

RODRIGO VERANO
(Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)

Conjunctive Adverbs and Discourse Markers. Problems and Evidence from Ancient Greek¹

This paper approaches conjunctive adverbs in Ancient Greek as a subset of the so-called discourse markers. Conjunctive adverbs have been defined and described within Functional Grammar as connective units which go beyond sentence boundaries. From a discourse-oriented perspective, these units could be also considered discourse markers. The concepts of conjunctive adverb and discourse marker are highly problematic. Overlapping these two approaches to the same lexical items gives us the opportunity of revisiting definitions, features and parameters, in order to have a clearer view of the roles performed by these words in actual texts. To illustrate the discussion, a number of passages coming from different Classical Greek types of texts are provided.

Il presente articolo presenta gli avverbi congiuntivi del greco antico come sottotipo dei cosiddetti “segnali discorsivi”. Dal punto di vista della grammatica funzionale, gli avverbi congiuntivi sono stati definiti e descritti come unità connettive che vanno oltre i limiti della frase. Da una prospettiva discorsiva, queste unità possono essere altresì considerate come segnali discorsivi. Il concetto di avverbio congiuntivo, così come quello di segnale discorsivo, è altamente problematico. La sovrapposizione di questi due approcci alle stesse unità lessicali ci dà l'opportunità di rivedere definizioni, caratteristiche e parametri, al fine di ottenere una visione più chiara delle funzioni assunte da queste parole nei testi. Diversi passaggi provenienti da diversi tipi di testi in greco classico saranno offerti per illustrare i contenuti della discussione.

1. A grammatical concept, a discourse-oriented approach

Functional-oriented grammars describe the connective role that certain adverbs perform, as they link up the linguistic unit in which they are embedded with the previous ones, occasionally beyond the boundaries of the sentence. In such contexts, adverbs display a series of features which seem to disclaim the properties of prototypical adverbial usage. Thus, in (1):

¹ Within the research project FFI 2015-65541 funded by the Spanish Government (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad). I want to thank Emilia Ruiz and Rafael Martínez their comments on the first draft of this paper, and the two anonymous referees of *Linguistica e Filologia* for their valuable suggestions.

- (1) X. *Mem.* 2.1.18 Τί δέ, ὦ Ἀρίστιππε; ὁ Σωκράτης ἔφη, οὐ δοκεῖ σοι τῶν τοιούτων διαφέρειν τὰ ἐκούσια τῶν ἀκουσίων, ἧ ὁ μὲν ἐκὼν πεινῶν φάγοι ἂν ὁπότε βούλοιο καὶ ὁ ἐκὼν διψῶν πίοι καὶ τᾶλλα ὠσαύτως, τῷ δ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης ταῦτα πάσχοντι οὐκ ἔξεστιν ὁπότεν βούληται παύεσθαι; ἔπειτα ὁ μὲν ἐκουσίως τλαιπωρῶν ἐπ' ἀγαθῆ ἐλπίδι πονῶν εὐφραίνεται, οἷον οἱ τὰ θηρία θηρῶντες ἐλπίδι τοῦ λήψεσθαι ἡδέως μοχθοῦσι.²

“What, Aristippus,” exclaimed Socrates, “don’t you think that there is just this difference between these voluntary and involuntary sufferings, that if you bear hunger or thirst willingly, you can eat, drink or what not, when you choose, whereas compulsory suffering is not to be ended at will? Besides, he who endures willingly enjoys his work because he is comforted by hope; hunters, for instance, toil gladly in hope of game.”

The adverb *ἔπειτα* – usually a temporal adverb – does not supply any information about the temporal circumstances in which the state of affairs is set out. By means of *ἔπειτα* the statement in which the adverb lies becomes attached to the previous segments of speech. According to functional grammar terminology, in this context *ἔπειτα* is a conjunctive adverb.³

The definition of conjunct, as one of the four broad categories of grammatical function (Quirk *et alii* 1985: 501) is based on two main ideas: the reference to the speaker – namely “in one quite specific respect: his assessment of how he views the connection between two linguistic units” (Quirk *et alii* 1985: 632) – and the extraclassical nature – “[conjuncts] are demonstrably outside the syntactically integrated clause structure which admits adjuncts” (Quirk *et alii* 1985: 633) –. Furthermore, conjunctive adverbs can be subcategorized attending to a range of semantic values

² Texts and translations quoted are always those of the Loeb Classical Library. Concrete references for each work are listed at the end of this paper.

³ The features of this function were first outlined by Greenbaum (1969), and then incorporated into descriptive grammars (Cf. Crespo *et alii* [2003: 220-222]; Kovacci [1999: 769-772]; Pinkster [1990: 252-254]; Quirk *et alii* [1985: 631-646]; RAE [2009: 2355-2370]). Also remarkable are the contributions of Pinkster (1972) and Bellert (1977), which both contain a grammatical description of ‘adverbs as connectors’ (Pinkster 1972: 153-164) and ‘conjunctive adverbs’ (Bellert 1977: 348-349) in Latin. The status of conjunctive adverbs in Ancient Greek has been discussed in the papers by Crespo (2009; 2011; 2015) and Martínez Vázquez / Ruiz Yamuza (2011).

attached to them. The most extensive list of these values (cf. Crespo 2011) includes addition, precision (particularization), ordering, simultaneity, temporal sequence, temporal phase, contrast, concession, consequence and result, explanation, reformulation, exemplification, recitification and summation.

From a different perspective, connectivity has been paid a great deal of attention by new discourse-oriented paradigms in linguistics, which have provided theoretical frameworks for the analysis of the elements involved in such phenomena, and it is worth mentioning the study of the so-called discourse markers. Though the literature produced around the concept, nature and features of discourse markers is immeasurably vast⁴, the main points remain controversial, and a unitary definition is still a *desideratum*.

Some specific properties, however, are repeatedly claimed by students to be prototypical of discourse markers: (a) the fact that they signal a relationship between linguistic segments (Fraser 1999: 950); (b) they do not play any syntactic role in the sentence (Martín Zorraquino Portolés 1999: 4057); (c) they do not convey a conventional conceptual meaning (Murillo Ornat 2010). All these features seem to be very close to those reported in conjunctive adverbs. Assuming this likelihood to entail a relationship, the aim of this paper is to provide a discourse-oriented description of the conjunctive function of adverbs, in order to contrast and complete the grammatical approach with the contributions achieved in the field of discourse markers. Though the nature of the study is theoretical, evidence from Classical Greek texts will be provided to support the discussion and set it in the context of this language, very rich in connective elements whose description has been deeply revisited in the last years, thanks to the implementation of frameworks and methodologies based on discourse analysis to the traditional problems of Ancient Greek linguistics.

