Discourse Markers in Early Byzantine Narrative Prose

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to provide an analysis of the pragmatic function, frequency and variability of discourse markers (the so-called connective particles) in the Early Byzantine Chronicle of John Malalas (6th cent. A.D.). The areas of prime concern are the following ones: (a) decrease in the variability of connective particles when compared to the Classical period works, (b) changes in the range of interpretations of the relationship between discourse segments linked by the ‘old’ connective particles when compared to the Classical period, (c) usage of discourse markers newly formed in post-Classical period and their pragmatic function in the discourse structure of the Chronicle. Finally, the problem of Malalas’s language register, as far as discourse marker analysis is concerned, is illustrated.

1. Introduction

The important role of discourse markers in discourse structure organisation has been appreciated and examined in detail in Functional Grammar with a growing tendency since the 1980s. Pragmatic approach, which surpassed the boundaries of a grammatical sentence, then made a deeper analysis of a sentence (or a discourse structure) possible as well as the principles which influence it. The starting points of the discussion on how to best define discourse markers were in this respect above all the fundamental works of Schiffrin (1987), Blakemore (1987) and Fraser (1999). While Schiffrin in particular stresses the integrative function of discourse markers which adds to discourse coherence, Blakemore’s approach, based on the Relevance Theory, focuses on the constraining function of discourse markers, which imposes semantic constraints on relevance of the proposition. Fraser approached discourse markers from a grammatical-pragmatic perspective, emphasising the fact that they indicate, according to the speaker’s intention, different relationships between the utterance introduced by the discourse marker and the foregoing utterance. Leaving other differences aside for the time being, Fraser’s theory and his definition of discourse markers is applied in this paper (see below).

This paper was written under the auspices of the ‘Centre for Interdisciplinary Research into Ancient Languages and Early Stages of Modern Languages’ (MSM 0021622435) at Masaryk University in Brno, Czech Republic.
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In his model, the linguistic category of discourse markers is defined as a group of lexical expressions originating primarily from the syntactic classes of conjunctions, adverbs or prepositional phrases. When functioning as discourse markers, they have a procedural meaning which specifies the interpretation of ‘their’ discourse segment to the previous one, while the conceptual meaning of these lexical items can – but does not have to – exist as their counterpart. The discourse markers indicate the relation between an aspect of discourse segment (i.e. proposition/sentence/utterance) which they are part of and the previous segment. The definition then excludes many expressions which, although they express emotions implying character and interpretation of an utterance, do not indicate any mutual relation with the previous discourse segments and are included separately as additional commentaries or statements. These expressions more likely go under the category of the so-called commentary pragmatic markers.

If this model is applied to Greek language, a group of lexical expressions which are traditionally referred to as connecting/connective particles (e.g. ἀλλά, δέ, γάρ, καί, οὖν) can be classified within discourse markers category. From these expressions that ensure text coherence, a group of particles which cannot be freely moved within propositions (e.g. δέ, οὖν) and which thus represent reliable indications for the determination of discourse boundaries (discourse boundary markers), can be further formally divided. On the contrary, those particles which specify the relation of a discourse unit to its communicative environment (e.g. τοι, ποι) do not fall into the category of discourse markers, but more likely into the category of commentary pragmatic markers.

For the needs of discourse markers description in Byzantine narration, Fraser’s classification of discourse markers which relate messages (1999), i.e. elaborative, contrastive and inferential markers, was accepted. The elaborative discourse markers signal an expansion of the previous discourse segment in another item (the discourse segment containing the elaborative discourse marker creates a relationship to the previous discourse segment which is interpreted as its enrich-

1 Cf. e.g. the expression equally which has both procedural meaning (I believe in fairness. Equally, I believe in practicality.) and conceptual meaning (I treat everyone equally.). In Fraser (1999, 942 ff.).
2 Cf. e.g. the expressions frankly, stupidly. In Fraser (1999, 942 ff.).
3 Cf. Denniston (1950), Blomqvist (1969). The category of particles in the traditional descriptive Greek grammar books is usually divided into three subcategories (conjunctions, enclitics, sentence adverbs), see e.g. Smyth (*2002, 631 ff.).
4 Greek, despite its almost free syntactic structure, also has elements which cannot be moved about freely without having an unfortunate effect on grammatical or syntactic correctness of the proposition. Grammatical principle as the leading principle is reflected in Greek especially in the case of particles, obeying Wackernagel’s law, according to which they appear in the second position in a sentence and their fixed position, which defines the left sentence boundary, has a strong influence on the comprehensibility of not only the sentence but also the discourse structure. Greek, with the help of these secondary means whose fixed position can also make it easier to recognise sentence syntactic articulation, can compensate for the non-formalised character of the Greek sentence. See Kurzová (1988).
ment, elaboration or augmentation). The contrastive discourse markers signal the contrast between contents of relative discourse segments and, finally, the inferential markers are interpreted as those indicating a conclusion resulting from the facts stated in the previous discourse segment (or providing a reason for the content of the previous discourse segment; cf. chapter 4).

