

ON CONJUNCTIVE ΑΛΛΩΣ

Rafael Martínez
Universidad de Sevilla
rmartinez@us.es

SOBRE ΑΛΛΩΣ CONJUNTIVO

ABSTRACT: This paper presents an identification and description, within a functional framework, of conjunctive uses of the adverb ἄλλως in several collocations with conjunctions and particles. The selected passages prove that the adverb was used in Ancient Greek prose in a variety of constructions expressing conditional, disjunctive, enumerative, adversative, additive and particularizing conjunction.

KEYWORDS: Ancient Greek syntax, conjunctive adverbs, ἄλλως, focusing adverbs, polyphony.

RESUMEN: El artículo presenta una identificación y descripción en un marco teórico funcional de empleos conjuntivos del adverbio ἄλλως en combinaciones varias con conjunciones y partículas. Los pasajes seleccionados demuestran que el adverbio fue usado en la prosa griega antigua en una variedad de construcciones en las que expresa conexión condicional, disyuntiva, enumerativa, aditiva y particularizadora.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Sintaxis del griego antiguo, adverbios conjuntivos, ἄλλως, adverbios de foco, polifonía.

RECIBIDO: 30.03.2016. ACEPTADO: 05.05.2016

The description and explanation of conjunctive adverbs has been neglected in traditional Ancient Greek grammars for two main reasons. Firstly, grammarians have focused on the syntax of the sentence, identifying the limits of the sentence with the limits of grammar. With the rare exception of a handful of particles and coordinating conjunctions, the study of the means for expressing relations between sentences and above the sentence have not been dealt with in grammar, because grammar was not thought to be concerned with them. Secondly, since adverbs are an open lexical class rather than a closed grammatical category, the study of the meaning and function of adverbs has been left to lexicographers, and thus most of the work on conjunctive adverbs in ancient Greek is found in the lexicons. During the past decades, however, interest in discourse particles – and

in particular conjunctive adverbs – has increased significantly. Greenbaum’s work on adverbial functions other than ad-verbal ones has been one turning point (Greenbaum 1969). Halliday’s work on cohesion and the grammatical structure of texts has undoubtedly served as a catalyst for further studies in Discourse Grammar (Halliday and Hassan 1976). Studies on discourse connectors in modern languages have provided a theoretical frame for their description and explanation in classical languages¹ and the definition of conjunctives as a subclass of adverbs in ancient Greek (Crespo, Conti and Maquieira 2003; Crespo 2009).

This paper presents an identification and description, within a functional framework, of conjunctive uses of the adverb ἄλλως in several collocations with conjunctions and particles. Quoted passages are drawn from a corpus of classical and post-classical prose texts². The different functions are classified according to Greenbaum’s (1969) subclasses of conjuncts, with reference to Halliday and Matthiessen’s (2004) functional tags for conjuncts whenever needed. I have also presented my findings within the frame of current discourse analysis theory for some of the functions (Fuentes 2009).

CONJUNCTIVE ADVERBS

In his seminal study of English adverbials, Greenbaum (1969) distinguishes three main classes of adverbials, which he terms *adjuncts*, *disjuncts* and *conjuncts*³. They are mainly distinguished on the basis of syntactic and semantic criteria, as well as the degree to which they are integrated into the structure of the clause:

“Roughly, adverbials that contribute to referential meaning are called adjuncts or circumstantial adverbials; those that convey the speaker’s evaluation of something in the proposition are called disjuncts or modal adverbials, and those that have mainly text-organizing and connective functions are called conjuncts or conjunctive/linking adverbials” (Hasselgård 2010:19).

¹ For instance, the frame developed by Schiffrin 1987 was later adapted and applied to Latin by Kroon 1995. See also Schrickx 2011 for an overview.

² The following authors have been included in the study: Hdt., Th., X., Pl., Arist., Plb. and Plut. The study has been supported by the Spanish Government (research projects FFI2012-36944-C03-03 and FFI 2009-13908-C03-03).

³ The classification has been widely adopted, although with different terms. So Biber *et al.* 1999 (*circumstance*, *stance* and *linking adverbials*); Halliday and Matthiessen 2004 (*circumstantial*, *modal* and *conjunctive adjuncts*). Quirk *et al.* 1985 add a fourth and less homogeneous class called ‘subjuncts’, characterized by their subordinate role either to the clause or to another constituent. They can express a wide range of meanings, which include viewpoint, courtesy, volition, subject-evaluation, time relationship, frequency, emphasis, intensification, approximation and focus. In other functional accounts of adverbials there is little room for conjunctives; see, e.g., Dik *et al.* 1990 and Ramat and Ricca 1998.

Conjunctive or connective⁴ adverbs serve to relate their hosting discourse unit (typically a sentence or clause, but smaller units as well) to the preceding adjacent text or, in extreme cases, even to the context⁵. Conjunctives are to some extent analogous to coordinators in that they link together the elements in a construction. The difference between conjunctives and coordinators lies in the type of link they establish. While coordinators relate two constituents of equal status at the level of the syntactic structure of the clause, conjunctives establish a cohesive connection between two segments of discourse (Martin 1992, Halliday and Matthiessen 2004), which can be described as different moves of an illocutive act. Thus, conjunctives perform the following functions: to link two independent sentences; to reinforce or specify the relation between two coordinated sentences or parts of sentences; to introduce a main clause after a subordinated clause; to introduce an extra-clausal constituent appended to a sentence or part of a sentence.