⁴ To collect even the most important contributions would require dozens of pages. We merely mention the most salient monographs, as those by Blakemore (2002); Aijmer (2012); Portolés (2001); Schiffrin (1987); sections in comprehensive grammars: Martín Zorraquino / Portolés (1999); collective works: Ducrot (1980); Martín / Montolio (1998); Fischer (2006); Loureda / Acín (2010); Aschenberg / Loureda (2011), among others; and specific chapters of Blakemore (2004) in *The Handbook of Pragmatics* (Blackwell) and Schiffrin (2001) and (2003) in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* and *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Linguistics* respectively.

2. *Perspectives in the study of discourse markers*

The access to a definition of discourse markers must be gained through a “jungle of publications” (Fischer 2006: 1). As Fischer states:

The studies available so far are hardly comparable; the approaches vary with respect to many different aspects: the language(s) under consideration, the items taken into account, the functions considered, the problems focused on, and the methodologies employed” (2006: 1).

Firstly, a prominent attention has been paid to discourse particles in pragmatics. This may be explained with the help of two main reasons: the peripheral status of markers in sentence structure and the fact that their meaning seems to display some properties that move away from the nature of conceptual meaning usually conveyed by words. Given the fact that these features question the boundaries of both syntax and semantics, it is not surprising that the role of discourse markers in grammar has been claimed by those who defend the status of pragmatics as a linguistic discipline of its own right.⁵

On the other hand, discourse markers have also been a matter of concern in text linguistics, as they usually perform a role beyond the sentence. First attempts to explain suprasentential ties were a translation of coordination and subordination bonds into texts. This ‘extended syntax’ approach (Loureda Acín 2010: 17) was soon overtaken: current trends in the grammar of text draw a portrait of discourse as a complex and many-sided reality, in which many components, levels or structures may simultaneously interact (cf. De Beaugrande Dressler 1981; Fuentes 2000; Kroon 1997; Schiffrin 1987).

⁵ “It is these two properties that have brought DMs into the center of pragmatics research. On the one hand, their non-truth-conditionality has meant that they play a role in discussions of the non-unitary nature of linguistic meaning and the relationship between semantics and pragmatics. On the other hand, their role in signaling connectivity in discourse has meant that they play a role in the discussion of how we should account for the textual unity of discourse. Given the theoretical divides that have emerged in the discussion of both these issues, it is not surprising that DM research has not yielded a single framework for the analysis of these expressions” (Blakemore 2004: 222).

3. *Conjunctive adverbs as discourse markers*

As regards the elements which may be labelled as discourse markers, the heterogeneity of lexical items able to fit in this category makes hardly sustainable the idea of a word-class, in the traditional sense.⁶ A functional approach to discourse markers as an open category, inclusive of the variety of the elements which can take part of the class, may be the only way of achieving a nearly-complete – as much as it is possible – overview of the linguistic devices which can actually perform this role in discourse⁷.

From this point of view, conjunctive adverbs may easily fit in the discourse markers class, namely among the connective items⁸. In the following pages, I will review the main properties which have been pointed out in the description of discourse markers in order both to complete the characterization of conjunctive adverbs provided by grammar with the help of a discourse-oriented perspective, and to test the accomplishment of these definition criteria and evaluate their appropriateness. My approach will focus, essentially, on four aspects: morphological status; syntactic nature; semantic features; role in discourse coherence.

3.1 *Morphosyntactic features*

3.1.1 *Conjunctive adverbs and invariability of discourse markers*

Some approaches have claimed invariability as a prototypical feature of discourse markers (Martín Zorraquino 2010: 104-105; also cf. Martín Zorraquino Portolés 1999; Portolés 2001). The addition of this parameter is supported by the fact that several elements performing this kind of discursive functions are drawn from other word-classes by means of historical process of grammaticalization, which involve, in some cases, the loss of inflectional variation (cf. Traugott 1995; Pons Rodríguez 2010).

⁶ “It is difficult to see how a subset of conjunctions, adverbials, and prepositional phrases could be cobbled together to form a syntactic category, particularly since their individual syntactic patterning follows their obvious syntactic lineage: conjunctions patterns like conjunctions, and so forth” (Fraser 1999, 994).

⁷ “Connectives are a pragmatic category, that is to say, what all connectives have in common is not the grammatical class to which they belong but their ability to signal a relationship between two units” (Pons Bordería 2006: 82).

⁸ For the discussion about connective and non-connective particles within discourse markers cf. Fuentes (2001); (2009); Portolés (1993); Tordesillas (1993).

Invariability as a compulsory requirement of discourse markers is problematic. As regards conjunctive adverbs, the non-flectional nature of adverbs let us evade such a polemical issue. In any case, instances such as (2) show that similar conjunctive functions may be performed by a variety of elements, and not only by invariable adverbs. A complete approach to discourse functions should explain the five instances marked in (2), including the latter two⁹:

- (2) D. *De falsa legatione* 4. εἰ σκέψαισθε παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί, καὶ λογίσαισθε τίνων προσήκει λόγον παρὰ πρεσβευτοῦ λαβεῖν. πρῶτον μὲν τοίνυν ὧν ἀπήγγειλε, δεύτερον δ' ὧν ἔπεισε, τρίτον δ' ὧν προσετάξατ' αὐτῷ, μετὰ ταῦτα τῶν χρόνων, ἐφ' ἅπασιν δὲ τούτοις, εἰ ἀδωροδοκῆτως ἢ μὴ πάντα ταῦτα πέπρακται.

'By consideration among yourselves, gentlemen, you should form a true conception of what should be included in the vindication which the state requires of any ambassador. He is responsible then, in the first place, for the reports he has made; secondly, for the advice he has offered; thirdly, for his observance of your instructions; then there is the question of times and opportunities; and to crown all, whether he has done his business corruptly or with integrity.'

3.1.2 *Conjunctive adverbs and peripheral syntax*

As regards the syntactic structure of the utterance where they are placed, discourse markers are usually characterized as follows. Firstly, they are considered to play a peripheral role in sentence syntax; secondly, since their scope goes over the utterance in which they are embedded, they are said to operate beyond the boundaries of sentence.

In accordance with this, conjunctive adverbs are actually able to conjoin discourse units of quite different nature¹⁰. The scope of the connection may exceed the sentence and even the utterance (3), or refer otherwise to elements syntactically related (4).

- (3) Pl. R. 432c Εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον, ἔφη. ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον, ἐάν μοι ἐπομένῳ χρῆ καὶ τὰ δεικνύμενα δυναμένῳ καθορᾶν, πάνυ μοι μετρίως χρήσῃ.

⁹ Cf. López Serena 2011; Borreguero Zuloaga / López Serena 2011.

“Would that I could,” he said; “but I think rather that if you find in me one who can follow you and discern what you point out to him you will be making a very fair use of me.”

- (4) Pl. *Smp.* 188d Οὕτω πολλὴν καὶ μεγάλην, μᾶλλον δὲ πᾶσαν δύναμιν ἔχει συλλήβδην μὲν ὁ πᾶς Ἔρωσ.

