Conjunctive adverbs in Ancient Greek
Position and development of conjunctive functions

José Miguel Jiménez Delgado
Universidad de Sevilla
jmjimdelg@us.es

Abstract

Conjunctive adverbs have generally been neglected in Ancient Greek grammars. In this language, textual cohesion is mostly assured by a battery of connective particles. While connective particles exhibit fixed position, conjunctive adverbs show a certain degree of positional variability. They usually take initial position, as well as medial position when preceded by a preposed constituent. Final position is very rare and most instances are due to ellipsis. This is comparable to the early phases of the development of similar adverbs in other languages.

Keywords

conjunctive adverbs – connective particles – topic / focus preposing – word order – Ancient Greek

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to study the position of conjunctive adverbs in Ancient Greek, more precisely in classical and postclassical texts. Conjunctive adverbs are a morphosyntactic type of discourse marker with connecting functions, cf. Crespo (2011); Martín Zorraquino (2010: 121–129).[1] The position of

---

[1] According to Bazanella (2006: 456), "Discourse markers are items external to propositional content which are useful in locating the utterance in an interpersonal and interactive dimension, in connecting and structuring phrasal, inter-phrasal and extra-phrasal elements in discourse, and in marking some ongoing cognitive processes and attitudes". A list of characteristics that define them can be seen in Fedriani & Sansò (2017: 2–4). Two main classes of

these elements has received attention in recent years, but those studies have mostly focused on modern languages whose word order does not always coincide with Ancient Greek's. Nevertheless, as discussed below, different adverbs' development of conjunctive functions in those languages shows a series of characteristics that can be compared to the development of similar functions by Ancient Greek adverbs. It must be noted that this paper's claims are exemplified by three adverbs that show a high degree of pragmaticalisation as conjunctive devices:[2] *hómōs* 'however, though', *proséti* 'besides' and *hōsaútōs* 'similarly, likewise'. This degree of pragmaticalisation is the main reason of this choice, since it allows for a more accurate analysis of their position than with other items.[3] It is not always easy to determine the conjunctive status of the examples when the adverb is not fully pragmaticalised. This becomes clear in the analysis of *hōsaútōs*, since the pragmaticalisation of the conjunctive sequence *hòs d' aútōs* gives way to a new adverb which also acquired non-conjunctive functions. Be that as it may, another highly pragmaticalised item like *aû* has not been included because of its postpositive nature. On *eîta* and *épeita*, see Jiménez Delgado (2014).

The first issue to be addressed is the distinction between conjunctive adverbs and other connecting devices, especially coordinating conjunctions and particles. One of the most striking features of Ancient Greek is the fact that independent sentences are generally linked to one another by connective particles (Denniston 1952: 99 and 1954: xliii), while the asyndeton is rare and

---

discourse markers can be distinguished: *connectors* and *operators*. The former relate two discourse segments, while the latter have scope only over the discourse unit hosting them. This distinction is based on Ducrot (1983), who speaks of "argumentative morphemes". See also Martín Zorraquino & Portolés Lázaro (1999: 4072); Fuentes (2009: 12–13).

2 Pragmaticalisation is a specific type of grammaticalisation whereby a lexical term develops pragmatic meanings that are finally reanalysed as encoded meanings, cf. Diewald (2011), as well as Allan (2017a), whose remarks on the grammaticalisation of Greek particles also apply to that of conjunctive adverbs, especially the correlation of semantic change and scope increase. The latter concept refers to the development of discourse-level meaning from propositional meaning. Moreover, this paper makes no terminological distinction between conjunctive adverbs and adverbials. Note that most "conjunctive adverbs" are fixed idioms in modern languages, like *even so*, *notwithstanding* or *in addition*. The same is applicable to *proséti* and *hōsaútōs*, which are decomposable into *prós + éti* and *hṓs + aútōs* respectively.

3 Other adverbs that exhibit conjunctive functions are *állōs* 'otherwise, besides', *háma* 'at the same time, besides', *aû* and *aûthis* 'again, on the other hand', *eîta* and *épeita* 'then', *éti* 'still, besides', *loipón* 'hereafter, then', *mâllon* 'more, rather', *hólōs* 'wholly, on the whole, all in all', *homoíōs* 'in like manner, likewise', *houtōs* 'so, thus', *pálin* 'backwards, again, in turn', *prôton … deúteron* 'first … second', *tounantíon* 'opposite, contrariwise, on the contrary', *hústeron* 'later, finally', *khōrís* 'separately, besides'.

generally conditioned (Denniston 1952: 99–123; Crespo 2013).[4] See the following passage corresponding to the beginning of Xenophon's *Anabasis*:[5]

(1) *Dareíou* **kaì** *Parusā́tidos paîdes gígnontai dúo, presbúteros*
of.Darius **and**.PTC of.Parysatis sons they.are.born two the.elder
mèn Artaxérxēs, neṓteros **dè** *Kûros. Epeì* **dè**
PTC Artaxexes the.younger **and**.PTC Cyrus when **and**.PTC
ēsthénei Dareîos **kaì** *hupṓpteue teleutḕn toû bíou,*
he.lay.sick Darius **and**.PTC he.suspected the.end of.his life
eboúleto tṑ paîde amphotérō pareînai. Ho **mèn oûn**
he.wanted his sons both be.present.INF the PTC **then**.PTC
presbúteros parṑn etúgkhane. Kûron
elder being.present.PTCP.NOM he.was.by.chance Cyrus.ACC
dè *metapémpetai apò tês arkhês hês autòn satrápēn*
but.PTC he.summons from the province of.which him satrap.ACC
epoíēsen, **kaì** *stratēgòn* **dè** *autòn apédeixe pántōn hósoi*
he.made **and**.PTC general.ACC PTC him he.appointed of.all who
es Kastōloû pedíon hathroízontai.
in Castolus' plain they.gather.together
"Darius and Parysatis had two sons born to them, of whom the elder was Artaxerxes and the younger Cyrus. Now when Darius lay sick and suspected that the end of his life was near, he wished to have both his sons with him. The elder, as it chanced, was with him already; but Cyrus he summoned from the province over which he had made him satrap, and he had also appointed him commander of all the forces that muster in the plain of Castolus". (X. *An.* 1.1.1–2)

In this example, the connective particles linking the sentences which make up the passage are in bold, as well as those relating other types of elements (*Dareíou* **kaì** *Parusā́tidos*; *presbúteros* **mèn** *Artaxérxēs, neṓteros* **dè** *Kûros*; *ēsthé-*

---

4 There are two main types of asyndeton: between phrases and between clauses (which Denniston refers to as half asyndeton) and between independent sentences (which Denniston refers to as full asyndeton). Asyndeton is more frequent in dialogic than in monologic texts. In monologic texts, it sometimes has a rhetorical effect of vividness, and full asyndeton is especially frequent when a sentence elaborates on the content of the preceding one, for instance, when an anaphoric pronoun announces it.

5 Greek texts are presented as they appear in the TLG, while English translations have been taken from the Perseus Digital Library and the Loeb collection, with only slight modifications made when necessary. Behr's translation of Aelius Aristides' works published by Brill has also been used.

nei kaì Dareîos hupṓpteue).[6] The term 'connective particle' is used in this paper as a general term in order to distinguish conjunctive adverbs from the elements traditionally classified as particles.[7] This term comprises conjunctions, like *kaí* 'and', a syntactic category with the ability to coordinate any kind of element; particles, a more semantic category that only relates sentences,[8] like *oûn*; other devices which stand more or less in between, like *dé*; and even elements that announce an upcoming conjunct, like *mén*. The adverbs that fulfill conjunctive functions are easily distinguished from connective particles.[9] Apart from their phonetic size (*particula* means 'small part [of speech]') and greater positional variability (see below), most of them still maintain non-conjunctive functions that coexist with the conjunctive ones; their frequency is more limited;[10] and they do not usually have the ability to connect by themselves but in association with particles. In Ancient Greek, conjunctive adverbs tend to reinforce or nuance the semantic and/or pragmatic instructions conveyed by the particles with which they associate, cf. Crespo (2014); Quirk et al. (1985: 645–646); Kovacci (1999: 769). See the following example, in which *proséti* associates with the particle *dé*:

(2) *ḗdē   dè   kaì   memisthoménous eînai polloùs*
     already and.PTC also.ADV hired   be.INF many
     mèn   Thrākôn   makhairophórous, Aiguptíous
     on.the.one.hand.PTC of.Thracians swordsmen   Egyptians

---

6   Note that the first sentence has no connective particle since it is the first of *Anabasis*.

7   For the distinction of the different word classes covered by the term *particle* in Ancient Greek, including sentence adverbs, see Sicking & van Ophuijsen (1993: 76–79). See also Allan's enumeration of the features of Greek particles (Allan 2017a: 103–104): a degree of bondedness, phonological lightness, membership in a relatively closed set, and abstract meaning.