In the following sections, and after briefly reviewing the use of ἄλλως as a predicate adjunct, we will present a functional description of the conjunctive uses identified in the corpus. Some such uses have been identified in the lexica, though, as expected, no explanation is given other than a mere translation. Our aim is to comprehensively analyze the functional properties of ἄλλως in order to improve not only our knowledge of the semantic description of this particular adverb, but also our understanding of the behavior of conjunctive adverbs and their grammaticalization patterns in Ancient Greek.

MANNER ADVERB: PREDICATE ADJUNCT

The adverb is used as a predicate adjunct expressing manner: ‘in some other way’, ‘otherwise’, and appears conjoined to other predicate adjuncts (1). An alternative and equivalent form would be ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ (2).

- 1) Hdt. 1.5.10 οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἐρέων ὡς οὕτως ἢ ἄλλως κως ταῦτα ἐγένετο. I will not say that things happened thus or in some other way⁶.
- 2) Th. 2.18.1 προσβολὰς παρεσκευάζοντο τῷ τείχει ποιησόμενοι μηχαναῖς τε καὶ ἄλλῳ τρόπῳ. They prepared assaults against the wall with engines and otherwise.

⁴ ‘Connective adjuncts’ (Huddleston, Pullum *et al.* 2002: 775).

⁵ For Huddleston, Pullum *et al.* 2002: 775, the adverbial *right* in *Right, last week we were examining the Bloomfieldian concept of the morpheme* “can be subsumed under the category of connective if that term is understood in a suitably broad sense”.

⁶ Greek texts have been translated by the author in order to give an account of the intended interpretation.

CONDITIONAL CONNECTION

The adverb functions as a conditional conjunctive when, in an initial position⁷, it indicates that something must happen, if the previous assertion will not take place: ‘otherwise’, ‘else’. It appears combined with the particle *δέ*. In (3-4) it appears in contrast with a correlative conjunctive *οὕτως*, which stands *in apodosi* to a preceding conditional clause and functions as a positive conditional conjunctive, while *ἄλλως* always works as a negative conditional conjunctive (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 545):

- 3) Pl. *Euthd.* 306b εἰ δὲ κακὰ ἀμφοτέρα, οὕτως ἂν τι λέγοιεν ἀληθές, ἄλλως δ’ οὐδαμῶς. And if both are bad, in this case they would be stating some truth, but in any other case absolutely not.
- 4) X. *An.* 5.2.20 ἐσκόπουν εἰ οἷόν τε εἶη τὴν ἄκραν λαβεῖν· ἦν γὰρ οὕτως σωτηρία ἀσφαλῆς, ἄλλως δὲ πάνυ χαλεπὸν ἐδόκει εἶναι ἀπελθεῖν. They were looking to see whether it was possible to capture the citadel, for in that case safety was secured, while otherwise a withdrawal seemed to be very difficult.

In (5) it stands on its own:

- 5) Arist. *Rh.* 1419a 16 περὶ δὲ ἐρωτήσεως, εὐκαιρὸν ἐστὶ ποιεῖσθαι μάλιστα μὲν ὅταν... δεῦτερον δὲ ὅταν... ἔτι ὅταν... τέταρτον δὲ ὅταν... ἄλλως δὲ μὴ ἐγγχείρει. In regard to interrogation, its employment is especially opportune, when... secondly, when... next, when... fourthly, when... Otherwise, do not attempt interrogation.

The adverb is also used *in apodosi* to a preceding conditional, as the *participium conjunctum* in (6):

- 6) Hdt. 1.187.2 τῶν τις ἐμέο ὕστερον γινομένων Βαβυλωνος βασιλέων ἦν σπανίση χρημάτων, ἀνοίξας τὸν τάφον λαβέτω ὅκῳσα βούλεται χρήματα: μὴ μέντοι γε μὴ σπανίσας γε ἄλλως⁸ ἀνοίξῃ. If any one of the kings of Babylon after myself needs money, let him open this tomb and take as much as he likes; but, otherwise, if he is not in need, let him not open it.

In (7) it functions as an ordering device, and accordingly appears combined with *μέν* and opposed to *νῦν δέ* ‘but now / but in fact’.

⁷ Initial position is important, though not determinant, if my analysis of (6) is correct. In Modern English, where position is more fixed and relevant, an adverb such as *otherwise* cannot be placed sentence-initially as manner adjunct (Greenbaum 1969: 77).

⁸ It should be noted that the analysis given in the text is based on one possible reading, namely taking the adverb as pro-conditional. The apodotic use of conjunctives, though pleonastic, is well attested elsewhere (Ruiz Yamuza 2011). A reviewer suggests that *ἄλλως* could be operating here as an adjunct, and offers the following as a possible rendering: “not being otherwise in need = generally/at all”. Surely the adverb might be read as adjunct, as well, but in that case we would link it to the imperative *ἀνοίξῃ*, ‘let him not open it for other reasons’. It is virtually impossible to draw a neat line between the functional domains of adjuncts and conjuncts in cases like this one (Martínez and Ruiz Yamuza 2011).

