its life as a past counterfactual, it will (ii) subsequently extend its temporal reference to the non-past (present and, where possible, the future), after which (iii) it risks losing its counterfactual value whilst retaining non-past temporal reference, which may trigger a replacement or strengthening by recruiting additional linguistic means to mark the counterfactuality. Whereas the early stages of the life-cycle of counterfactuals are well known (e.g. Patard 2019; la Roi forthc1. for Ancient Greek and the combined role of aspect and actionality), paths out of counterfactuality are relatively unknown (e.g. Dahl 1997 tentatively suggested that pluperfect counterfactuals “if I had had ...” are a systemic renewal in the Germanic languages). The logic of the life-cycle would suggest that paths out of the life-cycle are restricted to the tail end of the cycle, but the Ancient Greek data seems to provide evidence on the contrary.

Therefore this paper provides a detailed overview of the potential paths of Ancient Greek counterfactuals out of counterfactuality into post-counterfactuality (which may be both modal and non-modal). First, I discuss show that early on in the life cycle past counterfactual mood forms have (in Archaic and Classical Greek, VIII BC–IV BC) changed into a past habitual construction through an invited inference of epistemic certainty (la Roi forthc2). Second, the development of counterfactual modal verbs in Classical and Post-Classical Greek is discussed, as some start to lose their counterfactuality and ‘modalize’ into modal verbs which can refer to the present or future even though historically a past tense modal verb. Third, I detail the development of counterfactual ὡφελ(λ)ον ‘ought>if only’ which first had changed its scope from a deontic modal verb into a counterfactual wish mood marker (for parallels Narrog 2012 and for Ancient Greek, see Allan 2013; Revuelta Puigdolers 2017; la Roi 2021), but there are signs that it loses its counterfactual value in Post-Classical Greek (e.g. it hosts non-counterfactual mood forms) and acquires post-counterfactual (future) meanings.

## References

- Allan, R. J. 2013. Exploring Modality's Semantic Space: Grammaticalization, Subjectification and the case of ὁφεῖλω. *Glotta* 89, 1–46. <https://doi.org/10.13109/glot.2013.89.14.1>
- Dahl, Ö. 1997. The relation between past time reference and counterfactuality: A new look. In E.C. Traugott, A. Ter Meulen, J. S. Reilly & C. A. Ferguson (eds.), *On Conditionals Again*, 97–114. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Narrog, H. 2012. *Modality, Subjectivity, and Semantic Change: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Patard, A. 2019. To the Roots of Fake Tense and 'Counterfactuality.' In R. Peltola & E. Roussel (eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Perspectives on the Semantics of Grammatical Aspect*, 176–212. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Ia Roi, E. 2021. The insubordination of if- and that-clauses from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek: a diachronic constructional typology. *Symbolae Osloenses* 95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00397679.2021.1951005>
- Ia Roi, E. forthc1. Interlocking life-cycles of counterfactual mood from Archaic to Classical Greek: Aspect, Actionality and Changing Temporal Reference. *Indogermanische Forschungen*.
- Ia Roi, E. forthc2. Down the Paths to the Past Habitual: its historical connections with counterfactual pasts, future in the pasts, iteratives and lexical sources in Ancient Greek. *Folia Linguistica Historica*.
- Revuelta Puigdollers, A.R. 2017. "Ωφελ(λ)ον in Ancient Greek counterfactual desiderative sentences. From verb to modal particle. In K. Bentein, M. Janse & J. Soltic (eds.), *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect, and Modality*, 158–188. Leiden: Brill.
- Van Der Auwera, J. & V.A. Plungian. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2(1), 79–124.
- Van Linden, A. & J.C. Verstraete. 2008. The nature and origins of counterfactuality in simple clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(11), 1865–1895.
- Yong, Q. 2018. Pathways of Counterfactual Markings: A Diachronic Typology. *International Journal of English Linguistics* 8(2), 180–198.

## Panel 4

Outi Duvallon (INALCO, SeDyL) & Rea Peltola (Caen, CRISCO)

### Correlative verb reduplication as a modal and narrative resource

Our paper investigates the reanalysis of modal meaning in the Finnish verb construction  $V_1\ k(u)i_n$   $V_1=kin$ . This pattern includes the reduplication of a usually finite positive verb form, the comparative conjunction  $k(u)i_n$  and the inclusive focus enclitic  $=kin$  which is connected to the reduplicant. The construction is used to describe events that take place despite a potentially hindering antagonist force (Talmy 1988; 2000). This opposing force can be of different types: epistemic, intersubjective, or physical, as in (1):

- (1) *Kerran katselin ikkunasta, kun harakka reuhtoi omen[a]puun oksassa riippuvaa isoa talipalloa kaapatakseen sen itselleen kokonaan.*

'Once I watched through the window as a magpie was wrestling a huge fat ball hanging on an apple tree in order to get it all to himself.'