8   From a discourse-oriented perspective, particles relate acts or moves. Moves are minimal, free discourse units and they are composed of a main act and usually, one or more subordinated acts that are thematically tied; acts are minimal units with communicative intent and every act is supported by an argument or by the rejection of a counterargument. Cf. Kroon (1995: 64–67). For the application of these discourse units to Ancient Greek, see Bonifazi et al. (2016: II.2), who somewhat equates acts with *kôla* in terms of intonation units (Scheppers 2011).

9   The etymology of these particles is generally controversial, though in some cases an adverbial origin can be established, cf. Crespo (2014).

10 Compare the frequency of the particles *allá* (515 instances), *dé* (8075) or connective *kaí* (6339) with that of the conjunctive adverbs *hómōs* (20), *proséti* (1) or *hōsaútōs* (4) in the *History* of Herodotus.

> *dè*   *prospleîn ...*   ***proséti***   ***dè***   ***kaì***
> on.the.other.hand.PTC sail.to.join.INF **besides**.ADV **and**.PTC also.ADV
> *Kupríōn*   *stráteuma.*
> of.Cyprians army
> "[They reported] also that many Thracian swordsmen had already been
> hired and that Egyptians were under sail to join them ... Besides these,
> there was also the Cyprian army". (X. *Cyr.* 6.2.10)

The particle *dé* indicates that there is a thematic discontinuity between the
conjuncts, cf. Bakker (1993); Martín López (1993). The adverb *proséti* specifies
that the conjunct introduced by *dé* adds to the previous one and that they have
the same argumentative orientation.[11]

Conjunctive adverbs can additionally be used to strengthen the relation
between main and subordinate clauses. This use is characteristic of some con-
junctive adverbs. A clear case is that of *hómōs* between a concessive subordi-
nate and its main clause:

(3)   *kaì   ei pistaì   hūmîn eisin,   **hómōs***
      even if certain.NOM to.you they.are **however**.ADV
      episkeptéai   saphésteron
      to.be.examined.NOM more.carefully
      "Even though our first assumptions seem to you to be certain, however,
      they ought to be more carefully examined". (Pl. *Phd.* 107.b)

This "apodotic" function is especially frequent after concessive, conditional,
temporal and causal subordinate clauses. In the first case, *hómōs* is most typ-
ical, while in the conditional and temporal cases, the adverbs *eîta*, *épeita* and
tóte, all meaning 'then', are the most employed; *hoútōs* 'thus' is used after all
types of subordinate clauses, including manner clauses, after which *hōsaútōs*
is also used. It should be stressed that some connective particles also exhibit
this "apodotic" function, though this use is generally archaic and rare, cf. Den-
niston (1954: xl–xli).

Conjunctive adverbs can also function within a subordinate clause (Green-
baum 1969: 38–39). This adverbial function is not frequent at all,[12] but strength-

---

11   That is to say, that both conjuncts lead to the same conclusions. On argumentative orien-
     tation, see Anscombre & Ducrot (1983).
12   For instance, example (4) is the only one with *hómōs* functioning within a subordinate
     clause in Demosthenes' works, where this adverb is found 115 times.

ens or nuances the semantic relation between main and subordinate clause
and is exclusive to conjunctive adverbs:

(4) *tḕn   dè   boḗtheian   édei   kōlûsai*
     ART.FEM and.PTC reinforcement.ACC.FEM it.was.necessary to.stop.INF
     tḕn   eis   tā̀s Púlās,   eph' hḕn   hai pentḗkonta
     ART.FEM to.PREP the Thermopylai for   which the fifty
     *triḗreis   **hómōs**   ephórmoun,   hín',   ei*
     war-galleys **however**.ADV they.were.lying.at.anchor so.that if
     poreúoito   Phílippos, kōlúoith'   hūmeîs
     he.advanced Philip   you.could.stop you.NOM
     "It was necessary to stop the reinforcement of Thermopylae, for which
     fifty war-galleys were lying at anchor, though, to enable you to check
     Philip's advance". (D. 19.322)

In this example, the adverb *hómōs* indicates that the relative subordinate clause
leads to different conclusions with respect to those of the main one.

2   Conjunctive adverbs and their position

Conjunctive adverbs tend to be placed in initial position. This position best
accommodates their function as clause-linking devices since they occupy an
intermediary position between linked units.[13] Typologically, one of the features
that distinguishes conjunctive adverbs from coordinating conjunctions is posi-
tional variability (Martín Zorraquino & Portolés Lázaro 1999: 4062; Pasch et
al. 2003: 457 and 494; Lenker 2010: 43–44 and 67). Conjunctions occupy ini-
tial position in modern European languages, whereas conjunctive adverbs can
occupy initial, medial and final position; see the following Spanish examples
taken from Martín Zorraquino & Portolés Lázaro (1999: 4063):

---

13   Conjunctive adverbs function on Kroon's presentational level; Kroon distinguishes, fol-
      lowing Halliday & Hasan (1976), three levels determining the coherence relations among
      discourse units: representational (concerned with the representation of content), pre-
      sentational (concerned with organisation), and interactive (concerned with the inter-
      action of interlocutors). The presentational level is concerned with the organisation
      whereby the information is presented, and it "captures the fact that a language user
      imposes an organizing and rhetorical perspective on the ideas conveyed" (Kroon 1995:
      61).

(5)   a. Juan estaba cansado. **No obstante**, continuó su camino. (John was
         tired. However, he went on his way.)
      b. Juan estaba cansado. Continuó, **no obstante**, su camino. (John was
         tired. He went, however, on his way.)
      c. Juan estaba cansado. Continuó su camino, **no obstante**. (John was
         tired. He went on his way, however.)

The position of these elements has garnered some interest in the last years; see,
for instance, Georgakopoulou & Goutsos (1998); Altenberg (2006); Haselow
(2012); Lenker (2010: 43–44, 67–72, 197–213 and 233–241); Traugott (2016); and
Goutsos (2017). These studies mainly focus on medial and final position. In
English, conjunctive adverbs historically developed the medial position when
they were placed after a contrastive constituent. In the 18th and 19th centuries,
their use in medial position was already common (6a), including position after
a contrastive constituent (6b):

(6)   a. The natural sciences do not, **however**, stand on the same footing with
         these instrument-knowledges … (CLARN3, 127; see Lenker 2010: 237).
      b. This portion, **however**, may still be considered as the natural rent of
         the land … (Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, Chapter XI, Part 1).

Final position appeared later, and it supposes a re-interpretive strategy.[14] This
position has given birth to a new constituent order according to which many
conjunctive adverbs can be placed in that position in any type of text:

(7)   He is poor. He is satisfied with his situation, **though**. (Lenker 2010: 201).

In this position, not only adversative conjunctive adverbs like *though* but also
consecutive conjunctive adverbs like *then* and additive ones like *too* are en-
countered. Even though this position is intuitively unqualified to connect to
the preceding sentence, it is found in other languages, like German, where there
are also a number of conjunctive adverbs that can be placed in final position;
cf. Pasch et al. (2003: 553).
    Before examining the Ancient Greek data, it must be stressed that in English
and Spanish, sentences and clauses tend to be connected via conjunctions and
conjunctive adverbs that do not always overlap with the connective particles

---

14   Reinterpreting structures consist of the addition of information, at the end of the sen-
     tence/clause and preceded by a pause, when this piece of information leads to reinterpret
     what has been said from a new perspective; cf. Fuentes (2009: 21; 2012: 79–81).

proper to Ancient Greek. Moreover, word order is determined by syntactic patterns in English and Spanish, while Ancient Greek is what has been called a non-configurational language, in which word order is mostly determined by pragmatic factors;[15] cf. Matić (2003a); Bertrand (2010); Goldstein (2016a). Nevertheless, the position of conjunctive adverbs in these languages is not determined by syntactic patterns, or at least not only by them. This enables the comparison with the position of conjunctive adverbs in Ancient Greek, and as is examined below, the position of these adverbs in Ancient Greek corresponds to the early phases of the development of similar functions by English adverbs.

