

γινώσκειν σε οὖν θέλω: Causal particles and their semantic development in Post-classical Greek

Klaas Bentein
Ghent University
Klaas.Bentein@UGent.Be

Περίληψη

Σε αυτό το άρθρο εξετάζω τη χρήση των αιτιολογικών μορίων οὖν και γάρ σε μετακλασικές, μη λογοτεχνικές πηγές. Διαφορετικές γνώμες έχουν διατυπωθεί σχετικά με τον αριθμό των σημασιών που μπορούν να εκφράσουν τα συγκεκριμένα μόρια. Κάποιοι έχουν υποστηρίξει την ύπαρξη μίας μοναδικής κεντρικής σημασίας για κάθε μόριο, ενώ άλλοι έχουν αναγνωρίσει μια ποικιλία σημασιών. Ένα επιπλέον σημείο διαφωνίας είναι η διαχρονική σχέση μεταξύ της καθαρά αιτιολογικής και της προσθετικής χρήσης των μορίων. Κάποιοι ερευνητές θεωρούν ότι η προσθετική χρήση προηγείται διαχρονικά, ενώ άλλοι ισχυρίζονται το αντίθετο. Ακολουθώντας τους Pander Maat and Degand (2001), υποστηρίζω ότι όλες οι αιτιολογικές χρήσεις που έχουν εξεταστεί στη βιβλιογραφία μπορούν να τοποθετηθούν σε ένα συνεχές όπου η συμμετοχή του ομιλητή κυμαίνεται από «χαμηλή» ως «υψηλή». Καταλήγω στην υπόθεση ότι το ίδιο συνεχές είναι δυνατό να γίνει αντιληπτό ως ένα διαχρονικό «μονοπάτι» προς τη σημασιολογική εξέλιξη αυτών των μορίων.

Λέξεις-κλειδιά: αιτιότητα, σημασιολογία, διαχρονία, μη λογοτεχνικές πηγές

1 Introduction

Standard typological accounts of co-ordination in the European languages do not pay much attention to causal co-ordination:¹ Haspelmath (2007: 48), for example, notes that ‘these coordination types are marginal, and the linkers used in them are not always clear cases of coordinators.’ Scholars working on Ancient Greek, however, have noted that causal coordinating conjunctions (‘particles’) are actually quite well represented, and that especially at an early stage co-ordination, rather than subordination, forms the main strategy (Viti 2008). In the Post-classical period, too, causal conjunctions are well-represented, οὖν and γάρ in particular (see e.g. Bentein 2016a; 2016b).

Scholars generally agree that these causal particles can be used with a variety of meanings, although there is no general agreement as to the precise number of meanings and their labels: Moulton and Geden (1978: 1104), for example, recognize as many as eight different uses for οὖν: (i) *inference (logical consequence)*, (ii) *consequent command or exhortation*, (iii) *consequent effect or response*, (iv) *inferential question*, (v) *summary (a final inference, a conclusive statement)*, (vi) *adversative*, (vii) *continuation or resumption of narrative*, and (viii) *continuation of discussion*. Other scholars have suggested that only one core meaning needs to be postulated: Zakowski (2017: 388), for example, argues that the following ‘procedural rule’ explains all of οὖν’s uses: ‘take the upcoming assumption(s) to be mutually

¹ My work was funded by the Flemish Fund for Scientific Research (Grant Nr 12B7218N) and the European Research Council (Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme, Starting Grant Nr 756487).

manifest in the sense that it/they is/are in accordance with assumptions which are themselves mutually manifest.’

Moreover, causal particles such as οὖν and γάρ can not only be found with a purely causal sense, but also with an ‘additive’ (‘continuative’, ‘progressive’) one. So, for example, one writer starts his letter immediately with γινώσκειν σε οὖν θέλω, where the sole function of οὖν is to announce the start of the letter.

