Ronald Blankenborg Radboud University Nijmegen R.Blankenborg@let.ru.nl

PARTICLES AS DEICTIC PHONATION

Abstract

This paper focuses on the deictic usage of selected ancient Greek particles, whereby particles primarily represent sounds functioning as symbols.¹ In the study of Greek particles, little words with no stable thesis in prosody, much attention has been given to their auxiliary or nuancing semantic function, sometimes to the effect that a particle was awarded its own independent semantics. This approach, I argue, only suits written composition. From a prosodic point of view, the point of view of oral composition and performance, such semantic value is unexpected and often untenable, as rhythmical and intonational clisis resist any adverbial meaning. Usage as particles is the direct result of phonetic reduction, itself the effect of intonational variance. Particles are thus the printed representations of phonemes, of sound. In writing, particles primarily serve prosodic ends. I will argue that the clitic character and the unstable thesis of particles both serve as indicators for intonational deixis.

Keywords: particles, deixis, phonation, aural symbols, prosody of ancient Greek

¹ I thank the anonymous reviewers and the editor of *Quaestiones Oralitatis* for their helpful suggestions and comments.

Introduction

This article aims to demonstrate the deictic-phonetic usage of selected ancient Greek particles, whereby particles primarilv represent sounds functioning as symbols – a phenomenon known from other languages, and not exclusive for ancient Greek. As aural symbols, particles structure narrative while highlighting the narrative's illocutionary force. Particles do not represent semantics per se, but merely strengthen the text's explicit message and/or implicit meaning (= illocutionary force).² Particles' main characteristic is prosodic:³ as little words with fixed orthography, particles feature as 'parts' or syllables of lexical words without being lexicals themselves. much like pre- and suffixes.⁴ Their status as 'affix' is mirrored by their realization as clitic: unable to feature as independent, prosodically demarcated phonation, or as independently phonated lexemes, particles resemble phonemes like syllables and morphemes like affixes.⁵ Rather than adding meaning (as most [combinations of] syllables do) or delineating syntactical function (as many suffixes do), particles are rather indicative of larger scale structure, meaning, and intent, much like the deictic affixes that strengthen tense (the augment), or aspect (reduplication in present tense and in [plu]perfect tense). In all instances, their role in, and contribution to, prosody is more important than their exact shape or contribution to meaning. Particles are aural signallers, markers of progression, retardation,

² Cf. the approach of particles in questions in SICKING 1997.

³ SLUITER 1997, p. 234: 'Conjunctions' (σύνδεσμοι) were a recognized linguistic category from Aristotle onwards (*Poet.* 1456b39ff.), but the subcategory of παφαπληφωματικοί was a later addition to linguistic theory. Summarizing the relatively late *locus classicus* on the topic (Ap. Dysc. *coni.* 247.22 – 258.26), the group can provisionally be defined as consisting of particles with a wide range of meanings, but sharing the characteristic that they are also (and even predominantly) used without any distinguishable semantic or syntactic impact or purpose, to 'fill out' or embellish metre and style.'

⁴ CABLE 2019 discusses the advantage of categories in meter analogous to the concept of the phoneme over that of the syllable, cf. GURD 2016, 8.

⁵ Cf. WAANDERS 1997.

and pause through their effect on intonation patterns and boundaries.⁶ As such, particles are deictic in their contribution to, and effect on, phonation, rather than vehicles for meaning. What they do contribute to meaning, may better be analysed as the 'framing' or 'staging' of the constituents they phonologically and phonetically adhere to.⁷ In ancient Greek, however, particles play a role that goes well beyond an effect on the phonation of intonational patterning: as clitic phonemes, they appear in orthography and syllabification, as affixes (e.g. $\xi \gamma \omega \gamma \varepsilon$) and 'little words' – to an extent that exceeds the occurrence of comparable phenomena in written languages generally.⁸ This heightened visualization of deictic phonation is a remarkable instance of the interplay between oral and written tradition; it elicits the question why particles were materially preserved as written symbols too. In this article, I will briefly discuss the semantics and the shape of particles, before starting to argue that, and demonstrate how, the clitic character and the unstable thesis of particles both serve as indicators for what may be labelled 'intonational deixis'. To that end I will analyse the way in which shape and prosodic characteristics enable the particles to function as the demarcation of intonational phrases and rhythmical unities in various metrical surface structures. As rhythm brings out the constituent phrases in the metrical surface structure, particles are applied to signal and emphasize the phonological demarcation. Flexible and adaptable, particles are suited to 'fill out' meter and rhythm, more than lexical words are. My analysis is both a deviation from, and an addition to existing particle studies, that mostly focus on the syntax and semantics of particles: particles' mouldability and docility to rhythm, I argue, evidences that their prosodic qualities and usefulness

⁶ In Discourse Analysis known as embedded sequencing, cf. SLINGS 1997.

⁷ Cf. BAKKER 1997; BLANKENBORG forthcoming, pp. 280–283.

⁸ STEDE AND SCHMITZ 2000, p. 125; PISTOR 2016.

outbalance syntactical function and semantic value.⁹ Particles' ubiquity in written Greek points at the status of ancient Greek text as performable and a performance.

Particles' shape and semantics

The study of Greek particles greatly benefitted from Denniston's The Greek Particles, first published in 1934.¹⁰ Among the many virtues of the project is Denniston's attempt to define what particles are.¹¹ His treatment of 'particle' focuses on two distinct features of the object of investigation, but is clouded by the non-exclusiveness of the features he attributes to his inherited list of particles.¹² First, particles are indeclinable little words, but of course, so are combiners, prepositions, and adverbs. Secondly, particles as a word class have much in common with word classes like combiners and adverbs: 'they are in most cases naturally translated by adverbs'. and have a 'function as establishing a relationship between separate ideas'.¹³ Whereas Denniston chose to investigate the matter no further, I argue that what separates particles from the other word classes is mainly a syntactical matter, and it is identifiable by default: unlike combiners, particles cannot start subordinate clauses;¹⁴ and unlike adverbs, particles do not add their own specific and identifiable meaning (they work

 $^{^{9}}$ Particles' lexical representation thus facilitates phraseology in written text, cf. FONTAINE 2017.