2. Sources – John Malalas’s Chronicle, textual characteristics

Particles used in the texts of the Classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods have been given a lot of attention in the history of Greek linguistics. The breaking point in the research on Classical period particles came with the fundamental work of Denniston, whose results were later used by Blomqvist (1969), Wahlgren (1995) and Thrall (1962) for Hellenistic and Roman periods. A quality starting point for further research of the function of particles was fully exploited in the works of Sicking & van Ophuijsen (1993), Bakker (1993), Rijksbaron (1997) and many others, whose use of pragmatic approach in the 1990s revealed many principles to which the usage of particles in Classical, Hellenistic and Roman poetry and prose is subjected to. However, the Byzantine period remained aside of this increased interest in the function of Greek particles as textual cohesive means. There have so far been only lone pioneers such as Tabachowitz (1932; 1943), Egea (1993), and Wahlgren (2003) who have explored this area in their studies on particles in Byzantine Greek.5 Despite this exceedingly beneficial effort, only a small percentage of Byzantine texts have been analysed, covering just a segment of the history of Byzantium. That is why the purpose of this paper is to refer to the results of my study of pragmatic function, frequency and variability of connective particles in Byzantine narrative texts, more specifically in the Early Byzantine Chronicle of John Malalas.

John Malalas’s Chronicle was written around 530 A.D. in Antioch, Syria, and partly in Constantinople (book XVIII around 570 A.D.). Its eighteen books cover the period from the Creation of the world until as late as 565 A.D., i.e. the period of Emperor Justinian’s rule. Despite the immense popularity of Malalas’s Chronicle, only a single manuscript, which provides us with the whole text of the Chronicle, has been preserved (Codex Bodleianus Baroccianus gr. 182 (Ba); 11th/12th cent.).6 The text I am using is that of the Hans Thurn edition (2000).

5 Whereas Tabachowitz concentrated on Early Byzantine period hagiographies (Leontios of Neapolis’s Vita Symeonis; Palladios’s Historia Lausiaca), Wahlgren’s study of particles is a probe into 10th century historiography texts (The Chronicle of Symeon the Logothete, The Chronicle of Pseudo-Polydeukes and Joseph Genesius’s Regum libri quattuor). Egea excerpted the data for his conclusions from vulgar texts of the Comnenus period and Late Byzantine period written in verse (Belthandros and Chrysantza, The Chronicle of the Morea, Piochropodromika, Song of Armouris etc.).

6 Even though it provides the largest segment of the Chronicle preserved, the text is incomplete. Folia which contain book I and the beginning of book II are missing altogether, even within the text.
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The whole text, which means approx. 91,300 words, is investigated. When examining the language of Malalas, the sources out of which he compiled his Chronicle cannot be neglected either. Even though he does mention his authors by name more often than other chroniclers, it is known that most of those were not at his direct disposal. He had to use second or even third hand compendia, because a lot of material that had been at disposal to the historians of Antiquity was at that time already lost. The taken-over material does not seem to have influenced Malalas to such an extent that the sources could be considered the reason for the language choices in his Chronicle. On the contrary, it seems that Malalas subjected his material to a uniform linguistic edition, in the scope of which he could also perform changes in the content.

The Chronicle represents a very simple narrative text in the genre of historiography. One of the determining features of Malalas’s style and the style of chronicles in general is a distinctive participation of parataxis in discourse structure creation. The occurrence of hypotaxis is also diminished by excessive use of participial constructions which are used, aside from the particles, as another grammatical means of expressing a continuous sequence of events in narrative genre. Malalas takes pleasure in accumulation of sentences formed by the same syntactic framework (participle–predicate; predicate–participle); subsequently, these create the discourse structure with a trivial effect which is so typical of Malalas [1].

In a text with such structure, discourse markers are a significant factor which helps to organise the text within different communicative frameworks, to set discourse boundaries and to ensure the coherence of narrative. One more function

there are lacunas, last two pages of book XVIII were probably dropped. The character of the manuscript confirms the suppositions that it is only a segment of Malalas’s Chronicle or its adaptation by an unknown author, or possibly a combination of both. The manuscript can, however, be to a certain extent restored on the basis of numerous fragments which were copied from the complete version of Malalas’s Chronicle. For more details on the issue of text transmission see Jeffreys (1990a, 246 ff.).

7 Malalas probably drew his material only from several main sources he had direct access to: Domninos, Timotheos, Diktyes, Nestorianos, Priskos, Philostratos, Eutychianos, Eutropius, Eustathios, Charax, Bassus, Brunichius. For more details see Jeffreys (1990b, 167 ff.).

