

Connectives as Discourse Markers in Modern Greek

Περίληψη

Η ανακοίνωση αποτελεί μια λεπτομερή μελέτη των συνδετικών αλλά, όμως, λοιπόν, τελοσπάντων και έτσι σε ένα εκτεταμένο σύνολο προφορικών και γραπτών, αφηγηματικών και μη αφηγηματικών κειμένων. Αναπτύσσεται ένα θεωρητικό πλαίσιο που διακρίνει το ρόλο των συνδέσμων (μικρο-κειμενικές συνδέσεις) από αυτόν των γλωσσικών δεικτών (μακρο-κειμενική συνεκτικότητα). Με βάση το πλαίσιο αυτό, εξακριβώνεται η χρήση των συνδετικών ως γλωσσικοί δείκτες και διαπιστώνεται ότι η συχνότητα και η θέση τους σχετίζεται με τις λειτουργίες που επιτελούν και το είδος του κειμένου στο οποίο βρίσκονται στον προφορικό λόγο, οι γλωσσικοί δείκτες επιδεικνύουν μεγαλύτερο εύρος λειτουργιών και τείνουν να τοποθετούνται στην αρχή, ενώ στο γραπτό λόγο προτιμάται το μέσον της φράσης.

Introduction

Since the publication of Schiffrin's classic work on "discourse markers" (1987), research on the tiny linguistic items which help string together and segment units in discourse has proliferated. According to Schiffrin's definition, discourse markers are "textual co-ordinates of talk that bracket units of it" (31). Their vital role as signposts or frames in the process of discourse organization accounts for the central place they occupy in linguistic analyses of text-building mechanisms, as well as in the study of cross-generic and cross-linguistic relationships in discourse. This study hopes to contribute to the cross-linguistic line of research on the typology of form-function relations in discourse by focusing on the roles and uses of a set of connective forms as discourse markers in Greek. The aim is to uncover their structural and functional properties and look into their interaction with textual and contextual variation. Our starting assumption is that this calls for a variationist perspective, comparing the patterns of structure and use across registers, and that the empirical foundation for such a perspective is analysis of corpora with authentic data.

The five connectives in question are the traditionally called adversatives αλλά and όμως, and the resultatives λοιπόν, τελοσπάντων and έτσι. Their choice is primarily based on the criteria of frequency and saliency in everyday discourse construction as borne out by qualitative and quantitative observations of our corpora. Furthermore, they exhibit significant similarities in the type of connections that they establish.

Firstly, from the point of view of traditional analysis, they establish a coordinating rather than subordinating type of linkage. Secondly, they can be classified as "semantically rich" connectives as opposed to "semantically simple" connectives (Redeker 1990). This means that they specify a particular type of a semantic relation between the two units linked in contrast to connectives such as *and* which do not give the addressee information as to the specific relation involved. In view of the above, the connectives selected for this study can be argued to be representative and at the heart of discourse connectivity in Greek.

Our framework for illuminating their role as discourse markers derives from current multi-level views of discourse and, more specifically, endorses a latest tendency in studies of discourse organization which distinguishes between two interrelated but analytically separable activities of connectivity: the linear ordering of discourse connections along a horizontal axis and the projection of this horizontal axis onto an implicit vertical axis (e.g. see Karmiloff-Smith 1985, Berman & Slobin 1994). The former orientation works at the local level of adjacent clauses, i.e. of relating one clause with the previous and subsequent clause. The latter is concerned with signalling higher-level relations of saliency, that is, with how units are grounded in one another and how they are to be understood with respect to the overarching global organization of discourse. We can call the former local discourse organization and the latter global discourse organization or, following Bamberg & Marchman (1991), binding and unfolding, respectively. Connective forms can contribute to the discourse's binding, unfolding or both. The act of unfolding entails that of binding: when a connective operates at the level of integrating discourse parts into the whole, it creates local ties first. The opposite is not necessarily valid: the scope and function of a connective form can be confined in the boundaries of a sentence or of successive clauses and not be extended to the creation of more global links between discourse parts. As a result, in our framework we make a distinction between conjunctions and discourse markers, according to whether a connective form only has a local, micro-level scope or also contributes to global, macro-level connectivity. This distinction allows us to overcome the heterogeneity in the treatment of discourse markers in the literature, which commonly conflates the local cohesion with the global marker definition, thus failing to create a category which is substantially distinct from Halliday & Hasan's interclausal "conjunctions" (1976). (Schiffrin's approach is characteristic of this tendency; for lack of space we reserve a fuller discussion of the literature for a forthcoming article).

