BRILL

Connectives and discourse markers in Ancient Greek

The diachrony of atár *from Homeric Greek to Classical Attic*

Guglielmo Inglese*
Università degli Studi di Pavia/Università degli Studi di Bergamo
guglielmo.inglese01@ateneopv.it

Abstract

The Ancient Greek particle *atár* has been described as a connective device that encodes either an adversative or a progressive relation between sentences. The purpose of this paper is to revise the description of this particle by framing its analysis within a consistent and theoretically up-to-date model of clause linkage and discourse structure. Starting from previous findings on the function of *atár* in Homer, I undertake a corpus analysis of *atár* in Euripides and Aristophanes. This analysis reveals differences in usage at different stages of the language that have been previously neglected. Whereas in Homer, *atár* largely behaves as a connective and encodes a semantic relation of oppositive contrast between sentences, in later texts it rather behaves as a discourse marker and contributes to the management of both thematic continuity and interactional practices. These differences point to a specific diachronic path of grammaticalization that accounts for the changes undergone by *atár*.

Keywords

Ancient Greek – connectives – discourse markers – grammaticalization – conversation analysis

1   Introduction

In this paper, I propose a new descriptive framework for the particle *atár* in Ancient Greek and provide a detailed account of its functions in a diachronic corpus with texts ranging from Homeric to Classical Greek. The aim of the work is twofold. In the first place, I provide a new synchronic analysis of the function of *atár* in Ancient Greek. In reference works, *atár* has been described as a particle whose function is to establish adversative or progressive relations between sentences. My first aim is to give a more accurate, corpus-based, and theoretically updated description of *atár*, exploiting the notions of connective (cf. Halliday & Hasan 1976, Mauri 2008, Mauri & van der Auwera 2012) and of discourse marker (cf. Schiffrin 2003, Blackemore 2006, Diewald 2011, Heine 2013). These two notions also help shed light on the differences in usage between different periods of the language. In addition, my analysis is framed within a consistent model of discourse structure (Kroon 1995). The second aim of the paper is to account for these differences in diachronic terms. It is now commonly agreed upon that discourse markers can develop out of several lexical sources following specific paths of grammaticalization (cf. Traugott 1995, 2010a; Giacalone Ramat & Mauri 2009; Diewald 2011; Heine 2013), and this also applies to Greek particles (Allan 2017a). I illustrate how such a diachronic development might have taken place in the case of *atár* and discuss a number of critical contexts out of which the new functions have arisen, showing how dialogicity plays a key role in explaining such a change (Traugott 2010b).

The paper is organized as follows: in the second section, I briefly recapitulate the traditional analysis of *atár*. In the third section, I discuss the theoretical foundations of this work, and introduce the notions of connective and of discourse marker. In Section 4, I provide an outline of the function of *atár* in Homeric Greek, and then, in Section 5, I address the issue of the function of *atár* in Classical Greek. Finally, in Section 6, I discuss the diachronic interpretation of the data. Section 7 contains a concluding summary.

2   Etymology and previous scholarship

The form *atár* is a Greek formation, possibly formed within the Ionic dialect, but based on inherited Indo-European material (Ruijgh 1957: 43). According to Beekes (2010: 162), the form goes back to PIE *h_2et* (cf. Lat. *at*, Got. *aþþan*), combined with *ára*, itself the outcome of PIE *$h_2(e)r$* (cf. Lith. *iř*, Latv. *ìr*).[1] It

---

1   Following Beekes (2010), I assume the forms *atár* and *autár* to be etymologically unrelated.

first occurs in Homer and then sporadically in early Ionic prose. Though more frequent than in Ionic prose, in Attic literature of the classical age *atár* basically occurs only in the works of Euripides and Aristophanes, and to a much lesser extent in Plato; however, it is carefully avoided by historians and orators, with the exception of Xenophon. This peculiar distribution made Denniston (1954: 51) propose a vernacular origin of the form, socially marked as belonging to the lower register. Besides late sporadic usages, literary prose texts of Hellenistic age show no occurrence of *atár*, suggesting it had dropped out of use by that time.[2]

Concerning its classification, *atár* has been traditionally considered a particle, that is, a word "expressing a mode of thought, considered either in isolation or in relation to another thought, or a mood of emotion" (Denniston 1954: xxxvi; see also Allan 2017b: 280). The linguistic reality of and the theoretical need for a 'particle' category have been persuasively called into question by Duhoux (2003), to which I refer for further discussion. I follow here Duhoux's approach, and employ the term 'particle' only as a general cover term to refer to *atár*, without any implication as to its linguistic status.

According to Schwyzer & Debrunner (1950: 559), Denniston (1954: 51–54), Chantraine (1968: 132), Ruijgh (1971: 197), and Crespo et al. (2003: 349), among others, *atár* is a linking device that can occur either in an 'adversative' or a 'progressive' function. In its adversative function, *atár* encodes a semantic contrast between two sentences, whereas in its progressive function no contrast is intended, and *atár* behaves like a mere combining device. This interpretation seems, however, too sketchy, as it overlooks some crucial points. First, no difference has been pointed out in the use of *atár* at different diachronic stages of the language, or in texts belonging to different genres. Second, this poly-

---

Additionally, Inglese (2017) shows how the two particles should be kept functionally distinct, at least in Homeric Greek (see further Bonifazi 2012: 212 fn. 84). Therefore, the present analysis does not overlap with previous works on the function of *autár* (cf. Bonifazi 2012).

2   It must be stressed that this picture on the distribution of *atár* is somewhat oversimplified. As the evidence in the TLG shows, occurrences of *atár* are also documented in fragmentary texts from the Classical period, with a sizable number of occurrences from comic authors. Later on, the particle is sporadically attested in literary texts, both in poetry and in prose, up to the 13th century AD. Though a detailed analysis of the behavior of *atár* in post-Classical texts lies beyond the scope of this paper, it is interesting to observe that many of the occurrences are confined to specific textual genres, including epic poetry and scientific prose. Interestingly, the particle is virtually unattested in non-literary sources, such as inscriptions and papyri, thus bearing further evidence for its eventual demise after the Classical age.

semy account lacks an explanation as to how these two functions are related, either in synchrony or in diachrony. Besides the attempt by Ruijgh (1971: 198) to distinguish between an allegedly primary adversative function from a secondary progressive one, only Humbert (1960) reasonably argues for a clear-cut distinction between the two. For Humbert, the basic meaning of *atár* is the 'progressive' one, from which the 'adversative' meaning is naturally derived, since "a new object is likely to be opposed to already known objects" (Humbert 1960: 584, transl. mine).

3   Connectives, discourse markers, and discourse structure

In this section, I illustrate the theoretical background of my analysis. The behavior of particles has always puzzled scholars, and most traditional approaches to the subject fail in providing a satisfactory account of the real usage of these linguistic items. Most studies focus on clausal linkage only, while neglecting to consider the overall discourse structure. In this work, I frame the description of *atár* within a consistent model of discourse structure (Kroon 1995), and exploit the notions of connective and discourse marker.

Connectives have been thoroughly investigated by Mauri (2008) in her typological work on coordination strategies. For Mauri, connectives are defined as linguistic items encoding a coordination relationship, i.e. "a relation established between functionally equivalent States of Affairs (SoAs), that is, SoAs which have the same semantic function, autonomous cognitive profiles, and are both coded by utterances characterized by the presence of some illocutionary force" (Mauri 2008: 41). Mauri discusses three semantic types of coordination relations: combination, contrast, and alternative. Since *atár* has traditionally been described as an adversative particle, I take the contrast relation to be most relevant here. According to Mauri (2008: 121–124), who relies on a wealth of previous scholarship on adversativity (see also Kroon 1995: ch. 9; Allan 2017b: 280–283), languages attest to three types of contrast: (a) oppositive contrast, which SoAs are related to only by virtue of their being different (this case being very close to combination); (b) corrective contrast, in which the propositional content of the first utterance is negated and replaced by the content of the second one, and (c) counterexpectative contrast, in which the second utterance negates an inference or an expectation drawn from the first one. The three types are exemplified in (1):

(1)   a. Oppositive   *I bought a pair of shoes **whereas** Sue found a nice skirt*

  b. Corrective   *Peter is not studying in his room **but** he is playing in the garden*

  c. Counterexpective   *John is tall **but** he's no good at basketball*

The three semantic types of contrast relations illustrated in (1) are not unrelated. Based on the evaluation of a representative cross-linguistic sample, Mauri (2008) has shown that these functions can be arranged into the following conceptual space, onto which language-specific semantic maps are mapped:

  oppositive > corrective > counterexpective

The semantic map model enables us to make predictions about which patterns of polysemy are expected to occur in the languages of the world. Such predictions are based on the assumption that polysemous linguistic items can only encode meanings that are contiguous in the conceptual space (Croft 2003: 133–138; see further van der Auwera 2013). Crucially in our case, we expect that a connective cannot encode oppositive and counterexpective contrast unless it also encodes corrective contrast, because the latter occupies the central area of the conceptual space. It must be stressed that not all functions displayed by connectives should be given equal prominence. As Sweetser (1990: 76) and Mauri & van der Auwera (2012) argue, the role of pragmatics in determining the function of connectives should not be underestimated. Indeed, it is often the case that connectives feature only a single core semantic value from which related meanings can be pragmatically derived in specific discourse contexts (for a useful summary on monosemy vs. polysemy approaches in describing the function of particles, see also Allan 2017b: 276–280).