- 7) Hdt. 1.42.1-2 ἄλλως μὲν ἔγωγε ἂν οὐκ ἦμα ἐς ἄεθλον τοιόνδε· ...πολλαχῆ τε ἂν ἴσχον ἐμεωυτόν. Νῦν δέ, ἐπεῖτε σὺ σπεύδεις καὶ δεῖ τοι χαρίζεσθαι... ποιέειν εἰμὶ ἔτοιμος ταῦτα. I would not otherwise have gone into such a contest. And for many reasons I would have held back. But now, since you urge it and I must please you, I am ready to do this.

DISJUNCTIVE CONNECTION

Unlike ὁμοίως, which may be combined with a disjunctive conjunction to express inclusive disjunction (8), the collocation ἢ ἄλλως is used to express exclusive disjunction, where only one of the alternatives is presented as valid (9):

- 8) Hdt. 2.90.1 ὅς δ' ἂν ἢ αὐτῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἢ ξείνων ὁμοίως... τούτους πᾶσα ἀνάγκη ἐστὶ ταριχεύσαντας αὐτόν καὶ περιστείλαντας ὡς κάλλιστα θάψαι ἐν ἱρῆσι θήκησι. Anyone, both Egyptians and foreigners alike... it is absolutely necessary for them to embalm and wrap him as attractively as possible and bury him in a sacred coffin.
- 9) Hdt. 5.8.1 ἔπειτα δὲ θάπτουσι κατακαύσαντες ἢ ἄλλως γῆ κρύψαντες. Next, they do away with the body either by burning it or else by burying it in the earth.

In (8) Herodotus refers to both Egyptians and foreigners, and thus the construction is additive, but in (9) only an exclusive reading is acceptable. In the following passage it is unclear whether εἴτε καὶ ἄλλως renders an inclusive reading 'or also, in other respects' or an exclusive reading, 'or else', since both interpretations are possible. The presence of an additive καὶ favors an inclusive reading, marking a transition from a particular to a general point, a shift in generality frequently expressed by the adverb in other constructions⁹:

- 10) Hdt. 2.181.1 ἐδικαίωσε δὲ καὶ γῆμαι αὐτόθεν, εἴτε ἐπιθυμήσας Ἑλληνίδος γυναικός, εἴτε καὶ ἄλλως φιλότητος Κυρηναίων εἵνεκα. And he also decided to marry someone from there, either for want of a Greek wife, or, in other respects, for the sake of the Corcyreans' friendship.

In later Greek the collocation ἢ... ἄλλως ἢ is found, where the adverb again stands by the disjunct with general reference.

- 11) Plu. *Nic.* 11.1 ...ὀστρακοφορίας, ἣν εἰώθει διὰ χρόνον τινὸς ὁ δῆμος ποιεῖσθαι, ἕνα τῶν ὑπόπτων ἢ διὰ δόξαν ἄλλως ἢ πλοῦτον ἐπιφθόνων ἀνδρῶν τῷ ὀστράκῳ μεθιστὰς εἰς δέκα ἔτη. ...the process of ostracism, which the people used to make use of from time to time, removing for ten years, by the ostrakon, either one of the suspicious men because of their reputation, generally, or one of the envied men because of their wealth.

⁹ Shifts in specificity and generality are typically present in contexts of reformulation and reworking (see, for instance, Martín 1992: 210). All constructions presented in this paper appear in other contexts.

The sense conveyed by the adverb points to ‘for reasons such as reputation generally, but at times simply for jealousy’, again marking a transition from the general to the particular case.

ENUMERATIVE CONNECTION

Enumerative conjunctive adverbs are a subclass of listing connectors which basically indicate that the segment they introduce contains information to be added to previous information (Greenbaum 1969: 35-6). Enumeratives do so in order to form a sequence of informative units. The use of ἄλλως combined with μέν... δέ found in the corpus shows a clear compatibility of the adverb with the correlating particles to express a relation in a contrasting pair, similar to ‘on the one hand... on the other’, with the sense of a negative matter conjunctive (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 547-8) to indicate that something added to a previously mentioned case exists in other respects than the former: ‘in other respects’, ‘for the rest’:

- 12) Arist. *Metaph.* 1042a 27 ἔστι δ’ οὐσία τὸ ὑποκείμενον, ἄλλως μὲν ἢ ὕλη (ὕλην δὲ λέγω ἢ μὴ τότε τι οὐσα ἐνεργεία δυνάμει ἐστὶ τότε τι), ἄλλως δ’ ὁ λόγος καὶ ἡ μορφή, ὃ τότε τι ὄν τῷ λόγῳ χωριστόν ἐστιν· τρίτον δὲ τὸ ἐκ τούτων. And the substrate is substance; in one sense matter (by matter I mean that which is not actually, but is potentially, an individual thing); and in another the formula and the specific shape (which is an individual thing and is theoretically separable); and thirdly, there is the combination of the two.

The function of the adverb here is to specify the relation established by the correlatives μέν... δέ as an alternation – an enumeration of alternative cases (Longacre 1996: 105-6). The collocation μέν... ἄλλως δέ seems to perform the same function, ‘in one respect... in another’, when the correlative pair μέν... δέ does not have an adversative nuance:

- 13) Hdt. 6.105.1 οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀποπέμπουσι ἐς Σπάρτην κήρυκα Φιλίππιδην, Ἀθηναῖον μὲν ἄνδρα, ἄλλως δὲ ἡμεροδρόμην τε καὶ τοῦτο μελετῶντα. The generals sent to Sparta the herald Philippides, an Athenian and, in another respects, a long-distance runner and a professional one.