8 Weierholt only sets aside book V (there are traces of Ionic dialect and of the language of Septuagint which Malalas quotes word-for-word) and book XVIII, the different character of which might be caused by the change of Malalas’s source (cf. chapter 5) or by problematic text transmission. In Weierholt (1963, 8 ff.).
of the particles which is closely linked with their ability to distinguish discourse boundaries should be pointed out: it seems that the particles ensured the rhythmical segmentation of the texts intended also for recitation, i.e. not only chronicles as e.g. Malalas’s one, but also lives of the saints, sermons, letters, edicts etc. In this way we can at least partly explain the apparent abundance of particles in narrative texts where particles separating phrasal units occasionally do not even take sentence syntactic articulation into consideration. They presumably served not only as a text dividing means while reading, but they also indicated pauses during recitation. Playing the role of a simple rhetoric element, they supported the sentence rhythm so that the text while being recited would become easy to remember. This particle function is the next argument which supports the theory of the works being read out loud, at which this form of publicising is not provable.9

3. Data – frequency vs. variability

Looking at statistic data, connective particles in Malalas’s Chronicle show an apparent qualitative decrease. The Chronicle virtually does not break the stereotype in the form of καί, δέ (οὐδέ, μηδέ, μέν/δέ, καί/δέ), τε (τε/καί, οὖτε, εἴτε, μήτε), γάρ, ἀλλά and οὖν. The appearance of other than the above mentioned particles or their combinations which were common in Classical period is restricted to a few options (μέντοι, τοίνυν, καί δή, οὐ μην ἀλλὰ καί), of which there are approximately 2–4 examples in the whole Chronicle. In Malalas’s Chronicle, apart from μέντοι and τοίνυν, there are not any other compound particles. Similarly, the Chronicle does not contain, apart from the rare οὐ μην ἀλλὰ καί, γε μήν, καί γάρ and καί δή, any combinations of particles either, which were common in Classical period (e.g. ἀλλὰ γάρ, γάρ δή, δ᾿ αὖ, δὕνον etc.). The connective particles newly formed in the post-Classical period, such as e.g. λοιπόν, ἐν οἷς and ὅθεν, are from the point of view of their frequency in the Chronicle with regard to other particles neglectable (their pragmatic function in the Chronicle will be discussed in chapter 4). Thus we can only distinguish sixteen particles, out of which the four most common ones (καί, δέ, γάρ, οὖν) constitute 97% of all the connective particles (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very frequent particles</th>
<th>Frequent particles</th>
<th>Other particles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καί ± 6 135</td>
<td>ἀλλά</td>
<td>γε μην 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καί λοιπόν</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τε καί</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τε/καί</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καί ... δέ</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>ἐν οἰς 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καί δή</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λοιπόν</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Eideneier (1999a, 89). See also Eideneier (1999b).
### Table 1: Usage of connective particles in Malalas’s Chronicle

This qualitative decrease might be largely caused by, in this respect, little demand of a simple narrative text which practically lacks argumentative and dialogic passages – these are typical e.g. of philosophical prose which demands a higher variety of particles.\(^\text{10}\) It is also possible to recognise a certain quantitative decrease of particles when compared to Classical texts, as they constitute approx. 10% of all the words of the Chronicle, whereas for Classical texts (5th–4th cent. B.C.), the overall proportion was evaluated as approx. 17%.\(^\text{11}\) To a certain extent, it is also possible to give reason for this decrease by the almost total absence of the so-called emphatic particles in the Chronicle. Suppositions that a general decrease in particles is to blame for this poor image as compared to Classical period were refused by Blomqvist (1969) even for Hellenistic period. At least the so-called connective particles were not in general decline, only their spectrum changed (contrary to emphatic particles, see footnote 13). The particles which

---

\(^\text{10}\) For example, there are approx. 30 particles in Plato’s dialogues (Protagoras, Apology of Socrates), not counting their combinations, which compared to Malalas’s Chronicle is about twice as many. In Duhoux (1997, 21f.).

\(^\text{11}\) Duhoux (1997, 17).
were the most frequent ones in the Classical period, such as μέν, δέ, οὖν, γάρ, τε, were preserved as late as in Byzantine period with bigger or smaller frequency in literary texts of not only high but also middle and low style. Furthermore, expressions καί and ἀλλά were substantially strengthened12 and ‘new’ cohesive expressions came into use (e.g. λοιπόν, ἐν οἷς, τότε, εὐθύς), by which their ancient equivalents were gradually being substituted.13

4. Pragmatics

4.1 Inferential markers οὖν and γάρ used as elaborative markers

Apart from an apparent decrease in the variability of particles, nivelisation of the spectrum of relations among individual discourse segments expressed by the particles also occurs in the Chronicle. For example, particle οὖν had, in Classical period, its place both in the category of elaborative discourse markers and in the category of inferential markers, for which its occurrence is much more frequent in Classical texts.14 The particle οὖν is, after expressions καί, δέ and γάρ, the fourth most commonly used discourse marker in Malalas’s Chronicle. It appears that in most cases its function is, contrary to Classical period, that of an elaborative discourse marker (cf. [2a]–[2b]), whereas occurrences which could be referred to as of inferential marker are a minority.