    The notion of discourse marker (henceforth DM) has been refined in the last decades. Despite the wealth of recent contributions in the field, there is still no unanimous agreement on what discourse markers are and how they work, as the variation in the terminology employed suggests (e.g. Schiffrin 2003 'discourse markers'; Blakemore 2006 'discourse connectives'). I summarize here the mainstream position on the subject, and refer to Schiffrin (2003), Blakemore (2006), Diewald (2011), and Fedriani & Sansò (2017) for a detailed discussion of theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of DMs. Broadly speaking, DMs formally belong to different word classes, such as adverbs (*however*), prepositional phrases (*after all*), verbal phrases (*I mean*, *listen*). Most importantly here, the class of DM includes connectives (*and*, *or*, *but*) as well. From a diachronic standpoint, this heterogeneity reflects the different lexical sources that can give rise to DMs.

Functionally, DMs contribute to managing a wide range of functions. Schiffrin (2003: 71) defines DMs as polyfunctional items that work on the social and the expressive level of discourse and conversation, and on the textual level, i.e. the organization and management of coherent sequences of utterances, among other things. This last function has been identified since Halliday & Hasan (1976), who argue that connective items, including coordinators, are employed to establish coherence and cohesion relations in texts. In other words, as Kroon puts it, DMs "[are] involved in signaling the coherence of a stretch of discourse" (Kroon 1995: 58). As Drummen (2009: 135–138) points out, the main function of DMs is to constrain the hearer's interpretation of coherence relationships already inferable from the context. Hence, the use of DMs is non-obligatory.

In order to show how connectives and DMs interact in shaping discourse, I adopt here Kroon's (1995) model of discourse structure. According to Kroon, discourse can be conceived as a layered structure, in which structural and semantic relationships can be established at various levels (see Allan 2017a and 2017b for a similar approach). In particular, Kroon (1995: 69 ff.) individuates three distinct layers of discourse. The most basic level is the 'representational' level, which deals with the encoding of propositional content. At this level, semantic relationships between SoAs are established. The second one, the 'presentational' level, deals with the organization of semantic content and with the thematic structuring between conversational moves within a speaker's turn. Relationships established at this level are labelled 'rhetorical'. Finally, the 'interactional' level deals with conversational aspects of communication, including the management of turn-taking. Within this model, connectives as defined by Mauri (2008) operate at the representational level alone, as Kroon herself observes (1995: 69). In modern Indo-European (IE) languages, connectives are usually fully grammaticalized as coordinative conjunctions, and their occurrence is limited to specific syntactic environments.[3] Conversely, DMs generally act both at the presentational and at the interactional levels as they operate on the local and global coherence of texts and on the management of conversation. Crucially, one must keep in mind that connectives can be used as DMs in certain contexts, while at the same time retaining their basic function as connectives elsewhere. The need to keep the two functions distinct cannot be overestimated, since semantic clausal combining and discourse linkage should not be conceived as parallel and structurally equal phenomena (Blühdorn 2008). Therefore, in our texts, *atár* can in principle be shown to function either as a connective or as a DM.

---

3   For a general overview on coordination strategies in ancient IE languages, see also Viti (2008).

4 The particle *atár* in Homeric Greek

In this section, I summarize the results of my previous corpus-based analysis of the function of *atár* in Homeric Greek (Inglese 2017). Drawing on an analysis of all the occurrences of *atár* in Homer, I have suggested keeping *atár* distinct from *autár* on functional grounds. The former is a connective that works at the representational level of discourse since it generally connects equivalent SoAs in accordance with the criteria discussed by Mauri (2008), whereas the latter behaves as a discourse marker and contributes to the managing of topic continuity in discourse. In addition, *atár* responds positively to the syntactic test proposed by Dik (1968) for the identification of coordinative conjunctions. The fact that it never occurs in combination with other coordinators must be taken as evidence that *atár* is a coordinator itself. Finally, unlike *autár*, *atár* occasionally connects noun or adverbial phrases (e.g. Hom. *Od.* 8.320, Hom. *Il.* 2.214). Notably, this complies with the possibility of connectives to occur at the phrase level (cf. Haspelmath 2013), which is an environment normally unavailable to DMs. The connective function of *atár* is exemplified in (2):

(2) *hoì   d' óte   dế   r'   es khôron   héna*
     DEM.NOM.PL PTC when PTC PTC to land:ACC one:ACC
     ksunióntes   híkonto,   sún   r'   ébalon
     gather:PRS.PTCP.NOM.PL go:PRS.3PL together PTC throw:AOR.3PL
     rinoús,   sùn   d' énkhea   kaì méne'
     shield:ACC.PL together PTC spear:ACC.PL and strength:ACC.PL
     *andrôn   khalkeothōrḗkōn   **atàr** aspídes*
     man:GEN.PL in.bronzed.armor:GEN.PL CONN shield(F):NOM.PL
     omphalóessai   éplēnt'   allḗlēosi
     bossy:NOM.PL.F fill:AOR.M/P.3PL each.other:DAT.PL
     'When they came gathering in the same point, they dashed the spears and the strengths of men in bronzed armors together: the bossed shields clashed against each other.' (Hom. *Il.* 4.446–449)

Discussing example (2), I have argued that *atár* encodes an oppositive contrast relation as defined by Mauri (2008: 121), as the two sentences are contrasted only by virtue of their encoding different SoAs. Occurrences that feature a counterexpectative contrast, traditionally labeled 'strong adversative' function, are also attested in the corpus, as in (3):

(3) ê   rá   tís   esti   kaì ein Aḯdao   dómoisi
     PTC PTC INDF.NOM be:PRS.3SG also in   Hades:GEN house:DAT.PL
     psukhḕ̀   kaì eidolon   **atár** phrénes   ouk éni   pámpan
     soul:NOM and image:NOM CONN hearth:NOM.PL not inside at.all
     'Oh, wonder! Even in the house of Hades there is left something, a soul
     and an image, but there is no more life in it.' (*Il.* 23.104–105)

In example (3), *atár* can be conceived as encoding a counterexpectative rela-
tion, as Denniston (1954: 51) suggests. However, describing *atár* as encoding
both oppositive and counterexpectative contrast would lead to a cross-lin-
guistically implausible semantic map, since in Homer no occurrence of *atár*
encoding corrective contrast can be found. Therefore, I have argued that a
counterexpectative reading is only pragmatically triggered by specific contex-
tual features. For instance, in (3) the semantic opposition between *psukhḕ̀ kaì
eídōlon* 'a soul and an image' and *phrénes* 'life' on the one hand, stressed by
the contrastive topic position occupied by the latter, and the presence of the
negation *ouk* on the other hand can be responsible for the inference of a coun-
terexpectative relation between the two sentences. Oppositive contrast should
be taken as the semantic core of the connective, as opposed to the contextually
derived counterexpectative contrast function for the following reasons: first,
oppositive contrast seems cognitively less complex than counterexpectative
contrast. Whereas it is relatively easy for speakers to infer counterexpectative
relations out of oppositive ones, as Humbert (1960: 584) points out, the reverse
process seems to be less straightforward. Second, in Homer an oppositive con-
trast reading of *atár* is quantitatively prominent, whereas the counterexpec-
tative reading is rather marginal and only available when *atár* co-occurs with
other contextual cues of strong adversativity, as in (3).