(1) Πανίσκο[ς] τῆ σοιμβίῳ (l. συμβίῳ) μου Πλουτογενία μητρὶ τῆς θυγατρὸς μου πλῖστα (l. πλεῖστα) χαίρειν. πρὸ μὲν <πάντων> εὐχομέ (l. εὐχομαί) σοι τὴν ὀλοκληρία (l. ὀλοκληρία<ν>) καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν παρὰ τοῖς θεοῖς πᾶσι/. γινώσκειν σε οὖν θέλω κτλ. (P. Mich. III 214, ll. 1-7 (297 AD))

“Paniskos, to my wife Ploutogenia, mother of my daughter, very many greetings. First <of all> I pray daily for your good health in the presence of all the gods. I would have you know then [οὖν] etc.”

When it comes to the diachronic relationship between ‘causal’ and ‘additive’ uses, there is no agreement between the standard accounts: so, for example, Schwyzer (1950: 584–85) considers the causal use to have developed out of the additive use, whereas Denniston (1954: 416) suggests the reverse order.

This paper’s aim is to re-consider the debate, both synchronically and diachronically, by drawing on recent insights from Cognitively inspired approaches. The discussion focusses specifically on Post-classical non-literary sources from Egypt (I – VIII AD), letters, petitions, and contracts in particular. The paper is structured as follows: in §2, I briefly discuss the notion of causality, focusing in particular on recent proposals for a scalar approach; in §3, I outline the synchronic relevance of such a scalar approach, arguing in §4 that such an approach also has its diachronic relevance. Concluding observations are made in §5.

2 A scalar approach towards causality

While presenting an important step forward in the discussion, two significant disadvantages of the ‘procedural rule’-approach proposed by Zakowski (2017) is that (i) it disregards the notion of ‘causality’, and (ii) it does not seek to maintain the clear connection that seems to exist between particles such as οὖν and γάρ. When it comes to the first point, Cognitively inspired studies such as Kemmer and Verhagen (1994) and Stukker, Sanders and Verhagen (1999) consider causal relations ‘one of the most basic aspects of the way humans conceive coherence in the world they inhabit, in their experiences, and in their relationships with other people’ (Stukker, Sanders and Verhagen 1999: 66).

A central notion in this regard is the ‘causative situation’, which can be conceived of as a relation between two events, the ‘causing event’ and the ‘caused event’. The central participants to these two events can be referred to as the ‘causer’ and the ‘causee’ respectively. Consider the following example:

(2) The sun was shining, so I went to the beach.

The first clause, *the sun was shining*, can be considered the causing event, and the second clause, *I went to the beach*, the caused event. The sun represents the

causer, and the first person ('I') the causee. Because it is the causee that is influenced by the causal situation, the causee is considered the 'locus of causation': Pit (2003), for example, refers to the causee as the 'causally primary participant' (CP). Note that the causing event does not necessarily have to precede the caused event: in English, one can just as well say 'I went to the beach, because the sun was shining'. The same was possible in Ancient (Post-classical Greek), thanks, among others, to the presence of particles such as οὖν and γάρ.

Next to the order of the causing and the caused event, studies have argued that the human mind distinguishes between a couple of major types of causality (causation), including *volitional* vs. *non-volitional* causation (e.g. 'I felt tired so I left' vs. 'It rained so I couldn't play tennis'), and *argumentative* vs. *real-world* causation (e.g. 'May I have a sandwich, because I'm hungry' vs. 'I went to buy a sandwich, because I'm hungry'). Scholars have proposed to re-interpret these different types of causality in terms of a continuum, developing a scalar approach towards causality, which, I will argue, is able to capture the semantics of different types of causal particles, such as οὖν and γάρ.

For reasons of space, I will focus here on just one approach, that by Pander Maat and Degand (2001), which focuses on 'speaker involvement'. Speaker involvement refers 'to the degree to which the present speaker is implicitly involved in the construal of the causal relation', speaker involvement increasing 'with the degree to which both the causal relation and the related units are constituted by the assumptions and actions of the present speaker' (Pander Maat and Degand 2001: 214). Pander Maat and Degand (2001) explicitly distinguish a number of prototypical relational interpretations exemplifying increasing degrees of speaker involvement, which makes their approach more easily applicable to corpora such as ours. To be more specific, Pander Maat and Degand (2001) distinguish between the following five uses, which can be situated along a scale ranging from low to high speaker involvement: (i) *non-volitional causal relations*; (ii) *volitional causal relations*; (iii) *causality-based epistemic relations*; (iv) *non-causal epistemic relations*; (v.1) *speech-act relations type 1: motivating a speech act*; (v.2) *speech-act relations type 2: paraphrasing and summarizing*.