[2a] Καὶ ἐτελεύτα ὁ Κλαύδιος πολλὰ ἐν τῇ Κρήτῃ χαρισάμενος εἰς ἐπανόρθωσιν ἔτελευτήσαν οὖν ὁ αὐτὸς Κλαύδιος ἰδίῳ θανάτῳ ἐν τῷ παλατίῳ [...]. (189.67–9)

[2b] Καὶ τῇ ἑσ′ τοῦ δασίου μνήμος ἐξῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Λίγυπτον ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας ὁ Πομπήιος· καὶ ἐβασίλευσε πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς Ἀντίοχος ὁ Μακεδων ὁ Διονίκος. Ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς οὖν χρόνοις ἦν ὁ Κικέρων καὶ ὁ Σαλλούστιος, οἱ σοφῶτατοι Ῥωμαίων ποιηται. (160.33–7)

A similar tendency, even though on a smaller scale, can also be traced with particle γάρ. This particle carries the procedural meaning of expressing the rea-

12 The beginnings of the phrasal units had since Late Antiquity been introduced more and more often by the particle καί. At the end of the Middle Ages this particle introduced as many as 80% of all phrases in prosaic vulgar texts. In Eideneier (1999a, 89).

13 As a result of this development, at the end of Antiquity the difference between the frequency of connective and the so-called emphatic particles (= commentary pragmatic markers) was also all the more apparent. Their apparent decrease was probably mainly caused by the change of the melodic accent into the emphatic one (around 200 B.C.), while the ‘freed’ category of intonation was used exactly to ensure the expressiveness of words. It replaced the function which was originally performed by emphatic particles, above all in spoken language. Different need for expressing emotions in spoken and written language, the character of which is rather pragmatic, is one of the supportive arguments casting light to the small frequency of emphatic particles in literary texts of Hellenistic period. Blomqvist (1969, 143 ff.).

14 For traditional classification of οὖν as connecting particle expressing post hoc or propter hoc, see Denniston (1950, 415 ff.).
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son for the content presented in the previous discourse segment. It creates a kind of subclass of inferential markers (cf. the definition on page 297) and, with 319 examples of occurrence, functioning in this way, its position in the Chronicle is really privileged. It also markedly prevails over other means of expressing cause, i.e. causal connective propositions or propositional infinitive. Apart from fulfilling its primary function of inferential marker, particle γάρ also occasionally appears as an elaborative discourse marker. Cf. example [3a] where while depicting divine miracles during an earthquake in Antioch, γάρ is not a part of proposition explaining the cause of an action in the previous discourse segment but only indicates further extension of the same topic. In a similar way, γάρ is also used in a special task, that of introducing embedded narrative which as a whole can but does not have to explain an aspect of a foregoing utterance (cf. [3b–c]). Inserted narrative started by γάρ is often preceded by an ‘opening’ phrase (it happened… / I will say how it happened…) as in example [3b] (καὶ συνέβη τι φοβερὸν γενέσθαι τότε). In example [3c], the particle γάρ starts a very long narrative passage depicting emperor Iulian’s fight with Christians in Antioch, which follows the news of St Dometios being tortured to death (XIII, 19). Only in the next chapter does (XIII, 20) Malalas return to Dometios’s death during the campaign against Persians. In this way, the discourse marker γάρ introduces embedded narrative, which, however, does not explain the cause for St Dometios’s martyrdom. The relationship to the previous discourse segment is thus neutral, despite the presence of the marker γάρ; the marker γάρ tends to enter the class of elaborative discourse markers here. Paschal Chronicle provides an interesting comparison: the taken-over passage from Malalas is substantially shortened and the particle γάρ introduces the embedded passage, thus shedding light on the circumstances of St Dometios’s martyrdom mentioned in the previous clause (ἐμαρ τύρησε τρόπῳ τοιούτῳ). The particle γάρ functions here as an inferential discourse marker.

[3a] [...] ἔξαίφνης, ὑγιὴς δὼν [...], ἐτελεύτησεν, [...]. καὶ πάντες [...] ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν, [...]. ἡ δὲ αὐτοῦ περιουσία [...] ἀρπαγεῖσα ἀπόλευτο [...], καὶ ἐν ὅ τόπῳ ἐτελεύτησεν, [...] ἔξω καὶ ἐτάφη, ἐδείχθη γάρ καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ μυστήρια τοῦ φιλανθρώπου θεοῦ· ἔγκυοι γάρ γυναῖκες δι’ εύκοσιν ἡμερῶν ἢ καὶ τριάκοντα ἀνήλθον ἐκ τῶν χωσθέντων ὑγιείς. (348.72–349.81)

[3b] Καὶ ἐπιλύρκει τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ συνέβη τι φοβερὸν γενέσθαι τότε. Ἰουδιθ γάρ τις ἡ γυνὴ Ἑβραία, καὶ ἐμυθανόησατο κατὰ τὸν ἐξάρχον Περσῶν Ὀλοφέρνου, προσποιητὴν οὕσα ὡς τὸ θησος, φησί, τῶν Ἰουδαίων θέλουσα προδοῦναι. [...] καὶ ἔμφακως αὐτῆς τὴν εὐμορφίαν ὁ Ὀλοφέρνης εἰς ἑρωτα αὐτῆς ἐνέπεσεν. [...] τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἀφέλετο. [...] καὶ ἐπέτρεψε τοῦ κρεμασθῆναι αὐτῆς.

15 Helms (1971/1972, 380) mentions for the Chronicle of Malalas 102 connective causal sentences, Weierholt (1963, 49–50) has 16 substantivised infinitives with the preposition of διά and 2 infinitives with ἐκ τοῦ.