Ja    **sa-i**            **kuin**    **sa-i=kin**            se-n            oksa-sta            irti. [Suomi24]  
and    get-PRT.3SG   CONJ    get-PRT.3SG=CLT DEM-GEN   branch-ELA   off  
'And (**eventually**) he got it off the branch.'

The paper focusses on the iconic and force dynamic motivation of this modal meaning and the semantic transformation of the pattern into a postmodal narrative marker.

Coordinating two identical items creates an asymmetry: the first V1 corresponds to the narrator's perspective, in (1) reporting the magpie's achievement, whereas the second V1, which is focalized by the enclitic, gives rise to a perspective where two forces oppose one another, in (1) the magpie's intention, the agonist, and resistance of the fat ball, the antagonist. The reduplicant makes relevant the two underlying virtual facets of the event, p and not-p, which are co-present in the construal of the situation. On a conceptual level, the construction thus conveys a layered structure, to which the verb reduplication is analogous and on which the modal meaning of the construction is based. Both *ku(i)n* and *=kin*, the non-verbal components of the construction, contribute to reversing an initial force relationship and relate the construction *V<sub>1</sub> ku(i)n V<sub>1</sub>=kin* to other correlative constructions containing an overt modal verb.

On the other hand, *V<sub>1</sub> ku(i)n V<sub>1</sub>=kin* appears within narrative sequences as an intersubjective resource for highlighting tellability (Baroni 2009). In these uses, the antagonist force remains undetermined, or the event described can even be construed, to a certain extent, as aligning with it. Our claim is that the force dynamic pattern and the layered conceptual structure operate here on a narrative level. They bring to the fore the culmination of the story. The reduplicative construction (increase in linguistic material) furthermore iconically adds the intensity of the event (increase in quality) (Fischer 2011; Magni 2017). The analysis gives us insight into reduplication as a resource for modality and demodalization as a constructional change (Hilpert et al. 2021).

The data used for the analysis are collected from the text corpora of the Language Bank of Finland, from the 19th to the 21st century, and includes literary texts, folk tales and conversations from online discussion sites.

## References

- Baroni, Raphaël, 2009. Tellability. In Hühn, Peter & Pier, John & Schmid, Wolf & Schönert, Jörg (eds.), *Handbook of Narratology*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 447–454.
- Fischer, Olga, 2011. Cognitive iconic grounding of reduplication in language. In Michelucci, Pascal & Fischer, Olga & Ljungberg, Christina (eds.), *Semblance and Signification*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 55–82.
- Hilpert, Martin & Cappelle, Bert & Depraetere, Ilse (eds.), 2021. *Modality and Diachronic Construction Grammar*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Magni, Elisabetta, 2017. Intensity, reduplication, and pluractionality in Ancient Greek. *Lexis* 10.
- Talmy, Leonard, 1988. Force dynamics in language and cognition. *Cognitive Science* 12, 49–100.
- Talmy, Leonard, 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics. Vol 1: Concept structuring systems*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

**The post-modal grammaticalization of concessive *may* and *might*.**

The decline of certain core modals in English, including *may* and *might*, is a well-documented phenomena (cf. Daugs 2017). It is less clear, however, whether this tendency foreshadows the loss of these modals or whether other mechanisms (e.g. semantic change, constructionalization, etc.) are also at work. I aim to address this issue by looking at the use of *may* and *might* in concessive clauses, which, despite previous research on the topic (Sweetser 1990, Sugiyama 2003, Souesme 2009, Gresset 2012, Narrog 2012), still raises a number of empirical and theoretical questions. I will first present the results of a corpus study (COHA, Davies 2010) aimed at understanding the diachronic development of concessive *may* and *might*. A dataset of 4000 examples (200 per modal for each of the past 10 decades) was manually annotated for a number of different criteria (e.g. modal value, type of clause, factuality, etc.). A logistic regression model was then computed in R to pin down specific patterns and their evolution across the ten decades. In particular, the analysis reveals a significant increase of *may* and *might* in concessive contexts since the 1960s, especially in factual concessives with *but*, e.g.:

- (1) You *may* not approve of me, **but** you like me, and you know it. (FIC, 1953)
- (2) We *might* not be together, **but** that doesn't mean that everything we had instantly gets wiped away. (TV/MOV, 2007)

