

PARTICLES, PRAGMATIC AND OTHER*

Theodossia Pavlidou

*Department of Linguistics
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki*

ABSTRACT

This paper deals with problems in describing, from a synchronic point of view, certain "little words" in Modern Greek like ἀραγε ("I wonder"), δήθεν ("so-called", "as if"), ιόχα ("so-called"), called "hesitation adverbs" by Triantaphyllidis (1978), in his standard grammar of Modern Greek first published in 1941. In previous work I have shown that this class of linguistic items is a rather heterogeneous set from a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic point of view and that not all of them express hesitation on the speaker's part. But if they do not all deserve the name "hesitation adverbs" how else can they be described?

At least some of these little words can be (and have been, cf. Tzartanos 1953) described as particles. However, Zwicky has recently claimed that "languages contain no 'particles' but only words belonging to syntactic categories, clitics, and (inflectional or derivational) affixes". (Zwicky 1985:294). Moreover, such little words have turned out to play an important role in pragmatic theories, as illocutionary force indicators, discourse markers, etc. Sometimes though, it is not sufficiently clear how the diversity of categories relates to the phenomena described or how the different categories relate to one another.

Adequate answers to questions regarding the descriptive level as well as the relations between various descriptive categories used for such twilight zones of language is a necessary prerequisite for evaluating the different theories and the claims of universality with respect to such phenomena.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well known that pragmatics has developed very rapidly in the last 15 years. But it is still a rather young field in linguistics, a field that, even today, has to face existential questions like its delineation and delimitation to semantics, or the question whether pragmatics is just another level in linguistic analysis or a *modus vivendi* in linguistics. Of course this has not deterred linguists from looking for pragmatic universals.

One well-known example, is the work of Brown/Levinson 1978 about universals in politeness phenomena. Another, more recent one, is the talk by Frazer at the 1987 International Pragmatics Conference in Antwerp, which had the title: "Discourse particles: A pragmatic universal?", where discourse particles are regarded as a subset of pragmatic formatives. The latter are "those lexical expressions of a language which, on one reading, contribute not to the propositional content of the sentence but, rather, serve to signal aspects of the speaker's communicative intent" (Frazer 1987)¹⁾. However, together with all the other problems that one faces in universal research in general, within pragmatics we are confronted with difficulties at a more primitive level, due to the young age of the field. What I mean by this is problems concerning the descriptive level as well as the relations between various descriptive categories used for such phenomena, problems that only mirror the state of art of our pragmatic theories, but which make it quite difficult to check whether different theoretical claims are compatible, exclusive, better or worse than others.

In this paper I would like to present some of the above mentioned difficulties and exemplify them by the so-called hesitation adverbs of Modern Greek. In his standard grammar of Modern Greek, first published in 1941, Triantaphyllidis claims that the following adverbs express hesitation on the speaker's part: λως ("perhaps"), πιθανό(ν) ("probably"), δήθεν ("so-

called", "as if"), τάχα ("as if"), άραγε ("I wonder"). In addition, he says that the same function can be fulfilled by the conjunctions μήν (μή), μήπως (και) in phrases like 'μήν πέρασε η ώρα;' ("Can it be that the time is over?") 'μήπως (και) το είδε κανείς σας;' ("Has anybody seen it by any chance?") (Triandaphyllidis (1978:382).

Why or how can problems in describing such items be of relevance to the discussion of linguistic universals? Well, at least in two respects:

- (a) Some of these little words can be (and have been described, cf. Tzartanos 1953) as particles. But the status of this category is not that unproblematic within grammatical theory. Zwicky has even claimed that "languages contain no 'particles' but only words belonging to syntactic categories, clitics, and (inflectional or derivational) affixes". (Zwicky 1985:294). So a first question would be whether the grammatical category 'particle' is really that superfluous.
- (b) Such little words have frequently turned out to play an important role in pragmatic theories, as illocutionary force indicators, discourse markers, hedges, gambits, etc. For example, evidence for the presence of a politeness strategy is quite commonly drawn from the occurrence of things called particles (cf. e.g. Brown/Levinson 1978:151ff). But it is rarely the case that the relations holding among concepts like 'particle', 'illocutionary force indicator', 'discourse marker', 'hedge' etc. are made explicit. For example, how does therefore as a sentence adverb (cf. Bellert 1977:348) relate to the same unit as a discourse marker or even as an illocutionary force indicator (cf. Austin:75)? So a second question would be: granting that the above concepts are really applicable to all languages, how do they relate to one another?

I am not going to offer answers to these questions, but I do hope that the discussion of the so-called hesitation adverbs will show that there is a lot of work to be done, even

with respect to a single language, before questions of pragmatic universality can be tackled adequately.

2. SOME DISTRIBUTIONAL PROPERTIES OF THE SO-CALLED HESITATION ADVERBS

In previous work (Pavlidou 1988, 1989), I checked the distributional properties of the "hesitation adverbs" with the help of the following criteria:

1-In what types of sentence does one of the items under discussion appear: interrogative (I) or non-interrogative (NI)?

2-What is the mood of the verb in sentences allowing for such an item: indicative (IND), subjunctive (S), imperative (IMP)?

