

The non-defined boundaries between prototypical adverbs and discourse markers in Homer

In Ancient Greek, as in other Indo-European languages, adverbs comprise a set of words difficult to analyse due to their formal, functional and semantic variety. In general terms, adverbs that can work as predicate complements and convey notional meaning are considered to be prototypical adverbs.

As is widely accepted, prototypical adverbs can take both modifiers and complements. Furthermore, they can be used in coordination and can be negated. In contrast to this type of adverb, the set of adverbs that may be employed as discourse markers do not play a syntactic role in the predicate. In fact, their role is to link two or more segments in discourse, stressing the semantic and pragmatic connection between them. The meaning of the conjunctive adverbs is essentially relational, due to the fact that their main role is to structure discourse. The relational meaning of discourse markers is noticeable in examples (1) and (2), which cannot be interpreted using the temporal value of ἔπειτα and ἄμα:

(1) ἀλλά σευ ἢ κάματος πολυᾷξ γυῖα δέδυκεν | ἢ νύ σέ που δέος ἴσχει ἀκήριον·
οὐ σύ γ' ἔπειτα | Τυδέος ἔκγονός ἐσσι δαΐφρονος Οἰνεΐδαο (*Il.* 5.811-813) '...but fatigue from too much charging has seeped into your limbs, or perhaps some lifeless fear holds you hostage. *Thus* [****it follows that****] you're no offspring of Tydeus'

(2) ξεῖν', οὕτω γάρ κέν μοι εὐκλείη τ' ἀρετή τε | εἴη ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, ἄμα τ'
ἀντίκα καὶ μετέπειτα (*Hom. Od.* 14.402 s.) "Traveller, what fame and fortune I would gain myself in the eyes of men, *once and for all* // ****at the same time, both now and in the future****"

The failure to take complements or modifiers, the impossibility of their use in coordination with other discourse markers and their inability to be negated are other defining features of discourse markers.

The limits between prototypical adverbs and adverbs used as discourse markers are not often easy to determine. In practice, the intermediate points of this semantic and syntactic continuum cannot be established easily, as we are going to see in this presentation.

To date, the concept of discourse markers has essentially been used in analysis of modern Indo-European languages, but non in the case of Ancient Greek. However, the use of adverbs as discourse markers in ancient Greek was not a phenomenon that developed later on, but rather a trend that was yet established in Homer, at least for some semantic groups. Due to the fact that the use of temporal adverbs as discourse markers in Homer is not in doubt, as shown in examples (1) and (2), we will deal with those adverbs that have not yet received much attention.

In this presentation I will focus on the use of $\nu\tilde{\nu}$. First, we will describe the prototypical use of this adverb and then we will proceed to analyse its possible use as discourse marker. In these cases, the temporal implication associated with a prototypical use of this adverb normally persists, but we also recognize either a relational meaning that facilitates the inferences the interlocutor should draw from the speaker's words, as in (3), or a relational meaning that stresses the illocutive force of the message, as in (4). Thus, $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ may be interpreted in Homer both as an argumentative operator (3) and as a deontic modal marker (4). Let's explain these examples:

In the first one, Telemachus is speculating about the possibility that Odysseus could be alive; however, he corrects himself quickly and lets Athenea know what he really thinks:

(3) $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ δ' ὁ μὲν ὧς ἀπόλωλε κακὸν μόνον... (Od. 1.166) 'But, *as it is*, he is dead of an evil fate'

In the second one, Odysseus encourages his men to follow his orders in regard to avoid Scylla and Charybdis. Bear in mind the combination between $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ and ἄγετε, which is employed in Ancient Greek as a directive expression:

(4) $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ δ' ἄγεθ', ὧς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω, πειθόμεθα πάντες (Od. 12.213) *Come on!* Listen to my orders and all obey!

In this presentation, we will try to identify the semantic, pragmatic and textual factors that determine the evolution of $\nu\tilde{\nu}$ to the different types of discourse markers in Homer. Specifically, we will see that its use as a discourse marker might be evolved from its use as a temporal adverb.