3 Synchrony

When it comes to the synchronic use of οὖν and γάρ in our corpus of non-literary texts, it seems that both particles are predominantly used with a high degree of speaker involvement. Causal relations with a minimal amount of speaker involvement are relatively hard to come by, especially in the case of οὖν. The following examples illustrate non-volitional and volitional causal relations with γάρ:

(3) οὐχ εὐρίσκω τὰς δυναμένας συνεργάζεσθαι ἡμῖν, ἅπ[α(?)]σ[α(?)]ι γὰρ ταῖς ἰδίαις κυρίαῖς ἐργάζονται (P. Brem. 63, ll. 11-14 (II AD))

"I cannot find girls who can work with me, for [γάρ] they are all working for their own mistresses." [tr. Bagnall and Criore]

(4) ὡς οὖν ἔγραψάς μοι πρότερον τὸν λάκκον (l. λάκκον) ἀναψῆσαι ποιῶ· τὸ γὰρ χωρίον ἐὰν μὴ εὖρη τὸ αὐταρκες ὕδωρ μέλει (l. μέλλει) βλάπτεσθαι (P. Sarap. 97, ll. 8-11 (II AD))

“You wrote me to clean the tank first and that's what I do; because [γάρ] the property, if it does not get enough water, may suffer.”

In (3), the CP (*causally primary participant*, see §2) is human and animate, but does not have control over the situation. In (4), too, the CP is human and animate, too, and has control over the situation: the property needs water, so the first person, Anubion, has decided to clean the tank.

Epistemic and especially speech-act relations are much more frequently expressed by οὖν and γάρ. In such cases, a real-world causal relation is as it were ‘transposed’ to the mental domain of inference making. The causee is typically human, either the actual speaker or a third person. Epistemic relations are virtually limited to γάρ. They can be quite varied: they can express not only knowledge, judgment, or opinion, but also wonder, as the following example shows:

(5) θαυμάζω πῶς οὐκ ἐφρόντισας τῆς μηχανῆς τῆς Ταλεί, καὶ χωρὶς τοῦ γράψαι με· ὁμοίως γὰρ ἔμαθον πεφροντικέναι σε τῆς Εἰβιδῶνος (P. Mil.Vogl. IV 256, ll. 3-7 (II/III AD))

“I wonder about the fact that you did not take care of the machine of Talei, even without me writing to you. For [γάρ] likewise I have learned that you took care of the machine of Ibion.”

Speech-act relations are very often expressed by both οὖν and γάρ. With οὖν, these speech act-relations typically concern commands or questions, which may be explicitly perspectivized or not (that is, preceded by a complement-taking verb). In the following example, οὖν is explicitly accompanied by a verb of request, ἀξιῶ:

(6) τῶν συνήθων ὑδάτων δεόντων κατελθεῖν εἰς τὸν προκιμένον δρυμὸν ἕως πλήσθη, μέχρι νῦν οὐκ ἔσχευ, ἀλλὰ κινδυνεύει ἀποξηρανθῆν[α]ι ... ἀξιῶ οὖν, κύρ[ι]ε, φανερόν [τ]ῷ αἰγιαλοφύλα[κι ποιῆσα]ι, ἵν' ἐὰν ἔνε[κ]α ἀμελίας βλάβος τι γένηται, [.] [μ]ὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν [ἔχι]ν (l. ἔχειν) λόγον ἐπὶ τοῦ κρατίσ[του] ἐπ[ι]τρόπου (P.Wisc. I 34, ll. 4-16 (144 AD))

“Although the usual amount of water should flow to the above-mentioned brushwood, until it is filled, it has not so far received it, but is in danger of drying out ... I therefore [οὖν] request you, lord, to make it clear to the shore guard, in order that, if damage arises from neglect, I have remedy against him with the egregious procurator.”