16 For more details see Jong, de (1997, 175 ff.).
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[…] ἔωρακότες οἱ Πέρσαι τὴν κεφαλήν Ὄλοφέρνου […] ἔφυγον. καὶ διελύθη ὁ πόλεµος, καὶ νῦν ἐλαβον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι κατὰ Περσῶν. (123.90 ff.)

[3c] Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ βασιλείας ἐμαρτύρησεν ὁ ἄγιος Δοµέτιος. ἐπεστράτευσε γάρ κατὰ Περσῶν δυνατὴν στρατείαν, καὶ κατέλαβεν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἀνελθὼν ἐν τῷ ὅρει τῷ λεγοµένῳ Κασίῳ […] (251.8 ff.)

A passage depicting emperor Iulian’s fight with Christians in Antioch follows. (251, 10–30)

Καὶ ἐξελθὼν διὰ τῶν Κυρηστικῶν ἀπῆλθε κατὰ Περσῶν· παρερχόµενος δὲ διὰ Κύρου τῆς πόλεως ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ εἶδεν ὅχλον ἑστώτα ἐν τῷ στηλαίῳ τοῦ ἄγιου Δοµετίου καὶ ἡμένον παρ’ αὐτοῦ. […] Καὶ ἐκέλευσαν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰουλιανός ἀναφαγῆται τὸ στηλαίον λίθος· μεγάλους καὶ εἶναι αὐτὸν τὸν δίκαιον ἔσω. καὶ ἐκ τούτῳ ἐτελεύθη ὁ ἁγιὸς Δοµέτιος (***) (251.31 ff.)


4.2 Λοιπόν, ἐν οἷς, δένθε – used as adverbs or as discourse markers?

In chapter 4.1 we witnessed some changes in the procedural meaning of the above mentioned particles in favour of neutral connectives, i.e. elaborative discourse markers. Together with the almost omnipresent καὶ and δὲ,17 these tendencies confirm the development indicated as early as in post-Classical period (cf. chapter 3) and bring it to excess. On the other hand, newly formed discourse markers in post-Classical period penetrate the Chronicle only on a very limited scale and Malalas appears to be a surprisingly conservative author in this respect – taking into consideration that the language register of the Chronicle is popularly labelled as low-style Greek (cf. chapter 5), one would expect more innovative elements in the form of newly formed particles finding their way into the Chronicle from vulgar registers of Greek. This category of discourse markers is constituted by a group of expressions which only came into existence in post-Classical period from original adverbs or prepositional phrases. Malalas’s most favourite expression in this respect is the adverb/particle λοιπόν.

In Classical Greek, the neutrum of the adjective λοιπός (‘remaining over’) was

17 The communicative frame in which the particle δὲ is used for organisation of the discourse structure is different from the frame of the particle καὶ. Καὶ unlike δὲ means continuity of the narrative; it only develops the plot segment which the speaker is focused on, while δὲ implies the change in speech presentation. Thus the use of δὲ leads to the expression of some discontinuity in the text, while καὶ ensures the connection between the previous and the following context. For more details see Bakker (1993). Cf. also to original, now presumably obsolete Denniston’s argument (1950, 162): “Except in the apodotic use, δὲ is always connective […] As a connective, δὲ denotes either pure connexion, ‘and’, or contrast, ‘but’ […] The former sense preponderates where no μὲν precedes, and in such cases there is no essential difference between δὲ and καὶ.”
originally used first in nominative with the verb εἶναι meaning 'it remains' (λοιπών ἐστι); second in accusative or genitive, or possibly with the preposition ἐς (ἐς λοιπῶν) as an equivalent of the adverb of time 'henceforward, hereafter'. As early as in Classical period the expression (τὸ) λοιπῶν was, however, preserved in a context which suggests its new use as an inferential discourse marker. In Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods, it still preserves its conceptual meaning as the adverb of time and simultaneously it carries a procedural meaning as an inferential discourse marker. It is often very difficult to distinguish between these two 'forms' of use. In Malalas's Chronicle, 61 examples of the occurrence of λοιπῶν are preserved, from which a decisive majority (52) occurs in combination with καί at the very beginning of propositions. In the combinations of καὶ λοιπῶν it is also distinctly obvious that while καί is a connector, λοιπῶν still serves the purpose of a temporal adverb 'then, later' [4a]. Only rarely does the context appear in which expression λοιπῶν could be interpreted as inferential marker or at least on borderline between a temporal adverb and this function [4b–c].