     By virtue of its oppositive value, *atár* is also employed as a thematic bound-
ary marker. This is hardly surprising: Mauri herself observes that oppositive
connectives such as Polish *a* 'and, but' tend to be used in contexts of the-
matic discontinuity. Given this function, *atár* often correlates with the intro-
duction of preverbal contrastive topics (cf. Matić 2003).[4] More precisely, within
a discourse stretch that features a pair of topical referents, *atár* establishes a

---

4   I cannot go into further detail on the issue of information structure in Ancient Greek. For
    a general discussion on the notion of *topic*, see, among others, Gundel & Fretheim (2006).
    Information structure in Ancient Greek has been fully investigated by Dik (1995, 2007), Matić
    (2003), Bertrand (2010), and Allan (2014). In Inglese (2017), I have relied on the parameters
    discussed by these authors to evaluate the topical status of NPs following *atár*.

coordination relationship of oppositive contrast and hence favors the introduction of the second referent as a contrastive topic. This is an instance of what Givón (1983: 9) calls a local switch-reference in the 'participant/topic continuity' domain. The locality of the switch-reference is proven by examples like (4):

(4) *kaì tote mén min₁*   *Lêmnon*   *eüktiménēn*   *nēusìn*
     and then PTC 3SG.ACC Lemnos(F):ACC well.built:ACC.F ship:DAT.PL
     ágōn,   **atàr** *huiòs₂* *Iésonos*   *ônon*
     lead:PRS.PTCP.NOM CONN son:NOM of.Iason:NOM price:ACC
     édōke.   *keîthen*   *dè* *kseînós*   *min₁*
     give:AOR.3SG from.there PTC stranger:NOM 3SG.ACC
     elúsato
     free:AOR.M/P.2SG
     'And then (Achilles) sold him (Lykaon) in strong-founded Lemnos, carrying him there by ship, and the son of Jason bought him. From there a stranger freed him.' (Hom. *Il.* 21.40–42)

In (4), the discourse topics previously established are Lykaon, who is encoded by the anaphoric pronoun *min* 'him' in the first sentence, and Achilles, who is the subject of the first sentence and is not overtly marked. These topics are temporarily deactivated by the introduction of the new referent, *huiòs Iésonos* 'the son of Jason', which is a new preverbal sentence topic (Matić 2003: 589, Allan 2014: 189). However, this thematic boundary signaled by *atár* does not entail a new orientation in discourse, as the new topic does not achieve the role of new discourse topic, i.e. it displays low discourse persistence (Givón 1983). This is proven by the fact that the following light anaphoric pronoun *min* does not refer back to the son of Iones, which is the last accessible topical referent, but directly to the previously established discourse topic, Lykaon.

　　Though the majority of the occurrences of *atár* in Homer fall into this description, a handful of occurrences is not entirely consistent with this account. I provide two significant counterexamples in (5a) and (5b).

(5) a. *andra*   *thnētòn*   *eónta*   *pálai peprōménon*
        man:ACC mortal:ACC be:PRS.PTCP.ACC long assigned:ACC
        aísēi   *àps ethéleis*   *thanátoio dusēkhéos*
        fate:DAT back wish:PRS.2SG death:GEN ill.sounding:GEN
        eksanalûsai;   *édr':*   **atár** *oú toi*   *pántes*
        release:AOR.INF do:PRS.IMP.2SG CONN not 2SG.DAT all:NOM.PL
        epainéomen   *theoì*   *álloi*
        praise:PRS.1PL god:NOM.PL other:NOM.PL

'A mortal man, long doomed by his destiny, do you wish to release him from ill-sounding death? Do it. But not all of us other gods will praise you.' (Hom. *Il.* 16.441–443)

b. *ê   onósasth'   hóti moi   Kronídēs*
   INT complain:AOR.M/P.2PL that 1SG.DAT son.of.Chronos:NOM
   Zeùs   álge'   édōke   paîd'   olésai
   Zeus:NOM pain:ACC.PL give:AOR.3SG son:ACC destroy:AOR.INF
   tòn   áriston? **atàr** *gnṓsesthe   kaì úmmes*
   ART.ACC best:ACC CONN know:FUT.M/P.2PL also 2SG.PL.NOM
   'Do you complain that Zeus son of Chronos has given me sufferings, that he killed my most noble son? But you will know it yourselves.' (Hom. *Il.* 24.241–242)

In both (5a) and (5b), a connective interpretation of *atár* is ruled out by the fact that the utterances linked by the particle do not share the same illocutionary force, thus going against Mauri's (2008) criteria. In (5a), *atár* signals the boundary between an order and an assertion, whereas in (5b) it relates an assertion to a question, the latter overtly marked by the interrogative particle *ê*. Remarkably, in both cases *atár* occurs in dialogues, in which it seemingly behaves as a strong thematic boundary maker, as I argue in Section 5.3.2. The question that I address in the next sections is how to capture the function of *atár* in instances such as (5a) and (5b), and how this relates to the basic connective function detected in Inglese (2017).

5   The particle *atár* in Classical Greek

In this section, I analyze the behavior of *atár* in a corpus consisting of the works of Aristophanes and Euripides. Note that in the remainder of this paper, when I refer to Classical Greek I essentially refer to Classical Attic. First, in Section 5.1, I provide some methodological remarks, and then I proceed to a quantitative (Section 5.2) and qualitative (Section 5.3) analysis of the data. Finally, in Section 5.4, I present a unified account of the use of *atár* in Classical Greek.

5.1   *Methodological remarks*
The reason to restrict the corpus to Attic drama for this study is twofold. In the first place, this is the most representative corpus for the investigation of the particle, since in Attic drama one finds the majority of the occurrences of *atár*

in post-Homeric Greek. In the second place, the corpus is constituted by theatrical texts, the language of which is intended to imitate real-life conversation. Indeed, even though the language of theater must undergo metrical restrictions and fails to show spoken phenomena such as false starts and overlappings, it is nonetheless a 'quasi-spoken' stylized language, as it calls upon the hearer's pragmatic and conversational knowledge in order to understand the ongoing stage performance (Dik 2007: 7). These factors contribute to making this corpus the best candidate for investigating discourse and pragmatic phenomena in Ancient Greek.[5]

My corpus includes the works by Aristophanes and Euripides. I exclude Aeschylus' and Sophocles' works because they feature only a handful of occurrences of *atár*, one and three respectively. Moreover, I exclude fragmentary texts from the corpus, since in these texts one often lacks the discourse context needed for a correct pragmatic interpretation of the utterances (Dik 2007: 5). It should be stressed that, although I acknowledge the difference in genre between Aristophanes and Euripides, I consider them to some extent equally reliable sources for the study of the spoken language. Indeed, even though comedy displays a greater linguistic realism, as it matches more closely the morphosyntactic and lexical features of Attic (Willi 2002: 18), it must be kept in mind that comedy implies a rather non-standard usage of spoken language (Dik 2007). In particular, as Bain (1977) remarks, the comic dialogue constitutes by no means a better imitation of spoken Attic than tragedy, because comedy exploits a wide range of non-conventional linguistic resources to move the audience to laughter, such as puns and parody, as well as making extensive use of ruptures of the dramatic illusion.

5.2 *Quantitative analysis*

Table 1 shows quantitative data extracted from the corpus regarding the frequency of *atár* and its main collocations.[6] Overall, *atár* shows a token fre-

---

5 To be sure, *atár* also occurs in Herodotus' and Plato's works. However, in these authors the occurrences of *atár* are extremely scarce with respect to the entire size of the corpus, so the data is quantitatively not comparable to Attic drama. In addition, even though Plato might in principle provide a good candidate for the investigation of spoken Attic (cf. Horrocks 2010: 69), his works differ radically from drama in style, purpose, and use of discourse strategies. Based on these observations and for reasons of space, Herodotus and Plato are left out of consideration for the purposes of this paper.

6 Data comes from the TLG. Collocations have been analyzed through the software *AntConc* (http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software.html).

TABLE 1   *Frequency and collocations of atár and allá*

atár	Euripides	33		*allá*	Euripides	868	
	Aristophanes	47			Aristophanes	1068	
	Total	**80**	**100 %**		**Total**	**1936**	**100 %**
atàr […] ge	Euripides	7	21 %	*allà […] ge*	Euripides	5	0,6 %
	Aristophanes	11	26 %		Aristophanes	25	2,3 %
	Total	**18**	**22 %**		**Total**	**30**	**1,5 %**
atàr tís	Euripides	11	35 %	*allà tís*	Euripides	5	0,6 %
	Aristophanes	10	21 %		Aristophanes	13	1,2 %
	Total	**21**	**26 %**		**Total**	**18**	**0,9 %**

quency of 33 in Euripides and 47 in Aristophanes, which is strikingly low as compared to other clause-linking devices (e.g. *allá* 1936 and *dé* 6036). Another interesting parameter is the collocational behavior of *atár*, i.e. the set of its most recurrent syntagmatic associations. Since *atár* has been traditionally described as an adversative coordinator, in Table 1 I illustrate its collocational behavior as compared to *allá*, which is commonly held to be the main adversative connective in Ancient Greek (Drummen 2009, Lühr & Zeilfelder 2011: 118, Allan 2017b: 283–292).