¹⁰ DENNISTON 1934.

¹¹ DENNISTON 1934, xxxvii: 'I will define it as a word expressing a mode of thought, considered either in isolation or in relation to another thought, or a mood of emotion'. On page xxxix, he adds that 'particles may be compared to the marks of expression in a musical score, which suggest interpretation rather than dictate it'. Earlier on that same page, Denniston notes that 'often they cannot be appropriately translated into a modern language, and their effect must be suggested by inflexions of the voice in speaking, or by italics, exclamation marks, or inverted commas in writing'.

¹² Inherited from Bäumlein, Untersuchungen über griechische Partikeln (1861).

¹³ DENNISTON 1934, xxxix.

¹⁴ Particles rather 'introduce' embedded discourse, cf. DE JONG 1997.

non-propositionally) to the word group or to the sentence. Many particle studies appeared since Denniston's The Greek Particles, but the attempt to define particles as a separate nonlexical category of words kept on going without any definite outcome. In the recent particle overview study by Bonifazi et *alii*.¹⁵ the term particle is still an 'infelicitous' choice of word. In the Introduction, its use is nonetheless defended as the authors 'have decided to retain the word "particle" instead of choosing some other term for the following reasons. First, "particle" is neutral with respect to the notions "conjunctions" and "adverbs." We want to explore the relationship between the connective and adverbial functions of particles in a pragmatic perspective (...), instead of regarding their syntactic role as either conjunctions or adverbs as their raison d'être. Second, "particle" does not require a priori distinctions between words that have a propositional meaning and those that are only used non-propositionally. On the one hand, the same lexical item can be used both propositionally and non-propositionally depending on genre or context. On the other hand, words can come to have a non-propositional value over time (e.g. τ_{0L} ίδού, $\lambda_{0L}\pi$ όν). Third, on a metascientific level it makes sense to retain a term that has survived centuries of scholarship, even if problems and unresolved questions continue to exist. Rather than working on a closed group of lexical items, we focus on particles in terms of a core and a periphery. The core consists of the list inherited from earlier scholarship, of which we have selected those that are most frequent in our corpus. The periphery potentially includes all other words or phrases that work non-propositionally in our corpus. By extension, discussions of other adverbials, connectives, and phrases used as metalanguage are mostly subsidiary, and our analyses primarily concern the "core" particles, such as $\delta \acute{\eta}$ and $\tau \epsilon .'^{16}$

¹⁵ BONIFAZI 2016, Introduction.

¹⁶ BONIFAZI 2016, 1.4, §10–11.

A different approach to particles comes from Devine and Stephens, who define particles as non-propositional words with specific prosodic qualities: particles are clitic, susceptible to phonetic reduction, and without a stable thesis in prosody.¹⁷ At first, their outlook on particles may look like the usual word-class confusion: there is still no clear distinction between word classes, though pronouns, prepositions, articles, and conjunctions are (invariably) excluded based on their propositional working, despite their clitic character. In my view, however, the approach of Devine and Stephens brings out the most important characteristic in order to classify indeclinable words as particles. Since the differentiation between word classes does not provide a useful clue (in terminology from antiquity, what we refer to as 'particles' belong to the class of the sundesmoi 'function words')¹⁸, particles are to be identified as such based on their prosodic properties. Regardless of the observation that certain prosodic properties are shared by other word classes (such as clisis), susceptibility to phonetic reduction and the unstable thesis do not only define particles, they actually mark the transition of words from various word classes into particles.¹⁹ Hence my argument to identify little words as particles primarily on the basis of prosodic considerations. Particles do not necessarily differ from words in other word classes with regard to their shape and orthography – on the contrary, since they are indeclinable like prepositions and adverbs, or of identical shape as pronouns and modifiers. What turns such words from existing and identifiable lexical word classes into particles is their transformation over time, a transformation on the level of phonetics rather than phonology. As Bonifazi et alii put it, 'words can come to have a non-propositional value

¹⁷ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 352–363.

¹⁸ BONIFAZI 2016, I.2.2.

¹⁹ Cf. DENNISTON 1934, xxxvii: 'A few Greek particles can be clearly seen to have been, at an earlier stage, other parts of speech'; BONIFAZI 2016, cited above; WAANDERS 1997.

over time'. Devine and Stephens have shown that this 'having a non-propositional value over time' is induced, and indicated, by prosodic signaling:²⁰ whereas non-lexical words (mainly clitics) are severely restricted in their placement in both the word group and in the sentence, particles regularly undergo phonetic reduction²¹ resulting in elision, permanent crasis, and quantitative shortening.²² Usage of little words as particles is the direct result of phonetic reduction, itself the effect of intonational variance.²³ Furthermore, particles do not claim a stable thesis, an observation that is convincingly made in metrical text with regard to non-monosyllabic particles.²⁴ In itself, an unstable thesis is the result of rhythmical refooting, a phonetic process that exploits the possibility to adapt rhythmical phrasing to rhythmical word shapes.²⁵ Particles are a distinct category of phonemes in that they have worked the other way around, adapting their shape as a rhythmical word type to the requirements of the rhythmical phrasing (e.g. $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda(\dot{\alpha})$ -'/-, $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\dot{\alpha}$ -' \cup /- -'). As a result, particles are flexible with regard to their mapping onto a metrical grid; a flexibility that reflects their non-propositional meaning.