With γάρ, speech-act relations are more varied in nature. Speech-act relations can be found frequently with commands and questions, forming as it were, the reverse-image of οὖν-relations: we first get the imperative and then the causal relation. However, they can also be found with propositions and wishes, as the following example illustrates:

(7) ὄφελον εἰ ἐδυνάμεθα πετᾶσθαι καὶ ἐλθεῖν καὶ προσκυνῆσαί σε· ἀγωνιῶμεν γὰρ μὲ (l. μὴ) [βλ.]έπου[σ]αί σε (P. Giss.Apoll. 13, ll. 10-13 (113-120 AD))

“Would that we were able to fly and come and embrace you, for [γάρ] we are anxious to follow you.” [tr. Bagnall and Cribiore]

In their proposal, Pander Maat and Degand (2001: 226–27) explicitly entertain the possibility of a second type of speech-act relation, whereby speakers summarize or paraphrase a certain discourse segment through the use of a causal conjunction (as in ‘to win the elections an absolute majority (so more than half of the votes) is required’). They do not consider this second type to involve a higher degree of speaker involvement than the first type: both types embody what they call ‘hearer-directness’, which distinguishes them from epistemic relations. Interestingly, similar uses have been described for οὖν and γάρ, and can be found in our corpus as well. Consider the following example:

(8) διεπεμψάμη[ν σοι] διὰ Ακη ὄνηλάτου τοὺς ἀπο[λυ]θέντας σοι σάκκους δύο ... ἔπεμψά σοι οὖν τὸν Ακην ἔχοντα β κτήνη (P. Flor. II 226, ll. 3-22 (III AD))

“I’ve sent you through Akes the donkeydriver the two bags that were assigned to you ... so [οὖν] I sent you Akes having two mules.”

The sentence accompanied by οὖν at the end of the letter summarizes information that was given at the very beginning of the letter, namely that a certain Akes was sent with two mules.

Another use that seems to be quite intimately connected to Pander Maat and Degand's (2001) second type of speech-act relation is the ‘specifying’ use (Zakowski 2017: 286–93 refers to so-called ‘shell contexts’). This usage can be found with both οὖν and γάρ, as shown in the following two examples:

(9) [Ταλαιπω]ρίαν πάσχων, δέσποτα, ἐπὶ σὲ καταφεύγω καὶ ἀξιῶ εὐμενῶς προσέσθαι μου [τὴν ἀξίω]σιν· τε[λ]ευτῶν γὰρ, κύριε, ὁ δηλούμενός μου πατὴρ κατέλειπέν μοι ἄμπελον [ἐν τῇ] [B]εῖρθα (l. [B]ίρθα) ὄντι πάνυ νεωτέρῳ (SB XXII 15497, ll. 3-5 (240-250 AD?))

“A victim of hardship, lord, I appeal to you and ask you to welcome my request with kindness. For [γάρ] when he died, lord, my afore-mentioned father left me a vineyard in Birtha, when I was very young.”

(10) καὶ το(ῦ)το ἀκριβῶς ἐπιστάμενοι, προσπίπτωμεν (l. προσπίπτομεν) τοῖς εὐκλεέσι καὶ ἀνεπάφοις ὑμῶν ἴχνεσι, διδάσκοντες τὸ καθ’ ἡμᾶς πρᾶγμα ἐν τούτοις ἔχον † διδάσκωμεν (l. διδάσκομεν) οὖν τὸ φιλάνθρωπον ὕψος ὑμῶν ὡς κτλ. (P. Cair.Masp. I 67003, ll. 13-16 (567 AD))

“and knowing this very well, we fall down to your famous and untouched feet, informing you that our affair is as follows. † So [οὖν] we instruct your kind sublimity that etc.”

In both examples, οὖν and γάρ further explain an element from the previous sentence. This can be done more or less explicitly: in (10), οὖν specifies the cataphorically used pronoun ἐν τούτοις “as follows” (lit. “in these things”), whereas in (9), γάρ could be said to specify the noun ταλαιπωρίαν “hardship”.