Two main collocations of *atár* emerge from the corpus, which together cover almost half of the attestations. These are the construction with the interrogative pronoun *tís* 'who, what' in direct questions, and the construction involving the enclitic emphatic particle *ge* in assertions. These patterns cover respectively 22 % and 26 % of the occurrences. Interestingly, these two patterns are by no means relevant for *allá*, as they cover respectively 1,5 % and 0,9 % of the total. Moreover, *atár* and *allá* also differ in their distribution in relation to conversational turns. In my corpus, *atár* consistently occurs within conversational turns, with only one instance of turn-initial position (Eur. *Med.* 80), whereas turn-initial *allá* displays a much wider distribution, as Drummen (2009: 142 ff.) has shown. This different distributional behavior points to a difference in function between *atár* and *allá*.

Quantitative data allows for a few preliminary remarks on the diachrony of the particle. Despite being relatively well attested in Classical Greek, the overall frequency of *atár* is lower than other particles. Keeping in mind its already low frequency in Homeric Greek and its later disappearance from the language, it seems that Attic drama reflects a stage in which this form was slowly dropping out of use. This view is supported by the collocational patterns illustrated in Table 1. In Homer, *atár* shows no significant collocational pattern

besides the aforementioned construction with *ge*, which covers only 14% of the occurrences. This means that *atár* is basically freely used in Homer, as data on its low formularity confirms (Ruijgh 1957). Conversely, in Attic drama *atár* shows strong signs of idiomatization. I return to these observations in Section 6.

5.3 *Qualitative analysis*

In this section, I provide a synchronic account of the functions of *atár* in Aristophanes and Euripides. I describe various kinds of context in which *atár* occurs in order to investigate its function, exploiting the theoretical notions introduced in Section 3.

5.3.1 *Atár* as a connective

As argued in Section 4, in Homer *atár* largely behaves as a connective that acts at the representational level of discourse, where it establishes coordination relations of oppositive contrast (Mauri 2008). In my corpus, only three occurrences of *atár* follow this pattern (Eur., *Hipp.* 728; Eur., *Tr.* 344 and 416), as exemplified in (6):

(6)   *Hḗphaiste,*   *daidoukheîs*   *mèn en gámois*
    Hephaestus:VOC bring.flames:PRS.2SG PTC in marriage:DAT.PL
    brotôn   **atàr** *lugrán*   *ge*   *ténd'*   *anaithússeis*
    mortal:GEN.PL DM woeful:ACC.F PTC DEM.ACC.F light:PRS.2SG
    phlóga   *éksō*   *te*   *megálōn*   *elpídōn*
    torch(F):ACC beyond and big:GEN.PL hope:GEN.PL
    Hecuba: 'Hephaestus, you bring the flame to the marriages of men: now it's a woeful torch that you light, beyond my greatest hopes.'
    (Eur., *Tr.* 343–345)

In (6), as well as in the other two cases, *atár* functions as an oppositive connective, and more importantly, it always occurs in a correlative construction with *mén*, which constitutes a rather frequent structure already in Homer (Inglese 2017), as shown in (7). When occurring in such correlative structures, *atár* can be described as a 'complementation device' (Bakker 1993: 298), as it indicates the closure of a bipartite thematic section introduced by *mén*.

(7)   *ei mén k'*   *aûthi ménōn*   *Trṓōn*   *pólin*
    if PTC IRR here stay:PRS.PTCP.NOM Trojans:GEN.PL city:ACC
    amphimákhōmai   *ṓleto*   **mén** *moi*
    destroy:PRS.SUBJ.M/P.1SG perish:AOR.M/P.3SG PTC 1SG.DAT

> *nóstos*   **atàr** *kléos*   *áphthiton*   *éstai*
> return:NOM CONN glory(N):NOM everlasting:NOM.N be:FUT.M/P.3SG
> 'If I stay here and destroy the city of the Troians, I will not return home,
> but the glory will be everlasting.' (Hom. *Il.* 9.412–413)

A crucial difference between (6) and (7) lies in the fact that, in Classical Greek, *atár* does not correlate with the introduction of contrastive topics. Instead, in (6) *atár* is followed by a contrastive focus that is reinforced by the emphatic contrastive particle *ge* and by a non-canonical word order, with the fronting of the adjective *lugrán* 'woeful'. Note that example (6) could also be read as an instance of counterexpectative contrast, but I maintain that even in (6), it is better to interpret the counterexpectative reading as pragmatically inferred, for the reasons discussed in Section 4. First, a counterexpectative reading is triggered by the presence of the contrastive focus. And second, this reading is easily inferable from the semantic contrast established between the two SoAs, as they compare the habitual behavior of the god with his unexpected behavior in the situational context described in the second utterance.

5.3.2   *Atár* as a discourse marker

To begin with, let us discuss a number of occurrences in which a connective reading of *atár* is necessarily ruled out. These are the cases in which *atár* links two utterances with different illocutionary force, thus violating the definitional criteria set out by Mauri (2008). In the majority of the cases these are assertions followed by questions, but transitions from a question to an assertion (e.g. Eur., *Bacch.* 248) and from an assertion to an order (e.g. Ar., *Vesp.* 28) are attested as well. In these occurrences, *atár* can be shown to operate as a DM, and its function is better understood in the light of conversation analysis (Levinson 1983, Sidnell 2010; see also van Emde Boas 2017 on conversation analysis and Greek drama), exploiting the notions of turn and conversational move. I take the turn as the primary unit of a conversational exchange (Sacks et al. 1974), which in our theatrical texts roughly corresponds to the lines of a character. Each turn is further analyzable as a hierarchic structure of conversational moves, i.e. communicative acts conveying specific communicative intentions and entailing expected reactions (Andorno 2003: 162–163). It must be stressed that conversational moves do not always overlap with linguistic acts as defined by Searle (1969), since conversational moves represent a more nuanced description of interactional practices.

Let us start by considering example (8):

(8) T.: *heîs   tôn   Akhaiôn,   ô gúnai,*
          one:NOM ART.GEN.PL Achaean:GEN.PL oh woman:VOC
          tôn   athlíōn
          ART.GEN.PL wrecked:GEN.PL

    H.: *ou t' ára s'   Helénēn   ei stugeîs*
          NEG PTC PTC 2SG.NOM Helen:ACC if hate:PRS.2SG
          *thaumastéon. **atàr** tís   eî   póthen?*
          admirable:ACC DM INT.NOM be:PRS.2SG whence
          Teucros: 'I am one of the Achaeans, woman, of the wrecked ones.'
          Helen: 'No wonder then if you hate Helen. But whence do you
          come?' (Eur., *Hel.* 84–87)

The dialogue in (8) constitutes a good exemplification of *atár*'s most frequent
function in Attic drama. In (8), a dialogue between Helen and Teucros is staged.
In the first line, Teucros answers a question previously asked by Helen, who in
her turn responds with a brief comment before asking another question her-
self. This conversational pattern frequently occurs in the corpus and can be
sketched as follows. Character A ends his/her turn with a given conversational
move. Character B responds with what I call a 'comment move', which is irrel-
evant from an informative point of view and still preserves the discourse topic
introduced by A in his/her turn. Only then does character B utter within his/her
turn a second move, with which s/he fully takes his/her turn and carries on the
dialogue with a new orientation. Within this structure, the role of *atár* as a DM
is precisely to signal the end of a backgrounded comment line and the intro-
duction of a brand-new foregrounded line that encodes a *reactive* move (Kroon
1995: 366).

   Clearly, in structures such as (8), *atár* does not act as an oppositive connec-
tive on the representational level, as one cannot semantically coordinate an
assertion and a question. In discourse terms, the function of *atár* is rather fuzzy.
On the one hand, it structures the thematic transition between moves within
a single turn, thus working at the presentational level. On the other hand, the
move introduced by *atár* constitutes a reaction to what was previously said by
speaker A and emphasizes the achieved possession of the turn by speaker B, so
that *atár* displays an interactional function of sorts. This pervasive synchronic
fuzziness between the two levels is not surprising (as Kroon 1995: 350 discusses
for Latin *at*) and can be accounted for in diachronic terms, as I argue in Section
6.