‘Thus Love, conceived as a single whole, exerts a wide, a strong, may, in short, a complete power.’

The peripheral nature of conjunctive adverbs appears to be a *conditio sine qua non* of discourse markers, and examples to illustrate this lack of syntactic function are not hard to be found¹¹ (5). However, a wider overview of the corpus of conjunctive adverbs in Greek literature may also provide some cases in which the adverbs perform a very close or rather identical function as they do in conjunctive contexts, even if they are integrated in states of affairs¹². So in the following examples:

- (5) Th. 2.55 Οἱ δὲ Πελοποννήσιοι ἐπειδὴ ἔτεμον τὸ πεδίου, παρήλθον ἐς τὴν Πάραλον γῆν καλουμένην μέχρι Λαυρείου, οὗ τὰ ἀργύρεια μέταλλά ἐστὶν Ἀθηναίοις. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἔτεμον ταύτην ἣ πρὸς Πελοπόννησον ὄρᾳ, ἔπειτα δὲ τὴν πρὸς Εὐβοιάν τε καὶ Ἄνδρον τετραμμένην.

‘The Peloponnesians, after ravaging the plain, advanced into the district called Paralus as far as Laurium, where are the silver mines of the Athenians. And first they ravaged that part of this district which looked towards the Peloponnesus, and afterwards the part facing Euboea and Andros.’

¹⁰ In this sense, the term ‘suprasentential scope’, often used by scholars, may be understood, according to Fuentes (2001: 329), not necessarily as implying an actual conjunction between different utterances, but rather as a connection between elements in a level located beyond the domain of sentence, in discourse.

¹¹ It is also a classical test employed in case-studies focused on the coexistence of syntactic and discursive functions of adverbs. Cf. Conti (2014a and 2014b); Crespo (2014a); Fornieles (2014); Jiménez (2013, 2014, 2015); Maquieira (2014); Martínez Vázquez (2011, 2012, 2013); Martínez Vázquez / Ruiz Yamuza (2011); Redondo (2012), (2013); Ruiz Yamuza (2012), (2014a), (2014b); Verano (2014).

¹² This may be the case of the so-called apodotic usages of adverbs (cf. Martínez / Ruiz Yamuza 2011), the reformulatory adverbs employed with explicit *verba dicendi*, or the temporal adverbs in narrative texts (cf. Jiménez 2013).

- (6) Th. 3.47 Εἰ δὲ διαφθερεῖτε τὸν δῆμον τὸν Μυτιληναίων, ὃς οὔτε μετέσχε τῆς ἀποστάσεως, ἐπειδὴ τε ὄπλων ἐκράτησεν, ἐκὼν παρέδωκε τὴν πόλιν, πρῶτον μὲν ἀδικήσετε τοὺς εὐεργέτας κτείνοντες, ἔπειτα καταστήσετε τοῖς δυνατοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὃ βούλονται μάλιστα.

‘If, however, you destroy the populace in Mytilene, which took no part in the revolt, and which voluntary put the city into your hands as soon as it got hold of arms, in the first place you will be guilty of killing your benefactors, and, in the second place, you will bring about what the influential men most wish.’

Only (6) might be considered a purely conjunctive usage of the adverb, with no syntactic connection with the state of affairs. In a discourse-oriented functional approach, however, it is hard to establish a clearly-defined line with regard to the role developed by these elements in the articulation of discourse structure. Even if the adverbs in (5) are integrated in sentence structure, as Ricca affirms, “this is not to say, of course, that [...] the adverbs do not play a role in text organization. They obviously do, but at the same time each of them still provides a temporal setting for a state of affairs (be it only anaphorically, relative to other events in the chain), and therefore also pertains to the representational level” (Ricca 2010: 158).

3.2 *Semantic nature*

3.2.1 *Conjunctive adverbs and procedural meaning: the contribution of Relevance Theory*

The main contributions to the semantics of discourse markers have been provided by Relevance Theory (Sperber Wilson 1986), and particularly the papers of Blakemore (1987; 1992; 2002; 2004) must be mentioned. This branch of the theory is responsible for the concept of ‘procedural meaning’ – opposed to that of ‘conceptual meaning’ –, which has become indeed a *locus communis* in the semantic description of discourse markers (cf. Fischer 2006; Fraser 1999; Murillo Ornat 2010; Portolés 2001).

Though the term ‘procedural meaning’ comes from Blakemore, it is important to note that this concept has gone through substantial

changes. Blakemore's first attempt to define procedural meaning was the result of the ultimate exploitation of her model of understanding utterances. This model is based on a two-level process: the *explicature*, that consists on the obtaining of a truth-conditional proposition from the utterance; and the *implicature*, that is the process of generation of inferential meaning from the interaction of proposition and context (cf. Blakemore 1987; 1992).¹³

With the help of this framework, Blakemore noticed that there exist in language some elements whose semantic content seems to operate only in the processing of the inferences that are born in implicature, and not in the constitution of explicature. She called this kind of meaning 'procedural meaning', and attached it to a small portion of elements, which do not contribute to propositional meaning. However, she never stated those elements to be the only ones responsible for the generation of implicatures. As she exposes in many places, the proposition itself – when set against the context –, is the main source of inferential meaning, and every word contributing to propositional meaning in explicature is also capable of generating inferential meaning in the implicature domain.

This is important to remember, for the concept of 'procedural meaning' is usually employed in the description of discourse markers as a synonym of 'inferential meaning' or rather 'meaning which contributes to the generation of inferences',¹⁴ which is, in Blakemore's approach, almost every word meaning.¹⁵ The distinction between these two types of

¹³ According to Relevance Theory, context is the assumption of a communicative situation, and so implies not the physical environment, but rather the constructed idea of that environment that hearer and speaker do, in conjunction with their common knowledge and the information state in the conversation: "It should be recalled here that by context we mean the beliefs and assumptions the hearer constructs for the interpretation of an utterance either on the basis of her perceptual abilities or on the basis of the assumptions she stored in memory or on the basis of her interpretation of previous utterances. That is, we have defined the context in psychological terms" (Blakemore 1992: 87).

¹⁴ Cf. Portolés (2001: 75).

¹⁵ This shift in the understanding of the concept has been pointed out by Blakemore herself: "Discourse markers (e.g. *after all*, *but* and *as a result*) which, in contrast to commentary markers, do not contribute to representational meaning, but only have what Fraser calls procedural meaning, signaling how the basic message relates to the prior discourse. In adopting this terminology Fraser claims to be following Blakemore (1987). However, Fraser's distinction between representational and procedural meaning is not equivalent to the cognitive distinction that has been developed in Relevance Theory, since it appeals to the role that DMs play in the coherence of discourse. Not surprisingly, expressions that Fraser classifies as procedural (e.g., *as a result*) are not regarded as encoding procedural meaning in Relevance Theory" (Blakemore 2004: 223).