ADVERSATIVE CONNECTION

The adverb is also used as a negative matter conjunctive in the collocation with an adversative pair μέν... δέ. Here the addition of ἄλλως strengthens the contrast expressed by μέν... δέ: ‘but otherwise, though otherwise’:

- 14) Hdt. 5.31.1 ὡς Νάξος εἶη νῆσος μεγάθει μὲν οὐ μεγάλη ἄλλως δὲ καλή τε καὶ ἀγαθὴ καὶ ἀγχοῦ Ἰωνίης, χρήματα δὲ ἔνι πολλὰ καὶ ἀνδράποδα. That Naxos

was an island of no great size, but that it was otherwise a beautiful and noble island, and next to Ionia, and it also had much wealth and slaves.

- 15) X. *Ap.* 28 παρὼν δέ τις Ἀπολλόδορος, ἐπιθυμητῆς μὲν ὢν ἰσχυρῶς αὐτοῦ, ἄλλως δ' εὐήθης. A man named Apollodorus was there, who was a passionate disciple of Socrates, but otherwise simple.
- 16) Plu. *Sol.* 23.4 ἄς γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἐκκαιδεκάτῳ τῶν ἀξόνων ὀρίζει τιμὰς τῶν ἐκκρίτων ἱερείων, εἰκὸς μὲν εἶναι πολλαπλασίας, ἄλλως δὲ κάκεινα πρὸς τὰς νῦν εὐτελεῖς εἰσιν. For the prices which Solon fixes in his sixteenth table for choice victims, are naturally many times as great, still, even those in comparison with present prices are low.

An even stronger adversative force is perceived in ἄλλως μέντοι:

- 17) Hdt. 1.102.2 ...καὶ ἦρχον πρότερον πάντων, τότε δὲ ἦσαν μεμουνωμένοι μὲν συμμάχων ἅτε ἀπεστεώτων, ἄλλως μέντοι ἐσωτῶν εὖ ἦκοντες. And they had formerly been rulers of all, but then they were left alone, their allies having deserted them, though still they were a strong people by themselves.

The adverb is also found attached to the first correlative: ἄλλως μὲν... δέ. Now the construction is used to build an argumentative sequence where the validity of a first argument is conceded to a limited degree (ἄλλως μὲν) while it is next replaced by a stronger one (δέ): 'surely in general / for the rest / in other respects / otherwise... but' (Cp. Lat. *ceteroquin*).

- 18) Pl. *Phdr.* 229d ἐγὼ δέ, ὦ Φαῖδρε, ἄλλως μὲν τὰ τοιαῦτα χαρίεντα ἡγοῦμαι, λίαν δὲ δεινοῦ καὶ ἐπιπόνου καὶ οὐ πάνυ εὐτυχοῦς ἀνδρός... Well, I, Phaedrus, consider such explanations pretty charming in other respects, but mere inventions of a very clever and laborious and not too blessed man.
- 19) Plu. *Ly.* 12.5 (Cp. Plu. *Ly.* 23.2) ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐνταῦθα τῆς γῆς ἔβρισε καὶ παυσάμενοι φόβου καὶ θάμβους οἱ ἐπιχώριοι συνῆλθον, ὤφθη πυρὸς μὲν οὐδὲν ἔργον οὐδ' ἶχνος τοσοῦτο, λίθος δὲ κεείμενος, ἄλλως μὲν μέγας, οὐθὲν δὲ μέρος, ὡς εἰπεῖν, ἐκείνης τῆς πυροειδοῦς περιοχῆς ἔχων. But when it had fallen in that spot of the earth, and the inhabitants, having ceased their fear and amazement, gathered around, no action nor such a trace of fire was seen, but a stone lying there, of large size, it is true, but having no portion, so to say, of that fiery body.

ADDITIVE CONNECTION

One of the values of the collocation καὶ ἄλλως is to indicate that something exists in other cases besides those mentioned before: 'yet', 'besides', 'moreover'¹⁰. Like adversative ἄλλως δέ, additive καὶ ἄλλως is frequent in descriptive passages

¹⁰ This value is clearly identified in some lexicons. See the DGE.

where it conjoins two adjectives: ‘both... and besides’. The adjectives may express two independent properties or states as in (20-21).

20) Th. 8.38.3 οἱ δὲ Χῖοι ἐν πολλαῖς ταῖς πρὶν μάχαις πεπληγμένοι, καὶ ἄλλως ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς οὐ πάνυ εὖ διακείμενοι. The Chians, defeated in many previous battles, were also at discord among themselves.

21) X. *HG* 6.1.6 αὐτὸς δ’ ἐστὶ, λέγειν γὰρ χρὴ πρὸς ὑμᾶς τάληθῆ, καὶ τὸ σῶμα μάλα εὐρωστος καὶ ἄλλως φιλόπονος. And he himself is – for I must tell you the truth – not only very strong of body but also a lover of toil besides.

Or the conjuncts may have a specific and a generic reference, respectively, so that one of the mentioned properties is included in the other: ‘both... and, as for the rest’. The adverb is placed with the term expressing the general property:

22) Hdt. 1.60.4 ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τῷ Παιανιεῖ ἦν γυνή, τῇ οὖνομα ἦν Φύη, μέγαθος ἀπὸ τεσσέρων πήχεων ἀπολείπουσα τρεῖς δακτύλους καὶ ἄλλως εὐειδής. There was in the Paeanian deme a woman called Phya, three fingers short of four elbows in height, and otherwise, too, well-formed.