   To support this reading of *atár* as a foregrounding DM, let us consider various
ways in which the first line of character B, that I label the 'comment move', may
be interpreted as carrying backgrounded information. We begin by considering
example (9):

(9) M.: *éstai;   pónous   **gàr** daímones   paúsousí*
          be:FUT.M/P.3SG pain:ACC.PL for god:NOM.PL end:FUT.3PL
          *mou.   **atàr** thanónta   toû   m'   ereîs*
          1SG.GEN DM   die:AOR.PTCP.ACC INT.GEN 1SG.ACC say:FUT.2G
          pepusménē?
          learn:PF.PTCP.M/P.NOM.F
          Menelaus: 'Be it so; the gods will indeed end my sufferings. Anyway,
          from whom will you tell to have received the news of my death?'
          (Eur., *Hel.* 1075–1076)

In (9), Menelaus begins his turn with a brief responsive form *éstai* 'be it', fol-
lowed by a digressive move, whose background status is overtly marked by the
digressive particle *gár* 'for'. The digression is then ended by *atár* that introduces
a new reactive and foregrounded move.

   The corpus attests to at least three other patterns in which the backgrounded
status of the first move is evident, that is, orders given to a third character on
stage, jokes, and asides. The first pattern occurs when three characters are on
stage, and two of them, A and B, are talking to each other. Then, character B
gives an order to a third character C, thus breaking the dialogic channel with
character A. The dialogue with A is restored by character B with an utterance
introduced by *atár*, as in (10):

(10) S.: *sigḗsat',   ô   tékn',   ántra   d'   es*
          be.silent:AOR.IMP.2PL oh son:ACC.PL cave(F):ACC PTC to
          petrērephê   poímna athroîsai   prospólous
          rocky:ACC.F herd:ACC gather:INF.AOR servant:ACC.PL
          keleúsate.
          order:AOR.IMP.2PL herd:ACC
     C.: *khōreît',   **atàr** dè̀ tína   páter,   spoudḕn*
          proceed:PRS.IMP.2PL DM   PTC INT.ACC father:VOC hurry:ACC
          ékheis?
          have:PRS.2SG
          Silenus: 'Silence, sons; give order to the servants, to gather the flocks
          inside the rocky cave.'
          Coryphaeus: '(*To the servants*) Do as he says. (*To Silenus*) Anyway,
          why are you so eager, father?' (Eur., *Cycl.* 82–84)

The other two patterns are typical of comedy. Consider example (11):

(11) Sc.: *tautòn*   *dúnataí*   *soi*
           ART.ACC.N=same:ACC.N mean:PRS.M/P.3SG 2SG.DAT
           kárdopos   *Kleōnúmōi.*
           kneading.trough:NOM Cleonymus:DAT

     St.: *all' ôgáth'*   *oud' ên*   *kárdopos*
           but oh=good:VOC not be:IMPF.3SG kneading.trough:NOM
           Kleōnúmōi   *all' en thueíai*   *strongúlēi*   *g'*   *àn*
           Cleonymus:DAT but in mortar(F):DAT round:DAT.F PTC PTC
           emátteto   **atàr** *tò*   *loipòn*   *pôs*
           knead:IMPF.M/P.3SG DM   ART.NOM.N rest(N):NOM how
           me   *khrḕ*   *kaleîn*
           1SG.ACC need:PRS.3SG call:PRS.INF
           Socrates: 'For you 'kneading-trough' is the same as 'Cleonymus'.'
           Strepsiades: 'Good sir. Cleonymus didn't have a kneading-trough, he
           used to knead his bread in a round mortar! Anyway, how should I
           call it henceforth?' (Ar., *Nub.* 673–674)

In (11), Strepsiades reacts to Socrates' statement with a joke, and then changes
the subject by means of a question introduced by *atár*.[7] According to Bain
(1977: 65), jokes consist of lines uttered not with the purpose of carrying on an
on-stage dialogue, but rather aiming at insulting either the hearer or other char-
acters. Remarkably, the hearer often shows no sign of having heard the joke,
which is thus uttered only for the audience's sake and constitutes a rupture of
the dramatic illusion. After the joke, the conversation is restored by the utter-
ance introduced by *atár*, to which the hearer normally reacts.

     Asides differ from jokes in that they are never heard by other characters, who
are not the intended target of the utterance (Bain 1977: 15). A case in point is
example (12), in which the behavior of *atár* is similar to (11) in that it introduces
a move that restores the flow of the conversation after an interruption.

(12) H.: *haksápantas eis tò*   *bárathron*   *embaleîn.*
          every:ACC.PL to ART.ACC.N abyss(N):ACC throw:AOR.INF

     C.: *hē*   *glôtta*   *tôi*   *kḗruki*
          ART.NOM.F tongue(F):NOM ART.DAT messenger:DAT
          toútōn   *témnetai.*   **atàr** *dià*   *tí*   *dḕ*
          DEM.GEN.PL.N cut:PRS.M/P.3SG   DM   through INT.ACC.N PTC

---

7 The line arguably contains a hint to the sexual habits of Cleonymus that were well-known to
   the audience (Guidorizzi & del Corno 1996: 276).

>*taût'*   *epibouleúei*   *poieîn*   *hēmâs?*
> DEM.ACC.PL.N want:PRS.3SG do:PRS.INF 1PL.ACC
> Hermes: '[Zeus wants] to throw you all down in the abyss.'
> Carion: '(*aside*) Beware your tongue, you cursed harbinger! (*to Hermes*) But why would he reserve us such a treatment?'
> (Ar., *Pl.* 1109–1112)

Example (12) raises the issue of the relationship of *atár* with the management of turn-taking. In fact, the line introduced by *atár* is the first one to be effectively heard by the hearer and thus constitutes the proper beginning of Carion's turn. The link between example (12) and such turn-initial occurrences is dealt with in more detail below. In examples (10) to (12), since the function of *atár* is basically to restore the dialogic channel after some kind of interruption, one can also describe it as a "POP" device, in the terminology of Slings (1997), i.e. a means of indicating a return to the main thread of a storyline, much as he suggests for *allá*.

I turn now to discussing a pattern in which the backgrounded nature of the move preceding *atár* is apparently less clear, exemplified in (13):

(13) O: *ksénai*   *gunaîkes,*   *ê*   *tád'*
        foreign:VOC.PL.F woman(F):VOC.PL PTC DEM.NOM.PL.N
        ést'   *Akhilléōs*   *paidòs*   *mélathra*   *kaì*
        be:PRS.3SG Achilles:GEN son:GEN roof:NOM.PL and
        turannikaì   *stégai?*
        royal:NOM.PL.F house(F):NOM.PL
   Ch.: *égnōs,*   **atàr** *dè* *tís*   *sù*
        know:AOR.2SG DM PTC INT.NOM 2SG.NOM
        punthánēi   *táde?*
        inquire:PRS.M/P.2SG DEM.ACC.PL.N
        Orestes: 'Foreign women, is this the house of the son of Achilles and his offspring?'
        Chorus: 'You're right. But who are you to ask this?'
        (Eur., *And.* 881–883)

In (13), the conversational move immediately preceding *atár* is the answer to a direct question and updates the informational status of the current discourse. Therefore, it is hardly backgrounded or irrelevant. In these cases, the involvement of *atár* can be explained by reference to the notion of 'adjacency pair'. In conversation analysis, adjacency pairs are described as pairs of conversational moves, of which the first entails the uttering of the second in order

to preserve the specific conversational patterns (Andorno 2003: 163). Under this view, in (13) the answer uttered by character B is entailed by the question posed by character A, and thereby partly falls out of control of character B, who overtly establishes his own brand-new turn with a reactive move introduced by *atár*.

Besides occurring in dialogues, *atár* occasionally occurs in monologues, as in (14):

(14) *ánoma   mèn tekeîn   emé,   kakôs dè*
     illegal:ACC.PL.N PTC generate:AOR.INF 1SG.ACC badly PTC
     gêmai   patéra   sòn   phûnaí   te
     marry:AOR.INF father:ACC POSS.2SG.ACC generate:AOR.INF and
     *sé.   **atàr** tí   taûta?*
     2SG.ACC DM   why DEM.ACC.PL.N
     Jocasta: '[…] I gave birth to a forbidden child, I joined your father in wretched marriage, and I generated you. But why speak of all this?' (Eur., *Phoen.* 380–383)

In (14), Jocasta starts recalling her relationship with her son Oedipus, but she abruptly interrupts the narration with an utterance introduced by *atár* that dismisses the previous talking as nonsense. In order to understand the role of *atár* in (14), one should take this example as an instance of 'diaphonic' monologue (Kroon 1995: 111). Diaphony arises in monologues when a doubling of the voices occurs, such that characters address themselves as if they were external speakers. Accordingly, one can conceive the monologue in (14) as diaphonic, and the reactive move introduced by *atár* as uttered by an external speaker. In this case, *atár* acts in a fuzzy zone in which the presentational and the interactional levels partly overlap.