‘procedural meaning’ is relevant with regard to conjunctive adverbs, for if we consider ‘procedural meaning’ in the most restricted way in which Blakemore does, we find them not to convey this kind of meaning. Thus, forms such as the adverb in (7) are hardly to be considered ‘procedural’ in Blakemore’s way, though they obviously operate in the inferential level of communication, guiding the interpretation of utterances:

- (7) S. *Aj.* 761 ὅστις ἀνθρώπου φύσιν βλαστῶν ἔπειτα μὴ κατ’ ἀνθρώπον φρονῆ.

‘Each one who has human nature but refuses to think only human thoughts. (Even though he has human nature, he does not have, however (afterwards), the thoughts of a man).’

3.2.2 *Conjunctive adverbs and semantic instructions: the contribution of Argumentation Theory*

This wider understanding of ‘procedural meaning’ is closer to the contributions of French Argumentation Theory¹⁶, which describes the meaning of discourse markers as a sort of instructional meaning, through which the hearer or reader may better interpret the utterance¹⁷.

This theory is responsible for a new concept of signification, which refers to the link of propositional content in the phrase (‘phrase’ is the French word used by Ducrot) with the context of utterance (Ducrot 1980: 13), actually not so far, as it has been said, from the proposal of Relevance Theory. This revised ‘signification’ moves away from the ‘literal sense’ of proposition, and becomes what Ducrot calls ‘instructions’, lines that guide the interpretation of what the speaker says:

Pour notre part, c’est que nous entendons pour signification (du mot ou de la phrase) est tout autre chose que le “sens littéral” dont il vient d’être question. Car elle n’est pas un constituant du sens de l’énoncé, mais lui est au contraire complètement hétérogène. Elle contient, sur tout, des

¹⁶ As Portolés states, both approaches are actually related, and share the same interests, though from different points of view (Portolés 2001: 76).

¹⁷ The touchstone of the theory is the argumentative force which, according to this perspective, every member of discourse is able to supply. The argumentative force of an utterance entails a number of specific inferences which are attached to it, and which put the orientation of discourse towards the derivation of a certain conclusion, and avoid the implication of others (cf. Anscombe / Ducrot 1994: 55).

instructions données à ceux qui devront interpréter un énoncé de la phrase, leur demandant de chercher dans la situation de discours tel ou tel type d'information et de l'utiliser de telle ou telle manière pour reconstruire le sens visé par le locuteur (Ducrot 1980: 5).

Thanks to the concept of semantic instruction, the meaning of discourse markers may be more suitably explained and described (Portolés 2001). These instructions can operate in the argumentative structure and inform about the orientation of the discourse unit in which the marker is placed, regarding to the previous one, as in (8); they can be related to formulation process, highlighting the make-up of the production of utterances, as in (9); finally, they can also play a role in the management and structure of discourse units, as in (10). The following examples may help to illustrate in a broad way the value of these instructions by means of conjunctive adverbs:

- (8) Pl. *Ap.* 22b αἰσχύνομαι οὖν ὑμῖν εἰπεῖν, ὧ ἄνδρες, τάληθῆ· ὅμως δὲ ῥητέον.

‘Now I am ashamed to tell you the truth, gentlemen; but still it must be told.’

- (9) Pl. *Prt.* 324a ὧν ἔστιν ἔν και ἡ ἀδικία και ἡ ἀσέβεια και συλλήβδην πᾶν τὸ ἐναντίον τῆς πολιτικῆς ἀρετῆς.

‘One of them is injustice, and impiety, and in short all that is opposed to civic virtue.’

- (10) Ar. *V.* 1176 {Bδ.} τίνα δῆτ' ἂν λέγοις; {Φι.} πολλοὺς πάνυ. πρῶτον μὲν ὡς ἡ Λάμι' ἀλοῦσ' ἐπέρδετο, ἔπειτα δ' ὡς ὁ Καρδοπίων τὴν μητέρα – {Bδ.} μὴ 'μοιγε μύθους, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων, οἷους λέγομεν μάλιστα, τοὺς κατ' οἰκίαν.

‘Loathecleon: What story would you tell, then? :: Lovecleon: I've got lots of stories. First of all, how Lamia farted when captured. Then how Carpodion got hold of his mother and – :: Loathecleon: I don't want fairytales, I want stories with human interest, the sort we most often tell, the ones we tell at home.’

3.2.3 *Some final remarks on the meaning of discourse markers*

The definition of procedural meaning in less constraint terms than those proposed by Blakemore, let most scholars agree in the idea that the existence of procedural and conceptual meaning does not entail mutual exclusion (Garcés 2007: 321; Portolés 2001: 25). This coexistence of conceptual and instructional meaning is detected in conjunctive adverbs, that are said to retain, to some extent, the original semantic value of their etymological category.

In addition to this, it is often verified that discourse markers can perform more than one of the aforementioned semantic instructions, even in the same context. Polysemy, or rather discursive polysemy, has been claimed to be a prototypical feature of discourse markers, for these units are able to display a significant number of values not only in different contexts but even in the same place, at the same time¹⁸. The organization of these meanings – would there be actually any kind of relationship between them – is a challenge for those who intend the study of discursive items from a lexical perspective, for the establishment of a ‘core meaning’ to which the different senses of the marker in every context have to be drawn is not at all an easy task:

Just listing the different interpretations [of the particle] treats the items under consideration as homonymous; such an approach does not account for our intuition of the relatedness of these meanings, and it leaves unexplained how the interpretations observable are learnable and how contextual occurrences are interpretable. Moreover, the relationship between each particle lexeme and its interpretation has to be describe in order to explain why just these particle can get just these particular interpretations and no others (Fischer 2006: 3).

¹⁸ In functional approaches, the notion of polysemy is often substituted by that of polyfunctionality, assuming that the so-called semantic instructions of markers entail, in fact, the putting into operation of discursive functions. From this theoretical perspective, the possibility of markers to perform different functions in different contexts is called ‘paradigmatic polyfunctionality’, whereas the coexistence of several functions in the same occurrence of a form is denominated ‘syntagmatic polyfunctionality’ (cf. Bazzanella 2008). From a different – and perhaps more accurate – perspective, these overlapped ‘semantic’ values could be explained as instances of pragmatic ambiguity (cf. Sweetser 1990: 76; Horn 1985).

3.3 *Conjunctive adverbs and discourse coherence*

An important approach to the study of discourse markers comes from discourse coherence, a perspective that goes back to the seminal work of Halliday and Hasan (1976) on cohesion. Here I will follow the framework designed by Kroon (1998) for the study of discourse markers in Latin. According to this model, coherence in discourse implies the interaction of three levels¹⁹: representational level “(in other approaches called also ‘ideational level’ or ‘content level’) is concerned with the representation of some real or imagined world outside the language itself” (Kroon 1998: 207-208); presentational level points at both the linguistic action structure and the thematic structure of discourse; interactional level appeals to the way in which different members of discourse fit in an exchange structure (e.g. a conversation).