3 Position of conjunctive adverbs in classical and postclassical Greek

Even if textual cohesion is mostly assured by a remarkable variety of connective particles (Denniston 1954; Bonifazi et al. 2016), Ancient Greek does possess conjunctive adverbs, though most of them still maintain adjunct functions, and it is not always easy to distinguish their conjunctive use from other usages. The three adverbs on which this study is focused are clear cases of conjunctive adverbs. These adverbs are the result of different processes of pragmaticalisation: *hómōs* 'however, though' derives from the adverb of manner *homôs* 'similarly, likewise', with an accentual shift that reflects its conversion to a conjunctive adverb. Note that Homer only uses *hómōs* two times (*Il.* 12.393, *Od.* 11.565),[16] while he does not use *homoíōs*, the adverb that replaced *homôs* in classical Greek. However, *homôs* appears 28 times in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. *Proséti* 'besides' is the result of merging two elements, *prós* 'besides' and *éti* 'still', in conjunctive sequences like *pròs d' éti* 'and besides', in which the connective particle *dé* appears between these two elements. The first instance of *proséti* is attested in Hdt. 1.41.3, but Herodotus still uses intermediate forms (*pròs d' éti* in Hdt. 3.74.1, 9.111.2; *pròs toútoisi éti* in Hdt. 1.32.7, 99.1, 79.1, 5.62.1, 7.6.2; *pròs éti toútoisi* in Hdt. 1.64.2, 3.65.7, 9.111.2). *Hōsaútōs* 'likewise' is the result of merging

---

15   The concept of configurationality has been developed by grammarians working within Chomsky's generative framework. Non-configurational languages are mainly characterised by free word order, the use of syntactically discontinuous expressions and extensive use of null anaphora; cf. Hale (1983). Languages in which word order is determined by pragmatic factors have been called "discourse configurational"; cf. Kiss (1995). For references on the word order of Modern Greek and its (non-)configurationality, see Matić (2003b).

16   *Hómōs* is not frequent in Archaic Greek. Further instances are found in Thgn. 1.384, 1029 and Archil. *Fr.* 89.17 West.

hṓs 'thus' and *aútōs* 'in the same manner', and it is the only one that exhibits non-conjunctive functions. *Hōsaútōs* is used from the 5th century on and its conjunctive function developed from the sequence *hòs d' aútōs*, well known to Homer (*Il.* 3.339, 7.430, 9.195, 10.25; *Od.* 3.64, 6.166, 9.31, 20.238, 21.203, 225, 22.114, 24.409). The conjunctive adverbs *hōsaútōs* and *proséti* function as additive connectives, while *hómōs* functions as an adversative one; additive connectives express that their discourse unit has the same argumentative orientation as the previous one, while adversative connectives indicate that their discourse unit has an opposite argumentative orientation with respect to the previous unit.[17]

Generally speaking, conjunctive adverbs tend to be placed in initial position either before or after a connective particle in classical and postclassical Greek.[18] See the following examples:

(8)   *astôn   d'   akoà᷆   krúphion thūmòn barúnei   málist'*
      of.citizens and.PTC hearing secretly   soul.ACC weighs.on especially
      *esloîs   ep'   allotríois.| All'   **hómōs,**   krésson*
      merits.DAT on.PREP of.others.DAT but.PTC **however**.ADV stronger
      gàr   oiktirmoû phthónos, mḕ paríei   kalá.
      for.PTC than.pity envy   not you.abandon.IMP fine.deeds
      "What the citizens hear secretly weighs heavy on their spirits, especially
      concerning the merits of others. Nevertheless, since envy is better than
      pity, do not abandon fine deeds!" (Pi. *P.* 1.84–85)

---

17   Note that of the five adversative relations that can be expressed by adversative connectives according to Kroon (1995: 210–217)—see also Allan (2017b: 280–283)—*hómōs* expresses four: direct / indirect concession (Str. 1.2.20, example 13), semantic opposition (Paus. 2.15.2, example 16), discourse contrast (Pi. *P.* 1.85, example 8), and rebuttal (Ar. *Ra.* 1037, example 15). I have not found any instance of *hómōs* expressing substitution, for which *mâllon* 'rather' is more suitable.

18   They can also be found with no connective particle, although this is not frequent except when they connect a subordinate to a main clause (see above). Cf. Aristid. *Or.* 14.210 Jebb *dóntes d' heautoùs Athēnaîois, … metégnōsan, oúte tôn phórōn phérontes tḕn ametrían oúte toùs epì têi toútōn prophásei parakléptontas autoús … **proséti** tás te akropóleis eleuthérās ékhein ou dunámenoi kaì epì toîs dēmagōgoîs óntes tôn ekeínōn …* "But when they had handed themselves over to the Athenians … they repented. For they could not bear either the immoderate tribute or those who robbed them with this for an excuse … **In addition** they were unable to have free citadels and they were subject to the Athenians' popular leaders …". This is the only example of *proséti* connecting two main clauses or sentences by itself out of 38 instances in Aelius Aristides' works; there is no such instance in Aristophanes' works nor in Plato's, and only 4 out of the 47 instances of *proséti* in Lucian's works show this pattern; cf. Luc. *Fug.* 33; *Merc.Cond.* 3; *Salt.* 5; *Tim.* 55.

(9) hḗ te   oûn   īātrikḗ,   hṓsper légō, pâsa   dià
     the and.PTC so.PTC medicine.NOM like   I.say whole.NOM through
     toû theoû toútou kubernâtai, **hōsaútōs** dè   kaì
     the god   this   it.is.governed **likewise**.ADV and.PTC both.PTC
     gumnastikḕ kaì   geōrgíā.
     athletics and.PTC agriculture
     "And so not merely is all medicine governed, as I propound it, through
     the influence of this god, but likewise athletics and agriculture". (Pl. *Smp.*
     187.a)

In the first example, the conjunctive adverb appears after the connective particle *allá*, while in the second it appears before *dé*. This distinction is relevant since connective particles occupy fixed positions, either as first or second in their sentence.[19] The particles with which they usually associate are *dé* 'and, but', *kaí* 'and', *allá* 'but'. See the following example in which *proséti* follows *kaí*, which always occupies first position when it functions as a connective particle:[20]

(10) gnṓsesthe   gàr   ex   autês akoúsantes, tà memarturēmén'
     you.will.know for.PTC from it   having.heard the testimony
     hōs   éstin alēthê, kaì   tòn Milúān hóti   nûn
     that.COMP it.is true   and.PTC the Milyas.ACC that.COMP now
     mèn perì pántōn   phēsìn   exaiteîn,   tò dè
     PTC about all.matters he.declares to.demand.COMPL the but.PTC
     proton hupèr   triákonta mónon mnôn exḗitei,   kaì
     first in.regard.to thirty   only minae he.demanded and.PTC
     proséti   zēmioûtai   katà   tḕn marturíān
     besides.ADV he.has.been.penalised because.of the testimony
     oudén.
     nothing.INDF
     "For you will know, when you have heard it, that the testimony was true,
     and that Aphobus, who now declares that he demands Milyas to be exam-

---

19   Second position is often called Wackernagel's position and is characteristic of clitics. However, there are conspicuous differences, and in this regard, Goldstein (2016a: 86–89) distinguishes between sentential clitics, mostly connective particles; clausal clitics, personal pronouns and modal particles; and phrasal clitics, especially *ge*, *dé* and *per*. This distinction is based on the fact that these clitics occupy second position either in their sentence, clause or phrase.

20   This is a polyfunctional element that can function both as an additive connective meaning 'and' and as an additive focus particle meaning 'also, even'.

ined about all the matters involved in the suit, at first demanded him only in regard to a question of thirty minae; and, furthermore, that he has been put to no disadvantage because of the testimony". (D. 29.50)

Conjunctive adverbs can also occupy medial position and, exceptionally, final position. The three adverbs under consideration are encountered in medial position after the first constituent of their clause, as well as the connective particle when it is used (see note 18). The initial position of this constituent is determined by its pragmatic function (Goldstein 2016a: 25 and 215), and generally speaking, the pragmatic function of these constituents is that of contrastive focus or contrastive topic. Focus and topic are pragmatic functions that reside with the assertion and the presupposition of a proposition.[21] Focus is the element by which assertion differs from presupposition while topic is a category related to aboutness, i.e. a topic element is part of the presupposition since it is an element on which information is conferred. Contrastive topics comprise those topic expressions whose referents are selected from a limited set of candidates; cf. Allan (2014: 193). All these candidates belong to the same semantic class, and the non-selected ones can remain implicit or explicit. An example in which the conjunctive adverb is placed after a contrastive topic (*ho huiòs autoû* 'his son') is the following:

(11) [...] *exeboḗthei kaì   autòs   pròs tà hória   sùn toîs*
       he.sallied both.PTC himself to   the frontier with those
       perì   autòn kaì   ho huiòs autoû hōsaútōs   sùn toîs
       around him   and.PTC the son   of.him **likewise**.ADV with those
       paratukhoûsin   hippótais ...
       that.happened.to.be.at.hand knights
       "[When word was brought to Astyages that there were enemies in the country] he himself sallied forth to the frontier in person with his bodyguard, and likewise his son with the knights that happened to be at hand marched out". (X. *Cyr.* 1.4.18)

Note that the passage is about Cyrus, on the one hand, and his son, on the other. Contrastive focus can also be defined as the focus evoking an implicit or explicit