References:

- Adam, J. M. (1992) : *Les textes : types et prototypes. Récit, description, argumentation, explicaction et dialogue*, Paris.
- Austin, J. L. (1962): *How to do things with words*, Oxford.
- Van der Auwera, J., (ed.) 1998: *Adverbial Construction in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin.
- Bakker, S.J.-Wakker, G.C. (eds.) (2009): *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*, Leiden.
- Bybee, J. - Fleischman, S. (1995): *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, Amsterdam.
- Chantraine, P. (1953): *Grammaire homerique. Tome II, Syntaxe*, Paris.
- Conti, L. (2012a): “Los adverbios conjuntivos en griego antiguo: Análisis de ἄμα en Homero, Platón y Jenofonte”, *Emerita*, in press.
- (2012b): “Zu Konjunktionaladverbien im Altgriechischen: Analyse von ἔπειτα bei Homer”, in *Von Fall zu Fall*, Wiesbaden, in press.
- Crespo, E. (2009): “Conjunctive Adverbs in Ancient Greek”, in *Early European Languages in the eyes of modern Linguistics*, Berno, 111-120.
- (2011): “Conjunctive Adverbs: A neglected Chapter to Greek Grammar”, in *A man in the Iberian Street, Papers in Linguistics and Epigraphy in Honour of Javier de Hoz*, Innsbruck, 35-44.
- Crespo, E.-Conti, L.-Maquieira, H. (2003): *Sintaxis del griego clásico*, Madrid.
- Denniston, J. D. (1954²): *The Greek Particles*, Oxford.
- Dik, S.C., Hengeveld, K. -Vester, E. - Vet, C. (1990): “The hierarchical structure of the clause and the typology of adverbial satellites”, in Nuyts, J. *et alii* (eds.), *Layers and levels of representation in language theory*, Amsterdam-Filadelfia, 25-70.
- Domínguez García, M. N. (2011): “Los marcadores del discurso y los tipos textuales”, in *Los estudios sobre marcadores del discurso en español, hoy*, Madrid, 259-413.
- Fischer, K. (ed.) (2006): *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Amsterdam.
- Fraser, B. (2006): “Towards a theory of discourse markers”, in *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Amsterdam, 189-204.
- Greenbaum, S. (1969): *Studies in English Adverbial usage*, London.
- Juker, A.H.-Ziv, Y. (eds.) (1998): *Discourse markers, descriptions and theory*, Amsterdam.

- Kroon, C. (1995): *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*, Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 4, Amsterdam.
- Martín Zorraquino, M. A. (2010): “Los marcadores del discurso y su morfología”, in *Los estudios sobre los marcadores del discurso en español, hoy*, Madrid, 93-182.
- Martín Zorraquino, M. A. - Portolés, J. (1999): “Los marcadores del discurso”, in *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, Madrid, 4051-4207.
- Pons Bordería, S. (2006): “A functional approach to the study of discourse markers”, in *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Amsterdam, 189-204.
- Portolés, J. L. (1998): *Marcadores del discurso*, Barcelona.
- Quirk, R. *et al.* (1985): *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London-New York.
- Risselada, R. (1994): “*Modo and sane*, or what to do with particles in Latin directives”, in *Linguistic Studies on Latin. Selected Papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics*, Filadelfia, 319-343.
- Searle, J.R. (1969): *Speech acts. An essay in the philosophy of language*, Cambridge.
- Searle, J. R.-Vanderveken, D. (1985): *Foundations of illocutionary Logic*, Cambridge.
- Schiffrrin, D. (1987): *Discourse Markers*, Cambridge.
- Wierznicka, A. (1992): «The semantics of interjection», *Journal of Pragmatics* 18, 159-192.
- Wilkins, D.P. (1992): «Interjections as deictics», *Journal of Pragmatics* 18, 119-158.