²⁰ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 355. French discourse particles sharing the same pragmatic function also share similar prosodic patterns (LEE 2019).

²¹ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 357: 'a quite general tendency to reduce and compress accentual excursions in nonlexical words'.

²² DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 262–263. Phonetically, prosodic reduction maximizes the difference between stresses (or prominent) and unstresses (non-prominent) syllables, FLETCHER 2010.

²³ LIBERMANN AND PIERREHUMBERT 1984.

²⁴ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 372: 'Monosyllabic clitics never take an accent, and disyllabic clitics are accented only on their final syllable; this accent is the grave (within the phrase) if the final nucleus contains a short vowel and the circumflex if it contains a long vowel; the latter is the only condition under which an accentual High followed by a postaccentual fall is induced within the clitic word by secondary accentuation. The quantities of the syllables of the enclitic have no effect on its accentuation.' In modern Tokyo Japanese, bimoraic particles are accentually unstable depending on semantic property: only particles of contrast and/or limitation tend to retain their prosodic independence (MAEKAWE 2006).

²⁵ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 272–273.

Particles, I therefore argue, are prosodically identifiable, or rather, identifiable prosodically. In ancient Greek, status as particle is easiest evidenced in metrical text: poetry and rhythmical prose. Particles are appositive and clitic (either pro- or enclitic), and in that capacity markers of discourse.²⁶ Especially because of aural characteristic, since particles contribute to demarcation in the intonation pattern.²⁷ At the same time, as mentioned above, particles add to the intensity of the lexical word they form a phonetic word with.²⁸ Particles literally extend the lexical into a phonetic word, thus enlarging the constituents of the clause and the sentence.²⁹ In every respect, particles are tools for phonation rather than representatives of a specific word class.

With regard to semantics, much attention has been given to particles' auxiliary or nuancing semantic function,³⁰ sometimes to the effect that a particle was awarded its own independent semantics.³¹ This approach, I argue, only suits written composition and more often than not defies the attempt to identify independent semantics.³² From a prosodic point of view, the point of view of oral composition and performance, such semantic value is not to be expected and seems untenable, as rhythmical and intonational clisis resist any adverbial meaning.³³ For certain nuancing and discourse particles, however, not even auxiliary semantics can be readily established. Particles like $\delta \epsilon$, $\mu \epsilon \nu$, $\gamma \epsilon \rho$, $\delta \eta$ and $\tilde{\omega}$, for example, serve

²⁹ Cf. SLUITER 1997.

²⁶ TAYLOR 2006; COUPER-KUHLEN 2003; HIRSCHBERG 2006.

²⁷ COUPER-KUHLEN 2003; BONIFAZI AND ELMER 2012, 297–298.

²⁸ THIJS 2017 discusses as a case in point attitudinal μήν, demarcating direct speech in Plato, as targeting the illocution, rather than the propositional content, e.g. Ποῖα μήν, ἔφη λέγεις; (Pl. R. 523b), Ἀλλὰ μὴν μὴ ὄν γε οὐχ ἕν τι ἀλλὰ μηδὲν ὀϱθότατ' ἀν πϱοσαγορεύοιτο; – Πάνυ γε (Pl. R. 478c), Δοκεῖ μήν. – Ἄκουε δή, ὦ Σώκϱατες, ... (Pl. Ti. 20d), Σκόπει μήν, ἔφη, ... (Pl. Euthd. 283c), Πῶς γάς: – Οὐδὲ μὴν πόλλα γε[.] (Pl. Prm. 165e).

³⁰ BAZANELLA 2006; BAZANELLA AND MORRA 2010.

³¹ Cf. BECK 2012, p. 67: ἀν 'would'.

³² Cf. GEORGE 2009.

³³ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 303–306.

pragmatic purposes as signals, on a par (and possibly in combination) with gestures.³⁴ They remain, however, the printed representations of phonemes, of sound; reduced morphemes perhaps, appositive and/or accentual clitic, but visible. Mentioned particles ($\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$, $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, $\gamma \epsilon$, $\delta \dot{\eta}$, $\tilde{\omega}$) do not have independent or auxiliary semantics, and their value in spoken discourse is their sound in combination with their effect on intonational patterning: as syntactically pre- and postpositive (appositive), and prosodically pro- or enclitic, particles $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$, $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$, $\gamma \hat{\alpha} \rho$, $\gamma \epsilon$, $\delta \eta$, and $\tilde{\omega}$ are phonologically realized as the initial syllable in a rising intonational trajectory,³⁵ or the closing syllable in a falling trajectory (the 'slope').³⁶ Phonetically, as a phonetic word-initial syllable-shaped sound, the particle $\tilde{\omega}$ functions as attention-drawing phonation in order to focus the audience on the commencement of semantically valuable utterances to follow. Word-concluding syllable-shaped sounds $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$, $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$, $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, $\gamma \varepsilon$, δ ή, οὖν, τε, ἄρ(α) provide right-hand intonational demarcation for the extended phonetic word³⁷ without contributing to (phonetic-)word-level semantics.³⁸

It is in itself remarkable that ancient Greek has retained intonational phonation in writing, though (on a smaller scale) phonation for pragmatic purposes only is known from other languages, also in their written representation.³⁹ In English, for example, the utterance-initial "Well, ..." indicates that speaker demands or reclaims attention,⁴⁰ whereas phonation-continuing but meaningless "uh" indicates speaker's resilience to remain the audience's focus of attention, even despite

³⁴ BOLLY AND DEGAND 2013, 216-217.

³⁵ In case of an accentuated proclitic, the accent is realized as secondary, cf. DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 189–190, 363.