This new finding is important as it shows that, though decreasing in frequency, the two modals are developing new patterns of use. This observation thus raises the question of whether the status of *may* and *might* as modal verbs is also changing. It is typically argued that, in examples like (1) and (2), the modals are epistemic and that the concessive meaning is provided by the linguistic context (see e.g. Coates 1983, Palmer 1990, Collins 2009, Souesme 2009). I want to challenge this analysis. In keeping with the view presented in van der Auwera and Plungian (1998), I consider that *may* and *might* have developed a new, post-modal, concessive meaning. Specifically, I argue that in this case the two modals are going through a process of post-modal (secondary) grammaticalization characterized both by semantic bleaching (i.e. gradual loss of the conceptual notion of ‘possibility’) and pragmatic strengthening (i.e. the procedural content encoded by the two modals changes from a ‘propositional’ attitude to a more ‘discursive’ attitude, reflecting an increase in intersubjectivity).

Two further observations are also made. First, I claim that this functional change goes hand in hand with a process of constructionalization, and that the concessive meaning is linked to the more complex ‘SUBJ {*may/might*} VP, *but*-CLAUSE’ construction (cf. Gresset and Mélis 2020). Second, I argue that, within the paradigm of concessive constructions, the ones discussed here with *may* and *might* can be viewed as ‘*hedged* concessives’ that are used for a particular politeness strategy: concessive constructions being dismissive by nature, the speaker chooses concessives with *may* and *might* as a means to save their positive face.

To conclude, this paper therefore argues that the use of concessive *may* and *might* are marked by processes of post-modal grammaticalization and constructionalization that involve an increase in discursive function and intersubjectivity that is largely guided by considerations of politeness.

## References

- van der Auwera, J. and V. A. Plungian. (1998). Modality's semantic map. In *Linguistic Typology* 2: 79-124.
- Coates, J. (1983). *The semantics of the modal auxiliaries*. London and Canberra: Croom Helm.
- Collins, P. (2009). *Modals and quasi-modals in English*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Daugs, R. (2017). On the development of modals and semi-modals in American English in the 19th and 20th centuries. In T. Hiltunen, J. McVeigh and T. Säily (eds.), *Big and rich data in English corpus linguistics: Methods and explorations*. Helsinki: VARIENG. Available from: <https://varieng.helsinki.fi/series/volumes/19/daugs/>.
- Davies, M. (2010). *The Corpus of Historical American English (COHA)*. Available online at <https://www.english-corpora.org/coha/>.
- Gresset, S. (2012). De l'in/attendu dans les énoncés concessifs avec MAY. Illustration à partir d'un discours de Barack Obama. In *Linx. Revue des linguistes de l'université Paris X Nanterre* 66-67: 51-67.
- Gresset, S. and G. Mélis. (2020). Concession, intensité assertive et argumentation – étude comparée de deux constructions concessives en anglais. In *Anglophonia* [Online] 29.
- Narrog , H. (2012). Beyond intersubjectification: textual usages of modality and mood in subordinate clauses as part of speech orientation. In *English Text Construction* 5(1): 29-52 .
- Palmer, F. R. (1990). *Modality and the English modals* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- Souesme, J-C. (2009). MAY in concessive contexts. In R. Salkie, P. Busuttil and J. van der Auwera (eds.), *Modality in English: Theory and description*, 159-176. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sugiyama, K. (2003). On factual may. In *English Linguistics* 20(2): 441-466.
- Sweetser, E. (1990). *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Corinne Rossari, Cyrielle Montrichard, Claudia Ricci & Linda Sanvido (Neuchâtel)

### **Pouvoir et peut-être : approche textométrique de leur valeur post-modale de concession**

Les verbes modaux du français expriment des valeurs qui relèvent de catégories différentes de la modalité. La typologie de Gosselin (2010) distingue six catégories et les verbes *devoir* et *pouvoir* sont susceptibles d'être utilisés pour trois de ces catégories :

- Epistémique : *Paul peut/doit être en train de dormir*
- Déontique: *Tu dois/peux te coucher tard*
- Aléthique: *Elle peut/doit parvenir à ses fins, elle a les compétences*