So far, I have discussed instances in which *atár* cannot behave as a connective, due to the different illocution of the utterances involved, and I have argued that *atár* functions rather as a foregrounding DM. But how should we treat occurrences in which *atár* relates utterances with the same illocutionary force, yet in which a connective reading is not as straightforward as in (6)? Each case should be judged on its own. In a number of cases, *atár* behaves consistently with what I discussed for examples (8) to (13), as in (15):

(15) B.: *égnōs   gàr án; nûn d' oukhì gignṓskeis*
          know:AOR.2SG PTC IRR now PTC not   know:PRS.2SG
     Ph.: *egṑ   mà tòn   Dí'   ou toínun, **atàr***
          1SG.NOM yes ART.ACC.N Zeus:ACC not now   DM

> *dokeî   gé   moi   eoikénai   málista*
> seem:PRS.3SG PTC 1SG.DAT look.like:PF.INF most
> *Morúkhou   ságmati*
> Morichos:GEN coat:DAT
> Bdelycleon: '[…] You would have recognized it. And now you don't!'
> Philocleon: 'Yes, for Zeus sake, I can't now. Anyway, it seems to me
> to look like one of Moricho's coats.' (Ar., *Vesp.* 1140–1142)

In (15), despite linking utterances with the same illocutionary force, *atár* acts as a DM, and introduces a new move that carries on the discourse after a comment move, precisely as in (8).

In most occurrences presented in this section, *atár* operates in a fuzzy zone between the presentational and interactional level. This fuzziness is best exemplified by the passage in (16):

(16) *all' eis hápanta   dustykhḕs   éphus,   páter.*
    but to all:ACC.PL.N unfortunate:NOM be.born:AOR.2SG father:VOC
    atàr *s'   erōtô   tòn   neōstì koíranon. Tí   tónd'*
    DM 2SG.ACC ask:PRS.1SG ART.ACC now   leader:ACC why DEM.ACC
    hubrízeis   patér'   apostéllōn   khthonós
    offend:PRES.2SG father:ACC send.away:PRS.PTCP.NOM land:GEN
    Antigone: 'But you are most unfortunate after all, father. (*to Creon*) And to
    you, our new leader, I ask this. Why do you offend my father, driving him
    away from his land?' (Eur., *Ph.* 1642–1644)

In (16), *atár* contributes both to the internal structuring of a single turn and to the management of the dialogic channel. On the one hand, the utterance introduced by *atár* opens a new thematic segment, while on the other hand, the personal pronoun *s'* 'you' in the second utterance explicitly signals the change of addressee in the conversational exchange.

Nevertheless, in a handful of occurrences *atár* exclusively acts on a single level only. In the first place, it can function as a DM at the presentational level, by marking thematic discontinuities. In these occurrences, no interactional value can be detected and diaphony seems not to be at play, as exemplified in (17):

(17) *katabḗsomai.   kaítoi tò   katába*
    go.down:FUT.M/P.1SG though ART.NOM.N descend:AOR.IMP.2SG
    toûto   katabḗsomai.   polloùs   pánu dè
    DEM.NOM.N go.down:FUT.M/P.1SG much:ACC.PL PTC   indeed

eksēpátēken   **atàr** hómōs katabḗsomai
deceive:PF.3SG DM alike go.down:FUT.M/P.1SG
Bdelycleon: 'I will go down. Even if this 'descent' has done no good to oth-
ers, indeed. But, I will go down nonetheless.' (Ar., *Vesp.* 980–981)

In (17), *atár* structures the relation between conversational moves and signals
the reactivation of a previous discourse segment, temporary deactivated by the
digressive move marked by *kaítoi* 'though, mind you' (Allan 2017b: 292–293). In
this case, *atár* cannot be ascribed any conversational value. Note that the rela-
tion with the thematic structure of *atár* in (17) is by no means comparable to
the typical function of the particle in Homer, exemplified in (2), in which *atár*
signals a local thematic discontinuity and introduces a new sentence topic.
Rather, this function is partly similar to (5a) and (5b), where *atár* marks a
broader thematic break-off, even though the reactivating function detectable
in (17) is not attested in Homer.

In the second place, *atár* can operate as a DM at the interactional level only.
This behavior is attested only once in the corpus, as reported in (18):

(18) N.: *apōlómesth'*   *ár', ei kakón*   *prosoísomen neon*
          perish:AOR.M/P.1PL PTC if evil(N):ACC add:FUT.1PL new:ACC.N
          palaiôi, prìn tód   eksēntlēkénai
          old:DAT before DEM.ACC.N endure:PF.INF
     T.: **atàr** *sú*   *g', ou gàr kairòs   eidénai*
          DM 2SG.NOM PTC not PTC time:NOM know:PF.INF
          tóde   déspoinan
          DEM.ACC.N mistress:ACC
          Nurse: 'We will be ruined, if we add new sufferings to the old ones,
          before ending to suffer from them.'
          Tutor: 'But you, it is not the right time for your mistress to know this.'
          (Eur., *Med.* 78–81)

In (18), *atár* occurs turn-initially and links two conversational turns belonging
to different speakers, thereby acting at the interactional level only. More specif-
ically, by using *atár*, speaker B abruptly poses an end to speaker's A turn and
fully takes possession of his/her own turn. It is worth observing that, in this
case, *atár* displays a behavior similar to turn-initial *allà* in its 'correction of dis-
course topics' function (Drummen 2009: 151).

5.4   *Summary: a unified account of* **atár** *in Classical Greek*

In Attic drama, *atár* can be described as functioning either as a connective or as a DM. In a handful of occurrences, *atár* behaves as a connective and establishes coordination relationships of oppositive contrast between two sentences (Mauri 2008). Also, in this function it often correlates with *mén*. Since *atár* encodes semantic relationships between SoAs, when behaving as a connective it functions at the representational level of discourse. In most cases, *atár* rather behaves as a DM and performs different functions at different levels. This is hardly surprising, as polyfunctionality is one of the core features of DMs (Schiffrin 2003). When occurring at the beginning of a turn, as in (18), *atár* can be described as a turn-taking device that works at the interactional level. When acting as a thematic boundary marker within non-diaphonic monologues, as in (17), *atár* works at the presentational level. Nevertheless, in a wealth of cases the line between discourse levels seems to be partially blurred, as *atár* apparently works simultaneously both at the presentational and at the interactional level. On the one hand, *atár* signals a strong thematic break-off within the speech of an individual character, acting on what Givón (1983: 9) labels 'thematic continuity', as opposed to the narrower 'participant/topic continuity'. On the other hand, it is employed to manage turn-taking and speaker interaction. In this case, it either indicates a speaker's attempt to change the discourse's orientation at the beginning of a new turn after an introductory backgrounded conversational move, as in (8), or it explicitly marks a change of addressee, as in (16). In these occurrences, it is hard to judge which of the two functions is contextually more salient to speakers. In the next section, I argue that this synchronic fuzziness between discourse levels should be interpreted as the by-product of an ongoing process of grammaticalization.

6   The diachrony of *atár*

As pointed out in Section 4 and 5, one can detect a variation in the usage of *atár* between Homeric and Classical Greek. I would like to argue that such a difference can be explained in diachronic terms. To be sure, further investigation on the function of *atár* in archaic texts other than Homer, and in classical prose texts such as Plato, is needed to provide a more detailed diachronic picture, but some interesting conclusions can be provisionally drawn from the evidence discussed above. It is commonly agreed that sentence connectives can develop a DM function following specific paths of grammaticalization (cf. Traugott 1995, 2010a; Giacalone Ramat & Mauri 2009; Diewald 2011; see

Allan 2017a on the grammaticalization of Ancient Greek particles).[8] Grammaticalization is defined as "the process whereby lexical material in highly constrained pragmatic and morphosyntactic contexts becomes grammatical" (Traugott 1995: 1). With respect to connectives developing into DM, grammaticalization concerns the loss of semantic content, e.g. the encoding of oppositive contrast, and the acquisition of discursive functions. In what follows, I explain how *atár* might have developed a DM function out of its basic connective value.