---

21 In Lambrecht's terms (1994: 52), pragmatic assertion is "The proposition expressed by a sentence which the hearer is expected to know or take for granted as a result of hearing the sentence uttered", while pragmatic presupposition is "The set of propositions lexicogrammatically evoked in a sentence which the speaker assumes the hearer already knows or is ready to take for granted at the time the sentence is uttered".

contrast within a limited set of alternatives and the propositions associated with them; cf. Lambrecht (1994: 286–291). An example in which the conjunctive adverb is placed after a contrastive focus is (12):

(12) *plḕn   toûtó ge   mónon ṓnēso   tês   skeuês, hóti*
     besides this PTC only   you.benefited from.the attire   that.COMP
     mēdè eleoúmenos epì têi héttēi apérkhēi,   allà   misoúmenos
     not   pitied   for the defeat you.go.away but.PTC hated
     proséti   dià   tḕn átekhnón sou   taútēn truphḗn.
     besides.ADV owing.to the unartistic of.yours this   lavishness
     "However, you got at least this much by your outfit: you are going away not only unpitied for your defeat but hated into the bargain because of this unartistic lavishness of yours". (Luc. *Ind.* 10)

In this example, the element preceding the conjunctive adverb, the participle *misoúmenos*, is in contrast with the negated participle *eleoúmenos*. Both participles belong to a construction (*mēdè ... allà proséti* is a variant of *ouk ... allà kaí* "not only ... but also") called "expansive focus", a term coined by Simon Dik, in which the focus completes some information previously given; cf. Dik et al. (1981: 65); see also Bertrand (2010: 129), who speaks of "*fonction extensive*".

Note that the verb can also be the contrastive element (see example 13) or even constitute a contrastive focus domain along with one of its arguments,[22] like *hupéthratten eníous* in (14), an example in which *hómōs* is apodotic:

(13) *ouk enóēse   dè   toûto Eratosthénēs,   hupenóēse*
     not he.perceived but.PTC this.ACC Eratosthenes.NOM he.suspected
     *d'   **hómōs.***
     but.PTC **however.ADV**
     "But Eratosthenes did not perceive this, though he suspected it". (Str. 1.2.20)

(14) *Hoútō dè   toû Alkibiádou   lamprôs euēmeroûntos,*
     thus   but.PTC the Alcibiades.GEN brilliantly prospering.PTCP.GEN
     *hupéthratten eníous   **hómōs**   ho   tês   kathódou*
     it.troubled   some.ACC.PL **however.ADV** the.NOM of.the return.GEN
     kairós.
     time.NOM

---

22   Matić (2003a: 582–588) calls this type of domain a "broad focus"; see also Bertrand (2014).

"[The Athenians welcome Alcibiades after his victories in the Hellespont, and all the criminal proceedings against him are cancelled.] But while Alcibiades was thus prospering brilliantly, some were nevertheless disturbed at the particular season of his return". (Plu. *Alc.* 34.1)[23]

Furthermore, *hómōs* is sometimes placed far from initial position. See the following examples in which the contrastive elements precede the verb and *hómōs* (*Pantakléa* and *okhḗmasi* in examples 15 and 16 respectively) or *homōs* is preceded by two nominal constituents instead of one (*hoi Argeîoi présbeis* and *táde* in (17)):

(15) *Kaì   mḕn ou Pantakléa   ge | edídaxen* **hómōs**   *tòn*
and.PTC PTC not Pantacles.ACC PTC he.taught **however.ADV** the
skaiótaton.
clumsiest.ACC
"But I bet he didn't teach Pantacles, though, that clumsy oaf". (Ar. *Ra.* 1036–1037)

(16) *ek   Kleōnôn dé   eisin   es Árgos hodoì dúo, hē   mèn*
from Cleonae and.PTC there.are to Argos roads two one PTC
andrásin euzṓnois kaì   éstin epítomos, hē   dè   epì toû
for.men active   and.PTC it.is direct   other PTC on the
kalouménou Trētoû, stenḕ   mèn kaì autḕ   periekhóntōn
so.called   Tretus narrow PTC also this.one with.surrounding
horôn,   okhḗmasi   dé   estin **hómōs**   *epitēdeiotérā.*
mountains for.carriages but.PTC it.is   **however.ADV** more.suitable
"From Cleonae to Argos are two roads: one is direct and only for active men, the other goes along the pass called Tretus (Pierced), is narrow like the other, being surrounded by mountains, but is nevertheless more suitable for carriages". (Paus. 2.15.2)

(17) *hoi Argeîoi présbeis   táde   **hómōs**   epēgágonto   toùs*
the Argive ambassadors this.ACC **however.ADV** they.convinced the
Lakedaimoníous   sugkhōrêsai
Lacedemonians.ACC to.concede.INF
"However, the Argive ambassadors succeeded in obtaining from them this concession …". (Th. 5.41.2)

23   These people were disturbed because Alcibiades returned to Athens during the Plynteria, a festival in which Athena's statue was stripped of its garments and ornaments.

A somewhat different case of medial position consists of *proséti* and *hōsaú-tōs* appearing after the element they introduce in an enumeration. In these cases, this element is a contrastive focus / topic, although the fact that the rest of the members in the enumeration have no conjunctive adverb seems to be due to a specially designated status of said element:

(18) [AG]   *Oukoûn   kaì   tuphlòs háma   kaì kōphòs eînai*
      [Buyer] then.PTC both blind at.the.same.time and deaf   be.INF
      légeis?
      you.say?
      [PU]   *Kaì   ákritós   ge   **proséti**   kaì*
      [Pyrrus] and.PTC devoid.of.judgment PTC **besides**.ADV and.PTC
      anaísthētos   kaì   hólōs   toû   skṓlēkos oudèn
      without.sense and.PTC in.a.word from.the worm   nothing
      diaphérōn.
      differing
      "Then you mean being both deaf and blind? Yes, and devoid of judgement
      and feeling, and, in a word, no better than a worm". (Luc. *Vit.Auct.* 27)

(19) *en dè   taútēi oúsēi toiaútēi anà lógon   tà phūómena*
      in and.PTC this   being so   in proportion the growing.things
      phū́esthai, déndra te   kaì   ánthē kaì   toùs karpoús;
      grow.INF trees both.PTC and.PTC flowers and.PTC the fruits
      *kaì   aû tà órē   **hōsaútōs**   kaì   toùs líthous*
      and.PTC PTC the mountains **likewise**.ADV and.PTC the   stones
      ékhein   anà tòn autòn lógon   tḗn te   leiótēta
      have.INF in   the same proportion the both.PTC smoothness
      kaì   tḕn diapháneian kaì   tà khrṓmata kallíō.
      and.PTC the transparency and.PTC the colours   more.lovely
      "And in this fair earth the things that grow, the trees, and flowers and
      fruits, are correspondingly beautiful; and so too the mountains and the
      stones are smoother, and more transparent and more lovely in color than
      ours". (Pl. *Phd.* 110.d)

In the first example, the adjective *ákritos* is modified by the particle *ge*, which enhances its pragmatic function (Goldstein 2016b). In the second, *hōsaútōs* occupies medial position instead of *aû*, which appears after the connective particle *kaí*. This seems to point to a special status of those elements (*ákritos* and *tà órē*) from a pragmatic perspective; indeed, one gets the impression that the remainder of the elements is appended to it. Alternatively, it is possible to adopt

an interpretation that the conjunctive adverb insists on the addition of all of its enumeration members, even if appearing only in the first one: it should be noted that in both examples, the enumeration members make up a semantic unit differentiated from a previous one (physical vs sensory defects / things that grow vs mountains and stones); and the position of the adverb correlates with their contrastive status in relation to the previous semantic unit.

Final and medial positions coincide in a number of cases in which the adverb is the last element of its segment due to the ellipsis of other elements that already appear in the previous conjunct.[24] This mostly applies to additive conjunctive adverbs when they are placed after the element they introduce in an enumeration; if that element is the last of the enumeration and the adverb follows it, then the adverb is encountered in final position:

(20) *étisen   oûn   ho Makareùs   ou memptèn   tèn díkēn*
he.paid so.PTC the Macareus.NOM not contemptible the penalty
toûto dè̀   tò poiētikòn   sùn têi heautoû kephalêi kaì
this PTC the poetic.expression with the his.own head   and.PTC
têi tês gunaikòs kaì   oûn kaì   têi tôn paídōn
that of.the woman   and.PTC PTC also.ADV that of.the sons
proséti.
besides.ADV
"So Macareus paid no contemptible penalty, as the poets have it, with his own life, that of his wife and furthermore those of his sons". (Ael. *VH* 13.2)

(21) *toûto   dè   Maiándrou pedíon   pân   epédrame lēíēn*
this.ACC and.PTC Meandrus' plain.ACC all.ACC he.overran pillage
poieúmenos tôi   stratôi, Magnēsíēn te   hōsaútōs.
making   with.the army Magnesia and.PTC likewise.ADV
"And he overran the plain of the Maeandrus, giving it to his army to pillage and Magnesia likewise". (Hdt. 1.161)

---

24 These cases are examples of what has been called coordination reduction (Harris-Delisle 1978). Luraghi's (2014b: 362) definition of coordination reduction is as follows: "Conjunction reduction, or coordination reduction [...] occurs when some common feature of two coordinated sentences or clauses, which is overtly encoded in the first, is not repeated in the second". In contrast with canonical ellipsis (Martínez Linares 2006), coordination reduction includes not only the arguments of the predicate—namely, those which are obligatory in order to maintain the grammatical coherence of their clause—but also all those elements that are not repeated in a conjunct because they already appear in the previous one.