3-Can the item move (relatively) freely in a sentence or is it bound to the verb (+,-)?

4-Is the item syntactically necessary or can it be deleted without affecting the syntactic correctness of the sentence (+,-)?

5-Given that an item is syntactically deletable, does it contribute something to the propositional meaning or can it be deleted from the sentence without any change in the original meaning (+,-)?

6-Is an autonomous occurrence of the item possible, that is can the particle build an utterance on its own or not (+, -)?

7-What is the position of an utterance containing an item in discourse? Does such an utterance build an initiating (IN), reactive (RE) move or can it stand in isolation (IS)? Does it require an answer on the addressee's part or not (+answ,-answ)?

8-Does the occurrence of a item in an utterance impose some restrictions on the type of propositional content of the utterance? The type of propositional content is understood to be a function of three variables: who is the referent (speaker, addressee, some third party), what kind is the predicate (action, state, process etc.), where is the whole timely located (past, present, future).

The results are summarized in Table 1 for interrogative and in Table 2 for non-interrogative sentences respectively. Application of criterion 8 is impossible to summarize in a tabular form. The appearance of a plus (or minus) sign together with an exclamation mark indicates that something is (or not) the case unless the item in question is followed by the so-called aorist subjunctive²⁾.

Table 1
SENTENCES APPLICATION OF CRITERIA 2-7 FOR INTERROGATIVE

	άραγε	τάχα	μη(ν)	μήπως
2) Mood	IND S?	IND S?	IND S?	IND S?
3) Free position in sentence	+	+	-	+!
4) Syntactic necessity	-	-	-!	-!
5) Semantic contribution	-	-	-	-
6) Autonomous occurrence	-	-	-	-
7) Type of move	IS	IS RE -answ	IS	IS RE -answ IN

Table 2 APPLICATION OF CRITERIA 2-7 FOR NON-INTERROGATIVE SENTENCES³⁾

	τάχα	δήθεν	ίσως	πιθανό(ν)	μη(ν)	μήπως
2) Mood	IND S S! IMP	IND S IMP	IND S IMP?	IND? S	IND S	IND S
3) Free position in sentence	+	+	+!	-(+?)	-	-
4) Syntactic necessity	-	-	-!	-!	-!	-!
5) Semantic contribution	+	+	+	+	-?	-?
6) Autonomous occurrence	+	+	+	+	-	-
7) Type of move	IND:RE S/IMP:IN S!:IS	IND:RE S/IMP:IN	-	-	RE	RE

3. RESULTING CLASSES

Taking into account the distributional properties of the items under discussion seven classes and corresponding functions can be distinguished⁴⁾. In what follows, the subscripts INT and DECL indicate occurrence of an item in interrogative or non-interrogative sentences respectively. The (numerical) superscripts mean that an item belongs into more than one class. In the examples given below, instances of sentences containing an item in question are contrasted to sentences without it. Both English and German translations of the Greek examples are given, as German, a language richer in particles than English, corresponds closer to Greek in this respect.

(a) ἀραγε_{INT}, τάχα¹_{INT}: POSING A QUESTION (NOT REALLY ASKING)

These two particles occur in interrogative sentences only, without contributing anything to the propositional meaning, imposing however quite severe restrictions on the type of propositional content. So their function must be a pragmatic one. Compare:

1. a. Ἦρθε ο Γιώργος;
Has George come?
Ist Georg gekommen?
- b. Ἀραγε ἦρθε ο Γιώργος;
Has George come, I wonder.
Ob Georg gekommen ist?
2. a. Θα έρθει να με δει;
Will she come to see me?
Wird sie kommen, mich zu sehen?
- b. Θα έρθει τάχα να με δει;
Will she come to see me, I wonder?
Wird sie **wohl** kommen, mich zu sehen?

The difference between a. and b. is that with the first utterances we ask the question of someone, whereas with the second we simply pose question (cf. Lyons 1977:755). So we could paraphrase a question like b. as: I WONDER WHETHER P / WHO, WHERE, etc., where P is the propositional content.

(b) τάχα²_{INT}, μήπως¹_{INT}: RHETORICAL QUESTIONS

There is another function that τάχα can take in interrogative sentences. The same function can be also fulfilled by μήπως. In this case there are no restrictions as to the type of propositional content, but the utterance is a reacting move, not requiring an answer itself⁵). Compare again a. and b. in 3. and 4.:

3. a. Θα έρθει να με δει;
Will she come to see me?

Wird sie kommen, mich zu sehen?

- b. Τάχα θα έρθει να με δει; (Δε θα έρθει!)
 You think she will come to see me? (She won't!)
 Denkst du, sie kommt, mich besuchen? (Wird sie nicht!)

4. a. 'Ηρθε ποτέ να τον δει;

Did she ever come to see him?

Ist sie mal gekommen, um ihn zu sehen?

b. Μήπως ήρθε ποτέ να τον δει; (Ποτέ δεν ήρθε!)

Did she ever come to see him? (She never did!)

Ist sie denn jemals gekommen, ihn zu sehen? (Niemals!)