In agreement with the standard view in the literature, we consider textual positioning or placement of a connective to be an essential criterion for deciding on its role as a discourse marker. Our assumption is that a discourse marker occurs at the boundaries of higher-level units such as episodes, paragraphs or spans and at transitional locations as a cue for shifts relative to the preceding discourse. At the local level, initial placement is also a feature of saliency, in accordance with the widely endorsed view that first position has a strategic role. We also expect that fixed positions in the sentence would be revealing of functional norms.

The scheme employed in this paper to account for the functions of discourse markers is related to the widely accepted Halliday's tripartite division of language functions into ideational, interpersonal and textual, which has been systematized and revised to account for functions in discourse (e.g. Traugott 1982). Thus, the three functions in our present scheme are i) the sequential function: this is part of the definition of a discourse marker and can be further refined into the signalling of topic shift, continuity or re-introduction, ii) the interpersonal function: this relates to interactional uses, or the marking of interpersonal relations between addresser and addressee(s) and the expression of subjective feelings, attitudes, stances etc. and iii) the ideational function: this refers to propositional relations; a discourse marker relates two discourse units ideationally if it specifies a semantic relation which corresponds to its propositional meaning.

The above assumptions guided our analysis of the role of the five connectives as discourse markers in Modern Greek. Greek language grammar books have systematically shunned the discussion of their functions or textual positioning (e.g. Joseph & Warburton 1987, Mackridge 1985). The only exception is Tzartanos (1946) who adopts a distinction between "connectives" and "particles", thus implicitly recognizing that their role cannot be accounted for only in terms of the logical relations they establish. However, his sweeping category of particles includes a heterogeneous mix of items, comprising *va*, *θα*, *όπου*, *αμ*, *ντε* etc. In addition, no underlying theory can be discerned in his approach, which lacks sensitivity to and systematic evidence from a wide range of data from different discourse types. In view of the lack of a systematic research on discourse markers in the Greek linguistics literature, this paper is a step towards the direction of illuminating the functions of discourse forms in relation to different textual and contextual parameters.

Data

The data used in our study was carefully chosen to present significant textual variation by spanning the basic continua of discourse types, namely spoken-written, narrative-non-narrative and formal-informal. The spoken data comprise narratives and conversations, more particularly a corpus of over 500 everyday narratives (of about 60.000 words), recorded in informal conversations between intimates and a smaller corpus of conversations (20.000 words) in which some of these stories were embedded (for details see Georgakopoulou 1993, 1994a). The written data comes from the ECI corpus and is organized into two sub-corpora, comprising academic essays and newspaper articles, on the one hand, and literary narratives, on the other (2.5 million words, in total) (for details see Goutsos et al. 1994a). We have thus made use of a double pairing of four corpora, namely spoken narrative, spoken non-narrative (conversations), written narrative (literary) and written non-narrative (essays etc.).

Results

i. Frequency

The first insights into the genre-specific use of the five connectives were obtained by the count of their frequency. Table 1 below presents the frequency of these items per 10.000 words. As can be seen, λοιπόν and τελοσπάντων clearly emerge as spoken discourse connectives, while έτσι as a written non-narrative connective. Αλλά is very frequent in conversations, while όμως is least frequent in oral narratives. The following discussion will unravel how these findings bear on the functions of the connectives as discourse markers.

	Spoken Narr.	Spoken Non-Narr.	Written Narr.	Written Non-Narr.	TOTAL
Αλλά	22	95	33.2	25	30.2
Έτσι	0.83	-	1.8	7	4.5
Λοιπόν	30.6	16.6	8	4.6	7.2
Όμως	7.1	24	24.7	15.4	20.4
Τελοσπάντων	10.8	10.6	0.2	-	0.5

Table 1: Relative frequency per 10.000 words

ii. Conjunctions vs. discourse markers

In accordance with our definitional criteria, our qualitative and quantitative analyses first of all attempted to establish the exact connectivity role of each of the five conjunctions. This required constituency analyses as well as analyses of the patterns of co-occurrence with other text-building mechanisms (e.g. tense/aspect markers, reference etc.). These analyses suggested that λοιπόν and τελοσπάντων function in the majority of their occurrences as discourse markers. This mainly happens in spoken discourse, in particular narrative discourse, where they almost always establish global links in the discourse macro-organization. The role of αλλά varies in relation to discourse type. In conversations, its occurrences as a discourse marker are predominant. In written discourse, by contrast, the majority of its uses are purely localized and thus it tends to function as a conjunctive. έτσι is not a salient discourse marker in spoken discourse, since it exhibits restricted use. In written discourse, though more frequent, it as a rule exhibits a restricted scope in the confines of a sentence; in fewer cases, it is a discourse marker. Finally, όμως differs from the rest in that it is a conjunction in the overwhelming majority of its uses in all discourse types examined. It is in most cases confined in the boundaries of interclausal relationships and lacks a macro-segmentational power.