4 Diachrony

Whereas causal particles such as οὖν and γάρ typically establish a causal relation between a causing and a caused event, with the causee acting as the locus of causation, we see that in many examples these same particles can also be used in thematically discontinuous contexts, similarly to how an additive particle such as δέ is used (on δέ in non-literary sources, see most recently Bentein 2020). This is particularly true for οὖν, which can serve not only to indicate causal relations within certain generic parts, but also to introduce a new generic part. As we have seen in (1), οὖν could be used to mark the opening of the letter body, but it could also be used at the start of other generic parts, as the following example shows:

(11) ἀποστείλης εἰς τὸν Τρωίτην σὺ<v> ταῖς ἐσφραγ{ε}ισμέναι[ς] ὑπὸ τῶν ἐνπόρων (l. ἐμπόρων) πλὴν α. ἔσ[τιν] γὰρ ἐν Τανχάι μὴ δυνόμενα ἐνβληθῆναι (l. ἐμβληθῆναι) ἐπὶ τοῦ νῦν. τὰ δ' ἄλ<λ>α σεα<υ>τοῦ ἐπιμέλου ἴν' ὑγ{ε}ιαίνης, ὃ δὴ μέγιστον ἡγοῦμαι. ἔρρ(ωσο). (ἔτους) κα Καίσαρος Χοιά[.]κ. κε (l. καὶ) μὴ κατάσχης οὖν τὸ ἐπ{ε}ίσταλμα τῶν π{ε}τρακ{ε}ίων (l. πιττακίων) Ἀρσιν(οειτ) (BGU XVI 2630, ll. 13-19 (10 BC))

“You send to Troites together with the (artabs?) sealed by the merchants except for the 10,000 (artabs?). For the ones in Tanchais have not been able to be loaded up until now. Moreover, be careful to take care of yourself so that you stay in good health which I consider of utmost importance. Farewell. Year 21 of Caesar, Choiak 25. You should not impede [οὖν] the order for the *pittakia* to Arsinoe.”
[tr. Brashear]

I have suggested in the past (Bentein 2016b: 90) that the frequent co-occurrence of οὖν with formulaic phrases may have led to the extension of the particle’s usage when these phrases are used in different parts of the letter. While I do not want to deny that this may have played a role, it is worth stressing that ‘additive’ οὖν can also be found frequently at the beginning of structural parts without formulaic phrases, as in (9). Moreover, it can also be used to mark a second statement, request or order in the body middle. In texts with narrative parts such as petitions and some types of letters and contracts, οὖν can mark the next step in the narration, or even consecutive narrative steps. Consider the following example:

(12) ἀπελθόντων οὖν Ἀρχελάου τοῦ [.] [καὶ] [.]. μετὰ Ἀθαν[ασίου το]ῦ υἱοῦ Καπίτωνος, βουλόμενοι ἀποσπάσε (l. ἀποσπάσαι) Μακάριον, ἢ φάσις οὖν ἀπελθην (l. ἀπῆλθεν) πρὸς ἅπα Ἰωάννην ἐν Ἀντιοχίᾳ· ἦλθεν καὶ πιάσας αὐτοὺς κατέσχεν αὐτούς, ἐπιδῆ (l. ἐπειδῆ) ἐπὶ συκοφαντία καὶ δινὰ (l. δεινὰ) ἦσαν γράψαντες κατὰ Ἡραίσκου, καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀρχέλαος τὰ γάμματα ἦρκεν ἔξω. ὁ θεὸς οὖν ἐποίησεν καὶ τοὺς τρεῖς (l. τρεῖς) ἔξω καὶ ἔχι (l. ἔχει) ἔξω. τοῦτ' οὖν ἤκουσεν Ἀθανάσιος ὅτι Ἀρχέλαος συνεσχέθη, πάνυ ἀθυμεῖ Ἀθανάσιος (P.Lond. VI 1914, ll. 32-38 (335 AD))

“Accordingly [οὖν], when Archelaus, the ... and ... departed with Athanasius, the son of Capito, wishing to carry off Macarius, the report therefore [οὖν] came to Apa John in Antioch. He came and having seized them put them under arrest, because they had written vile slanders against Heraiscus, and Archelaus himself

took the letters abroad. Now [οὖν] God brought it about, and the three abroad he still keeps abroad! So [οὖν] Athanasius heard this, that Archelaus was arrested; Athanasius is very disheartened.” [tr. Winter]

A certain Callistus reports to two priests violent events that took place: throughout the passage, the particle οὖν is used to connect the events, rather than the more usual particle δέ.