[4a] Τὸν δὲ Σικυωνίων τῶν νυν λεγομένων Ἑλληνῶν ἐβασίλευσεν πρῶτος ὁ Αἰγαλεός ἐτη νῦν ἐκαί λοιπῶν ἄλλοι βασιλεῖς καὶ ἄλλοι βασιλεῖς καὶ καὶ λοιπῶν καὶ κατέσκεψεν ἡ βασιλεία αὐτῶν ἐτη Ἰπτε'. καθὼς Ἀφρικανός ὁ σοφώτατος συνεγράφατο. (48.12–6)

[4b] In the previous passage, a crowd in hippodrome values deeds of the town prefect Kyros more than those of the Emperor Constantine. Καὶ ἐχόλησεν ὁ βασιλεύς, ὡς ἀνακραξαν περὶ Κύρου καὶ μετὰ Κωνσταντίνου αὐτῶν ἐκραξαν, ώς ἀνανεωθήσεται λοιπῶν καὶ ἐπέλεγκα ὡς Ἐλλην ὁ αὐτός Κύρος, καὶ ἐδημεύθη παυθετὶς τῆς ἀρχῆς. (282.23 ff.)

[4c] Καὶ ἐφοβεῖτο αὐτὴν ἡ Κίρκη, ἐπειδὴ ἡ Καλυψώ εἶχε πληθὺς ἀνδρῶν γενναίων ἐν τῇ ιδιᾷ αὐτῆς νήσῳ, μήποτε ὡς ἀνακραξαν περὶ Κύρου καὶ κακῶς αὐτή χρῆσται. λοιπῶν ἡ Κίρκη, ὡς μὴ δυναμένη τινὰς προτρέψασθαι εἰς συμμαχίαν καὶ παραφυλακὴ ἐαυτῆς, κατασκευάσασα διὰ βοτανῶν των φάρμακον [...]. (88.10 ff.)

Interesting possibilities of comparison of function of expression λοιπῶν are found in chronicles written not long after the Chronicle of Malalas, such as e.g. the anonymous Paschal Chronicle (7th cent.) or the Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor (8th/9th cent.). Those from Malalas’s Chronicle derive extended passages word for word or paraphrase them and their authors often only change discourse markers in those excerpts. For example, in the dialogue between the emperor Koades of Persia and the Roman emperor Justin about a Persian who became a Christian, Malalas uses prepositional phrase ἐκ τοῦτου ‘from that rea-

18 For examples of the expression (τὸ) λοιπῶν with its new function of inferential marker from Classical period see Cavallin (1941, 122–3). For examples from Hellenistic period see Blomqvist (1969, 100 ff.).

19 For specification of the quoted passages see Rochow (1983); Whitby (1989).
son’ combined with connective καί to convey the origin of hostility between Romans and Persians, whereas the continuity of the plot with the previous discourse segment is marked by the use of καί [4d]. The author of Paschal Chronicle uses connector καί for the same purpose [4f]; Theophanes used the pseudo-asyndeton with the adverb of ἐκτότε. Even in these cases, it is difficult to judge whether λοιπὸν is still an adverb of time (‘thereafter’), in the case of [4e] even in a pleonastic combination, or whether it is a co-occurrence of two markers, an elaborative and an inferential one. With regard to the fact that both Theophanes and the author of the Paschal Chronicle had Malalas’s text at their disposal, they possibly already considered λοιπὸν to be a suitable equivalent to expression ἐκ τούτου, i.e. inferential discourse marker.

[4d] Καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα ἀντεδήλωσεν ο ἄσιλεὺς Ἄρσαμην Ἰουστίνος διὰ προσβευτοῦ· ’[…] Καὶ καλύσα τὸν βουλόμενον εἰς βελτίων τὰξιν ἔλθειν καὶ γνῶναι θεὸν ἀληθινὸν οὐκ ἐνεδέχετο, ὅστε χριστιανὸν αὐτῶν γενόμενον καὶ ἀξιώθεντα τὸν ἐποιημένον μυστήριον εἰς τὴν ἤδη ἀπελύσαμεν χώραν. ‘καὶ ἐγένετο ἐκ τούτου ἔξθρα μεταξὺ Ἡρωμάιων καὶ Περσῶν. (341.83–94)

[4e] Ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀντεδήλωσεν αὐτῷ ’[…] ἐδείξῃ προσπίπτων ἡμῖν ὑσθῆναι μυστήριον καὶ ἑλληνικὸν δόγματος καὶ ἁσβετὴν θυσίν καὶ πλάνης δαιμόνων καὶ προσελθεῖν τῷ δημιουργῷ τῶν ὅλων θεῶν καὶ γενέσθαι Χριστιανὸς. τοῦτον ἡμῖν βαπτίσαντες εἰς τὴν ἱδίαν ἀπελύσαμεν χώραν.’ ἐκτότε λοιπὸν ἐγένετο ἔξθρα μεταξὺ Ἡρωμάιων καὶ Περσῶν. (Theoph. Hom. 169.5–12)

[4f] Καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα ἀντεδήλωσεν αὐτῷ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰουστίνος ταῦτα: ’[…] καὶ καλύσαι τὸν βουλόμενον εἰς τὸ βέλτιων ἔλθειν καὶ γνῶναι θεὸν ἀληθινὸν οὐκ ἐνεδέχετο. δὴ καὶ χριστιανὸν αὐτῶν γενόμενον καὶ ἀξιώθεντα τὸν ἐποιημένον μυστήριον εἰς τὴν ἤδη ἀπελύσαμεν χώραν.’ Καὶ ἐγένετο λοιπὸν ἔξθρα μεταξὺ Ἡρωμάιων καὶ Περσῶν. (Chron. Pasch. 614.15–615.4)