 $^{^{36}}$ In case of an accentuated enclitic, the accent is realized as secondary, cf. DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 187–188, 386–373.

³⁷ GOLDSTEIN 2014.

³⁸ As the right-branch demarcation of the intonational phrase is phonetically signaled by tonal downtrend; GOLDSTEIN 2014, 254.

³⁹ GEORGE 2009, VATRI 2012.

⁴⁰ AIJMER 2002, 251-275; 2009.

a (temporary) lack of semantics.⁴¹ In writing, the different instances of deictic phonation, merely indicating the drawing of, or continuing claim on, audience's attention, may or may not be presented;⁴² if they are, written attention-particles primarily serve prosodic ends.⁴³ The various degrees of representation in writing are commonly tied to varying levels of 'orality': the denser the written text with phonation particles, the closer the text's resemblance to unplanned, non-stylized speech.⁴⁴ As it is widely observed and attested that unplanned speech displays ubiguitous use of attention-focused particle-like phonation ('sounds')⁴⁵, texts that abound with particles seem to resemble, or represent, written-out transcripts of orally delivered, or deliverable, speech.⁴⁶ It is tempting to assume that the abundance of particles in certain Greek authors, particularly authors of prose, serves a function in facilitating the reading out loud of the written text in performance.⁴⁷ Below I will argue that in non-metrical text particles thus supplemented part of the structuring impulse that stemmed from metrical rhythm in poetry; a feature of written text that helped bridge the gap with oral delivery that was both its source (as writing took down what had been said) and its outcome, as written versions served as screenplays and rehearsal texts for, for example, actors and orators.48

⁴¹ AIJMER 2002, 97-151; BOLDEN 2006; ARGAMAN 2010; BARA 2010.

 $^{^{42}}$ A well-known example in ancient Greek is the deictic morpheme –ı in, e.g., oúτωσί.

⁴³ Primarily 'tonal downtrend', cf. GOLDSTEIN 2014.

 $^{^{44}}$ To the extent, and with the risk, of 'stylistic stigmatization', BRINTON 1996, 267–268.

 $^{^{45}}$ A case in point is offered by the analysis of Dutch particle 'hoor' in MAZELAND AND PLUG 2010.

 $^{^{46}}$ Statistics on particle distribution over various text types in DUHOUX 2006; criticism on his findings in GEORGE 2009.

⁴⁷ Cf. Denniston's well-known claim that "Greek conversation was full of particles: at moments of excitement the dialogue of tragedy and comedy fairly bristles with them", DENNISTON 1934, lxxii–lxxiii.

⁴⁸ GONZÁLEZ 2013, ch. 14 [retrieved 02.09.2020]. <https://chs.harvard.edu/ CHS/article/display/6123.14-the-aristotelian-tekhn%C4%93-of-hypokrisis>.

Phonation-deixis particles in ancient Greek

In ancient Greek, the prosodic contour of particles reflects their intonational-deictic usage. By showing how particles flexibly fill out, and demarcate, the rhythmical unities in the metrical surface structure, and emphasizing particles' significance for illocution rather than propositional content, I will demonstrate that their importance and role is primarily prosodic. I will argue that the clitic character and the unstable thesis of particles both serve as indicators for intonational deixis.

To start with particles' clitic character: it is not a characteristic of particles exclusively. Words from other word classes may be clitic as well.⁴⁹ Furthermore, clisis is defined on various levels, and to varying degrees.⁵⁰ To start with the latter, clisis may be identified on three different levels, only the first of which, accentual clisis, should be considered clisis proper.⁵¹ In that capacity, clisis refers to the disposition of words that cannot be used without an accentuated word immediately preceding or following, on which the non-accentuated word 'leans'.⁵² For non-accentuated words, such 'leaning' is necessary as ancient Greek is uttered, and understood, as consisting of phonetic words, each organised, or uttered, around at least one accentuated syllable.⁵³ Within the phonetic word, there may be more than one accent, but only one accent is primary: the accentual summit separating the rising intonational trajectory from the slope. Other accents may occur, like the oxytonon accent on the adjective, as secondary: within the rising or falling trajectory, without changing its course from rising to falling, or vice versa.⁵⁴ A phonetic word hence comprises of at least one lexical word, and possibly several non-lexicals carrying secondary accent, or no accent at all. The terminology clisis is also used

⁴⁹ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 303-323.

⁵⁰ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 303–305.

⁵¹ BLANKENBORG forthcoming, "Glossary" s.v. Clisis.

⁵² DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 352–364.

⁵³ GOLDSTEIN 2014.

⁵⁴ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 368-373.

for the disposition of syntactical pre- and postpositives, words that either 'lean' on other words to specify or supplement their lexical or case meaning (like pre- and postpositions, and various pronouns and forms of the verb ϵ_{IIII}), and words that are suggestive of a much wider scope (usually to follow the prepositive) like conjunctions and connectors.⁵⁵ Such 'syntactical clisis' is often a correlate of proper, accentual clisis, but not necessarily so.

As mentioned above, enclisis of $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, $\mu \epsilon v$, $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, and $\gamma \epsilon$ prolongs, stretches, and deepens the intonational slope of the phonetic word.⁵⁶ Reverse, proclisis contributes to the rising trajectory of the intonation pattern.⁵⁷ Clitic particles thus not only demarcate the intonation boundaries of the phonetic word. but also enable the phonetic word, the unit of both utterance and perception, to expand to a seize that fits the rhythmical impulse, the natural unit of unplanned speech.⁵⁸ This becomes particularly noticeable in ancient Greek's poetry. Both its shorter and longer metrical surface structures (some of which may encompass tens of syllables divided over multiple verses) comprise of rhythmically characterised cola, compositional spurts that tend to keep together syntactically coherent units.⁵⁹ The prosodic boundaries separating these spurts may be orthographically realised in various ways: either as a space, or as a space with complimentary printed punctuation suggestive of pause, preparatory emphasis, or silence.⁶⁰ In all instances, however, the printed space reflects phonetic word end, and hence intonational closure.⁶¹ Prosodic bridges prevent or subdue

⁵⁵ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 303.