There is a difference in intonation between 3.b and 1.b: in 3.b τάχα is followed by a short pause and it gets more emphasis than in 1.b. Obviously the difference between a. and b. lies in the fact that the former are information questions, whereas the latter are rhetorical ones. 3.b and 4.b can be paraphrased as: I CHALLENGE P AND CLAIM (INDIRECTLY) THAT -P, where P is the propositional content of the question.

(c) μήπως_{INT}: POLITE INFORMATION QUESTIONS

The only particle that can accompany a (yes/no) question for information is μήπως 5). In contrast to class (b), the utterance in this case can only be an initiating move and, of course, it does expect an answer. In this case, μήπως could be said to express objective epistemic modality (cf. Setatos 1985:175ff and Lyons 1983:237) and could be considered to be the equivalent of ως in interrogative sentences; however, the fact that μήπως does not have an autonomous existence (cf. criteria 4 and 6) differentiates it from linguistic items like ως and renders its pragmatic contribution more important. Compare 5.a and 5.b:

5. a. Είναι η Λένα εκεί;

Is Lena there?

Ist Lena da?

- b. Μήπως είναι η Λένα εκεί;
Is perhaps Lena there?
Ist Lena vielleicht da?

Although both a. and b. are seeking for information, b. sounds more polite and would be more likely to be used e.g. on the phone. The reason, I believe, is the following: with the use of μήπως the speaker insinuates that s/he does not consider a positive answer to be very likely. This is especially the case when the answer requires some doing on the addressee's part, like getting somebody on the phone (cf. b.). So 5.b can be paraphrased as: I WANT TO KNOW IF P, THOUGH I WOULD NOT BE SURPRISED IF -P.

(d) μήπως³_{INT}, μη(ν)_{INT}: POSING A QUESTION

There is a last type of questions that can be marked with μήπως and, more rarely, with μη(ν) (as MacKridge (1985:301) says μη(ν) is less frequent than μήπως in interrogative sentences). Their difference from (c) lies in that questions of this type can appear totally isolated in discourse. In this respect they are similar to (a) 6). Look at 6. and 7.

6. a. Ήρθε η Λένα και δε μας βρήκε;
Did Lena come and not find us?
Ist Lena gekommen, aber hat uns nicht gefunden?
- b. Μήπως ήρθε η Λένα (και δε μας βρήκε);
Can it be that Lena came (and/but didn't find us)?
Ist Lena etwa gekommen (und/aber hat uns nicht gefunden?)
7. a. Βαρέθηκε και έφυγε;
Did she get bored and leave?
Hat sie sich gelangweilt und ist gegangen?
- b. Μην βαρέθηκε (και έφυγε);
Could it be that she got bored and left?
Hat sie sich etwa gelangweilt (und ist gegangen?)

In b. sentences the speaker utters indirectly a hypothesis about what could be the case, whereas in a. the speaker asks whether something is the case. So the b-sentences can be paraphrased as: I EXPRESS (INDIRECTLY) THE HYPOTHESIS THAT P. The indirectness apparently results from interrogativity.

(e) μήπωςDECL, μη(ν)DECL: SLIGHT REBUTTALS

Similar to (d) is the function of μήπως and μη(ν) in non-interrogative (independent) clauses. However, the utterances containing them are always reacting moves. See examples 8. and 9.:

8. X: Είναι αργά. Ας φύγουμε.
It's late; let's go.
Es ist spät; gehen wir!
Y: Μήπως έρθει ο Γιώργος.
George might (still) come.
Vielleicht kommt Georg doch!
9. X: Γιατί δεν κοιμάσαι;
Why don't you go to bed?
Warum schläfst du denn nicht?
Y: Μην έρθει ο Γιώργος.
George might come.
Georg könnte noch kommen.

In both 8. and 9. Y reacts to X's speech act, by expressing a hypothesis about what could happen; this in turn is never in agreement with what X proposes (as in 8.) or believes Y should do (as in 9.). Y's utterances thus become slight rebuttals of what X did, which could be paraphrased as: I (INDIRECTLY) DISAGREE WITH WHAT YOU JUST SAID.

(f) lowςDECL, πlθανό(ν)DECL: QUALIFICATION OF ILLOCUTIONARY POINT

In contrast to the particles examined up to now, lowς and πlθανό(ν) do contribute semantically to the sentence (cf.

table 2). Their pragmatic function is a consequence of their semantic contribution (qualification of the truth (cf. Belletert)/effect on the truth-value of the sentence): their occurrence in an utterance does not change the type of speech act, but it lessens the intensity of the illocutionary point. For example:

10.a. Η Λένα έφυγε.

Lena left.

Lena ist gegangen.

[statement]

b. Πιθανόν να/ίσως έφυγε η Λένα.

Lena probably/perhaps left.

Lena ist möglicherweise/vielleicht gegangen.

[modified statement]

11.a. Θα έρθω.

I will come.

Ich komme.

[promise]

b. Πιθανόν να/ίσως έρθω.

Probably/perhaps I will come.

Möglicherweise/vielleicht komme ich.

[modified promise]

12.a. Πέρνα αργότερα.

Come back later.

Komm später!

[request]

b. Πέρνα ίσως αργότερα.

You might come back later.

Komm vielleicht später.

[modified request]

The gloss that can be given for the b-sentences is on a metacommunicative level and would amount to: I MODIFY THE INTENSITY OF THE ILLOCUTIONARY POINT.