23) Hdt. 9.20.1 ἵππον ἔχων Νησαῖον χρυσοχάλινόν τε καὶ ἄλλως κεκοσμημένον καλῶς. He had a Nesaeian horse which had a golden bit and was elsewhere beautifully adorned.

Another construction of ἄλλως as a re-enforcement of an additive conjunction is ἄλλως τε... καί, ‘both (in other ways)... and’. There the adverb forms a functional unit with the correlative conjunctions, merely ‘both... and’ (24).

24) Th. 8.38.2 Δελφίνιον ἐτείχιζον, χωρίον ἄλλως τε ἐκ γῆς καρτερόν καὶ λιμένας ἔχον καὶ τῆς τῶν Χίων πόλεως οὐ πολὺ ἀπέχον. (The Athenians) fortified Delphinium, a place strong on the land side, provided with harbors, and not far from the city of Chios.

Connecting full sentences, the adverb indicates that its host unit expresses a proposition stated in general terms, but also elaborates on a previous discourse unit in order to strengthen its discourse value as an argument (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 541). It is frequent in γάρ clauses in the corpus, particularly in descriptions, marking a transition from a particular to a general point.

25) Hdt. 2.77.2-3 συρμαΐζουσι τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐπεξῆς μηνὸς ἐκάστου, ἐμέτοισι θηρώμενοι τὴν ὑγιεῖν καὶ κλύσμασι, νομίζοντες ἀπὸ τῶν τρεφόντων σιτιῶν πάσας τὰς νούσους τοῖσι ἀνθρώποισι γίνεσθαι. εἰσὶ μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλως Αἰγύπτιοι μετὰ Λίβυας ὑγιηρέστατοι πάντων ἀνθρώπων. They purge themselves for three consecutive days every month, pursuing health by means of emetics and drenches; for they think that all sicknesses come to men from the food they eat. In fact, the Egyptians are generally the healthiest of all men, next to the Libyans.

26) Th. 3.39.5 χρῆν δὲ Μυτιληναίους καὶ πάλαι μηδὲν διαφερόντως τῶν ἄλλων ὕφ' ἡμῶν τετιμῆσθαι, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐς τόδε ἐξύβρισαν· πέφυκε γὰρ καὶ ἄλλως ἄνθρωπος τὸ μὲν θεραπεῖον ὑπερφρονεῖν, τὸ δὲ μὴ ὑπεῖκον θαυμάζειν. We should have treated the Mitylenians long ago like the rest, and they never would have become so insolent; for in fact humans tend by nature to be arrogant with those who treat them well, and to admire those who do not yield¹¹.

Instances like (27-28) are to be interpreted in this way. The difference is that the general point is made first, and the specific statement is introduced by καὶ νῦν. Although the adverb in (27) seems to point to a temporal nuance, ‘always’, in (28) the presence of a temporal adjunct ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ shows that ἄλλως has a mere generalizing function, ‘both in general... and’.

27) X. *Cyr.* 8.7.25 ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ ἄλλως φιλόανθρωπος ἐγενόμην καὶ νῦν ἡδέως ἂν μοι δοκῶ κοινωῆσαι τοῦ εὐεργετοῦντος ἀνθρώπου. [Cyrus has instructed his people to bury him.] I have always been benevolent to man, and now I think I should gladly become a part of (earth) which does him much good.

28) Pl. *Phd.* 116c σὲ δὲ ἐγὼ καὶ ἄλλως ἔγνωκα ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ γενναιότατον καὶ πραότατον καὶ ἄριστον ἄνδρα ὄντα τῶν πώποτε δεῦρο ἀφικομένων, καὶ δὴ καὶ νῦν εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι οὐκ ἐμοὶ χαλεπαίνεις, γινώσκεις γὰρ τοὺς αἰτίους, ἀλλὰ ἐκείνοις. I have found you in all this time generally the noblest and gentlest and best man of those who have ever come here, and now I know well that you are not angry with me – for you know the ones responsible – but with them.

PARTICULARIZING CONNECTION

The adverb plays a crucial role in the locution ἄλλως τε καί, lit. ‘both otherwise and, especially’, which acts as a particularizing conjunctive (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 541) that elaborates on a previous segment and clarifies its reference by giving a more specific description. It works as a cohesive conjunctive device between two discourse segments, which is why it has been treated as a conjunctive locution in this paper.

Ἄλλως τε καί introduces a phrase or a dependent clause as a supplement or extra-clausal constituent. It is placed to the right of its anchor¹², either in the form of an interpolation or parenthesis, or in the form of an appendage (technically, ‘tail’ or ‘appendix’), on the right periphery of the sentence. At the level of discourse structure, the construction shows two moves with different illocutive

¹¹ Classen: “über den vorliegenden Fall hinaus zur allgemeinen Bemerkung erweiternd”.

¹² Supplements or extra-clausal constituents are semantically linked to an anchor, not syntactically dependent on a head (Huddleston, Pullum *et al.* 2002: 1350 ff.). On extra-clausal constituents in general, see Dik 1997: 379-407.

functions. First, there is an assertion (or any other illocutive act) that states a point. Next, there is a second move that forces the addressee to turn back to the former and reinterpret it with reference to the information just added. This has been called a structure of re-interpretation (Fuentes 2009).