3.3.1 *Conjunctive adverbs and the presentational level of discourse*

In general terms, conjunctive adverbs are said to operate in the presentational level (cf. Crespo 2011: 36). That they can set a rhetorical connection between speech acts and, as regards the thematic structure, they are specially appropriate for ordering and organizing information units, including the introduction of new topics and commentaries, the setting of lists and enumerations and other discursive arrangements:

- (12) Aeschin. *In Timarchum*. 7.1 Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ περὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης τῶν παιδῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐνομοθέτησαν, καὶ διαρρήδην ἀπέδειξαν ἅ γρη τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἐλεύθερον ἐπιτηδεύειν, καὶ ὡς δεῖ αὐτὸν τραφήναι, ἐπειτα δεύτερον περὶ τῶν μειρακίων, τρίτον δ’ ἐφεξῆς περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἡλικιῶν, οὐ μόνον περὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν ῥητόρων.

‘First, you recall, they laid down laws to protect the morals of our children, and they expressly prescribed what were to be the habits of the freeborn boy, and how he has to be brought up; then they legislated for the lads, and next for the other age-groups succession, including in their provision, not only private citizens, but also the public men.’

¹⁹ The model proposed by Kroon is related to that of Schiffrin (1987), who conceived discourse as the sum of different structures (‘ideational structure’, ‘action structure’ and ‘exchange structure’), and that of Paris-Geneva Linguistic School (cf. Kroon 1998: 206-207). Schiffrin’s tripartite distinction also follows Halliday and Hasan (1976): “There are three major functional-semantic components, the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual” (Halliday / Hasan 1976: 26). For a further analysis of other critical revisions of Schiffrin’s model of coherence, see Fraser (1999).

3.3.2. *Conjunctive adverbs and the representational level of discourse*

According to Kroon, the representational level of discourse “is concerned with the representation of some real or imagined world outside the language itself. Connective particles with a function on this level usually signal semantic relations between the states of affairs that make up the represented world” (1998: 207-208).

As regards conjunctive adverbs, it is possible to provide some cases, in which a relationship between the states of affairs represented in the utterances is displayed. I refer, specially, to the so-called consecutive usages, like in the following example:

- (13) X. *HG* 6.3.3 Καλλίστρατος δὲ ὁ δημηγόρος παρῆν· ὑποσχόμενος γὰρ Ἴφικράτει, εἰ αὐτὸν ἀφείη, ἢ χρήματα πέμψειν τῷ ναυτικῷ ἢ εἰρήνην ποιήσειν, οὕτως Ἀθήνησιν τε ἦν καὶ ἔπραττε περὶ εἰρήνης.

‘Callistratus, the popular orator, also went with the embassy; for he had promised Iphicrates that if he would let him go home, he would either send money for the fleet or bring about peace, and consequently he had been at Athens and engaged in efforts to secure peace.’

As the connection is established between the content of the discourse units involved, it is forcible to accept to some extent that some conjunctive adverbs – the so-called content consecutive at least – may play a role in the representational level of discourse coherence.

3.3.3. *Conjunctive adverbs and the interactional level of discourse*

Kroon’s model approaches the interactional level in a twofold way: it includes, on the one hand, the role of physical participants in communication (speaker, hearer, etc.) and their relationships with the linguistic discourse (*alicubi* ‘interpersonal level’), and, on the other hand, the existence of internal voices in texts, following the concept of polyphony developed by the Paris-Geneva school of Linguistics²⁰.

²⁰ This consists on the revision of an old linguistic and literary notion that comes from Bakhtine (cf. Roulet 1985). According to this approach, the more prominent feature of discourse is its interactive nature. This nature is not accomplished only in dialogue; also in many monological contributions of speakers underlies the structure of a secret conversation (Ducrot 1980: 49-56; Kroon 1998: 212).

Conjunctive adverbs do not play any role in the exchange structure, that is to say, they do not point out directly to the speaker or any other participant in the communication exchange. They do not interact with extralinguistic context, but only set relationships between linguistic units. Thus, in the example (11):

- (11) X. *Mem.* 1.4.11 Εὖ ἴσθι, ἔφη, ὅτι, εἰ νομίζοιμι θεοὺς ἀνθρώπων τι φροντίζειν, οὐκ ἂν ἀμελοίην αὐτῶν. Ἔπειτ' οὐκ οἶε φροντίζειν;
 'I assure you, that if I believed that the gods pay any heed to man, I would not neglect them :: Then do you think them unheeding?'

Though the adverb ἔπειτα occupies a hinge-position in the dialogue structure, it does not point at the hearer or speaker as an interpersonal coherence device (such as vocatives or modal particles). As a discourse marker, the adverb fulfills an inferential function, establishing a relation between the previous utterance and that in which it lies. It may be discussed, however, in which level operates this relationship.

However, by means of polyphony it is possible to approach certain discourse phenomena which concern conjunctive adverbs. Polyphonic devices are able to introduce the dialogical properties of a conversational exchange into an – apparently – monological sequence. In order to approach the polyphonic structure, it is necessary to distinguish the speaker from the participants of this inner dialogue, which are called utterers. In the following example:

- (14) D. *De falsa legatione* 248 τὴν δ' ἄτην ὀρῶν στείχουσαν ὁμοῦ, τὴν ἐπὶ Φωκέας στρατείαν, οὐ προεῖπεν οὐδὲ προεξήγγειλεν, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον συνέκρυψε καὶ συνέπραξε καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους εἰπεῖν διεκώλυσεν.
 'And when he [Aeschines] saw the curse that came, – to wit, the army advancing upon the Phocians, – he sounded no warning, sent no timely report; rather he helped both to conceal and execute the design, and obstructed those who were ready to tell the truth.'

The opposition between the sequences (a) “οὐ προεῖπεν οὐδὲ προεξήγγειλεν” and (b) “συνέκρυψε καὶ συνέπραξε καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους εἰπεῖν διεκώλυσεν”, marked by the adverbial τοῦναντίον – in combination

with ἀλλὰ – is hardly sustainable according to the actual content of both sequences, for the fact of “not to tell” or “not to warn” is not in conflict with “to conceal” and “to collaborate”. With the help of polyphony, the function of the adverbial may be clarified by exposing an underlying dialogical sequence, namely:

Utterer 1: προεἶπεν καὶ προεξήγγειλεν [Αἰσχίνης].

Utterer 2: ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον·Συνέκρυψε καὶ συνέπραξε καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους εἰπεῖν διεκόλυσεν.

Most of the so-called adversative conjuncts show signs of polyphony:

- (15) Pl. *Ap.* 22b αἰσχύνομαι οὖν ὑμῖν εἰπεῖν, ὃ ἄνδρες, τάληθῆ· ὁμῶς δὲ ῥητέον.

‘Now I am ashamed to tell you the truth, gentlemen; but still it must be told.’