A frequent alternative to stereotypical, syndetic connecting of propositions by means of καί was connecting propositions by the means of relative pronouns. In this way, some frequently used collocations acquired, in post-Classical Greek, apart from their basic meaning a new, adverbial meaning, which later enabled them to rank alongside discourse markers. Collocation ἐν οἷς originally indicating relative clauses but gradually acquiring a meaning of an adverb of location (cf. Theoph. Hom. 313.7: κατέλαβε τὸν Εὐφράτην, ἐν οἷς ἦν πλεκτὴ γέφυρα) and an adverb of time (cf. Theoph. Hom. 297.11: Τῷ δ’ αὐτῷ ἔτει γέγονε χειμώνας καὶ ἰχθύς πολὺς ἐξερρίφη) also belongs in this group. From this, another semantic meaning developed: ‘as, for instance’ (cf. Pall. Hist. Laus. 94.5: Ἐστὶ δὲ ἄλλα μοναστήρια ἀπὸ διακοσίων καὶ τριακοσίων· ἐν οἷς καὶ εἰς Πανὸς τὴν πόλιν εἰσελθὼν ἀνήκε τριακοσίους),20 thanks to which the collocation of ἐν οἷς can be classified as an elaborative discourse marker.

20 Tabachowitz (1932, 99–102).
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In Malalas’s Chronicle, the collocation of ἐν οἷς occurs 34 times altogether, but in the majority of examples the original meaning of the relative pronoun, with the help of which it is possible to pseudo-asyndetically connect another discourse segment, is preserved. Only in three examples, a shift towards the adverbial interpretation is evident (cf. [5a] for temporal and [5b] for local interpretation).

[5a] Ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ φόβῳ καὶ ἄλλαι πόλεις ἔπαθον, ἐν οἷς καὶ Νικομηδείας μέρος (πολί) καταπέσειν. (416.21–2)

[5b] Ὡπερ ὑπόμνημα ηὗρον ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ Πανεάδι πόλει παρὰ Βάσσω τινὶ [...]. ἐν οἷς υπήρχον ὁ βίος πάντων τῶν βασιλεύσαντων πρώην τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς χώρας. (181.40–3)

Expression ὅθεν, originally an adverb of location, can in post-Classical Greek acquire, apart from the meaning of an adverb of location and cause, also the function of an elaborative discourse marker, i.e. it only serves to express the elaboration of an action and its reassuming. Malalas is, however, very restrained while using expression ὅθεν in his Chronicle. Of 22 examples, the majority are of adverbial function, only with two examples it is possible to identify the function of an elaborative discourse marker [6a–b], which is an insignificant number when compared to the preference of later Medieval authors writing in vulgar language for this expression.21

[6a] Οἱ δὲ Αργοναῦται [...] εἰπὶ τὴν Ποντικὴν ἀνέπλευσαν διὰ τὸ χρύσεον δέρας. οἵτινες ἔλαβον αὐτὸ καὶ τὴν Μήδειαν [...] ὅθεν ἱστορεῖται τὰ κατὰ Ἰάσσων καὶ Γλαύκην, τοῦ Κρέοντος θυγατέρα [...]. (56.18 ff.)

[6b] Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ταραχή· εἶχαν γὰρ πλῆθος Γότθων καὶ κόμητας καὶ ἄλλους παῖδας [...]. ὅθεν Ἐλλάτος [...] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πάλατον [...]. (294.21–5)

4.3 Summary

Table 2 contains a summary of those connective particles which were supposed to perform the function of discourse markers in Malalas’s Chronicle. The prevalence of elaborative markers over the remaining two categories gives evidence of the character of the text as of a simple narrative which makes do with the depiction of mere order of events. The tendency of markers οὖν and γάρ to express mere elaboration of the previous discourse segment and also the presence of marker ὅθεν (though the frequency is insignificant) in this category contributes towards the predominance of this category. The classification of the expressions

[21] For example, an anonymous author of Byzantine Alexander poem (14th–15th cent.) used particle ὅθεν in its connective function 113 times altogether, several times also combined with λοιπὸν. In Christensen (1898, 395). Cf. e.g. 791 ff.: Καταφιλήσας οὖν αὐτὸν [...] εἶπε τούτῳ· ἐί βούλει, τέκνο, ἀπέλθε. [...]. ὅθεν Ἀλέξανδρος ταχὺ φθάσας εἰς τὸν λιμένα [...] προσέταξε [...]. For more examples see Reichmann (1963).
ἐν οἷς and λοιπόν into the category of discourse markers is rather ambiguous in the Chronicle – this, on one hand, can indicate a certain conservatism of Malalas’s language towards the influences penetrating from vulgar registers of Greek, but, on the other hand, it is impossible not to see the gradual change in the function of these expressions, particularly when compared to other works of approximately the same period.