(g) τάχαDECL. δήθενDECL: CANCELLATION OF THE SINCERITY CONDITION

The last two particles, τάχα and δήθεν, too, have a metacommunicative function. In this case, too, this is a consequence of their semantic effect (reversing the truth value of the sentence): they cancel the sincerity condition of the speech act that would have been performed, if they were not present. Cf.:

- 13.a. Ἦρθε και δε με βρήκε.
 He came and/but didn't find me.
 Er ist gekommen, aber hat mich nicht gefunden.
 [statement: the speaker believes that the referent came but didn't find her]
- b. Τάχα/δήθεν ἦρθε και δε με βρήκε.
 [He says] he came and/but didn't find me.
 Angeblich kam er und fand mich nicht.
 [statement, but the speaker insinuates that s/he does not believe that the referent came; thus: indirect claim that the referent didn't come]
- 14.a. Φύγε.
 Go away.
 Geh weg!
 [request: the speaker wants the hearer to go away]
- b. Τάχα/δήθεν φύγε.
 Do as if you were going away.
 Tu so, als ob du gehen würdest.
 [request, but the speaker does not really want the addressee to do what s/he says; thus: request that the addressee makes believe that s/he does the requested act]

In this case the paraphrase we could give depends on the type of the speech act that we start with: I INDIRECTLY CHALLENGE THAT P, I DO NOT REALLY REQUEST THAT YOU DO WHAT I AM ASKING YOU TO, etc.

4. "HESITATION ADVERBS" AND THE EXPRESSION OF HESITATION

The above findings led me to the conclusion that the so-called hesitation adverbs do not comprise as a homogeneous set as one might think at first glance. For example, some are exclusive to declarative sentences (δηθεν), other to interrogative ones (αραγε); some are syntactically indispensable under certain conditions (if the verbform is the aorist subjunctive), others have no significance at all with respect to grammatical correctness.

As for their function, it is by no means self-evident that they all express hesitation. If we understand the expression of hesitation semantically, as Triantaphyllidis (1978) indeed does, then only the items belonging to the last two categories (λως, πιθανό(ν), ταχα and δηθεν) could be regarded as candidates for this characterization, because these are the only ones that can contribute something to the propositional meaning. However, the last two (ταχα and δηθεν) can only be rejected since they actually do not express hesitation but (subjective) certainty. Therefore, only λως and πιθανό(ν) can claim the attribute "hesitating" on a semantic level.

On the other hand, if we look at the expression of hesitation or doubt pragmatically, then classes (b), (e), (g) would not get the characterization "hesitating", since the primary function of these items is to turn the utterance into a rhetorical question, a slight rebuttal, or cancel the sincerity condition respectively. As for classes (a), (c) and (d), these may indeed have something to do with hesitation, or more accurately with the lack of certainty; but this is actually a characteristic of all "real" questions, i.e. questions that are not e.g. didactic or rhetorical. And the actual contribution of the items under consideration lies in marking the question as a question of a special type (posing a question for (a) and (c)) or in making it more polite (for (d)). So even pragmatically, we have to conclude that the main functions of these items do not consist in the expression of

hesitation. In sum, then, the name "hesitation adverbs" is not justified for the set as a whole, either from a semantic or a pragmatic point of view and we have to look for alternative descriptions.

5. ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTIONS

5.1 Let us now turn to the question whether the items we have been talking about are really adverbs, and, if so, of what kind. Or, let us even ask a more primitive question: are all of them full words or, would we be better off, if we accepted some of them as particles?

As I already mentioned in the introduction, Zwicky sees no reason for admitting a category 'particle' in grammar because of the problematical status of what has been called 'particle' in different languages. He says: "I shall argue here that there is no grammatically significant category of particles; for the most part, the classes of things so labeled are distinguished entirely negatively, and never require mention in a grammar" (Zwicky 1985:290). He is certainly right in saying that the classes of items called 'particles' are defined negatively because of syntactic (distributional) and semantic peculiarities (Zwicky 1985:290f). But I have difficulties in following his statement that 'particles' "never require mention in a grammar". This may be so in some languages, but it is certainly not the case with Greek or German, to mention only two.

Moreover, even if things like particles are not mentioned in a grammar, this is not necessarily an argument against such a category, but presumably only a reflection of the difficulties in describing 'particles'. It is well known that particles can not be readily accommodated in current linguistic models, especially when they have no grammatical functions but rather pragmatic ones (cf. e.g. Wierzbicka 1986:520). Moreover, particles belong to the linguistic elements that are quite difficult to teach and foreigners,

even those in good command of other aspects of the language, do have problems with (at least some) particles, as for example with the German modal particles (cf. e.g. Helbig 1977:30).

Zwicky shows for English that 'the name 'particle' covers quite different things, some of which can be treated as affixes, some as clitics and others (most of them) as words. So he sees no need for an additional grammatical unit along with affixes, clitics, words, phrases and clauses. But if 'particles' are words, then they must belong to a syntactic category, since acategoriality raises "grave problems" (Zwicky 1985:293). He goes on to say that "a particle word must be assigned to a syntactic category; but nothing requires that it be listed in the lexicon, as a content word (or that it have a meaning common to all of its occurrences)" (Zwicky 1985:295).