In the first place, one needs to account for the shift from connective at the representational level of discourse to DM at the presentational level, a process which had apparently already started in Homer, as hinted by examples (5a) and (5b). The DM function most likely arose in cases of non-prototypical usage of the connective, which can still be detected in Classical Greek, as in (19):

(19) *steíkhoim'   án; hó   ti   gàr mề khreṓn,*
      go:PRS.OPT.1SG PTC REL.ACC.N INDF.ACC.N PTC NEG need(N):NOM
      *oútoi   khreṑn   patheîn.   **Atár** toi tônd'*
      certainly.not need(N):NOM suffer:AOR.INF CONN PTC DEM.GEN.PL
      ápoin'   hubrismátōn   méteisi   Diónusós
      ransom:ACC.PL.N insolency:GEN.PL pay:FUT.3SG Dionysos:NOM
      se
      2SG.ACC
      Dionysos: 'I will go, for I cannot suffer what is unnecessary. And as for these insolences, Dionysos will make you pay the price for them.'
      (Eur., *Bacch.* 515–516)

In (19), *atár* connects two stretches of discourse, and correlates with the introduction of the preverbal contrastive topic *tônd'* […] *hubrismátōn* 'these insolences'. However, a digressive move marked by *gàr* is inserted between the two utterances connected by *atár*, which thus performs a reactivating func-

---

tion as well. This is a case of non-prototypical coordination, since one expects coordinated utterances to be at least adjacent in the linear sequence, as Blühdorn (2008: 64–65) points out. In occurrences such as (19), in which backgrounded material is inserted between the coordinated segments, the semantic link between the two may be weakened and *atár*'s context-driven function of thematic boundary marker may be consequently taken over as primary, given its higher saliency in discourse. This is arguably how the connective becomes a DM operating at the presentational level.

In the second place, the development of interactional functions may be explained by taking dialogicity as one of the factors at play. According to Traugott (2010b), dialogic functions of DMs often arise in dialogic contexts, i.e. contexts in which two or more points of view are invoked in discourse. In such contexts, speakers start to use connectives in a speaker-oriented perspective, and exploit their basic function for conversational purposes. The role of dialogicity is more evident within diaphonic monologues, in which the doubling of the voices constitutes a clear index of dialogicity. Example (20) is remarkably instructive in this respect.

(20) *étoi   philoûsa   g'   ês   húper*
     indeed love:PRS.PTCP.NOM.F PTC REL.GEN.F over
     manteúetai,   è̀ kaí ti   sigôs'
     divine:PRS.M/P.3SG or also INDF.ACC.N keep.silent:PRS.PTCP.NOM.F
     *hôn   siōpâsthai   khreṓn   **atàr***
     REL.GEN.PL keep.silent:PRS.INF.M/P need:NOM.N DM
     thugatròs   tês   Erekhthéōs   tí   moi
     daughter(F):GEN ART.GEN.F Erechtheus:GEN INT.ACC 1SG.DAT
     mélei
     care:PRS.3SG
     Ion: 'Does she indeed ask for a reply on behalf of a friend, or is she also keeping secret something that must stay hidden? But what do I even care of the daughter of Erechtheus?' (Eur., *Ion.* 431–434)

In (20), *atár* introduces an utterance featuring the preverbal topic *thugatròs* 'of the daughter', thus behaving consistently with its basic connective function. However, the utterance introduced by *atár* also invokes a different point of view in discourse and can be conceived as question posed by an external character, similar to the diaphonic monologue in (14). Starting from diaphonic contexts such as (20), *atár* might have been reinterpreted as operating at the interactional level of discourse. This process ultimately leads *atár* to be used as a full-fledged turn-taking device, as in (18).

Another source for interactional functions may be traced to instances of top-icalization of second person pronouns, as in (21), taken from Homer:

(21) *átt',*   *êtoi   mèn egṑn   eîm'   es pólin,   óphra*
     father.VOC indeed PTC 1SG.NOM go.PRS.1SG to city.ACC in.order
     *me   métēr   ópsetai.   [...] **atàr   soí   g'   hôd'***
     1SG.ACC mother.NOM see.FUT.3SG   CONN 2SG.DAT PTC thus
     epitéllō
     order.PRS.1SG
     'Father, I will go to the city indeed, so that mother can see me. And to you
     I command this.' (Hom. *Od.* 17.9)

In (21), after a digression—here, put into brackets with ellipsis due to its length—the previous discourse is reactivated with a topic shift marked by the occurrence of *atàr* in conjunction with the second person pronoun *soí* 'to you'. It seems plausible that from contexts such as (21), in which a second person pronoun is contrastively topicalized, speakers may infer a conversational usage of *atár* as a marker of change of addressee, which turns out to be more salient in interactional practices. This path also accounts for examples such as (16) above, in which the change of addressee co-occurs with the introduction of a foregrounded move.

Summing up, the cline of this grammaticalization process can be sketched as follows:

> connective (representational level) > DM (presentational level) > DM
> (interactional level)

This schema describes how, and in which order, the functions of *atár* have developed over time. Remarkably, the new functions acquired by *atár* turn out to follow the subjectification cline proposed by Traugott: "speaker-based, sub-jective meanings may become salient in certain types of communication as a result of certain interactional practices" (Traugott 2010b). Such a development is also fully supported by similar grammaticalization processes undergone by other Ancient Greek particles, as thoroughly discussed by Allan (2017a). The connective function of *atár* is prominent in Homeric Greek, although the DM function at the presentational level may have started its development already at this time, as discussed for examples (5a) and (5b). The interactional function, which seems unknown to Homer, is possibly fully achieved only in Classical Greek. To be sure, *atár* mostly occurs in dialogues already in Homer, but it never shows an interactional value comparable to the one discussed in Section

5.3.2. and it never appears turn-initially. This provides evidence for the fact that, though source contexts for the subsequent development of *atár* were possibly already available in Homer, in this phase the grammaticalization of the particle from connective to DM was at most beginning.[9]

Most interestingly, the development of new functions does not entail the loss of the older ones, leading to the situation described in Classical Greek, in which the three functions, viz. connective, DM at the presentational level, and DM at the interactional level, coexist to different extents, as discussed in Section 5.4. This is fully consistent with Diewald's (2001: 377) observation that the so-called 'pragmaticalization' of DMs should be conceived of as a first stage of a grammaticalization process, whereby items undergoing grammaticalization increase their semantic and functional scope without restriction on their structural scope (see Allan 2017a for similar remarks). Therefore, the high frequency of occurrences in which the line between the different functions is blurred can be explained if one assumes that Classical Greek attests to a transitional phase in which *atár* was still undergoing this grammaticalization process.

The emergence of the collocational patterns discussed in Section 5.3.1, that is, *atàr* […] *ge* and *atàr tís*, fits well such a diachronic process. The pattern *atàr* […] *ge* is already known to Homer. In Homer, the particle *ge* emphasizes the contrastiveness of the noun phrase following *atár*, which can serve either as a sentence topic or as a setting. The expansion of this pattern in Classical Greek is motivated by the new function of *atár* as a DM. It seems plausible that, having now become a DM marking thematic boundaries, *atár* starts to strongly correlate with the introduction of new information, which can be emphasized as such by the use of *ge*, as in (15) above. Instead, the pattern *atàr tís* is entirely

---

9 I prefer to describe this variation as the outcome of a diachronic process, rather than as a mere synchronic variation due to stylistic features of the texts employed for the following reasons. First, the absence of an interactional value of *atár* in Homer cannot be simply ascribed to the lack of proper dialogic contexts, as even in Homer *atár* virtually occurs only in direct speeches. Thus, if an interactional value was indeed already available, I do not see any plausible stylistic reason for its absence in Homer. Conversely, although the selection of Attic drama as a corpus may partly bias the analysis, the low frequency of *atár* as a connective in the corpus can be hardly linked to the lack of narrative contexts, as *atár* is not specifically tied to narratives even in Homer. Again, I find no compelling stylistic reason for this distribution. Finally, it is clear that, even in the case that the variation between Homer and Attic drama is in fact due to stylistic reasons, one still needs to account for the development of the DM functions out of the connective one in the first place. Therefore, not only a diachronic explanation for the polyfunctionality of the particle is needed, but it also fits the distributional patterns observed in the available textual data better.

unknown to Homer, and its creation must follow the reanalysis of *atár* as a DM. Functionally, such a relation with interrogative pronouns is fully compatible with the picture outlined so far. Interrogative pronouns and adverbs constitute focal elements of the predication, hence their frequent occurrence after the kind of strong thematic boundaries signaled by *atár* in Attic drama. In conclusion, in Classical Greek these two collocational patterns of *atár* increase in frequency as compared to Homeric Greek, on account of the newly created functions of the particle as a presentational and interactional DM.