Parmi ces valeurs, les travaux de van der Auwera & Plungian (1998) ont montré dans une perspective typologiste que les valeurs post-modales dérivent de la modalité épistémique (nécessité ou possibilité). En français, *pouvoir* est le seul verbe qui revêt une valeur post-modale (*Tu peux toujours pleurer, je ne cèderai pas*), valeur que plusieurs auteur-e-s, notamment Saussure (2014), Barbet & Vettters (2012), mettent en relation avec une valeur concessive. Une telle valeur est également identifiée pour *peut-être* (*Je suis peut-être une femme, mais je sais me défendre*), notamment par Nölke (1993). Dans cet emploi, *pouvoir* comme *peut-être* ne donnent pas d'indication sur la possibilité que le destinataire pleure ou que le locuteur soit une femme. Ils mettent en relation deux propositions

(dont la seconde peut être implicitée), en signalant une mise à l’arrière-plan de la première par rapport à la deuxième. Ce type de construction est typique de la relation concessive, qui hiérarchise également deux propositions au moyen de connecteurs tels que *certes/d'accord...mais/il n'en demeure pas moins que*, dont l'une est présentée comme accordée et constitue l'arrière-plan du discours, et l'autre est présentée comme prise en charge et constitue le premier plan du discours (cf. Rossari 2015). Toutefois, au-delà de cette hiérarchisation, la mise en relation des deux propositions n'est pas la même selon que la forme utilisée est *pouvoir* ou *peut-être*. Avec *pouvoir*, c'est une construction dont l'interprétation est fondée sur la non-actualisation (cf. Saussure 2014 : 9) de la première proposition qui est en jeu, alors qu'avec *peut-être* ce n'est pas le cas : dans la construction de type *tu peux pleurer, je ne céderai pas*, la proposition avec *pouvoir* peut être paraphrasée par une construction en *si* ou en *quand bien même*, alors que la seconde construction correspond à une structure où la première proposition est actualisée.

Notre propos sera de comprendre (i) pourquoi, parmi les modaux, seuls *pouvoir* et *peut-être* sont susceptibles d'être utilisés dans ce type de construction ; (ii) ce qui différencie *pouvoir* et *peut-être* eu égard à l'actualisation / non actualisation de la proposition quand il revêt une valeur post-modale.

Pour la question (i) nous utiliserons un trait sémantique abstrait de ‘potentialité’ qui ne caractérise parmi les verbes modaux que *pouvoir*, en montrant que ce trait est en jeu dans tous ses emplois, y compris les emplois post-modaux. Pour (ii), nous analyserons les accompagnateurs spécifiques qui caractérisent *pouvoir* et *peut-être* en montrant que *pouvoir* est le seul verbe modal qui s'associe de façon statistiquement significative avec des connecteurs introduisant des situations non actualisées comme les conjonctions de finalité, et que *peut-être* est le seul adverbe épistémique évoquant une probabilité à être attiré à la gauche de *mais*, à l'instar de *certes* et *sans doute*.

Notre étude sera fondée sur une exploration outillée de corpus représentant différents genres (encyclopédie, presse) et époques (21<sup>ème</sup> et 18<sup>ème</sup> siècles).

## Références

- Auwera van der, J. & Plungian, V. (1998). Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2, pp. 79-124.  
Barbet, C. & Veters, C. (2012). Pour une étude diachronique du verbe modal pouvoir en français : les emplois « postmodaux ». *Cahiers Chronos* 26, pp. 315-336.  
Gosselin, L. (2010). *Les modalités en français*. Amsterdam/New York, NY: Rodopi.  
Nølke, H. (1993). *Le regard du locuteur: Pour une linguistique des traces énonciatives*. Paris: Éditions Kimé.  
Rossari, C. (2015). Une concession implique-t-elle une opposition ? In A. Ferrari, L. Lala, R. Stojmenova. *Testualità. Fondamenti, unità, relazioni. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi di Linguistica testuale*. Firenze: Franco Cesati, pp. 189-203.  
Saussure de, L. (2014). Verbes modaux et sous-détermination. In Blochoviak J. & al. (Eds), *Mélanges offerts à Jacques Moeschler*, publication en ligne, <https://www.unige.ch/lettres/linguistique/files/8314/5934/7873/deSaussure2014.pdf>.