On the whole, I find Zwicky's argument quite evasive and pretty hard to refute step by step, because at some points it is rather a matter of one's overall theoretical standing to decide on one or the other alternative and because sometimes native-like knowledge of the languages discussed is required, which I do not have. It is clear, however, which way one should have to go in order to argue against Zwicky's position: one would have to show either that a grammatical unit 'particle' should be accepted some place between clitics and words, or regard 'particles' as words and then establish the syntactic category (or categories) to which they belong, or, finally, admit 'particles' as acategorial words and show that acategoriality can be tackled with.

I opt for the second possibility, that is, I will try to find out which of the so-called hesitation adverbs are words and then try to establish their syntactic category. Following Zwicky's line of thought, as well as Brian Joseph's, who adopted Zwicky's ideas and applied them to the Greek verbal complex⁷⁾ (Joseph 1987), I employ three tests to check whether our items are words or not:

1) ordering: "...an element that is strictly ordered with respect to adjacent morphemes is almost surely a clitic (or an affix), while an element exhibiting free order with respect to adjacent words is certainly an "independent word" (Zwicky 1985:288);

2) binding: "We expect that bound elements will be affixes, but that free elements will constitute independent words. Correspondingly, if an element is bound, and especially if it cannot occur in complete isolation, it should be a clitic; if free, and especially if it occurs in complete isolation, it should be an independent word" (Zwicky 1985:287);

3) deletion: "... whole words may (in the appropriate circumstances) undergo such deletions [deletion under identity]. ...in an X+Y combination, if either X or Y is deletable under identity, then X and Y are words; neither is a clitic" (Zwicky 1985:288).

Application of these three criteria yields the results summarized in Table 3. I would like to remind the reader that the combination of a plus sign with an exclamation mark indicates that something is the case unless the verbform following the item is the so-called aorist subjunctive. In Table 3, as well in the subsequent ones, $\mu\eta\pi\omega\varsigma^1_{INT}$ and $\mu\eta\pi\omega\varsigma^2_{INT}$ show free order and are deletable without restrictions because when expressing these specific functions they do not combine with the aorist subjunctive. The last four items in the left column fulfill the criteria, so they are words; the first five fail to fulfill the requirement of autonomy, so I am inclined not to accept them as words. The rest does not satisfy fully any of the three criteria (one could argue that these are affixes, cf. Joseph 1987 for $\mu\eta(v)$ as an affix).

Table 3 CHECKING FOR WORDS

	free order +	isolated +	deletable +	WORD
ἀραγε _{INT}	+	-	+	-?
τάχα ¹ _{INT}	+	-	+	-?
τάχα ² _{INT}	+	-	+	-?
μήπως ¹ _{INT}	+	-	+	-?
μήπως ² _{INT}	+	-	+	-?
μήπως ³ _{INT}	+!	-	+!	-
μη(ν) _{INT}	-	-	+!	-
μήπως _{DECL}	-	-	+!	-
μη(ν) _{DECL}	-	-	+!	-
ὡς _{DECL}	+!	+	+!	+
πῶς ἀνό(ν) _{DECL}	+?	+	+?	+
τάχα _{DECL}	+	+	+	+
δῆθεν _{DECL}	+	+	+	+

5.2 Now granting that we have four real words and five dubious ones, the next question is: what is their syntactic category? For the last four, the answer is quite clear: they are sentence adverbs. That is, adverbs which "express the speaker's attitude to what he is saying, his evaluation of it, or shades of certainty or doubt about it." (Greenbaum 1969:9-4).

But what about the first five? Here we come up against some complications. In the relevant literature, as far as I know, there is no mention of sentence adverbs which are exclusive to interrogative sentences (as ἀραγε is). Moreover, some authors consider it to be a constitutive characteristic of certain sentence adverbs that they can not appear in ques-

tions. For example, of the five subclasses (evaluatives, modals, domain adverbs, conjunctives, pragmatics) of sentential adverbs that Bellert (1977) discusses, the evaluative (e.g. luckily, fortunately, surprisingly) and the modal ones (e.g. probably, possibly, certainly, surely, evidently) cannot occur in questions. The reason is that sentences containing the first ones "express two asserted propositions" (Bellert 1977:342), while sentences "containing a modal adverb can be paraphrased by a more explicit statement expressing a complex proposition, in which the adverb is clearly a predicate of truth" (Bellert 1977:343). In either case it would be semantically absurd to build corresponding questions.

Of the five subclasses of sentential adverbs it is the modal adverbs that the five items we have been discussing would best fit in. But if we accept ἀραγε, τάχα, etc. as modal adverbs this would run counter to Bellert's analysis, since it would amount to admitting the possibility of asking a question and at the same time qualifying the truth of the proposition expressed. Now, there is still another possibility: we could accept them as not purely modal adverbs, like perhaps, definitely, etc., which, according to Bellert, carry an additional meaning component. In the case of perhaps this is "an implication that gives a suggestion as to a possible answer" (Bellert 1977:344). This additional meaning component makes the occurrence of the adverb possible, even in interrogative sentences.