Thus, in the intervention of Socrates, two utterers may be found: the one who states that he is ashamed to tell the truth, and the one who decides to tell it anyway. The transition between the two of them may be paraphrased as the change of turns in a dialogue sequence. In fact, they can also be employed in dialogical sequences:

- (16) Ar. *Av.* 82 {Θεράπων Ἔποπος} ἀλλ’ ἀρτίως νῆ τὸν Δία εὐδὲι καταφαγῶν μύρτα καὶ σέρφους τινάς. {Πισθέταιρος} ὁμῶς ἐπέγειρον αὐτόν.

‘Slave: Oh, no! He’s just started his nap after a lunch of myrtle berries and gnats. Pistaeterus: Wake him anyway.’

On the other hand, some conjunctive adverbs used in dialogical context do not show the properties of this kind of interactional value. I refer to the cases involving consecutive or illative connectors between turns, as in (17):

- (17) E. *Hel.* 808-810 {Με.} ἀνανδρά γ’ εἶπας Ἰλίου τ’ οὐκ ἄξια. | {Ελ.} οὐκ ἂν κτάνοις τύραννον, ὃ σπεύδεις ἴσως. | {Με.} οὕτω σιδήρωι τρωτὸν οὐκ ἔχει δέμας; | {Ελ.} εἶση· τὸ τολμᾶν δ’ ἀδύνατ’ ἀνδρὸς οὐ σοφοῦ.

Menelaos: You make me out to be a coward, unworthy of Troy.
Helen: Perhaps you want to kill the king. That is impossible.
Menelaos: Is his body invulnerable to the sword, then? *Helen*: You will find out. But a wise man does not undertake the impossible.'

In these cases, the adverbs behave as monophonic devices: though they link up the utterances belonging to two different speakers, by using them, the second speaker declares himself not to be the utterer of the sequence he introduces. In the same way in which, by means of polyphonic devices, a dialogue is set out inside a monological intervention, with the help of these units, the properties of monological discourse may be also translated into an exchange structure.

4. *Conjunctive adverbs: a discourse-oriented definition*

Based on the morphosyntactic, semantic and pragmatic features examined all along these pages, the following characterization of conjunctive adverbs in terms of a discourse-oriented approach can be proposed:

1. Conjunctive adverbs belong to the functional category of discourse markers. They are one of the components by which such functional role may be performed. Since, as adverbs, they are non-flectional items, their morphological status does not come into conflict with the necessity of a lexicalized profile for being considered a full-blown discourse marker.
2. Among the different types of discourse markers, conjunctive adverbs fit in the category of connectives, for they always link up linguistic units, either both explicit or an explicit to an implicit one. The connection they carry out may be accomplished at different levels of discourse structure.
3. Conjunctive adverbs are prototypically peripheral in syntactic structure. However, as it has been shown, it is not uncommon to find the same adverbs in less peripheral contexts, performing discursive functions very close to those that they fulfill as conjunctive forms. As many other linguistic devices, they challenge any monolithic conception of discourse markers as syntactically marginal elements.

4. The semantics of conjunctive adverbs does not modify the truth-conditions of the proposition in which they are embedded; this does not mean, however, that they do not convey any meaning. They do determine, by means of their semantic features, the way in which the utterance where they are placed must be understood. This communication-guidance is possible because they have some kind of meaning which does not work in the propositional level, but in that of the inferences that are produced in the interaction between proposition and context. For they point out, among the vast possibilities of understanding an utterance, the inferences that must be rather assumed, they are said to constrain the interpretation of the utterance.
5. Conjunctive adverbs contribute to the coherence of discourse: they are able to work in the presentational, representational and interactional level. They do not exhibit connectivity, however, with the extralinguistic context. Some of them are polyphonic, and make rise up the hidden voices of texts; other are strictly monological, and keep this property even when used in dialogue.

5. *Final remarks*

In the previous pages, I have tried to show how conjunctive adverbs may be described as discourse markers, according to the data provided by Classical Greek texts. As it has been shown, the features displayed by so-called conjunctive adverbs fit properly in the general requirements that most approaches to the study of these units propose. Thus, though the category of conjunctive adverbs and the corpus of units itself have been outlined by means of grammatical criteria, in my opinion, without an integrated analysis within a discourse-oriented approach, the description of such elements cannot be achieved.

Rodrigo Verano
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
rodrigo.verano@uam.es

References

- Texts and translations: [Aristophanes] *Aves*, J. Henderson, *Aristophanes*, vol. III, Loeb Classical Library, 2000; *Vespae*, J. Henderson, *Aristophanes*, vol. II, Loeb Classical Library, 1998; [Demosthenes] *De falsa legatione*, C. A. Vincen & J. H. Vince, *Demosthenes*, vol. II Loeb Classical Library, 1926; *In Aristocratem*, J. H. Vince, *Demosthenes*, vol. III, Loeb Classical Library, 1935. [Euripides] *Helen*, D. Kovacs, *Euripides*, vol. V, Loeb Classical Library, 2002. [Plato] *Apologia Socratis*, H. N. Fowler, *Plato*, vol. I, Loeb Classical Library, 1914; *Protagoras*, W. R. M. Lamb, *Plato*, vol. II, Loeb Classical Library, 1924; *Res Publica*, P. Shorey, *Plato*, vols. V-VI, Loeb Classical Library 1930-1935; *Symposium*, W. R. M. Lamb, *Plato*, vol. III, Loeb Classical Library, 1932; [Sophocles] *Ajax*, H. Lloyd-Jones, *Sophocles*, vol. I, Loeb Classical Library, 1994; [Thucydides] C. F. Smith, *Thucydides*, vols. I & II, Loeb Classical Library, 1928 and 1930; [Xenophon] *Cyropaedia*, W. Miller, *Xenophon*, vol. V, Loeb Classical Library, 1914; *Hellenica*, C. L. Brownson. *Xenophon*, vols. I & II, Loeb Classical Library, 1918 & 1921; *Memorabilia*, E. C. Marchant, O. D. Todd, *Xenophon*, vol. IV, Loeb Classical Library, 1923.
- Aijmer, Karin, 2012, *Understanding Pragmatic Markers. A Variational Pragmatic Approach*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Aschenberg, Heidi / Loureda Lamas, Óscar, 2011, *Marcadores del discurso: de la descripción a la definición*, Madrid/Frankfurt, Iberoamericana-Vervuert.
- Baldi, Philip / Cuzzolin, Pierluigi, 2010, *New Perspectives in Latin Historical Syntax*, Berlin-New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Bazzanella, Carla, 2008, "Polifunzionalità dei segnali discorsivi, sviluppo conversazionale e ruolo dei tratti fonetici e fonologici". In Pettorino, M. *et al.* (eds.), *La comunicazione parlata. Atti del congresso internazionale*, Napoli, Liguori: 934-963.
- Bellert, Irenal, 1977, "On semantic and distributional properties of sentential adverbs". *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.2: 337-351.
- Blakemore, Diane, 1987, *Semantic constraints on relevance*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Blakemore, Diane, 1992, *Understanding Utterances*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Blakemore, Diane, 1993, "The relevance of reformulations". *Language and Literature* 2/2: 101-120.
- Blakemore, Diane, 2002, *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning: the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*, Cambridge/New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Blakemore, Diane, 2004, "Discourse Markers". In Horn, L. R. / Ward, G., *Handbook of Pragmatics*, Oxford, Blackwell: 221-240.