(22) *Oxù   kaì   andreîon   prôtón poú   phamen, kaì   takhù*
      acute and.PTC courageous firstly somehow we.say   and.PTC quick
      *kaì   andrikón, kaì   sphodròn **hōsaútōs**.*
      and.PTC manly   and.PTC energetic **likewise**.ADV
      "We say acute and courageous in the first instance, also quick and coura-
      geous, and energetic too". (Pl. *Plt.* 306.e)

Only in the case of *hómōs* there are some examples in which the conjunctive
adverb appears in final position and no ellipsis is involved:

(23) *aganakteîs, | allà   poētéa   taût' estin **hómōs**.*
      you.are.angry but.PTC to.be.done this it.is **however**.ADV
      "Be angry. Nonetheless we must do that". (Ar. *Lys.* 499–500)

However, the number of those examples is still reduced when one excludes the
cases in which the constituent preceding the conjunctive adverb is what Matić
(2003a) calls a 'broad focus', namely, a focal domain consisting of the verb and
one of its arguments. Conjunctive adverbs cannot interrupt such a domain, and
as a result, they are placed in final position. This final position is apparent only
because the focal domain is contrastive. See, for instance, examples 24 and 25,
especially the latter, in which *hómōs* is apodotic and the elements belonging to
the broad focus constitute an idiom (*égete tèn eirḗnēn*):

(24) *ou gàr   mónon ek   toû prokaleîsthai   toútous paradoûnai,*
      not for.PTC only   from the challenging.INF these   to.give.up.INF
      toûton dè   mḗ 'thélein,   allà   kaì ek   pántōn
      this   and.PTC not to.be.willing.INF but.PTC also from everything
      dêlón   estin pseûdos ón ...   taûta
      obvious it.is lie   being.PTCP.COMPL this
      memartúrētai.   Lége   dè   tèn próklēsin
      it.is.confirmed.by.testimony.PF.PASS you.tell.IMP PTC the challenge
      ***hómōs**.*
      however.ADV
      "Not only from my challenging him to give up these slaves for torture and
      from his refusing to do so, but from every circumstance of the case its
      falsehood is manifest ... Of this you have heard the evidence. Neverthe-
      less, read the challenge". (D. 37.27)

(25) *hūmeîs d'   huphorṓmenoi   tà   pepragména kaì*
      you   and.PTC viewing.with.suspicion the things.done and.PTC

TABLE 1   Frequencies of initial, medial and final position in several authors

AUTHORS	HDT.			S.			AR.			PL.			DEM.			LUC.		
POSITION	I.	M.	F.	I.	M.	F.	I.	M.	F.	I.	M.	F.	I.	M.	F.	I.	M.	F.
HÓMŌS	18	2	–	16	9	3	25	6	2	162	11	–	98	15	2	87	92	1
PROSÉTI	1	–	–	–	–	–	4	1	–	6	–	–	1	–	–	31	16	–
HŌSAÚTŌS	–	4	–	1	–	–	–	–	–	26	54	–	2	2	–	1	–	–

duskheraínontes égete   tền eirḗnēn **hómōs.**
being.displeased you.observed the peace   **however.**ADV
"You Athenians, though suspicious and dissatisfied, nevertheless observed the terms of peace". (D. 18.43)

The frequency of initial, medial and final position is illustrated in Table 1, which shows the positions of the three adverbs under consideration in the works of Herodotus, Sophocles, Demosthenes, Aristophanes, Plato and Lucian.

All the authors belong to the classical period save Lucian, who belongs to the postclassical period; two of them are dramatists (Sophocles and Aristophanes), Herodotus is a historian, Plato a philosopher, Demosthenes an orator and Lucian a satirist and rhetorician. The frequencies are similar and reflect a clear preference for initial over medial position, although *proséti* and *hōsaútōs* are not employed by all of them. *Hómōs*, the best represented item, appears in initial position in 90% of Herodotus' instances, in 57.1% of Sophocles', in 89.3% of Aristophanes', in 93.6% of Plato's, in 85.2% of Demosthenes' and in 48.3% of Lucian's. Final position is rare and exclusive to *hómōs*: 10.7% of the instances in Sophocles are in final position, 6.1% in Aristophanes, 1.7% in Demosthenes and 0.5% in Lucian, while Herodotus and Plato do not show any instance of final position (on the positional variability of *hómōs*, see below). Note that *hōsaútōs* is encountered in medial position in 70% of Plato's instances, as well as in all 4 of Herodotus' instances. This is partly related to the fact that *hōsaútōs* appeared in the 5th century both as an additive conjunctive and as an adverb of manner (see below); and the adverb of manner is not always easy to distinguish from the conjunctive one, especially when it does not take initial position.[25]

---

25   A case in point is the following: Pl. *Tht.* 186b, *állo ti toû mèn sklēroû tền sklērótēta dià tês*

4   Medial and final positions and the development of conjunctive functions

Conjunctive adverbs are placed both in initial and in medial position in classical and postclassical Greek. With respect to initial position, these adverbs are generally encountered either in absolute first position or after a connective particle. In medial position, the adverb is restricted, occurring after a first constituent, as well as the connective particle when it is used—connective particles always occupy first or second position regardless of the clause structure.

Typologically speaking, connecting devices tend to occur early in the clause, namely, in a position between the two conjuncts they connect. The development of conjunctive functions is a process that can be roughly sketched as follows: first, the adverb restricts itself to initial position; this position is associated with adverbials that fulfil the pragmatic function of *setting*,[26] and indeed, the development of conjunctive functions can be related to the use of the adverb as *setting* in a number of cases.[27] Once the conjunctive function is established,[28] conjunctive adverbs are placed in initial position before other elements, including *settings*.[29] The last stages of this evolution are traceable in the case of *hōsaútōs*, which is the result of the univerbation of an adverbial

---

epaphês aisthḗsetai, kaì toû malakoû tḕn malakótēta **hōsaútōs** "Does it not perceive the hardness of the hard through touch, and **likewise** the softness of the soft?". In this excerpt, it is possible to interpret *hōsaútōs* as an adjunct of *aisthḗsetai* (referring to *dià tês epaphês*). However, the ellipsis of the verb form also allows its interpretation as an additive conjunctive.

26   "*Setting* constituents … are adverbial phrases at the opening of clauses. Such phrases are like Topics in that they provide an orientation for the clause that follows, but they tend to be part of the spatial or temporal (or causal) organization of the text rather than themselves a participant about whom the speaker provides information" (Dik 2007: 36–37).

27   For instance, in Ancient Greek some adverbs of time develop conjunctive functions as inferential connectives when they fulfil the pragmatic function of *setting*; cf. Jiménez Delgado (2013).

28   This pragmaticalisation (see n. 2) can be considered a case of Traugott's *subjectification* (Traugott 2010). *Subjectification* is the development of metatextual meanings by a linguistic expression; these metatextual meanings express speaker attitude or viewpoint, while *intersubjectification* (a variant of *subjectification*) involves the expression of the speaker's attention towards the addressee's self-image. See also Allan (2017a: 104–105).

29   A clear case is Pl. *Soph.* 267d **hómōs dé, kàn ei tolmēróteron eirêsthai, diagnṓseōs héneka** *tḕn mèn metà dóxēs mímēsin doxomimētikḕn proseípōmen, tḕn dè met' epistḗmēs historikḕn tina mímēsin* "**however**, even though the innovation in language be a trifle bold, let us, for the sake of making a distinction, call the imitation which is based on opinion, opinion-imitation, and that which is founded on knowledge, a sort of scientific imitation", in which *hómōs* precedes a concessive protasis and the *setting, diagnṓseōs héneka*.

locution, *hṑs d' aútōs* (*hṓs* + *dé* + *aútōs*), that was used as a conjunctive device at the beginning of the sentence:

(26) ***Hṑs d' aútōs***   *tôn*   *híppōn* *tà*   *mèn perì*
     and.likewise.PTC.ADV of.the horses ART.NEUT PTC around.PREP
     tà   *stérna khalkéous*   *thṓrēkas*   *peribállousi,*
     their chests of.bronze.ACC breastplates.ACC they.put.around
     tà   *dè*   *perì*   *toùs khalīnoùs kaì stómia kaì*
     ART.NEUT and.PTC around.PREP their reins   and bits   and
     phálara   *khrūsôi*
     cheekplates with.gold
     "Similarly, they equip their horses protecting their chests with bronze breastplates and putting gold on reins, bits and cheekplates". (Hdt. 1.215.2)

In this example, *hṑs d' aútōs* precedes the theme (*tôn híppōn*) and the constrastive topics (*tà mèn perì stérna … tà dè perì toùs khalīnoùs kaì stómia kaì phálara*), the topic the sentence treats. "Themes" are extra-clausal constituents "with regard to which the following clause is going to present some relevant information" (Dik 1997: 389; see also Allan 2014: 184).