⁵⁶ TAYLOR 2006; AUER 1999, 35–54; BARTH-WEINGARTEN 2010, 191–212; BONIFAZI AND ELMER 2012, 299–300; cf. BONIFAZI 2016, 1.5 §21.

⁵⁷ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 356–361; GOLDSTEIN 2014.

⁵⁸ Terminology 'rhythmical impulse' in PORTER 1951.

⁵⁹ BAKKER 1997, building on the work of Chafe (W.L. Chafe, *Discourse*, *Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speech and Writing*, Chicago 1994).

⁶⁰ Even the absence of printed punctuation may suggest emphasis, as in the case of enjambment; cf. BLANKENBORG 2014, 4.7.

⁶¹ SCHEPPERS 2011, 21-24.

intonational closure at metrical boundaries. Particles equally support the timely start and completion of phonetic words within the rhythmical spurts of poetry. Examples from various (sub)genres illustrate this capacity of particles:

[1] Il.16.325-339a:62

δούπησεν δέ¹ πεσών, κατὰ δέ² σκότος ὄσσε κάλυψεν ὣς τὼ μὲν³ δοιοῖσι κασιγνήτοισι δαμέντε βήτην εἰς Ἐξεβος Σαφπηδόνος ἐσθλοὶ ἑταῖξοι υἶες ἀκοντισταὶ Ἀμισωδάξου, ὅς ἑα⁴ Χίμαιξαν θξέψεν ἀμαιμακέτην πολέσιν κακὸν ἀνθφώποισιν. Αἴας δέ³ Κλεόβουλον Ὁϊλιάδης ἐποξούσας ζωὸν ἕλε βλαφθέντα κατὰ κλόνον: ἀλλά οί⁵ αὖθι λῦσε μένος πλήξας ξίφει αὐχένα κωπήεντι. πᾶν δ'⁶ ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι: τὸν δἐ⁴ κατ' ὄσσε ἔλλαβε ποξφύξεος θάνατος καί⁷ μοῖξα κραταιή. Πηνέλεως δὲ¹ Λύκων τε⁸ συνέδραμον: ἔγχεσι μὲν γὰξ⁹ ἤμβξοτον ἀλλήλων, μέλεον δ'⁶ ἠκόντισαν ἄμφω: τὼ δ'⁶ αὖτις ξιφέεσσι συνέδραμον. ἔνθα Λύκων μὲν⁹ ἱπποκόμου κόξυθος φάλον ἤλασεν, ἀμφὶ δὲ⁵ καυλὸν φάσγανον ἐξοαίσθη

¹ Despite Meyer's Law: demarcation in a particle is allowed; ² hephthemimeral caesura through lengthening of the syllable; ³ trithemimeral caesura through lengthening of the syllable; ⁴ following the 5th trochee; ⁵ demarcation of the fifth foot; ⁶ elision frustrates demarcation⁶³; ⁷ proclitic καί strengthens the hephthemimeral caesura; ⁸ trochaic caesura; ⁹ verse end.

[2] E. Med.23-16:64

πρώτας δὲ¹ Θήβας τῆσδε γῆς Ἑλληνίδος ἀνωλόλυξα, νεβρίδ' ἐξάψας χροὸς θύρσον τε² δοὺς ἐς χεῖρα, κίσσινον βέλος:

⁶² Text after M.L. West, Homeri Ilias, Munich-Leipzig 1998-2000.

⁶³ BLANKENBORG forthcoming, 100–102.

⁶⁴ Text after J. Mossman, *Euripides: Medea*, Liverpool 2011.

ἐπεί μ'³ ἀδελφαὶ μητρός, ἂς ἥκιστα χρῆν, Διόνυσον οὐκ ἔφασκον ἐκφῦναι Διός, Σεμέλην δἑ² νυμφευθεῖσαν ἐκ θνητοῦ τινος ἐς Ζῆν' ἀναφέρειν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν λέχους, Κάδμου σοφίσμαθ', ὧν νιν⁴ οὕνεκα κτανεῖν Ζῆν' ἐξεκαυχῶνθ', ὅτι γάμους ἐψεύσατο. τοιγάρ νιν¹ αὐτὰς ἐκ δόμων ῷστρησ' ἐγὼ μανίαις, ὄρος δ'³ οἰκοῦσι παράκοποι φρενῶν: σκευήν τ'³ ἔχειν ἠνάγκασ' ὀργίων ἐμῶν, καὶ πῶν τὸ θῆλυ σπέρμα Καδμείων, ὅσαι γυναῖκες ἦσαν, ἐξέμηνα δωμάτων:

 1 Following the first trochee, preparing for a prepausal spondaic word; 2 following the first trochee, preparing for a (4th) epitrite-shaped rhy-thmical phrase; 3 elision frustrates demarcation; 4 hephthemimeral caesura.