- Borreguero Zuloaga, Margarita / López Serena, Araceli, 2011, “Marcadores discursivos, valores semánticos y articulación informativa del texto: el peligro del enfoque lexicocentrista”. In Aschenberg, Heidi / Loureda Lamas, Óscar, 2011, *Marcadores del discurso: de la descripción a la definición*, Madrid/Frankfurt, Iberoamericana/Vervuert: 169-210.
- Conti Jiménez, Luz, 2012, “Los adverbios conjuntivos en griego antiguo: Análisis de ἄμα en Homero, Platón y Jenofonte”. *Emerita* 80/1: 45-68.
- Conti Jiménez, Luz, 2014a, “El espectro funcional de οὐτω(ς) en los poemas homéricos”. In *Emerita. Revista De Lingüística y Filología Clásica*, 82/1: 25-49.
- Conti Jiménez, Luz, 2014b, “Adverbios y marcadores del discurso en Homero: El caso de δεῦρο y δεῦτε”. In Martínez Fernández, Á. / Ortega Villaro, B. / Velasco López, M. del Henar / Zamora Salamanca, H. (eds.), *Ágalma. Ofrenda desde la filología clásica a Manuel García Teijeiro*, Valladolid, Ediciones Universidad de Valladolid: 119-127.
- Crespo Güemes, Emilio, 2009, “Conjunctive Adverbs in Ancient Greek”. In *Early European Languages in the eyes of modern Linguistics*, Brno: 35-43.
- Crespo Güemes, Emilio, 2011, “Conjunctive Adverbs: A Neglected Chapter of Greek Grammar”. In Luján, Eugenio / García, J. L., *A Greek Man in the Iberian Street*, Innsbruck: 35-43.
- Crespo Güemes, Emilio, 2015, “Los adverbios conjuntivos en griego”. In Villa Polo, Jesús de la / Cañizares Ferriz, Patricia / Falque Rey, Emma / González Castro, José Francisco / Siles Ruiz, Jaime, *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y Forms del Mundo Clásico*, Madrid, SEEC: 485-494.
- Crespo Güemes, Emilio / Conti, Luz / Maquieira, Helena, 2003, *Sintaxis del Griego Clásico*, Madrid, Gredos.
- De Beaugrande, Robert-Alain / Dressler, Ulrich, 1981, *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, London, Longman.
- Ducrot, Oswald, 1980, *Les mots du discours*, Paris, Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Fischer, Kerstin, 2006, *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Amsterdam, Elsevier.
- Fornieles Sánchez, Raquel, 2013, “Οὐτως como adverbio conjuntivo en la tragedia griega”. In Cabedo Nebot, A. / Aguilar Ruiz, M. J. / López-Navarro Vidal, E. (eds.), *Estudios de lingüística: Investigaciones, propuestas y aplicaciones*, Valencia, Universitat de València: 269-278.
- Fornieles Sánchez, Raquel, 2014, “Εἶτα y ἔπειτα en la tragedia griega: De adverbios de tiempo a marcadores del discurso”. *Minerva. Revista De Filología Clásica* 27: 97-118.
- Fraser, Bruce, 1999, “What are discourse markers?”. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 31/7: 1999, 931-952.

- Fraser, Bruce, 2006, "On the Conceptual-Procedural Distinction". *Style* 40/1/2: 24-33.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, Catalina, 2000, *Lingüística pragmática y Análisis del discurso*, Madrid, Arco Libros.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, Catalina, 2001, "Los marcadores del discurso, ¿una categoría gramatical?". In Méndez, Elena / Mendoza, Josefa / Congosto, Yolanda, *Indagaciones sobre la lengua. Estudios de Filología y Lingüística españolas en memoria de Emilio Alarcos*, Sevilla: 323-348.
- Fuentes Rodríguez, Catalina, 2009, *Diccionario de conectores y operadores del español*, Madrid, Arco-Libros.
- Garcés Gómez, María Pilar, 2007, "Perspectivas en el análisis de los marcadores discursivos". *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 58: 306–328.
- Greenbaum, Sidney, 1969, *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*, London, Longman.
- GDLE: Bosque, Ignacio / Demonte, Violeta / Lázaro Carreter, Fernando, 1999, *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*, Madrid, Espasa-Calpe.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. / Hasan, Ruqaiya, 1976, *Cohesion in English*, London, Longman.
- Horn, Lawrence R., 1985, "Metalinguistic Negation and Pragmatic Ambiguity". *Language* 61/1: 121-174.
- Jiménez Delgado, José Miguel (2013), "Adverbios temporales como conectores con valor consecutivo". *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios Griegos e Indoeuropeos* 23: 31-52.
- Jiménez Delgado, José Miguel, 2014, "Adverbios, partículas y marcadores del discurso: αὐῶν y αὐθις en los historiadores griegos." *Emerita. Revista de Lingüística y Filología Clásica* LXXXII.2: 223–247.
- Jiménez Delgado, José Miguel, 2015, "Εἶτα y ἔπειτα en los historiadores griegos: de adverbios temporales a marcadores discursivos". In Villa Polo, Jesús de la / Cañizares Ferriz, Patricia / Falque Rey, Emma / González Castro, José Francisco / Siles Ruiz, Jaime, *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y Forms del Mundo Clásico*, Madrid, SEEC: 523-530.
- Kovacci Conicet, Ofelia, 1999, "El adverbio". In Bosque, Ignacio / Demonte, Violeta / Lázaro Carreter, Fernando, 1999, *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*, Madrid, Espasa-Calpe: 705-786.
- Kroon, Caroline H. M., 1998, "A Framework for the Study of Latin Discourse Markers". *Journal of Pragmatics* 30: 205-223.
- López Serena, Araceli, 2011, "Más allá de los marcadores del discurso". In Bustos Tovar, José Jesús de, *Sintaxis y análisis del discurso hablado en español: homenaje a Antonio Narbona*, Sevilla, Universidad de Sevilla: 275-294.