     During the 5th century, *hṑs d' aútōs* still coexisted with *hōsaútōs* as a conjunctive locution; cf. Hdt. 1.215.2, 2.67.1, 7.86.2, 8.21.1, 9.47, 81.2 (no instance of *hōsaútōs dé*); X. *An.* 5.6.9; *Cyr.* 3.1.32, 6.4.16; *Eq.* 6.2; *Mem.* 1.7.3. (against 4 instances of *hōsaútōs dé*); Pl. *Phd.* 102e; *Plt.* 310d; *Phdr.* 240e, 275e; *Prt.* 313e; *Lg.* 728e, 809e, 879d, 910a (against 17 instances of *hōsaútōs dé*). The univerbated *hōsaútōs*, though, finally replaced the analytic form.[30] Moreover, the new adverb not only exhibits conjunctive uses, but it is also used as an adverb of manner by Herodotus in 9 out of 13 instances. This development complicated the emergence of conjunctive uses since they could appear through the univerbation of the conjunctive locution *hṑs d' aútōs*, as well as the pragmaticalisation of the corresponding adverb of manner.[31]

     As a matter of fact, one can verify the association of position with conjunctive functions in the case of *hōsaútōs*. In this respect, it must be noted that the

---

30   *Hōsaútōs* can still be found in somewhat high-style Modern Greek (ωσαύτως). Even so, *hṑs d' aútōs* can be found later, for example, 44 times in Strabo's *Geography* (2nd century BC–1st century AD) against 21 instances of *hōsaútōs*.

31   The adverb of manner also derives from *hṑs d' aútōs* since the reinforcement of *aútōs* with *hṓs* is only known within that locution. This is related to *layering*, namely, the coexistence of older and newer meanings in a linguistic form; see Hopper & Traugott (2003: 124–126).

conjunctive interpretation dissipates when the adverb does not occupy initial or medial position immediately after a contrastive constituent and the connective particle:

(27) a. *Proeîpe   táde: … pempedárkhōi d'   autòn   ónta*
      he.proposed this   to.the.corporal and.PTC himself being
      hoîonper tòn agathòn idiṓtēn kaì tền pempáda eis   tò
      like   the good   private also the five.squad as.far.as the
      dunatòn toiaútēn parékhein, dekadárkhōi   dè   tền
      possible that.way make.INF to.the.sergeant and.PTC the
      dekáda   hōsaútōs …
      ten.squad **likewise**.ADV
      "What he proposed was as follows: to the corporal, that, besides being himself like the good private, he make his squad of five a model, as far as possible; to the sergeant, that he do likewise with his squad of ten / likewise to the sergeant with his squad of ten". (X. *Cyr.* 2.1.22)

   b. *all' hūmeîs t',   éphē,   hōs paraggéllō táttesthe,   kaì*
      PTC you   PTC he.said as I.direct   take.positions and.PTC
      hūmeîs hoi tôn   peltastôn   árkhontes epì   toútois
      you   the of.the light-armed.troops officers   behind those
      hōsaútōs   toùs lókhous kathístate,   kaì   hūmeîs hoi
      likewise.ADV the platoons you.bring.up.IMP and.PTC you   the
      tôn   toxotôn epì   toîs peltastaîs   hōsaútōs.
      of.the archers behind the light-armed.troops **likewise**.ADV
      "Do you, therefore, take your positions as I direct, and you, the officers of the light-armed troops, bring up your platoons immediately behind them, and you, the officers of the archery, fall in, in the same way, directly behind the light-armed troops / bring up your platoons immediately behind them, likewise, and you, the officers of the archery, fall in directly behind the light-armed troops, likewise". (X. *Cyr.* 6.3.26)

In the first example, the conjunctive interpretation of *hōsaútōs* is possible, though less suited to the context: the adverb refers to the way in which the sergeant has to model his squad, but it might indicate that the command directed to the corporal also applies to the sergeant. In the second, the interpretation of *hōsaútōs* as a conjunctive adverb fits the context even less, since both tokens of the adverb (the first one is omitted in Miller's translation) refer to the way in which Cyrus has directed other units to take their positions.

We have already seen that medial position is a historical development that can be analysed in languages such as English; furthermore, this position is characteristic of conjunctive adverbs when the preceding constituent has a contrastive pragmatic function (Lenker 2010: 68–72 and 235), even if in English, word order determines that only contrastive subjects and adverbials can normally precede them (Altenberg 2006: 19–30). Regarding our adverbs, we do not possess data from Homer,[32] but in classical Greek, the alternation of initial and medial position is already established, as can be seen in minimal pairs like the following:

(28) a. *Kaítoi skhedòn   mèn oîda   paraítēsin eû   mála*
       PTC   more.or.less PTC I.know request   well very
       philótimon   kaì   toû   déontos   agroikotérān
       presumptuous and.PTC than.the necessary more.rude
       *méllōn   paraiteîsthai, hrētéon   dè   **hómōs.***
       going.to.PTCP.NOM ask.INF   to.be.told but.PTC **however.ADV**
       "I am sufficiently aware that the request I am about to make is decidedly presumptuous and less civil than is proper, but nonetheless it must be uttered".[33] (Pl. *Criti.* 107.a)

   b. *aiskhū́nomai oûn hūmîn eipeîn   talēthê.   **Hómōs**   dè*
      I.am.ashamed PTC to.you say.INF the.truth **however.ADV** but.PTC
      hrētéon.
      to.be.told
      "Now I am ashamed to tell you the truth, gentlemen; but still it must be told". (Pl. *Ap.* 22.b)

Both examples are Platonic, and in both, the same sequence of elements involving *hómōs* is encountered, although their word order is the opposite. It must be

---

32   *Hómōs* is rare in Archaic Greek, and *proséti* and *hōsaútōs* appeared later (see above). Nonetheless, an adverb like Homeric *émpēs* 'in any case, all the same, nevertheless' shows a distribution comparable to that of *hómōs* when functioning as an adversative conjunctive: it appears in initial (*Il.* 5.191, 8.33, 464; *Od.* 4.100, 14.214, 16.147, 19.302, 20.311, 23.83), medial (*Il.* 1.562) and final position (*Od.* 18.12). Note that Homer uses *émpēs* 38 times.

33   The position of *hómōs* is apparently final in this example, although this is due to the ellipsis of the elements already appearing in the previous sentence; cf. D.C. *Epit.Xiph.* 163.31–164.1 *hôn dè apékteinen epiphanôn andrôn polù mèn érgon arithmêsai kaì tò onómata, hrētéon dè **hómōs** olígous tinás* "to enumerate the names of the renowned men they killed is an arduous task; a few of them must, **nevertheless**, be mentioned" (the English translation is mine).

noted that the position of *hómōs* in (28b) can be related to the presence of the infinitive *eipeîn* in the previous conjunct, since *hrētéon* is implied by the infinitive and is not a contrastive focus/topic.