iii. Position

As already suggested, positioning was counted not just at the low-level of clauses but also at the meso-level of paragraphs (for a discussion of such units see Longacre 1989). In spoken discourse, the postulation of units took into account intonational criteria, in addition to syntactic and thematic criteria. The units employed were the idea unit (see Chafe 1980), roughly equivalent to "clause", the stanza (see Gee 1989), a kind of a "spoken paragraph" and macro-structural categories (e.g. Labov 1972), at an even higher-level. In view of our assumptions about discourse markers, positioning was an essential criterion for a) distinguishing between a discourse marker and a conjunction and b) determining the salience of a discourse marker. This means that our finding that λοιπόν and τελοσπάντων are salient discourse markers in spoken discourse correlates with and is partly based on the fact that in a striking 95% of the cases they are located at both paragraph and idea-unit boundaries (for further details on frequency, see our forthcoming paper). Λοιπόν is overwhelmingly fronted, while τελοσπάντων is either the very first or the very last element of a higher-level unit. Furthermore, in half of their instances, their strategic positioning is maximized by their occurrence as separate intonation units. As such, they exhibit an

intonational rise which suggests that "there is more to come", or, when unit-final, a sentence final intonational contour marked by a low fall. This intonational extra coding is an additional salience-creating device for the two markers which, as will be seen below, occur at maximal shifts. In the case of *τελοσπάντων*, as will be seen, this position goes hand in hand with its function. Comparably, *έτσι* as a written discourse marker tends to be situated at the final rather than initial boundaries of higher-level units. This positioning is again intertwined with its sequential function which is that of establishing continuity with and acting as a recapitulatory reference (cf. Longacre 1989) of the prior segment.

The correlation between position and function is also evident in the case of *όμως*. *Όμως*, which was found to be a conjunction in most cases, is as a rule located in the midpoints of clauses and paragraphs. At the level of clausal positioning, *όμως* exhibits an unmarked placement, applying to all our discourse types, namely, that of second position. (The same finding is suggested in Goutsos et al. 1994b). On the basis of our data, we would suggest that this placement has acquired a high degree of fixity and normativity in the language (see the 90% of second-position occurrence which satisfies the Hallidayan conception of unmarkedness), which might support another hypothesis, namely that *όμως* has been established as a conjunction rather than discourse marker in Greek.

A general modality-specific tendency which emerged in the analyses is that in spoken texts discourse markers are almost always initialized, that is, rendered as salient as possible on the basis of strategic positioning. However, in written discourse, second (or, medial) clausal position is also a strong candidate for the placement of a discourse marker. This is certainly the case with *αλλά*, for which the 9 to 1 ratio of initial to medial placement in the spoken data is exactly reversed in the written data. Comparably, as regards *λοιπόν*, 91% of its occurrences in spoken narrative are initialized. By contrast, in written narrative, only 37% of its occurrences are in initial position. More strikingly, there are no instances of *λοιπόν* in clause-initial position in written non-narrative. This picture confirms the findings about Greek oral narratives that connectivity relies on a closed set of signals, including prosodic ones, and an overall strategy of implicitness as evidenced by the rapid tense shifts (see Georgakopoulou 1994b, 1995). *Λοιπόν* and *τελοσπάντων*, in comparison with temporal and adverbial discourse markers, emerge as very powerful macro-connectors. By contrast, written discourse, due to its decontextualized nature and the lack of a physically present addressee, employs a wide variety of explicit lexical and syntactic devices to signal connectivity (see e.g. Gee 1989, Goutsos 1994).

In view of the above, we could tentatively suggest that the difference in positioning of the markers points to different connectivity patterns emerging from the contextual constraints of each modality. The analysis of our written texts showed that discourse markers are normally preceded by other elements such as adverbials or passive verbs, for which the initial position is reserved. We could assume that written discourse, choosing from a more varied repertoire of devices and working towards maximization of explicitness, does not opt for assigning as much salience and macro-segmentational power to the connectives in question. As the following section will show, the above modality-associated preferences of marker placement are interrelated with the functions which the markers exhibit in spoken vs. written texts.