- Loureda Lamas, Óscar / Acín Villa, Esperanza, 2010, *Los estudios sobre marcadores del discurso en español, hoy*, Madrid, Arco-Libros.
- Maquieira Rodríguez, Helena (2014), “Usos conjuntivos de ὁμοίως en Platón y la oratoria clásica”. In Martínez Fernández, Á. / Ortega Villaro, B. / Velasco López, M. del Henar / Zamora Salamanca, H. (eds.), *Ágalma. Ofrenda desde la filología clásica a Manuel García Teijeiro*, Valladolid, Ediciones Universidad de Valladolid: 199-206.
- Martín Zorraquino, María Antonia, 2010, “Los marcadores del discurso y su morfología”. In Loureda Lamas, Óscar / Acín Villa, Esperanza, 2010, *Los estudios sobre marcadores del discurso en español, hoy*, Madrid, Arco-Libros: 93-181.
- Martín Zorraquino, María Antonia / Montolío Durán, Estrella, 1998, *Los marcadores del discurso: teoría y análisis*, Madrid, Arco Libros.
- Martín Zorraquino, María Antonia / Portolés, José, 1999, “Los marcadores del discurso”. In Bosque, Ignacio / Demonte, Violeta / Lázaro Carreter, Fernando, 1999, *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*, Madrid, Espasa-Calpe: 4051-4214.
- Martínez Vázquez, Rafael, 2011, “Tipología textual, adverbios conjuntivos y la Historia de Tucídides”. In Carande, Rocío / López-Cañete, Daniel (eds.), *PRO TANTIS REDDITVR. Homenaje a Juan Gil en Sevilla*, Sevilla, Universidad de Sevilla: 95-114.
- Martínez Vázquez, Rafael, 2012, “Adverbios conjuntivos en griego antiguo: οὐτως como conector de ordenación en la lengua de Tucídides”. In Cabedo Nebot, Adrián / Infante Ríos, Patricia, *Lingüística XL. El lingüista ante el siglo XXI*, Madrid, Ediciones SEL: 141-147.
- Martínez Vázquez, Rafael, 2013, “Valores discursivos de la expresión ἄλλως τε καί en griego antiguo”. In Cabedo Nebot, Adrián / Aguilar Ruiz, María José / López-Navarro Vidal, Elena (eds.), *Estudios de lingüística: Investigaciones, propuestas y aplicaciones*, Valencia, Universitat de València: 97-107.
- Martínez Vázquez, Rafael / Ruiz Yamuza, Emilia, 2011, “Una aproximación escalar al empleo de adverbio como adjunto y conjunto: οὐτως”. *Habis* 42: 315-336.
- Murillo Ornat, Silvia, 2010, “Los marcadores del discurso y su semántica”. In Loureda Acín 2010, 241-280.
- Pinkster, Harm, 1972, *On Latin Adverbs*, Amsterdam, North Holland Pub. Co.
- Pinkster, Harm, 1990, *Latin Syntax and Semantics*, London/New York.
- Pons Rodríguez, Lola, 2010, “Los marcadores del discurso y la historia del español”. In Loureda Lamas, Óscar / Acín Villa, Esperanza, 2010, *Los estudios sobre marcadores del discurso en español, hoy*, Madrid, Arco-Libros: 523-616.

- Pons Bordería, Salvador, 2006, “A functional approach to the study of discourse markers”. In Fischer, Kerstin, 2006, *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Amsterdam, Elsevier: 77-99.
- Portolés Lázaro, José, 1993, “La distinción entre los conectores y otros marcadores del discurso en español”. *Verba: Anuario galego de filoloxia* 20: 141-170.
- Portolés, José, 2001, *Los marcadores del discurso* (2nd ed.), Barcelona, Ariel.
- Quirk, Randolph / Greenbaum, Sidney / Leech, Geoffrey / Svartvik, Jan, 1985, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London, Longman.
- RAE: Real Academia Española / Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española, 2009, *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española*, Madrid, Espasa.
- Redondo Moyano, Elena, 2012, “Estudio del adverbio conjuntivo ὅμως en la novela griega”. In Cabedo Nebot, Adrián / Infante Ríos, Patricia, *Lingüística XL. El lingüista ante el siglo XXI*, Madrid, Ediciones SEL: 201-208.
- Redondo Moyano, Elena, 2013, “Coherencia discursiva y adverbios de tiempo”. *Habis* 44: 367-83.
- Redondo Moyano, Elena, 2015, “Estudio de los usos del adverbio conjuntivo ὁμοίως en la novela griega”. In Villa Polo, Jesús de la / Cañizares Ferriz, Patricia / Falque Rey, Emma / González Castro, José Francisco / Siles Ruiz, Jaime, *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y Forms del Mundo Clásico*, Madrid, SEEC: 599-607.
- Ricca, Davide, 2010, “Adverbs”. In Baldi, Philip / Cuzolin, Pierluigi, 2010, *New Perspectives in Latin Historical Syntax*, Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter: 109-191.
- Roulet, Eddy, 1985, *L'articulation du Discours en Français Contemporain*, Berne/New York, Peter Lang.
- Ruiz Yamuza, Emilia, 2012, “Los matices de la consecuencia: ejemplificación con οὕτω”. In Cabedo Nebot, Adrián / Infante Ríos, Patricia, *Lingüística XL. El lingüista ante el siglo XXI*, Madrid, Ediciones SEL: 225-231.
- Ruiz Yamuza, Emilia, 2014a, “El adverbio v̄v̄v̄ como marcador discursivo”. *Emerita. Revista de Lingüística y Filología Clásica* 82/1: 1-23.
- Ruiz Yamuza, Emilia, 2014b, “Mitigar o reforzar: precisiones sobre una función discursiva del adverbio οὕτω(ς)”. In Martínez Fernández, Á. / Ortega Villaro, B. / Velasco López, M. del Henar / Zamora Salamanca, H. (eds.), *Ágalma. ofrenda desde la filología clásica a Manuel García Teijeiro*, Valladolid, Ediciones Universidad de Valladolid: 279-286.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, 1987, *Discourse Markers*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, Deborah / Tannen, Deborah / Hamilton, Heidi E., 2001, *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Oxford, Blackwell.

- Schiffrin, Deborah, 2003, "Discourse Markers". In *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, Oxford University Press.
- Sperber, Dan / Wilson, Deirdre, 1986, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Sweetser, Eve, 1991, *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Tordesillas, Marta Inés, 1993, "Conectores y operadores: una diferencia de dinámica argumentativa". In *Revista de Filología Francesa* (UCM) 3: 233-244.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs, 1995, "The Role of the Development of Discourse Markers in a Theory of Grammaticalization", paper presented at *XII International Conference on Historical Linguistics (ICHL)*, Manchester, 1995. Version 11/1997, online: <http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/papers/discourse.pdf>.
- Verano, Rodrigo, 2012, "El adverbio συλλήβδην como marcador del discurso en griego antiguo y los matices de la recapitulación". *Habis* 43: 341-358.
- Verano, Rodrigo, 2015, "Reformuladores de recapitulación en griego antiguo". In Villa Polo, Jesús de la / Cañizares Ferriz, Patricia / Falque Rey, Emma / González Castro, José Francisco / Siles Ruiz, Jaime, *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y Forms del Mundo Clásico*, Madrid, SEEC: 627-634.