[3] Sapph. 'Brothers Song' (5)1-(24)20:65

άλλ' ἄι θρύλησθα Χάραξον ἔλθην νᾶϊ σὺν πλήαι. τὰ μὲν1 οἴομαι Ζεῦς olde súmpantés te² θ eol· sè d'³ où noñ ταῦτα νόησθαι, αλλά καί⁴ πέμπην έμε και κέλεσθαι πόλλα λίσσεσθαι βασίληαν ήραν ἐξίκεσθαι τυίδε σάαν ἄγοντα νᾶα Χάραξον κἄμμ' ἐπεύρην ἀρτέμεας. τὰ δ'³ ἄλλα πάντα δαιμόνεσσιν ἐπιτρόπωμεν· εὕδιαι γὰρ⁵ ἐκ μεγάλαν ἀήταν αἶψα πέλονται τῶν κε⁶ βόλληται βασίλευς Όλύμπω δαίμον' ἐκ πόνων ἐπάρωγον ἤδη περτρόπην, κῆνοι μάκαρες πέλονται καὶ πολύολβοι.

⁶⁵ Text after OBBINK 2014 (reconstructed, many textual uncertainties remain [not indicated in my citation]).

κἄμμες⁷, αἴ κε⁵ ϝὰν κεφάλαν ἀέρρη Λάριχος καὶ δή ποτ⁷³ ἄνηρ γένηται, καὶ⁸ μάλ' ἐκ πόλλαν βαρυθυμίαν κεν⁹ αἶψα λύθειμεν.

¹ Bringing out the rhythmical dactyl in choriamb surface structure; ² splitting the choriamb, suggestive of trochaic continuation; ³ elision frustrates demarcation; ⁴ prepositive καί prevents word-end before the anceps element on position 4; ⁵ right-branch demarcation of the rhythmically light anceps, left-branch demarcation of the choriamb; ⁶ following the first trochee; ⁷ left-branch demarcating phonetic reduction (crasis); ⁸ left-branch demarcating proclisis; ⁹ emphatic verse end, left-branch demarcation of the dodrans/adonius.

Together with other means of prosodic start and completion (like the start or completion of a phonetic word with a lexical, accentuated word), particles audibly demarcate, but without adding to, or enhancing, the phonetic word's semantics.⁶⁶ Thus particles are prosodically demarcating and attentionally sensitive, rather than semantically nuancing.⁶⁷ In recent research, examples abound of seemingly superfluous or 'random' particles in particularly the first extant instances of ancient Greek poetry (e.g. the use of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \varrho$ in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*), and of ancient Greek prose (the use of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \varrho$ in Herodotus' *Histories*).⁶⁸ In their attempt to reflect (rather than visualize) the conventions and practicalities of oral presentation and aural reception, both text types fill out and demarcate their constituents by means of, among other non-lexicals, phonation particles.

The other indicator of particles' intonational deixis is the variability of the thesis of both monosyllabic and polysyllabic

⁶⁶ SCHEPPERS 2011, 48-49.

⁶⁷ The frequently used label *pragmatic* does not fully cover such characterization of particles, as 'intentionally sensitive' refers to particles' function as drawing/requesting audience attention, rather than help structure discourse information, cf. BONIFAZI 2016, I 3.3.

⁶⁸ BLANKENBORG 2014, 2.2.2.

particles:⁶⁹ this variability enables the particle to contribute to demarcation depending on the text's rhythm.⁷⁰ Again, particularly in metrical text evidence can be found for the prosodic motivation behind particles' signalling continuation of phonation. Particles' flexibility with regard to their patterning onto the metrical grid gives them a serious advantage when compared to lexical words and non-flexible pre- and postpositives. Whereas such words are restricted in their possibilities for location, as syllables cannot randomly be refooted from thesis to arsis or vice versa, such refooting is without serious problems for particles: cf. the lengthening of $\delta \hat{\varepsilon}$ on the prepausal thesis of *Il*.16.330 (cited above, and, as for the other examples, passim), the lengthening 'by position' of $\mu \epsilon \nu$ on the prepausal thesis of *II*.16.326, and the rhythmical indeterminacy of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ (II.16.35) and $\mu \epsilon \nu$ (II.16.37) on the metrically indifferent versefinal position. It is actually in accordance with particles' prosodic guality as mere phonation: in their prosodic shape, particles are not fixed rhythmical words.

In prose, the clitic character of particles is not disputed. Nor is their capacity to demarcate phonetic words or 'phonation impulses'.⁷¹ It is more difficult to trace particles' unstable thesis, though. Following the well-established practice from the study of prose rhythm (identifying first [----] and fourth paeons [----] and cretics [----] in accordance with the alleged system of Hegesias), one might expect to find similar rhythmical patterning with right-demarcating enclitic particles as wordfinal syllables.⁷² Especially with regard to particles in prose,

⁶⁹ DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994, 288-291, 304-323.

⁷⁰ WENNERSTROM 2001, 20–25; COUPER-KUHLEN 2003, 2005; HIRSCH-BERG 2006, 5.3.

⁷¹ SCHEPPERS 2011, 21-24; GOLDSTEIN 2014.

⁷² Paeons and cretics, however, characterize parentheses and clausulae, rather than the minor phrase (HUTCHINSON 2018, 26–27). From the particles in poetry, it may be expected that right branching particles form the final syllable of spondaic (|--|), iambic (\cup -) or trochaic ($-\cup$) shaped minor phrases. Together with the last syllables of the preceding sentence – together with which the minor phrase may form a rhythmical unit if the sentence does

further research is necessary to establish the criteria for the identification of phonation particles.