The medial position of conjunctive adverbs cannot be determined by morphosyntactic criteria, since these adverbs can only appear after pragmatically relevant constituents and cannot interrupt a morphosyntactic constituent[34] like particles do when taking Wackernagel's position.[35] This position of conjunctive adverbs can relate to the criteria governing the position of pronominal clitics and the modal particle *án* in classical Greek as established by Goldstein (2016a). Goldstein has found that these clitics lean on the first prosodic word of the sentence nucleus, which can be preceded by contrastive elements.[36] See the following examples, in which pronominal clitics are placed after the first word of the sentence nucleus and a contrastive topic (*Ikhthúōn*) and contrastive focus (*tò khrēstérion*), respectively, are preposed to it:

(29) [...] *sitía   sphi   esti hīrà   pessómena, kaì kreôn*
      food.NOM for them it.is sacred.NOM cooked   and meat.GEN
      boéōn kaì khēnéōn plêthós   ti   hekástōi   gínetai
      of.beef and of.goose abundance.NOM a.NOM for.each.one there.is

---

34 Conjunctive adverbs can be found within a morphosyntactic constituent only when one of its elements is pragmatically highlighted; cf. Th. 7.70.8 *kaì hoi stratēgoì* **proséti** *hekatérōn, eí tiná pou horôien mè kat' anágkēn prúmnān krouómenon, anakaloûntes onomastì tòn triérarkhon ērótōn* ... "the generals, **moreover**, on either side, if they saw in any part of the battle backing ashore without being forced to do so, called out to the captain by name and asked him", where *hoi stratēgoì* is a contrastive topic, while *hekatérōn* refers to the parties involved and constitutes a continuous topic (this passage of the Second Battle of Syracuse between the Syracusans and the Athenians follows the description of the boatswains' action in the previous section). Another example is Plu. *Cam.* 10.5 [...] *khalepòn mén ésti pólemos kaì dià pollês adikíās kaì biaíon perainómenos érgōn, eisì dè kaì polémōn* **hómōs** *tinès nómoi toîs agathoîs andrási* "war is indeed a grievous thing, and is waged with much injustice and violence; **but** even war has certain laws which good and brave men will respect", where *polémōn* is the focus element as the particle *kaí* 'also, even' makes clear.

35 The connective particles that occupy Wackernagel's position are not necessarily placed after the first prosodic word, they are generally placed after the first morphosyntactic word, so that they can be inserted within a constituent comprising more than one word; cf. Goldstein (2016a: 80–84). Prosodic words are characterised as the domain of word stress, phonotactics and segmental word-level rules. On the definition of prosodic word, see Hall (1999).

36 More precisely, they can be preceded by contrastive topics and by what the author calls "non-monotonic focus", which corrects or rejects some of the propositions making up the common ground (Goldstein 2016a: 176–177).

pollòn   hēmérēs hekástēs ... Ikhthúōn dè   oú **sphi**
great.NOM day   every   of.fish   but.PTC not **for.them**
éxesti   pássasthai.
it.is.possible eat.INF
"Sacred food is cooked for them, beef and goose are brought in great abundance to each man every day ... They may not eat fish". (Hdt. 2.37.4)

(30) [...] *èn mèn [dè] tò   khrēstḗrion anélē   min basiléa*
         if PTC PTC the oracle   it.should.ordain **him** king
eînai   Lūdôn,   tòn dè   basileúein, èn dè   mḗ,
to.be.INF of.the.Lydians he PTC reign.INF if but.PTC not
apodoûnai opísō es Hērakleídās   tḕn arkhḗn.
return.INF back to the.Heraclidae the kingship
"If the oracle should ordain him king of the Lydians, then he would reign; but if not, then he would return the kingship to the Heraclidae". (Hdt. 1.13.1)

In the first example, the pronominal clitic *sphi* is placed after the negative *oú*, which constitutes the beginning of the sentence nucleus, while *ikhthúōn* is preposed. In the second example, the pronominal clitic is *min*, the verb form *anélē* is the first constituent of the sentence nucleus, and *tò khrēstḗrion* is preposed. The position of the pronominal clitics signals the preposing of these elements for pragmatic reasons (Luraghi 2014a: 304–305). We can extrapolate this to the medial position of the conjunctive adverbs under study, but in this case, the preposed element is delimited by the subsequent conjunctive adverb.[37]

Nevertheless, differences are obvious, not only because conjunctive adverbs are not clitics, but also because they do not function on the representational level, the level of content. In this regard, in sentences made up of a main and a participle clause or a main and an infinitive clause that escapes the matrix verb control, clitics are placed after the first accented word of the syntactic domain they belong to, whether it is the main or the dependent clause (Goldstein 2016a: 221–289).[38] Conjunctive adverbs can be found following those domains, but only when their constituents are preposed:

---

37 Typologically speaking, discourse markers tend to have specific intonation contours (Fedriani & Sansò 2017: 4).

38 Apart from the main clause, the syntactic domains in which the clitics can be inserted are those of circumstantial participles in initial position which articulate the discourse relation between their sentence and the preceding one, circumstantial participles placed

(31) *tòn éranon   tòn legómenon pappôion   ek   tôn*
      the contribution the called   of.grand-fathers from the
      Mēdikôn | eît' analṓsantes   ouk anteisphérete   tā̀s
      Persian.Wars then having.squandered not you.paid.in.return the
      *eisphorā́s, | all'   huph'   hūmôn dialuthênai   **proséti***
      taxes   but.PTC because.of you   break.up.INF.PASS **besides.ADV**
      kinduneúomen.
      we.run.the.risk
      "You've squandered your paternal inheritance, won in the Persian Wars,
      and now pay no taxes in return. On the contrary, we're all headed for
      bankruptcy on account of you!"[39] (Ar. *Lys.* 653–655)

In this example, the infinitive clause depending on *kinduneúomen* appears
before *proséti*. This is a construction of expansive focus (see above), and the
infinitive clause depending on *kinduneúomen* and preposed before *proséti* is in
contrast with the clause under *ouk*'s scope (*anteisphérete tā̀s eisphorā́s*).

   Regarding final position, there are only instances of *hómōs*.[40] Final position
is almost unattested in classical and postclassical Greek. One of the rare exam-
ples in which the conjunctive adverb is in final position is the following:

(32) *ei dè   mḕ légō phíla, | oukh hḗdomai,   tò d'*
      if and.PTC not I.say welcome.words not   I.enjoy.myself the but.PTC
      *orthòn   exeírēkh' **hómōs.***
      right.thing I.have.said **however.ADV**
      "If my words are unwelcome, I am grieved; but nevertheless I have spoken
      the truth". (S. *Tr.* 373–374)

In this case, the contrastive element is a preverbal constituent, *tò orthón*, yet the
conjunctive adverb appears after the verb. This is not due to the pragmatic rea-
sons we have seen above, since the adverb is, rather, the dislocated element and
can even be placed in final position as in the above example. The data is insuffi-
cient to draw firm conclusions, but this might be related to the positional vari-
ability of *ómōs* in Modern Greek (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton

---

      after the main clause and introducing new information, as well as complement infinitive
      clauses whose subject does not depend on any argument of the matrix verb.

39   In this case, the subject of the infinitive clause is the same as the subject of the matrix
      verb, so it does not escape its control.

40   Cf. S. *OC* 1529, *Tr.* 374, 1115, Ar. *Ec.* 860, *Lys.* 500, D. 23.25, 25.2, Plb. 12.12.1, 34.14.4, Luc. *Cal.*
      24.

TABLE 2   Frequencies of initial, medial and final position in several prose authors

AUTHORS	TH.			PL.			PLB.			ARISTID.			LUC.			AEL.		
POSITION	I.	M.	F.	I.	M.	F.	I.	M.	F.	I.	M.	F.	I.	M.	F.	I.	M.	F.
HÓMŌS	45	31	–	162	11	–	79	7	2	110	21	–	87	92	1	32	8	–
PROSÉTI	17	1	–	6	–	–	5	–	–	37	1	–	31	16	–	4	10	–
HŌSAÚTŌS	–	–	–	26	54	–	5	1	–	7	10	–	1	–	–	–	–	–

2012: 564). In the previous case, a reinterpreting structure can be perceived. Nevertheless, there are still examples in which *hómōs* is placed far from initial position without implying a reinterpreting structure:

(33) *ho   Súros eisénegkh'   **hómōs**   pánth', | hósa <ge>*
      ART Syros you.take.in.IMP **however**.ADV everything that PTC
      phéromen.
      we.carry
      "Still, Syros, you must take all our loads in". (Men. *Georg.* 39–40)

All these cases, though few, seem to point to a certain positional variability of *hómōs*, in its beginnings.[41] This variability is shown by the positional frequencies of this adverb in comparison with the other two, as can be seen in Table 2, which displays the number of instances in initial, medial and final position in the prose works of Thucydides (5th century BC), Plato (5th–4th century BC), Polybius (2nd century BC), Aelius Aristides (2nd century AD), Lucian (2nd century AD) and Aelian (2nd–3rd century AD).

   Hómōs and *proséti* tend to appear in initial position, while the case of *hōsaútōs* is somewhat special (see Table 1); nevertheless, *hómōs* is the only one encountered in final position. Note that the chronological gradient does not correspond to any tendency on the respective frequencies of each adverb. Only in the case of Lucian can we see clear differences, probably related to genre. Genre may also explain the frequency of *hómōs* in final position in Sophocles' and Aristophanes' dramatic works (see Table 1).

41   Some other examples of medial far-from-initial position are in Th. 1.15.1, 7.48.5, 7.80.5, 8.36.2, 97.1; Plb. 5.20.7, 9.26a; D. 18.168; Pl. *Ep.* 325a.