**« Je (le) veux bien » : de l'expression de la modalité boulique au développement d'un marqueur concessif**

L'énoncé « je (le) veux bien » est en premier lieu associé à l'expression de la modalité boulique : en traduisant l'accord de son locuteur, il exprime aussi la volonté de celui-ci et rend possible la réalisation du procès évoqué dans une intervention antérieure par un premier locuteur :

- (1) Ils aimait tous deux à montrer leur force.  
– luttons, dit Desrais.  
– *je veux bien*, répondit Chazal.  
Ils se mirent tous deux nus jusqu'à la ceinture et se prirent à bras le corps. (A. France, *La Vie en fleur*, 1922)

D'après les données de la base Frantext, sur laquelle nous nous appuierons dans cette présentation, « je le veux bien » apparaît toutefois, dès le 18<sup>e</sup> siècle, également souvent dans des enchaînements discursifs dans lesquels l'expression de la volonté du locuteur devient secondaire ; son énonciation n'entraîne alors pas systématiquement la réalisation de la demande formulée par l'interlocuteur :

- (2) Géronte. Je ne la remets pas bien ; viens-t'en m'y conduire toi-même.  
Merlin. *Je le veux bien*, monsieur ; mais...  
Géronte. Quoi ! mais ?  
Merlin. Le diable ne s'est pas emparé de celle-là ; mais madame Bertrand y loge encore.  
Géronte. Elle y loge encore ! (J.F. Regnard, *Le Retour imprévu*, 1700, scène 17)

Nous avons ainsi choisi de commencer nos investigations à cette période, afin de nous interroger sur l'évolution ultérieure de « je (le) veux bien ».

Celle-ci nous mènera en effet vers des emplois discursifs ainsi qu'à l'apparition de la séquence « je veux bien / j'veux bien », dans laquelle le pronom anaphorique a disparu :

- (3) Vous autres savants, vous avez vos idées, et nous avons les nôtres. Nous sommes simples, *je le veux bien*, mais nous voyons aux champs, où nous vivons de jour et de nuit, des choses que vous ne voyez pas et que vous ne connaîtrez jamais. (G. Sand, *Jeanne*, 1844)
- (4) Montessini : [...] J'espère qu'on saura reconnaître la joie, une joie informe *je veux bien*, mais enfin la joie qui se dégage des tableaux de Lorenzi. (J. Perry, *Vie d'un païen*, 1965)

Dans (3) et (4), « je (le) veux bien » est suivi, comme dans (2), de la conjonction *mais*. Son emploi y est toutefois discursif et de ce fait très différent de celui dont témoignent les deux premiers extraits :

- il ne constitue plus un énoncé réponse à l'intérieur d'un échange verbal mais porte sur un énoncé ou un syntagme qui se trouve dans l'intervention-même locuteur ;
- il n'est plus caractérisé par la valeur prospective traditionnellement associée à la modalité boulique, dans la mesure où il commente, après coup, une affirmation déjà énoncée et figurant par conséquent dans son cotexte gauche immédiat ;
- l'énonciation de « je (le) veux bien » n'y est plus liée à l'expression de la volonté de son locuteur, mais elle apporte une appréciation critique sur une affirmation que celui-ci ne souhaite pas prendre en charge.

Dans cette communication, nous proposons de décrire avec plus de précisions l'émergence et le développement de ces emplois, dans lesquels « je (le) veux bien » cesse de relever de la modalité boulique pour devenir un marqueur discursif à valeur concessive.

#### Eléments de bibliographie

- Authier-Revuz J., 1988, « Non-coïncidences énonciatives dans la production du sens », *LINX* 19, p. 25-28.
- Authier-Revuz J., 1995, *Ces mots qui ne vont pas de soi. Boucles réflexives et noncoïncidentes du dire*, Paris, Larousse.
- Dostie G., 2004, *Pragmaticalisation et marqueurs discursifs : analyse sémantique et traitement lexicographique*, Bruxelles, De Boeck / Duculot.
- Ducrot O., 1991, *Dire et ne pas dire*, 3<sup>e</sup> éd. corrigée et augmentée, Paris, Hermann.
- Gosselin L., 2010, *Les Modalités en français. La validation des représentations*, *Etudes Chronos* 1, Amsterdam, New York, Rodopi.
- Haßler G. (éd.), 2022, *Manuel des modes et modalités*, *Manuels of Romance Linguistics* 29, Berlin, Boston, De Gruyter.
- Le Querler N., 1996, *Typologie des modalités*, Presses universitaires de Caen.
- Le Querler N., 2004, « Les modalités en français », *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 82/3, p. 643-656.
- Marque-Pucheu Ch., 2019, « De l'accord imparfait au désaccord : concéder... mais », *Thélème. Revue Complutense d'études françaises* 34 (1), p. 77-98.
- Rossari C., Ricci C., 2021, « L'emploi de *bien*, *ben/bene* dans les séquences concessives. Quelques hypothèses sur les différences entre français et italien à partir d'une démarche quantitative », *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata*, anno L, 2021/1, 20 p.
- Rouanne L., 1998, « A propos de l'adverbe *bien* en français contemporain », *Les Chemins du texte*, T. Garcia-Sabell et al. (éds), p. 147-156.