Given the extensive usage of additive οὖν, not only in Post-classical and Late Antique documentary texts, but also in literary ones, it seems that we are dealing with a larger diachronic development, one which probably started at an early date: Denniston (1954: 426) explicitly mentions the use of ‘progressive’ οὖν in Classical literature, and Des Places (1929) also recognizes this usage for Plato. One way to explain it is to connect it to the particle’s discourse use, ‘thematic ordering’ in particular: if we take it that οὖν marks what precedes as ‘communicatively subsidiary’ (or, in another terminology, indicates a ‘push’ to a higher discourse level), then it is not hard to imagine an extended usage whereby οὖν comes to mark additive, rather than purely causal relationships between sentences and clauses. That this explanation holds some truth can be seen from the fact that texts where additive οὖν is used in a narrative context often have a sort of ‘bipartite’ structure: what comes before οὖν forms a sort of background to the crucial narrative step marked by οὖν. Consider the following example:

(13) ἔτι ἀπὸ τοῦ 18 (ἔτους) θεοῦ Αἰλίου Ἀντωνεῖνου ἐξ ἐνκελεύσεως Σεμπρωνίου Λιβελάρ[ι]ου τοῦ ἡγεμονεύσαντος ἀπελύθην ἅμα ἄλλοις [ἀν]δράσιν ὡς ἀσθενῆς π[ο]ῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς· ὁ οὖν τῆς [Β]ακχιάδος κομογραμματ[ε]ύς καὶ ἐκβολεὺς χωμάτ[ω]ν ὑπογύως ἐξέβαλέν με [ε]ἰς τὸ ἐργάσασθ[αι] εἰς τὰ χ[ώ]ματα (P.Mich. XI 618, ll. 6-17 (165-169 AD))

“As long ago as the 18th year of the deified Aelius Antoninus I, together with some other men, was by reason of my weak vision granted exemption [from corvée labor] by order of Sempronius Liberalis, who then served as prefect; well now, the village secretary and *ekboleus chōmatōn* of Bacchias has just assigned me to work on the [dikes - - -].”

Two main events are narrated in this passage, namely that (i) the sender was long ago exempted from corvée labor because of his bad vision, and (ii) the sender has recently been assigned work on the dikes anyway. The two events are connected through οὖν: even though the particle does not have a causal function, there still seems to be a background – foreground effect, the second event being particularly relevant to the request that is made.

Not all of the examples of additive οὖν occur in this type of context, however, so it is worth looking for a more encompassing explanation. In this context, I would like to suggest that Pander Maat and Degand's (2001) speaker-involvement scale can be considered not only a synchronic map of the usage of causal particles, but also a diachronic pathway of semantic extension. From this point of view, οὖν’s additive usage could be considered as yet another semantic extension of those usages which are highest in speaker involvement. This not only includes speech act relations of the first type, but also those of the second type, in particular οὖν’s ‘specifying’ usage. As we have seen above, causal particles may be used to specify either cataphorically used pronouns, verbs and phrases, or simply words, phrases or clauses which are in need of

further qualification (examples (9) and (10)). Especially in the second type of context, it is easy to imagine how οὖν in time may have come to specify elements left implicit between the sender and the addressee:

(14) θαυμάζω ὅπως οὕτω γράφεις (l. γράφεις) μοι μὴ δηλώσας διὰ σῶν γραμμάτων μήται (l. μήτε) τὴν τιμὴν εἶνα (l. ἵνα) πρὸ τῆς ἀνάγκης καὶ οἱ ἄγροικοι τὸ ἔτυμον (l. ἔτοιμον) ἑαυτῶν ποιήσο[υ]σιν ... ἐδήλωσας οὖν διὰ Ἀμόιν ἴδιόν σου ὡς περὶ κρέως λι(τρῶν) χ· οὐκ ἐδήλωσας ἐκ πόσου τῆς λίτρας (P.Oxy. XLVIII 3420, ll. 4-16 (IV AD))

“I am astonished how you write to me this way not even stating the price in your letter so that the country people can prepare themselves before absolutely necessary ... You told us, then, through your own man Amois about 600 pounds of meat; you did not say how much it was per pound.” [tr. Chambers *et al.*]

In this fourth-century business letter, the sender explicitly takes the effort to recapitulate what the addressee had written on a previous occasion, a statement that is then specified through the use of οὖν. The first lines could just as well have been omitted, since the addressee is well aware of this fact, starting the letter right away with ἐδήλωσας οὖν, which would entail a semantic extension for οὖν from causal (specifying) to additive.