Concluding remarks

The notion that ancient Greek particles in writing represent attention-guiding sounds from oral performance and aural perception, is both trodden ground and new territory: trodden ground as other languages feature such 'written sounds' as well, be it much less frequently, and usually in what resembles the verbatim writing-out of a spoken version of naturally unplanned speech. Ancient Greek is new territory in that it applies particles so lavishly in writing, and in that particles so strongly maintain the attention-structuring function they had in spoken language. From the point of view of intonational patterning and rhythmical demarcation, written particles appear to have become indispensable, to the extent that scholars have assumed and identified independent semantics in their application. That particles are indispensable also becomes clear from their correlation with the application of other structure-representing devices in ancient Greek, especially meter: it has often been observed and noted that ancient Greek orthography and phonology take great pains to strictly align with metrical surface structure, and vice versa: Greek meter itself extremely precisely mirrors rhythm, its ontological reason for being, itself an inherent characteristic of language. Particles are thus a step in a process via which ancient Greek expresses sound in written signs: rhythm is expressed in meter, meter rationalised in phonology, phonology apt to exactly expressing what sound-symbols/syllables constituted the rising or falling accentual and intonational trajectory of phonetic words. And it was two-way traffic: because of their perseverance in written forms of Greek, particles continued to help shape ancient Greek as

not end in a *clausula* – clause-combining rhythmical phrases are expected to turn out either dactylic (as adoneus) or as epitrites (fourth epitrite: $---\cup$).

built up from phonetic-word constituents in reading out loud and oral performance, presumably even in the case of prose.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AIJMER 2002: K. Aijmer, English Discourse Particles: Evidence from a Corpus, Amsterdam 2002.

AIJMER 2009: K. Aijmer, The Pragmatic Marker well: A Text Study, [in:] O. Dontcheva-Navratilova, R. Povolná (eds.), Coherence and Cohesion in Spoken and Written Discourse, Newcastle 2009, pp. 4–29.

ARGAMAN 2010: O. Argaman, *Linguistic Markers and Emotional Intensity*, "Journal of Psycholinguistic Research" 39 (2010), pp. 89–99.

AUER 1999: P. Auer, E. Couper-Kuhlen, F. Müller, Language in Time: The Rhythm and Tempo of Spoken Interaction, Oxford 1999.

BAKKER 1997: E.J. Bakker, The Study of Homeric Discourse, [in:] I. Morris, B. Powell (eds.), A New Companion to Homer, Leiden 1997, pp. 284–304.

BARA 2010: B.G. Bara, *Cognitive Pragmatics: The Mental Processes of Communication*, Cambridge, MA 2010.

BARTH-WEINGARTEN 2010: D. Barth-Weingarten, E. Reber, M. Selting (eds.), *Prosody in Interaction*, Amsterdam 2010.

BAZANELLA 2006: C. Bazzanella, Discourse Markers in Italian: Towards a 'Compositional' Meaning, [in:] K. Fischer (ed.), Approaches to Discourse Particles, Amsterdam–Boston 2006, pp. 449–464.

BAZANELLA AND MORRA 2010: C. Bazzanella, L. Morra, Discourse Markers and the Indeterminacy of Translation, [in:] I. Korzen, C. Marello (eds.), Argomenti per una linguistica della traduzione, Alessandria 2010, pp. 149–157.

BECK 2012: J. Beck, S. Malamud, I. Osadcha, A Semantics for the Particle $\dot{\alpha}\nu$ in and outside Conditionals in Classical Greek, "Journal of Greek Linguistics" 12.1 (2012), pp. 51–83. BLANKENBORG 2014: R. Blankenborg, *Rhythm Without Beat* (2014) [retrieved 18.02.2020]. <https://chs.harvard.edu/ CHS/article/display/6881>.

BLANKENBORG forthcoming: R. Blankenborg, Audible Punctuation. Performative Pause in Homeric Prosody, Washington, DC 2020.

BOLDEN 2006: G.B. Bolden, Little Words That Matter: Discourse Markers 'So' and 'Oh' and the Doing of Other-Attentiveness in Social Interaction, "Journal of Communication" 56 (2006), pp. 661–688.

BOLLY AND DEGAND 2013: C. Bolly, L. Degand, Have You Seen What I Mean? From Verbal Constructions to Discourse Markers, "Journal of Historical Pragmatics" 14 (2013), pp. 210–235.

BONIFAZI AND ELMER 2012: A. Bonifazi, D.F. Elmer, The Meaning of Melody: Remarks on the Performance-Based Analysis of Bosniac Epic Song, [in:] J. Harris, B. Hillers (eds.), Child's Children: Ballad Study and Its Legacies, Trier 2012, pp. 293–309.

BONIFAZI 2016: A. Bonifazi, A. Drummen, M. de Krey, Particles in Ancient Greek Discourse: Five Volumes Exploring Particle Use Across Genres (2016) [retrieved 11.02.2020]. <chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/6220>.

BRINTON 1996: L.J. Brinton, Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions, Berlin-New York 1996.

CABLE 2019: T. Cable, How to Find Rhythm on a Piece of Paper, [in:] B. Glaser, J. Culler (eds.), Critical Rhythm: The Poetics of a Literary Life Form, New York 2019, pp. 174–196.

COUPER-KUHLEN 2003: E. Couper-Kuhlen, Intonation and Discourse: Current Views from Within, [in:] H.E. Hamilton, D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen (eds.), The Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Oxford 2003, pp. 13–34.

COUPER-KUHLEN 2005: E. Couper-Kuhlen, Prosodic Cues of Discourse Units, [in:] E.K. Brown, A.H. Anderson (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Oxford 2005², pp. 178–182.

DE JONG 1997: I.J.F. de Jong, ΓAP Introducing Embedded Narrative, [in:] A. Rijksbaron (ed.), New Approaches to Greek Particles, Leiden–Boston 1997, pp. 175–185.

DENNISTON 1934: J.D. Denniston, The Greek Particles, Oxford 1934.

DEVINE AND STEPHENS 1994: A.M. Devine, L.D. Stephens, *The Prosody of Greek Speech*, Oxford 1994.