5   Conclusions

Conjunctive adverbs are mainly used in Ancient Greek to reinforce or provide nuance to the instructions conveyed by the connective particles with which they associate; they rarely have the ability to connect two main clauses or sentences by themselves. Conjunctive adverbs can also be used to strengthen the relation between main and subordinate clauses, and are usually placed after the subordinate clause and without connective particle; the cases in which they function within the subordinate clause are exceptional.

These adverbs occupy two positions in classical and postclassical Greek: initial, either absolute first position or position after a connective particle; and medial, after a constituent with a contrastive pragmatic function and the connective particle when it is used. The position of connective particles is fixed and does not count for assessing that of conjunctive adverbs.

Medial position, less frequent than initial position, can be related to the position that clitics occupy when they are placed after the first word of the sentence nucleus if preceded by a preposed constituent. In this position, conjunctive adverbs are placed immediately following these constituents, and so they delimit them. These constituents tend to be a contrastive focus or topic.

Finally, there are some examples of *hómōs* in which it appears in final position or at least far from initial positions. This cannot be explained by the above pragmatic reasons, yet these examples, though few, may indicate that the positional variability of this adverb in Modern Greek has its origins in Ancient Greek.

The position of conjunctive adverbs in classical and postclassical Greek coincides with what has been observed in other languages. Nevertheless, the traceable evolution, for instance, in English, according to which conjunctive adverbs develop medial position when they are placed after a contrastive constituent and later final position is still in its beginnings in Ancient Greek.

ments on previous versions of the paper. Needless to say, all the remaining shortcomings and errors are exclusively the author's.

References

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

Allan, Rutger J. 2017a. The grammaticalization of Greek particles. In *Ancient Greek linguistics. New approaches, insights, perspectives*, ed. by Felicia Logozzo and Paolo Poccetti, 103–118. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Altenberg, Bengt. 2006. The function of adverbial connectors in second initial position in English and Swedish. In *Pragmatic markers in contrast*, ed. by Karin Aijmer and Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenbergen, 11–37. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Anscombre, Jean-Claude and Oswald Ducrot. 1983. *L'argumentation dans la langue*. Bruxelles: Mardaga.

Bakker, Egbert J. 1993. Boundaries, topics, and the structure of discourse: an investigation of the Ancient Greek particle *dé*. *Studies in Language* 17 (2): 275–311.

Bazanella, Carla. 2006. Discourse markers in Italian: Towards a 'compositional' meaning. In *Approaches to discourse particles*, ed. by Karin Fischer, 449–464. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Bertrand, Nicolas. 2010. *L'ordre des mots chez Homère. Structure informationelle, localisation et progression du récit* (Dissertation Université de Paris-Sorbonne). Paris.

Bertrand, Nicolas. 2014. Focus. In *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek language and linguistics*, ed. by Georgios K. Giannakis, 595–599. Leiden: Brill.

Bonifazi, Anna, Annemieke Drummen, and Mark de Kreij. 2016. *Particles in Ancient Greek discourse. Five volumes exploring particle use across genres*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies. [https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/6391].

Crespo, Emilio. 2011. Conjunctive adverbs: a neglected chapter of Greek grammar. In *A Greek man in the Iberian street. Studies in linguistics and epigraphy in honour of Javier de Hoz*, ed. by Eugenio R. Luján and José Luis García Alonso, 35–43. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

Crespo, Emilio. 2013. Notas sobre el asíndeton. In *Καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς ἀνήρ· διδασκάλου παράδειγμα. Homenaje al profesor Juan Antonio López Férez*, ed. by Luis Miguel Pino and Germán Santana, 213–216. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.

Crespo, Emilio. 2014. De adverbio a conjunción coordinante. In *Ágalma. Ofrenda desde la filología clásica a Manuel García Teijeiro*, ed. by Ángel Martínez, Begoña Ortega Vil-

laro, M. del Henar Velasco Lopez, and Henar Zamora Salamanca, 135–141. Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.

Denniston, John D. 1952. *Greek prose style*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

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

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

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

Dik, Simon, M.E. Hofmann, R.J. de Jong., Sie Ing Djiang, H. Stroomer, and L. de Vries. 1981. On the typology of focus phenomena. In *Perspectives on functional grammar*, ed. by Teun Hoekstra, Harry van der Hulst, Michael Moortgat, 41–74. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dik, Simon. 1997. *The theory of functional grammar. Part 2: Complex and Derived Constructions*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ducrot, Oswald. 1983. Opérateurs argumentatifs et visée argumentative. *Cahiers de linguistique française* 5: 7–36.

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

Fuentes, Catalina. 2009. *Diccionario de conectores y operadores del español.* Madrid: Arco/Libros.

Fuentes, Catalina. 2012. El margen derecho del enunciado. *Revista Española de Lingüística* 42 (2): 63–93.

Georgakopoulou, Alexandra and Dionysis Goutsos. 1998. Conjunctions versus discourse markers in Greek: the interaction of frequency, position, and function in context. *Linguistics* 36 (5): 887–917.

Goutsos, Dionysis. 2017. A corpus-based approach to functional markers in Greek: Exploring the role of position. In *Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and modal particles. New perspectives*, ed. by Chiara Fedriani, and Andrea Sansò, 125–149. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goldstein, David. 2016a. *Classical Greek syntax: Wackernagel's Law in Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill.

Goldstein, David. 2016b. Discourse particles in the LSJ: a Fresh Look at γε (unpublished manuscript).

Greenbaum, Sidney. 1969. *Studies in English adverbial usage*. London: Longman.

Hale, Ken. 1983. Warlpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages. In *Natural language and linguistic theory* 1: 5–47.

Hall, Tracy A. 1999. The phonological word: A review. In *Studies on the phonological word*, ed. by Tracy A. Hall and Ursula Kleinhenz, 1–22. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Harris-Delisle, Helga. 1978. Coordination reduction. In *Universals of human language. Volume 4: Syntax*, ed. by Joseph Greenberg, 515–583. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Haselow, Alexander. 2012. Subjectivity, intersubjectivity and the negotiation of common ground in spoken discourse: Final particles in English. In *Language and Communication* 32: 182–204.

Holton, David, Peter Mackridge, and Irene Philippaki-Warburton. 2012. *Greek. A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.

Hopper, Paul. J. and Elizabeth Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jiménez Delgado, José Miguel. 2013. Adverbios temporales como conectores consecutivos en griego antiguo. *Cuadernos de filología clásica: Estudios Griegos e Indoeuropeos* 23: 31–52.

Jiménez Delgado, José Miguel. 2014. Posición inicial y adverbios conjuntivos en Griego antiguo: el caso de ἔπειτα. *Revista Epañola de lingüística* 44 (2): 39–62.

Kiss, Katalin É. 1995. *Discourse configurational languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kovacci, Ofelia. 1999. El adverbio. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, ed. by Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte, 705–787. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

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

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lenker, Ursula. 2010. *Argument and Rhetoric. Adverbial Connectors in the History of English*. Berlin/New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

Luraghi, Silvia. 2014a. Clitic group. In *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek language and linguistics*, ed. by Georgios K. Giannakis, 300–307. Leiden: Brill.

Luraghi, Silvia. 2014b. Conjunction reduction. In *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek language and linguistics*, ed. by Georgios K. Giannakis, 362–363. Leiden: Brill.

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

Matić, Dejan. 2003b. *Topics, presuppositions, and theticity: An empirical study of verb-subject clauses in Albanian, Greek, and Serbo-Croat* (Dissertation Universität zu Köln). Cologne.

Martín López, María Isabel. 1993. La función discursiva de la partícula griega δέ. *Habis* 24: 219–234.

Martín Zorraquino, María Antonia. 2010. Los marcadores del discurso y su morfología. In *Los estudios sobre los marcadores del discurso en español, hoy*, ed. by Óscar Loureda, Esperanza Acín-Villa, 93–182. Madrid: Arco/Libros.

Martín Zorraquino, María Antonia and José Portolés Lázaro. 1999. Los marcadores del discurso. In *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, ed. by Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte, 4051–4213. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Martínez Linares, María Antonia. 2006. La elipsis. In *E-Excellence, www.liceus.com* (ISBN: 84-9822-505-1).

Pasch, Renate, Ursula Brauße, Eva Breindl, and Ulrich H. Waßner. 2003. *Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfer* (*Konjunktionen, Satzadverbien und Partikeln*). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Scheppers, Frank. 2011. *The colon hypothesis. Word order, discourse segmentation and discourse coherence in Ancient Greek*. Brussels: VUB Press.

Sicking, Christiaan M.J. and Johannes M. van Ophuijsen. 1993. *Two studies in Attic particle usage. Lysias and Plato*. Leiden: Brill.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2010. Revisiting subjectification and intersubjectification. In *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*, ed. by Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte, and Hubert Cuyckens, 29–70. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2016. On the rise of types of clause-final pragmatic markers in English. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 17 (1): 26–54.