Οὖν’s semantic extension forms a good example of what in the literature is called ‘(inter)subjectification’, defined by Evers-Vermeul *et al.* (2011: 446) as ‘a shift from meanings pertaining to the characterization of the objective world first to meanings involving the expression of personal attitudes of the speaker (subjectification) and then to meanings linked to speaker-hearer interactions (i.e., intersubjectification).’ It is worth noting that, if what is hypothesized here is correct, it goes against earlier claims by Schwyzer (1950: 584–85), stating that οὖν’s ‘continuative’ use actually preceded its ‘causal’ use. [Already on the basis of frequency, this claim is hard to maintain, as noted by Heckert (1996: 92)].

Moreover, other causal particles, which are less frequently attested in earlier times with both senses, provide additional evidence that the semantic development goes from causal to additive and not the other way around. In our corpus of non-literary sources, I have come across several potential examples of additive γάρ. On various occasions, we see that γάρ is used to introduce a new structural part of texts, as we have also observed with οὖν. The particle is not limited to announcing the body of the text: it can also be found at the beginning of the closing and at the beginning of the postscript. Additive γάρ is, contrary to οὖν, never found in a narrative context, but it is frequently used to denote a second statement in exposition, a usage which is particularly striking in the following passage:

(15) Ἀρποκρατίων Βελλήνωνι Σαβεῖνοι τῷ ἀδελφῷ χα(ίρειν). καὶ ἐκθές (. ἐχθές) σοι ἔγραψα διὰ Μάρδωνος τοῦ σοῦ γυνῶναι σε θέλων ὅτι διὰ τὸ ἐπιηρεᾶσθαι οὐκ ἠδυνήθην κατελθεῖν, καὶ ὡς ἔχωι (l. ἔχω) ὧδε ἡμέρας ὀλίγας εἰάν δοκῇ σοι πέμψαι τὸ ἀποχορον (l. ἀπόχυμα) Ἰσατος καὶ παραλάβωμεν τὸ ἐλάδιον λυπὸν (l. λοιπὸν) εἰάν δόξῃ σοι. ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ Τεύφιλος Ἰουδαῖος λέγων [ὅ]τι ἤχθην ἰς (l. εἰς) γεωργίαν καὶ βούλομαι πρὸς Σαβεῖνον ἀπελθεῖ[ν]. οὕτε γὰρ εἶρηχε (l. εἶρηκε) ἡμ[ῖ]ν ἀγόμενος ἵνα ἀπολυθῆ, ἀλλὰ αἰφνιδί[.]ως (l. αἰφνιδίως) εἶρηγεν (l. εἶρηκεν) ἡμῖν σήμερον. γνώσομαι γὰρ εἰ ἀληθῶς λέγει (l. λέγει) (P. Fay. 123, ll. 1-24 (100 AD))

“Harpocraton to his brother Bellenus Sabinus, greeting. I wrote to you yesterday too by your servant Mardon, desiring you to know that owing to having been molested I was unable to come down, and as I am staying here a few days, if you think fit send the receipt (?) of Isas, and let us get from him the rest of the oil, if you agree. Teuphilus the Jew has come [γάρ] saying 'I have been pressed in as a cultivator, and I want to go to Sabinus'. He did not ask me to be released [γάρ] at the time that he was impressed, but has suddenly told me to-day. I will find out [γάρ] whether he is speaking the truth.” [tr. Grenfell *et al.*]

After informing the addressee, Bellienus Sabinus, that he has been molested and therefore unable to come down, Harpocraton writes in the second part of this letter about Teuphilus the Jew, noting that he has come down with a complaint, and that he (Harpocraton) will find out the truth. Surprisingly, γάρ is used three times to connect sentences which do not seem to be causally related.