From a structural point of view there are two slightly different constructions with ἄλλως τε καί that resemble the ‘constituent-like’ and ‘sentence-like’ appendices described in other languages (van der Wouden 2000). In the first construction the supplement is linked to a constituent anchor and its function closely resembles that of a free partitive apposition (Heringa 2002). In the second construction ἄλλως τε καί introduces an extra-clausal constituent in the form of a non-finite clause (participium coniunctum or genitive absolute) or an adverbial subordinate clause (conditional or causal), and is anchored to its hosting sentence.

29) Pl. *Smp.* 173c ὅταν δὲ ἄλλους τινάς, ἄλλως τε καὶ τοὺς ὑμετέρους τοὺς τῶν πλουσίων καὶ χρηματιστικῶν, αὐτός τε ἄχθομαι ὑμᾶς τε τοὺς ἐταίρους ἐλεῶ. But when (I listen to) other sorts of talk, especially yours, of wealthy and money-making men, I am annoyed and feel sorry for you, my fellows.

30) X. *Smp.* 1.8.1 εὐθὺς μὲν οὖν ἐννοήσας τις τὰ γινόμενα ἠγήσατ’ ἂν φύσει βασιλικόν τι κάλλος εἶναι, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἂν μετ’ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης, καθάπερ Αὐτόλυκος τότε, κεκτῆταί τις αὐτό. Anyone who could realize what was happening would think that beauty is by nature something kingly, especially when one possesses it, as Autolycus does, with modesty and sobriety.

In (29) ἄλλως τε καί introduces an interpolated NP, τοὺς ὑμετέρους τοὺς τῶν πλουσίων καὶ χρηματιστικῶν, in appositive relation to the preceding NP, ἄλλους τινάς. In (30) the ἂν conditional clause is appended to the preceding infinitive clause.

In a functional perspective there are, again, two slightly different constructions. In one of them, the supplement has a restrictive function. In the other, the supplement has an explicative role. The partially restrictive construction involves, as in above-mentioned uses, a transition from a general to a particular expression. Both (29) and (30) are restrictive. Constituent-anchored supplements seem to have this function in all cases. Sentence-anchored supplements may have either the restrictive or the explicative function.

The constituent-anchored restrictive construction with ἄλλως τε καί appears, in any case, very infrequently, as the usual indicator of partitive free appositions (Heringa 2002) in Ancient Greek is the adverb μάλιστα (Martínez, in press), as illustrated in (31):

31) Th. 8.73.6 βοηθησάντων πάντων τούτων, μάλιστα δὲ τῶν Παράλων. All these came to the rescue, and above all the people of the Paralus.

These constructions have been explained as restrictive focus constructions (Quirk *et al.* 1985; König 1991; Sudhoff 2010). The semantic contribution of the

conjunctive is to indicate that the proposition applies predominantly to the constituent it introduces. The adverb somehow quantifies over a set of entities to which the proposition possibly applies, and selects the one under its scope as the most fit. The constituent modified by the adverb thus becomes an (alternative) focus, namely, a restrictive focus.

In the second construction the sentence-like supplementary constituent is always linked to the whole clause as its anchor and appears again as a parenthetical interpolation or as an appendage on the right periphery of the sentence. But the anchor-sentence is not generic and the supplement is not restrictive. Consider the following (32-33):

- 32) Pl. *Phdr.* 247c ἔχει δὲ ὧδε – τολμητέον γὰρ οὖν τό γε ἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν, ἄλλως τε καὶ περὶ ἀληθείας λέγοντα... It is thus; for I must dare to tell the truth, especially as I am speaking about truth.
- 33) X. *Mem.* 2.8.1 δοκεῖ δέ μοι τοῦτο κρεῖττον εἶναι ἢ δεῖσθαί τινος ἀνθρώπων, ἄλλως τε καὶ μηδὲν ἔχοντα ἐφ' ὅτῳ ἂν δανειζοίμην. I think that's better than begging, especially as I have no security to offer for a loan.

The supplement is used as a strengthening addition that supports the previous statement or proposal, even strengthening its informative profile¹³. This function is performed at the level of the logical relations between propositions, where the conjunctive adds a circumstance that re-enforces what has been previously said, increasing its argumentative force. Informatively, these constituents are postponed settings, and the information they provide is accordingly highly presuppositional. The general function of conditional and causal ἐπειδή clauses in the left margin is thematic: they act as settings that provide a conceptual frame or an orientation for the clause that follows. As Dik¹⁴ defines them, “Settings will provide information that is not previously given, but has to be considered as presupposed.” For obvious reasons, the orientative and scene-setting function performed by settings turns into clarification when these appear as appendices. But the content of the appended supplement in this construction is highly presuppositional, as is shown by the fact that, when it is attached to an interrogative sentence, the appendix falls out of the scope of interrogation¹⁵. Thus in (34-35):

- 34) X. *Smp.* 8.1.1 ἄρ', ἔφη, ὧ ἄνδρες, εἰκὸς ἡμᾶς παρόντος δαίμονος μεγάλου καὶ τῷ μὲν χρόνῳ ἰσηλικὸς τοῖς ἀειγενέσι θεοῖς, τῇ δὲ μορφῇ νεωτάτου, καὶ μεγέθει πάντα ἐπέχοντος, ψυχῇ δὲ ἀνθρώπου ἰδρυμένου, Ἐρωτος, μὴ [ἂν]

¹³ Appendices are used for clarification, weakening, falsification, correction or comment, as well (van der Wouden 2000: 4).