7   Conclusions

In this study, I have provided a description of the usage of *atár* in Ancient Greek and have shown how its use varies over time, with a focus on Homeric Greek and Attic drama.

In Homer, *atár* largely behaves as a sentence connective and encodes oppositive contrast at the representational level of discourse. Moreover, it correlates with the introduction of contrastive sentence topics. By contrast, in Attic drama, *atár* behaves as a foregrounding discourse marker and performs a variety of functions. First, it works at the presentational level of discourse and marks thematic boundaries within conversational turns. Second, it acts at the interactional level and interacts with the turn-taking system. In addition, in a number of cases the line between these functions is rather fuzzy, and *atár* seemingly acts at both levels.

The functional differences detected between Homeric and Classical Greek can be accounted for in diachronic terms, by postulating a specific path of grammaticalization whereby *atár* eventually developed conversational values. I have discussed various types of context in which the new functions of *atár* may have arisen and shown that the direction of the pragmatic change fits well our general understanding of 'pragmaticalization' processes as featuring an increase of subjectivity and of speaker-oriented functions (Traugott 2010b). Notably, the development detected for *atár* provides further evidence for the existence of a common trend in the grammaticalization of Greek particles such as the one advocated by Allan (2017a).

References

Allan, Rutger J. 2014. Changing the topic: topic position in Ancient Greek word order. *Mnemosyne* 67(2).181–213.

Allan, Rutger J. 2017a. The grammaticalization of Greek particles. *Ancient Greek Linguistics. New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*, ed. by Felicia Logozzo & Paolo Poccetti, 103–118. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Allan, Rutger J. 2017b. Ancient Greek adversative particles in contrast. *Pragmatic approaches to Latin and Ancient Greek*, ed. by Camille Denizot & Olga Spevak, 273–301. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Andorno, Cecilia. 2003. *Linguistica testuale. Un'introduzione*. Roma: Carocci.

Bain, David. 1977. *Actors and audience: a study of asides and related conventions in Greek drama*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakker, Egbert. J. 1993. Boundaries, topics, and the structure of discourse: an investigation of the Ancient Greek particle δέ. *Studies in Language* 17.275–311.

Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill.

Bertrand, Nicolas. 2010. *L'ordre de mots chez Homère: structure informationnelle, localisation et progression du récit*. PhD dissertation, Université Paris-Sorbonne.

Blakemore, Diana. 2006. Discourse Markers. *The handbook of pragmatics*, ed. by Laurence Horn & Gregory Ward, 221–240. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blühdorn, Hardarik. 2008. Subordination and coordination in syntax, semantics and discourse: Evidence from the study of connectives. *'Subordination' versus 'Coordination' in Sentence and Text*, ed. by Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen & Wiebke Ramm, 59–85. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Bonifazi, Anna. 2012. *Homer's versicolored fabric: The evocative power of Ancient Greek epic word-making*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Chantraine, Pierre. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Crespo, Emilio, Luz Conti & Helena Maquiera. 2003. *Sintax del griego clásico*. Madrid: Gredos.

Croft, William. 2003. *Typology and universals* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Degand, Liesbeth & Jaqueline Evers-Vermeul. 2015. Grammaticalization or pragmaticalization of discourse markers? More than a terminological issue. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 16(1). 59–85.

Denniston, John D. 1954. *The Greek particles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Diewald, Gabriele. 2011. Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics* 49(2).365–390.

Dik, Helma. 1995. *Word order in Ancient Greek: a pragmatic account of word order variation in Herodotus*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Dik, Helma. 2007. *Word order in Greek tragic dialogue*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dik, Simon C. 1968. *Coordination: its implication for the theory of general linguistics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Drummen, Annemieke. 2009. Discourse cohesion in dialogue. Turn-initial ἀλλά in Greek drama. *Discourse cohesion in Ancient Greek*, ed. by Stephanie J. Bakker & Gerry Wakker, 135–154. Leiden: Brill.

Duhoux, Yves. 2003. Les particules: une classe des mots à supprimer en grec ancien? *Word classes and related topics in Ancient Greek*, ed. by Emilio Crespo, Jesus de la Villa & Antonio R. Revuelta, 519–536. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Fedriani, Chiara & Andrea Sansò. 2017. Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and modal particles. What do we know and where do we go from here? *Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and modal particles: New perspectives*, ed. by Chiara Fedriani & Andrea Sansò, 1–33. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Giacalone Ramat, Anna & Caterina Mauri. 2009. Dalla continuità temporale al contrasto: la grammaticalizzazione di *tuttavia* come connettivo contrastivo. *Sintassi storica e sincronica dell'italiano. Subordinazione, coordinazione e giustapposizione*, ed. by Angela Ferrari, 449–470. Firenze: Franco Cesati.

Givón, Talmy. 1983. Topic continuity in discourse: An introduction. *Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative cross-language study*, ed. by Talmy Givón, 1–45. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gundel, Jeanette K. & Thorstein Fretheim. 2006. Topic and focus. *The handbook of pragmatics*, ed. by Laurence Horn & Gregory Ward, 175–196. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Guidorizzi, Guido & Dario del Corno. 1996. *Aristofane. Le Nuvole*. Milano: Valla.

Halliday, Michael A.K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2013. Nominal and verbal conjunction. *The world atlas of language structures online*, ed. by Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Accessed at http://wals.info/chapter/64

Heine, Bernd. 2013. On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics* 51(6).1205–1247.

Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010. *Greek. A history of the language and its speakers* (2nd ed.). London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Humbert, Jean. 1960. *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Inglese, Guglielmo. 2017. Connettivi testuali: il caso di *atár* e *autár* in greco omerico. *Ancient Greek Linguistics. New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*, ed. by Felicia Logozzo & Paolo Poccetti, 155–170. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kroon, Caroline. 1995. *Discourse particles in Latin. A study of* nam, enim, autem, vero *and* at. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lühr, Rosemarie & Susanne Zeilfelder. 2011. Zur Interdependenz von Diskursrelationen und Konnektoren in indogermanischen Sprachen: Kontrast und Korrektur. *Satzverknüpfungen. Zur Interaktion von Form, Bedeutung und Diskursfunktion*, ed. by Eva Breindl, Gisella Ferraresi, & Anna Volodina, 107–148. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matić, Dejan. 2003. Topic, focus, and discourse structure: Ancient Greek word order. *Studies in language* 27(3).573–633.

Mauri, Caterina & Johan van der Auwera. 2012. Connectives. *The Cambridge handbook of pragmatics*, ed. by Allan Keith & Kasia M. Jaszczolt, 347–402. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mauri, Caterina. 2008. *Coordination relations in the languages of Europe and beyond*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ruijgh, Cornelius. 1957. *L'élement achéen dans la langue épique*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Ruijgh, Cornelius. 1971. *Autour de «τε épique»: études sur la syntaxe grecque*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schlegoff & Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. *Language* 50.696–735.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 2003. Discourse markers: language, meaning, and context. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, ed. by Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen & Heidi E. Hamilton, 54–75. London: Wiley.

Schwyzer, Eduard & Albert Debrunner. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns griechischer Grammatik. Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. Munich: Beck.

Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sidnell, Jack. 2010. *Conversation analysis: an introduction*. London: Wiley.

Slings, Simon. 1997. Adversative relators between PUSH and POP. *New approaches to Greek particles*, ed. by Albert Rijksbaron, 101–129. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

TLG: *Thesaurus linguae Grecae*, http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 1995. The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalization. Paper presented at ICHL XII, Manchester 1995.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2010a. Grammaticalization. *The Bloomsbury companion to historical linguistics*, ed. by Silvia Luraghi & Vit Bubenik, 271–285. London: Bloomsbury.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2010b. Dialogic contexts as motivations for syntactic change. *Studies in the history of theEnglish Language. Variation and change in English grammar and lexicon*, ed. by Robert A. Cloutier, Anne Marie Hamilton-Brehm & William A. Kretzschmar, 11–27. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

van Emde Boas, Evert. (2017). Analyzing Agamemnon: Conversation analysis and particles in Greek Tragic Dialogue. *Classical Philology* 112(4).411–434.

van der Auwera, Johan. 2013. Semantic maps, for synchronic and diachronic typology.

Synchrony and diachrony. A dynamic interface, ed. by Anna Giacalone Ramat, Caterina Mauri & Piera Molinelli, 153–176. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Viti, Carlotta. 2008. The meaning of coordination in early Indo-European languages. *Revue de sémantique et pragmatique* 24.35–64.

Willi, Andreas. 2002. The language of Greek comedy: Introduction and bibliographical sketch. *The language of Greek comedy*, ed. by Andreas Willi, 1–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.