5 Conclusion

I have argued that all of the uses that have been suggested in the literature for causal particles such as οὖν and γάρ can be placed on a continuum ranging from ‘low’ to ‘high’ speaker involvement, following Pander Maat and Degand (2001). I have suggested that the same continuum can also be viewed as a diachronic pathway for the semantic development of these particles: Traugott (1995), among others, has suggested that (inter)subjectification forms one of the major mechanisms of semantic change. From this perspective, the additive use can be considered as an extension of the two most speaker-involved causal uses, which Pander Maat and Degand (2001) refer to as ‘speech act relations of the first type’ (motivating a speech act), and ‘speech act relations of the second type’ (paraphrasing and summarizing) respectively. Whereas the first type seems particularly relevant to οὖν’s above-mentioned use in narration, the second type seems relevant to the conjunction’s use in exposition. Confirmation for this hypothesis can be found in the parallel development of other causal particles, such as γάρ.

References

- Bentein, Klaas. 2016a. “Διό, διὰ τοῦτο, ὅθεν, τοίνυν, οὖν, or Rather Asyndeton? Inferential Expressions and Their Social Value in Greek Official Petitions (I – IV AD).” *Acta Classica* 59 (annual): 23–51. <https://doi.org/10.15731/AClass.059.02>.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2016b. “Ἐγραψέ μοι γάρ ... τὰ νῦν οὖν γράφω σοι. Οὖν and γάρ as Inferential and Elaborative Discourse Markers in Greek Papyrus Letters (I – IV AD).” *Revue Belge de Philologie et d’Histoire* 94 (1): 67–104. <https://doi.org/10.3406/rbph.2016.8875>.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2020. “The Syntax of Δέ in Post-Classical Greek.” *Les Études Classiques*. Denniston, J. D. (John Dewar). 1954. *The Greek Particles*. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Des Places, Édouard. 1929. *Études sur quelques particules de liaison chez Platon*. Paris: Société d’édition Les Belles Lettres.

- Evers-Vermeul, Jacqueline, Liesbeth Degand, Benjamin Fagard, and Liesbeth Mortier. 2011. "Historical and Comparative Perspectives on Subjectification: A Corpus-Based Analysis of Dutch and French Causal Connectives." *Linguistics* 49 (2): 445–3949. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2011.014>.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. "Coordination." In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. II: Complex Constructions*, edited by Timothy Shopen, 1–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heckert, Jakob K. 1996. *Discourse Function of Conjoiners in the Pastoral Epistles*. Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Kemmer, Suzanne, and Arie Verhagen. 1994. "The Grammar of Causatives and the Conceptual Structure of Events." *Cognitive Linguistics (Includes Cognitive Linguistic Bibliography)* 5 (2): 115–156. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.1994.5.2.115>.
- Moulton, William Fiddian, and Alfred Shenington Geden. 1978. *A Concordance to the Greek New Testament*. 1st ed. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.
- Pander Maat, Henk, and Liesbeth Degand. 2001. "Scaling Causal Relations and Connectives in Terms of Speaker Involvement." *Cognitive Linguistics* 12 (3): 211–246. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cogl.2002.002>.
- Pit, Mirna. 2003. *How to Express Yourself with a Causal Connective: Subjectivity and Causal Connectives in Dutch, German and French*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Schwyzler, Eduard. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik; II Band: Syntax und syntaktische Stylistik*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. München: Beck.
- Stukker, Ninke M., Ted J. M. Sanders, and Arie Verhagen. 1999. "Waar Een Wil Is, Is Geen Wet: De Categorisering van Causale Relaties Binnen En Tussen Zinnen." *Gramma/TTT* 7 (1): 66–86.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1995. "Subjectification in Grammaticalization." In *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives*, edited by Dieter Stein and Susan Wright, 31–54. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Viti, Carlotta. 2008. "The Meanings of Coordination in the Early Indo-European Languages." *Revue de Sémantique et Pragmatique* 24: 35–64.
- Zakowski, Samuel. 2017. "From Coherence to Procedures. A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to the Discourse Markers δέ, γάρ, and οὐν in Basil the Great's Hexaemeron, Gregory of Nazianzus's Invectives Against Julian and Heliodorus's Aethiopia." PhD dissertation, Ghent University.