It would not be difficult to formulate meaning postulates for the additional meaning components of ἀραγε_{INT}, τάχα_{1INT}, τάχα_{2INT}, μήπως_{1INT}, μήπως_{2INT} and regard them as not purely modal sentential adverbs. But there are some bothering facts about this. For one, if we admit the possibility of one "not pure" category (like not pure modal adverbs), then why not admit also this possibility for other categories, e.g. "not pure words" (=particles?), "not pure verbs" or what have you? Secondly, there is still this disturbing feature of ἀραγε, namely that it can not stand in isolation; this would not change, even if we found an ap-

appropriate word-class to stick άραγε in. Thirdly, while τάχα¹_{INT}, τάχα²_{INT} have homonyms in the adverb class (see τάχα_{DECL}), μήπως¹_{INT}, μήπως²_{INT} have homonyms in the conjunction class (besides not being able to appear in isolation⁸)).

5.3 This is the point, where I start wondering whether it is really worth pushing particles into a word's being. Besides, I feel highly tempted to try out another category used mainly in the German literature and for the German language⁹), called, among others *Abtönungspartikeln*, *Modalpartikeln*, or simply *Partikeln im engeren Sinne* (Helbig 1977). Adopting Hartmann's (1986) designation, I will refer to this category as *modal particles* in what follows.

According to Weydt, modal particles are characterized by the following features: " [sie] a) sind unflektierbar, b) dienen dazu, die stellung des Sprechers zum Gesagten zu kennzeichnen, c) können nicht in gleicher Bedeutung eine Antwort auf eine Frage bilden, d) können nicht die erste Stelle im Satz einnehmen, e) beziehen sich auf den ganzen Satz, f) sind unbetont... g) sind im Satz integriert, h) dieselben Lautkörper haben, anders akzentuiert oder in anderer syntaktischer Stellung, mindestens noch eine Bedeutung und gehören dann anderen Funktionsklassen" (Weydt 1977:218). Moreover: this category refers to a function class; all of its elements have homonyms in other function classes, for example adverbs, conjunctions, etc. However, this feature of homonymity is later on not considered as crucial as the other ones. In Weydt/Hentschel's dictionary of modal particles there are cases of particles admitted ("near modal particles") which do not have homonyms in other word classes (Weydt/Hentschel 1983:5).

Helbig (1977) considers modal particles to be a word-class of its own¹⁰), which differs both from sentence adverbs and other adverbs (cf. Helbig 1977:31): while adverbs are major constituents and sentence adverbs are more than major constituents, modal particles are neither. Moreover, they can not build an answer to a question, neither to wh-questions (as

adverbs can) nor to yes/no-questions (as sentence adverbs can). In other words, their occurrence is not autonomous, but dependent on other linguistic elements.

There is still another characteristic of modal particles, which, though never mentioned explicitly, seems to act latently as a defining feature of this category: modal particles can be deleted from a sentence without affecting its syntactic and semantic correctness. I will use this criterion of deletability together with two other formal criteria, autonomy (lack of) and homonymity, in order to find out which of the items on our list are modal particles. The fact that modal particles do not appear in sentence initial position may be specific to the German language, as word order is more inflexible in German than in Greek. So may be the case with the feature of unstressedness. I will not take these two into account for the time being.

Applying the three criteria to our list of items we get:

-four clear-cut cases of modal particles: τάχα¹INT, τάχα²INT, μήπως¹INT, μήπως²INT;

-four items that are definitely not modal particles (the sentence adverbs of our list): ὅμωςDECL, πλὴθὺνDECL, τάχαDECL, δήθενDECL;

-five cases of near modal particles: ἀραγεINT, μήπως³INT, μη(ν)INT, μήπωςDECL, μη(ν)DECL. Since the last four are not always deletable, they should not be regarded as modal particles. The first one, though, can be considered a modal particle, since the criterion of homonymity is subsidiary to the criteria of deletability and nonautonomy.

These results are shown on Table 4.

Table 4 CHECKING FOR MODAL PARTICLES

	deletable autonomous homonyms			MODAL PARTICLES
	+	-	+	
ἀραγε _{INT}	+	-	-	+
τάχα ¹ _{INT}	+	-	+	+
τάχα ² _{INT}	+	-	+	+
μήπως ¹ _{INT}	+	-	+	+
μήπως ² _{INT}	+	-	+	+
μήπως ³ _{INT}	+!	-	+	-
μη(ν) _{INT}	+!	-	+	-
μήπως _{DECL}	+!	-	+	-
μη(ν) _{DECL}	+!	-	+	-
τῶς _{DECL}	+!	+	-	-
πῶς ἀνό(ν) _{DECL}	+?	+	-	-
τάχα _{DECL}	+	+	+	-
δῆθεν _{DECL}	+	+	-	-

5.4 Now modal particles have been frequently described as illocutionary force indicating devices (see for example Helbig 1977, Franck 1980). Moreover, taking into consideration how the items under discussion function (see Ch. 4) we can easily accept categories like illocutionary force devices and mitigators, or more generally illocutionary force modifiers. This leads us to adding at least these two categories into our discussion as legitimate descriptive devices. The results of applying the different descriptive categories to the items under consideration are summarized in Table 5:

Table 5 APPLYING DIFFERENT DESCRIPTIVE CATEGORIES

	WORD	SENT. ADVERB	MODAL PARTICLE	ILL. F. INDIC.	ILL. F. MODIF.
ἀραγε ¹ _{INT}	-?	?	+	+	
τάχα ¹ _{INT}	-?	?	+	+	
τάχα ² _{INT}	-?	?	+	+	
μήπως ¹ _{INT}	-?	?	+	+	
μήπως ² _{INT}	-?	?	+		+
μήπως ³ _{INT}	-		-	+	
μη(ν) _{INT}	-		-	+	
μήπως _{DECL}	-		-	+	
μη(ν) _{DECL}	-		-	+	
ὡς _{DECL}	+	+	-		+
πιθανό(ν) _{DECL}	+	+	-		+
τάχα _{DECL}	+	+	-		+
δῆθεν _{DECL}	+	+	-		+

Well, we could go on to consider further pragmatic categories like discourse markers and gambits. But I think it is sufficiently clear by now what kind of problems we are confronted with, if we attempt to describe linguistic items that are not clear-cut cases of either lexical or grammatical morphemes. So let me come to a conclusion.

6. CONCLUSION

In discussing the so-called hesitation adverbs of Modern Greek, I have tried to make the following points:

(1) As far as Modern Greek is concerned, I do not see any gain in giving up the grammatical category 'particle'. On the contrary, I find it intuitively more natural to allow in our descriptive system categories that can accommodate word-like things which are neither grammatical morphemes nor vehicles of lexical meaning, but rather have pragmatic functions, like modal particles. Besides their pragmatic function, modal particles do exhibit certain common syntactic properties; moreover, they are characterized by the fact that, in most cases, they have homonyms in other syntactic categories (like Greek τάχα). Accepting such a category does not seem to run counter even to Zwicky's standpoint; after all, Zwicky himself is willing to accept in his system a word-class which is mainly delineated from the others by means of its pragmatic function, namely 'discourse markers' (Zwicky 1985:302ff).

(2) If we approach a language in an unbiased way, that is without favouring particularly a certain theory about language, then there may be multiple descriptions applying to the same items and it is not always possible to exclude one in favor of another. For example: as shown above, in Modern Greek verbal aspect seems to influence the function that μήπως can fulfill in interrogative questions. As I argued above, since μήπως¹_{INT} and μήπως²_{INT} do not precede the aorist subjunctive, they are deletable and can be considered to be modal particles (cf. Table 4), having homonyms in the class of conjunctions. However, one could also argue, that they are affixes (cf. 5.1), since in other instances (μήπως³_{INT}, μήπως_{DECL}) μήπως is bound and not deletable, i.e. if it precedes an aorist subjunctive. This close interdependence of function and aspect, as well as the fact that e.g. άραγε and μήπως can be at least sometimes replaced by the typical subjunctive marker να, indicates the connection of άραγε and μήπως to the subjunctive mood. It may also indicate that we actually have a continuum from lexical to semi-lexical to grammatical morphemes, all of which can be carriers of pragmatic meaning even if this is accomplished in different ways. That is a linguistic item can combine different types of meaning, e.g. lexical plus pragmatic, grammatical plus pragmatic and so on. And I

suspect that the same holds for the different pragmatic meanings or roles that we ascribe to linguistic items: things may not always turn out to be either illocutionary force indicators or discourse markers or gambits or what have you.

(3) Concerning the status of a category 'particle' within a linguistic theory, I would like to keep particles on a grammatical level and then go on to questions regarding their role as illocutionary force indicators or modifiers, gambits, etc. In describing phenomena like the so-called hesitation adverbs we need a linguistic theory that allows both for syntactic categories as well as for pragmatic ones and which escapes from the one-sidedness of, say, just a syntactic or a semantic or a pragmatic approach. Such a theory would have to embrace not only the relations between e.g. syntactic and pragmatic notions, but would also have to show how the different pragmatic categories are related to one another.

FOOTNOTES

* I would like to thank E. Koutoupi-Kiti for reading and commenting on this paper.

- 1) Among them are: frankly, by the way, perhaps, by all means, as well as performative expressions.
- 2) Cf. Triantaphyllidis 1978:314. What is meant with "aorist subjunctive" is a perfective non-past verb-form which (in most cases) is immediately preceded by a grammatical morpheme functioning as a marker of the subjunctive mood. See also Mackridge 1985:103 and Hesse 1980:29.
- 3) In this table, "S!" means that there is a second meaning in the use of the subjunctive besides the one associated with "S". The question mark indicates my doubts as to the decision made.
- 4) I have not checked systematically the role of intonation in the realization of a certain function. In some cases I suspect that a sentence without the item in question could carry the same function if it were accompanied by the appropriate intonation.
- 5) As far as I can see, μήπως¹INT and μήπως²INT never combine with the so-called subjunctive aorist.
- 6) Also with respect to intonation (d) seems similar to (a), but they differ in that they impose different restrictions on the propositional content of the utterance.
- 7) As a matter of fact, it was Brian Joseph's three lectures at our Department in November 1987 that gave me the impulse to look again at the question particles of Modern greek.
- 8) There is still one more possibility: to regard these five problematic items as conjunctive adverbs like however, nevertheless, hence, therefore, etc. which "function as connectives between sentences in a text, and thus ...occur not only in statements, but also in questions and other performative sentences with various illocutionary functions" (Bellert 1977:344). But as we saw, άραγε, τάχα¹ can occur in isolated moves, so they do not connect anything; τάχα², μήπως¹INT even though they appear in reactive moves, they do not function as

connectives; as for $\mu\eta\eta\omega\varsigma^2_{INT}$, this appears in initiating moves, so it certainly does not connect anything.