¹⁴ She treats Settings as intra-clausal constituents, basically because she sees “no reason to consider the Settings extracausal” (Dik 2007: 37).

¹⁵ Both questions are rhetorical, implying either a proposal or a statement. Still, the appended constituent falls out of the scope of the intended proposal and assertion.

ἀμνημονῆσαι, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐπειδὴ πάντες ἐσμὲν τοῦ θεοῦ τούτου θιασῶται; “Gentlemen,” said he, “it should be expected from us, should it not, in the presence of a mighty deity of the same age as the eternal gods, yet youngest of all in appearance, and also in magnitude encompassing all things, but dwelling in man’s soul, namely Eros, that we should not forget him, particularly in view of the fact that we are all his following?”

- 35) Pl. *R.* 456c οὐκοῦν πρὸς γε τὸ φυλακικὴν γυναῖκα γενέσθαι, οὐκ ἄλλη μὲν ἡμῖν ἄνδρας ποιήσει παιδεία, ἄλλη δὲ γυναῖκας, ἄλλως τε καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν φύσιν παραλαβοῦσα; In order to become a guardian, then, will we not have one education for men and another for women, especially since it receives one and the same nature?

The functional difference between a right-margin setting and one on the left periphery is that the former has an additional explanatory role in a context of re-interpretation. Moreover, when approached from a more illocutive or even interpersonal perspective, this construction may represent a case of diaphony or polyphony (Ducrot 1984; Kroon 1995; Nølke *et al.* 2004; Anscombe *et al.* 2012). This point is best illustrated by examples in narrative passages, where the appended segment introduces a comment by the author which explains the previous statement, more than a mere cause of the previous event:

Th. 2.3.1 οἱ δὲ Πλαταιῆς ὡς ἦσθοντο ἔνδον τε ὄντας τοὺς Θηβαίους καὶ ἐξαπιναίως κατειλημμένην τὴν πόλιν, καταδείσαντες καὶ νομίσαντες πολλῷ πλείους ἐσεληλυθέναι (οὐ γὰρ ἑώρων ἐν τῇ νυκτί) πρὸς ξύμβασιν ἐχώρησαν καὶ τοὺς λόγους δεξάμενοι ἠσύχαζον, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐς οὐδένα οὐδὲν ἐνεωτέριζον. As the Plataeans became aware that the Thebans were inside, and that the town had been occupied quickly, and having concluded in their fear that many more had entered than was really the case – for they could not see in the night – they came to terms, and accepting the proposal, made no movement, especially as the Thebans were exerting no violence against any of them.

Th. 2.85.2 ἐδόκει γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἄλλως τε καὶ πρῶτον ναυμαχίας πειρασαμένοις πολὺς ὁ παράλογος εἶναι, καὶ οὐ τοσοῦτω ᾤοντο σφῶν τὸ ναυτικὸν λείπεσθαι, γεγενῆσθαι δὲ τινα μαλακίαν. For they thought – mostly because it was their first attempt at a battle at sea – that the situation had been very absurd, and that their navy was not so inferior, but that there had been misbehavior somewhere.

The conjunctive has a polyphonic effect, in that it introduces a piece of information presented from a different point of view than the information given in the anchor (Portolés 2011). The appended constituent and the anchor sentence thus represent different ‘voices’ of Thucydides, namely the voice of the narrator

who gives an account of the facts and the rational historian who gives his personal reflections and comments on the related facts¹⁶. Even though there is no explicit reference to the communicative frame in which the passage is integrated, I dare suggest that we are dealing with ‘diaphonic’ moves in the sense observed by Kroon (1995: 112-3).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the preceding sections I have presented an analysis of some passages in which we can identify the conjunctive function served by the adverb ἄλλως in Ancient Greek prose. As a conjunctive, it establishes a cohesive relation between sentences, between main and subordinate clauses, between (adjective) phrases, and also between a sentence and an appended extra-clausal constituent. Likewise, it always appears in collocations with the additive particles δέ and (τε) καί, with the only exception shown in (6), where it stands *in apodosis* to a participle. Thus, its basic contribution is to either specify or strengthen the relation expressed by the particle¹⁷. Semantically, it serves different conjunctive functions. It expresses a specific semantic relation when it serves the conditional, disjunctive, enumerative functions. Combined with adversative and additive particles it can merely re-enforce the relation expressed by the particle. The conjunctive status of the adverb has been proved, which was the main objective of this study.

In the last section I have presented an analysis of the construction ἄλλως τε καί, which points to the overlapping of the particularizing conjunctive and restrictive focusing functions¹⁸, as well as their compatibility with extra-clausal constituents. This feature of conjunctives surely merits further research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anscombre *et al.* 2012: J-C. Anscombre, A. Rodríguez Somolinos and S. Gómez-Jordana (eds.), *Voix et marqueurs du discours: des connecteurs à l'argument d'autorité* (Lyon 2012).
- Biber *et al.* 1999: D. Biber, S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad and E. Finnegan, *The Longman grammar of spoken and written English* (London 1999).
- Buijs 2007: M. Buijs, “Aspectual differences and narrative technique: Xenophon’s Hellenica and Agesilaus”, in R. J. Allan and M. Buijs (eds.), *The language of literature: linguistic approaches to classical texts* (Leiden 2007) 122-53.