DUHOUX 1997: Y. Duhoux, Grec écrit et grec parlé, [in:] A. Rijksbaron (ed.), New Approaches to Greek Particles, Leiden–Boston 1997, pp. 15–48.

DUHOUX 2006: Y. Duhoux, Les particules: une classe de mots à supprimer en grec ancient?, [in:] E. Crespo, J. de la Villa, A.R. Revuelta (eds.), Word Classes and Related Topics in Ancient Greek, Louvain-la-Neuve 2006, pp. 519–536.

FLETCHER 2010: J. Fletcher, *The Prosody of Speech: Timing and Rhythm*, [in:] W.J. Hardcastle, J. Laver, F.E. Gibbon (eds.), *The Handbook of Phonetic Sciences*, Hoboken, NJ 2010², pp. 521–602.

FONTAINE 2017: L. Fontaine, On Prepositions and Particles: A Case for Lexical Representation in Systemic Functional Linguistics, "Word" 62.2 (2017), pp. 115–135.

GEORGE 2009: C.H. George, Greek Particles: Just a Literary Phenomenon?, [in:] S.J. Bakker, G.C. Wakker (eds.), Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek, Leiden 2009, pp. 155–169.

GOLDSTEIN 2014: D. Goldstein, Intonational Phrase, [in:] E. Giannakis (ed.), Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics, Vol. II, Leiden–Boston 2014, pp. 253–256.

GONZÁLEZ 2013: J.M. González, The Epic Rhapsode and his Craft: Homeric Performance in a Diachronic Perspective, Washington, DC 2013.

GURD 2016: S.A. Gurd, Dissonance: Auditory Aesthetics in Ancient Greece, New York 2016.

HIRSCHBERG 2006: J. Hirschberg, *Pragmatics and Intonation*, [in:] L.R. Horn, G. Ward (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Malden, MA 2006, pp. 515–537.

HUTCHINSON 2018: G. Hutchinson, *Plutarch's Rhythmic Prose*, Oxford 2018.

LEE 2019: L. Lee, K. Bartkova, D. Jouvet, M. Dargnat, Y. Keromnes, *Can Prosody Meet Pragmatics? Case of Discourse Particles in French* (2019) [retrieved 02.09.2020]. <https://hal. inria.fr/hal-02177202/document>.

LIBERMANN AND PIERREHUMBERT 1984: M. Liberman, J. Pierrehumbert, Intonational Invariance under Changes in Pitch Range and Length, [in:] M. Aronoff, R.T. Oehrle, F. Kelley, B. Wilker Stephens (eds.), Language Sound Structure, Cambridge, MA 1984, pp. 157–233.

MAEKAWE 2006: K. Maekawe, Y. Igarashi, Prosodic Independence of Bimoraic Accented Particles: Analysis of the Corpus of Spontaneous Japanese, "Journal of the Phonetic Society of Japan" 10.2 (2006), pp. 33–42.

MAZELAND AND PLUG 2010: H. Mazeland, L. Plug, Doing confirmation with ja/nee hoor. Sequential and prosodic characteristics of a Dutch discourse particle, [in:] D. Barth-Weingarten, E. Reber, M. Selting (eds.), Prosody in Interaction, Amsterdam 2010, pp. 161–188.

OBBINK 2016: D. Obbink, The Newest Sappho: Text, Apparatus Criticus, and Translation, [in:] A. Bierl, A. Lardinois (eds.), The Newest Sappho: P. Sapph. Obbink and P. GC inv. 105. FRS. 1–4, Leiden–Boston 2016, pp. 13–33.

PISTOR 2016: T. Pistor, Prosodic Universals in Discourse Particles, "Speech Prosody" (2016), pp. 869–872.

PORTER 1951: H.N. Porter, The Early Greek Hexameter, "YCS" 12 (1951), pp. 3–63.

SCHEPPERS 2011: F. Scheppers, The Colon Hypothesis. Word Order, Discourse Segmentation, and Discourse Coherence in Ancient Greek, Brussels 2011. SICKING 1997: C.M.J. Sicking, Particles in Questions in Plato, [in:] A. Rijksbaron (ed.), New Approaches to Greek Particles, Leiden–Boston 1997, pp. 157–174.

SLINGS 1997: S.R. Slings, Adversative Relators between PUSH and POP, [in:] A. Rijksbaron (ed.), New Approaches to Greek Particles, Leiden–Boston 1997, pp. 101–129.

SLUITER 1997: I. Sluiter, Parapleromatic Lucubrations, [in:] A. Rijksbaron (ed.), New Approaches to Greek Particles, Leiden–Boston 1997, pp. 233–246.

STEDE AND SCHMITZ 2000: M. Stede, B. Schmitz, *Discourse Particles and Discourse Functions*, "Machine Translation" 15 (2000), pp. 125–147.

TAYLOR 2006: A. Taylor, A Prosodic Account of Clitic Position in Ancient Greek, [in:] A.L. Halpern, A.M. Zwicky (eds.), Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena, Stanford 2006, pp. 477–503.

THIJS 2017: K. Thijs, The Attic Particle $\mu \eta v$: Intersubjectivity, Contrast and Polysemy, "Journal of Greek Linguistics" 17.1 (2017), pp. 73–112.

VATRI 2012: A. Vatri, *The Physiology of Ancient Greek Reading*, "The Classical Quarterly" 62 (2012), pp. 633–647.

WAANDERS 1997: F.M.J. Waanders, Particulars of Some Proto-Indo-European Particles, [in:] A. Rijksbaron (ed.), New Approaches to Greek Particles, Leiden–Boston 1997, pp. 269– 274.

WENNERSTROM 2001: A.K. Wennerstrom, *The Music of Everyday Speech: Prosody and Discourse Analysis*, Oxford 2001.