9) It is worth noting that Zwicky discusses, some German modal particles (he calls them conversational particles (1985:297)) and says they are not clitics, as Kaisse has claimed, but adverbs, without, however, specifying WHAT kind of adverbs they would be. It is also interesting that his arguments run counter to some features of modal particles according to the common conception.

10) As has already been mentioned, Weydt understands modal particles as a function class. I am not sure, however, whether he would be willing to identify conceptually a function class with a word-class, that is whether he would admit a distinct syntactic category only on account of its function.

11) One can easily get a taste of what I mean by looking at the lemmatization tree in the Pragmatics Bibliography (Nuyts/Verschueren 1987). We can reach the entry "particle" by starting at the node message structure and following either the path unit of linguistic expression-word-word class-particle or the path meaning-linguistic meaning-proposition-reference-deixis-discourse deixis-metalinguistic markers of conversational organization-pragmatic particles.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J.L. (1965). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford.
- Bellert, I. (1977). "On Semantic and Distributional Properties of Sentential Adverbs", Linguistic Inquiry 8.2:337-351.
- Brown, P./Levinson, S. (1978). "Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena". In: Goody, E. N. (ed.) (1978). Questions and politeness. Strategies in social interaction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 56- 290.
- Franck, D. (1980). Grammatik und Konversation. Königstein/Ts.: Scriptor.

Greenbaum, S. (1969). Studies in English Adverbial Usage. London: Longmans.

Hartmann, D. (1986). "Context analysis or analysis of sentence meaning? On modal particles in German". Journal of Pragmatics 10:543-557.

Helbig, G. (1977). "Partikeln als illokutive Indikatoren im Dialog". Deutsch als Fremdsprache 1:30-44.

Hesse, R. (1980). Syntax of the Modern Greek Verbal System. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.

Joseph, B. D. (1987). "Η μορφολογική θεωρία και η ταξονομία μορίων και μικρών λέξεων/Η ταξονομία του ρηματικού συμπλέγματος στα Νέα Ελληνικά:Α'/Η ταξονομία του ρηματικού συμπλέγματος στα Νέα Ελληνικά:Β'". Τρεις διαλέξεις στον Τομέα Γλωσσολογίας του Αριστοτελείου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης, Νοέμβριος 1987, Θεσσαλονίκη.

Joseph, B. D. (1988). "Pronominal affixes in Modern Greek: The case against Clisis". To appear in Brentari, E. et al. (1988). Papers from the 24th Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society.

Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1983). Language, Meaning and Context. Bungay: Montana.

Mackridge, P. (1985). The Modern Greek Language: A descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek. Oxford: Clarendon.

Pavlidou, Th. (1988), see: Παυλίδου, Θ. (1988). "Πόσο δισταχτικά είναι τα 'δισταχτικά' επιρρήματα;". Υπό δημοσίευση.

Pavlidou, Th. (1989), see: Παυλίδου, Θ. (1989). "Τα 'δισταχτικά' επιρρήματα". Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 9ης ετήσιας συνάντησης του Τομέα Γλωσσολογίας της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Α.Π.Θ. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυριακίδης. σ. 527-546.

Setatos, M. (1985), see: Σετάτος, Μ. (1985). "Τροπικότητες του ρήματος στην κοινή νεοελληνική (ΚΝΕ) (Προκαταρκτικές παρατηρήσεις)". Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 6ης ετήσιας συνάντησης του Τομέα Γλωσσολογίας της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Α.Π.Θ. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κυριακίδης. σ. 175-182.

Tzartanos, A. (19532), see: Τζάρτζανος, Α. (19532). Νεοελληνική Σύνταξις (της κοινής δημοτικής) Β'. Αθήνα: ΟΕΣΒ.

Triantaphyllidis, M. (1978), see: Τριανταφυλλίδης, Μ. (1978). Νεοελληνική Γραμματική (της Δημοτικής). Ανατύπωση της έκδοσης του ΟΕΣΒ (1941). Θεσσαλονίκη: Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών, Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη.

Weydt, H. (1977). "Nachwort. Ungelöst und strittig." In Weydt, H. (ed.) (1977). Aspekte der Modalpartikeln. Studien zur deutschen Abtönung. Tübingen: Niemeyer. pp. 217-225.

Weydt, H./Hentschel, E. (1983). "Kleines Abtönungswörterbuch". In: Weydt, H. (ed.) (1983). Partikeln und Interaktion. Tübingen: Niemeyer. pp. 3-25.

Wierzbicka, A. (1986). "Introduction" (Special issue on 'Particles' ed. by A. Wierzbicka). Journal of Pragmatics 10:519-534.

Zwicky, A. M. (1985). "Clitics and Particles". Language 61:283-306.