¹⁶ Cp. the collocation γε μήν, which is characteristic of those sections of Xenophon’s *Agesilaus* that contain the author’s evaluative commentaries on Agesilaus’ life as opposed to simple diegetic narrative sections, as Buijs (2007: 126–7) observes.

¹⁷ I follow Kovacci 1999 in considering this as (at least) one basic function of conjunctives.

¹⁸ See König 1991: 64-66. The adverb μάλιστα also points to such an overlapping (Martínez, in press).

- Classen: J. Classen, *Thukydides* (Berlin 1862-1878).
- Crespo 2009: E. Crespo, “Conjunctive adverbs in Ancient Greek”, in K. Loudová and M. Žáková (eds.), *Early European languages in the eyes of modern linguistics* (Brno 2009) 111-120.
- Crespo, Conti and Maquieira 2003: E. Crespo, L. Conti and H. Maquieira, *Sintaxis Griega* (Madrid 2003).
- DGE: F.R. Adrados (ed.), *Diccionario Griego-Español* (Madrid 1989-).
- Dik 2007: H. Dik, *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue* (Oxford 2007).
- Dik *et al.* 1990: S. Dik, K. Hengeveld, E. Vester and C. Vet., “The Hierarchical Structure of the Clause and the Typology of Adverbial Satellites”, in J. Nuyts, A. M. Bolkenstein and C. Vet. (eds.), *Layers and Levels of Representation in Language Theory: a functional view* (Amsterdam 1990) 25-70.
- Dik 1997: S. Dik, *The theory of functional grammar*, Part 2: *Complex and Derived Constructions* (2nd, revised edition, ed. by K. Hengeveld) (Berlin / New York 1997).
- Ducrot 1984: O. Ducrot, *Le dire et le dit* (Paris 1984).
- Fuentes 2009: C. Fuentes, *Diccionario de conectores y operadores del español* (Madrid 2009).
- Greenbaum 1969: S. Greenbaum, *Studies in English Adverbial Usage* (London 1969).
- Halliday and Hassan 1976: M. A. K. Halliday and R. Hassan, *Cohesion in English* (London 1976).
- Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: M. A. K. Halliday – Ch. Matthiessen, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (London 2004).
- Hasselgård 2010: H. Hasselgård, *Adjunct Adverbials in English* (Cambridge 2010).
- Heringa 2002: H. Heringa, *Appositional Constructions* (Utrecht 2002).
- Huddleston, Pullum, *et al.* 2002: R. Huddleston, G. K. Pullum *et al.*, *The Cambridge grammar of the English language* (Cambridge 2002).
- Kovacci, O. 1999: *El adverbio*. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, ed. I. Bosque and V. Demonte (Madrid 1999) 705-786.
- König, E. 1991: *The meaning of focus particles: a comparative perspective* (London 1991).
- Kroon, C. 1995. *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of “nam”, “enim”, “autem”, “vero” and “at.”* (Amsterdam 1995).
- Longacre 1996: R. Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse* (New York / London 1996).
- Martin 1992: J. R. Martin, *English Text: System and Structure* (Amsterdam 1992).
- Martínez, in press: R. Martínez, “Adverbios de foco en griego clásico: μάλιστα”, to appear in *Minerva* 29.
- Martínez and Ruiz Yamuza 2011: R. Martínez and E. Ruiz Yamuza, “Una aproximación escalar al empleo del adverbio como adjunto y conjunto: οὐτως” *Habis* 42 (2011) 317-337.
- Nølke *et al.* 2004: H. Nølke, K. Fløttum and C. Norén, *ScaPoLine. La théorie scandinave de la polyphonie linguistique* (Paris 2004).

- Portolés 2011: J. Portolés, “Las partículas focales desde una perspectiva polifónica”, in H. Aschenberg and Ó. Loureda (eds.), *Marcadores del discurso: de la descripción a la definición* (Madrid / Frankfurt 2011) 51-76.
- Quirk *et al.* 1985: R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (London/New York 1985).
- Ramat and Ricca 1998: P. Ramat D. Ricca, “Sentence adverbs in the Languages of Europe”, in J. van der Auwera (ed.), *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe* (Berlin 1998) 187-275.
- Ruiz Yamuza 2011: E. Ruiz Yamuza, “Apodotic uses between syntax and text”, in E. Torrego, E. Crespo and A. Pompei (eds.), *Linguistics and Classical Languages* (Rome, February 17th-19th 2011) [Book of Abstracts] (Cantoblanco-Roma 2011) 65.
- Schiffirin 1987: D. Schiffirin, *Discourse markers* (Cambridge 1987).
- Schrickx 2011: J. Schrickx, *Lateinische Modal Partikeln* (Leiden 2011).
- Sudhoff 2010: S. Sudhoff, *Focus Particles in German* (Amsterdam 2010).
- van der Wouden 2000: A. van der Wouden, “Focus on appendices in Dutch”, *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 01/2000; 17. DOI: 10.1075/avt.17.22wou. accessed 13/02/2016 at https://www.researchgate.net/publication/46614966_Focus_on_appendices_in_Dutch.