Elaborative discourse marker | Contrastive discourse marker | Inferential discourse marker
---|---|---
ἀλλά | × | 
γάρ | × | ×
γε μήν | × | 
δέ | × | ×
καὶ δή | × | 
ἐν οἷς | (x) | 
καὶ | × | ×
καὶ ... δέ | × | 
λοιπόν | | (x)
όθεν | × | 
oūdē | × | 
oūn | × | ×
oῦ μήν ἀλλὰ καὶ | | ×
μέντοι | | ×
te | × | 
τοίνυν | | ×

Table 2: Classes of discourse markers in Malalas’s Chronicle according to their function (applying Fraser’s theory)

5. Malalas’s ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος in the view of discourse markers analysis

To bring this paper to a conclusion, I would like to point out that the discourse marker analysis may also help trace whether Malalas, as far as textual coherence is concerned, uses different linguistic strategies or code-switching. For its simple and easy style, the Chronicle has traditionally been classified as a work providing a good picture of the spoken language of the 6th century. It was included in this category by first modern scholars who examined the language of chronicles and the opinions of whom had not been questioned until late 20th century. Even though this categorisation of the language of the Chronicle appears to be misleading, scholars have yet reached no consensus on the level of Malalas’s lan-
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guage and their opinions still oscillate between its categorisation into either low or middle/administrative style Greek.22

Malalas himself labels his Greek as ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος (104.61). Ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος in Malalas’s presentation seems to be a language idiom in which grammar, syntax and vocabulary of late literary/administrative Koine were mixed with the spoken Koine of the time, but not with its popular of even vulgar form.23 Malalas surely did not avoid certain elements of a higher style which penetrated the Chronicle from copied sources. The passages dealing with law legislation of emperor Justinian in book XVIII, which Malalas already turned for to contemporary sources, show strikingly similar structures and phraseology. On the basis of a similar analysis of passages dealing with juridical orders in the whole Chronicle, it is assumed that Malalas as a civil servant (he probably held the office of ‘comes Orientis’), while writing these passages, could make use of official reports on the emperor’s credits that were to be made public by the imperial bureaucracy in churches or other public places. Those he incorporated, with certain mild variations, into the text of the Chronicle, not being puzzled by a certain change of style in the passages mentioned. The language of Malalas also becomes much more refined when quoting letters and reports of delegates to diplomatic missions between the emperor Justinian and the emperor Koades of Persia (XVIII, chapter 36–68, ed. Thurn) and it seems that when conveying information on this cause, he worked with existing current news and official documents.24

This is also obvious from a different variability of particles in the passages which are supposed to come directly from the official documents or are based on those. The fact can be illustrated by the particle τοίνυν. In Malalas’s Chronicle there are only two examples of this particle, both of them in direct speech ([7a–b]).

[7a] [...] εἶπεν Ἀὐτῆ ἡ εἰς σὲ γενομένῃ ἱάσει, ὦ γύναι, μείζονος στήλης ἐστίν ἀξία. παρευθείσα τοίνυν οίαν βούλει ἀνάστησιν αὐτῶ στήλην [...] (181.31–4)

[7b] Καὶ οἱ ἐχθροὶ δὲ ἐκατέρας πολιτείας καταπέσονται ταύτης [sc. τῆς εἰρήνης] σὺν θεῷ γενομένης. διὰ τάχους τοίνυν ἐπικαταλήψονται οἱ ἡμέτεροι πρεσβευταί, ὁφελοῦσα τοίνυν ἀναπληρωσῆ τὰ πρῶς ἀσφάλειαν τῆς εἰρήνης. εὐχόμεθα γοῦν [...] (382.44–7)

The extremely low use of particle τοίνυν can be partly caused by the fact that

22 From relatively new studies see e.g. Horrocks (1997, 179 ff.) as defender of administrative style vs. Caragounis (2004). He sees in the chronicle the reflection of Greek spoken as early as the end of the 5th century or perhaps even earlier. He is not afraid of the label ‘proto-modern Greek’, this on the basis of an idea that the text can be relatively easily paraphrased in Modern Greek style. Cf. Caragounis (2004, 45 ff.).

23 The language register of Malalas is neither a spontaneous demonstration of vulgar language nor its imitation (only in certain passages in the form of direct speech it is possible to find language representing spoken vulgar Greek or what we picture as such, e.g. acclamations at hippodrome etc.).

24 Scott (1981; 1992, 159 ff.).
Malalas’s Chronicle does not contain many dialogues in which this particle appears more frequently than in narrative in Classical prose. Nevertheless, even in Classical period it was not one of the most frequent particles and in Byzantine Greek it was already a rather unusual word whose presence in a text might perhaps indicate a certain stylistic ambition of the author. Whereas with example it is impossible to state whether Malalas took this particle over from copied sources or it was his own invention, because we do not have Malalas’s pattern containing this very passage, with it is most probably a direct quote of a letter from peace negotiations between Emperor Justinian and Persians, which also corresponds to a more sophisticated language including the use of particles that were non-standard for Malalas (apart from particle τοίνυν there is also the commentary pragmatic marker γοῦν in this passage, which does not occur anywhere else in the Chronicle either). In this way, the occurrence of these particles untypical for Malalas may indicate alternations between two registers of a single Koine dialect, as an inconspicuous but useful aid for the evaluation of Malalas’s language register.
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