iv. Functions

The major finding which the functional analysis of markers brought to the fore is that in written texts they are primarily ideational (with minor sequential uses), whereas in spoken texts they exhibit a versatility of functions covering a range of sequential and interpersonal uses. Specifically, while in written discourse even the sequential relations which they establish are closely associated with their ideational meanings, in spoken discourse they are very removed from them. To illustrate the versatility of such functions in spoken discourse we will now focus on the example of *λοιπόν* and *τελοσπάντων* in spoken narrative discourse. Both of them are classic examples of how the ideational role of discourse markers gives way to other textual and interpersonal functions. They hardly ever function as resultative ideational relations between discourse units, but, instead, contribute to global segmentation. More specifically, they are both found at boundaries with shifts relative to the preceding discourse and act as hypotactic markers (Redeker 1990), i.e. they lead into and out of a commentary, correction, paraphrase, aside, digression, interruption segment etc. Our argument is that both markers connect asymmetric segments as illustrated below:

(1) M: ... δεν πάμε μια βόλτα και στην Αγία Παρασκευή του λέω .. σήμερα, λες, μου λέει, για ΠΑμε ρε παιδί μου κι εκεί λέω, μπορεί να βρούμε, όμως μπορεί και να μη βρούμε, και θα πούμε πήγαμε ψάξαμε κι εκεί

→ *Λοιπόν* σηκωνόμαστε .. πάμε Αγία Παρασκευή, πάμε προς τα κει, αφού γενικώς είναι καλή περιοχή //και

Θ: εγώ έλεγα να ψάξουμε στην Πετρούπολη, να'μαστε κάπου κοντά με τη Βάσω, κι έλεγα ότι δε μπορούσαμε να γαγγίζουμε πουθενά αλλού. Και τσακωθήκαμε και στο δρόμο, γιατί μου λεγ'η Μαρία να πάμε Αγία Παρασκευή.

A: Ορίστε θεία που τελικά ήτανε δική σου ιδέα=

Θ: =ναι εγώ δε λέω //οτ'ήτανε

- M: τελοσπάντων .. πάμε κει, σταματάμε, κι αρχίζουμε τώρα να ψάχνουμε πολυκατοικία προς πολυκατοικία ... ((further on in the story)) ... κάποια στιγμή κουραστήκαμε, είχε πάει και μιάμιση .. δύο παρά, .. πτώμα κι εμείς απ'το πρωί, και τα παιδιά μόνα τους, είχε πιάσει και το μεσημέρι.
- Λοιπόν βλέπουμε εκεί-, την ώρα που φεύγαμε, μια - αφοί Γκιώνη, τάδε τηλέφωνο.

(2) X: κι εκείνο το καημένο όπως ανοίξανε το αλεύρι, δεν περίμενε να φτιάξουνε κάτι- //χυλό

Π: καμιά τηγανίτα ξέρω γω κάτι,

- X: ναι, λοιπόν βουτάει με τη μούρη, και χώνεται όλος, και δε μπορούσε να .. το πάει κάτω όλο, κι έκανε: ((laughing and pointing))

B χα χα χα

X εμείς ήμαστε μπροστά, ήταν απόγευμα, και κάναμε και το απόγευμα σχολείο, στο .. δημοτικό

- Λοιπόν αρχίζει η αδερφή του η μεγάλη/ ταπ/ ταπ/ ((laughing)) του ριχνε νερό

In extract (1) above, the first *λοιπόν* occurs after a direct speech segment, signalling shift to an upcoming action unit. Comparably, the second *λοιπόν* is a push of the action after a segment of background commentary. Its occurrence as a discontinuity marker is highlighted by the tense shift to the narrative present (*βλέπουμε*). In a similar vein, *τελοσπάντων* terminates the addressee's interruption and signals return to the main action. The two instances of *λοιπόν* in extract (2) also exemplify shift to the action after an interruption and a background commentary. This last occurrence of *λοιπόν* signals return to the story's climax, that is, emphasizes the macro-segmentational significance of the upcoming unit by putting an end to the suspense which was created by the brief digression from the action.

On the basis of their primary sequential function, both *λοιπόν* and *τελοσπάντων* also gain secondary interpersonal functions. Marking

the sequential significance of narrative segmentation is interrelated with marking the addresser's shifts of orientation towards discourse. This is particularly evident in the occurrences of the markers as closing signals of addressee contributions. In such cases, the addresser communicates his intention of regaining the floor. *Τελοσπάντων* commonly exhibits a secondary interpersonal function which *λοιπόν* does not seem to draw upon. It is very frequent (39% of its occurrences) in exits from a subjective context (i.e. evaluative utterances) and entry into narrative action as a more objective context:

(3) Π: σε κάποια φάση .. σε μια αριστερή στροφή, ούτε πινακίδες ούτε τίποτα, >φρενάρω φρενάρω φρενάρω<, τίποτα.

Καταλαβαίνω ότι όσο και να φρέναρα .. πήγαινα απέναντι στην πλαγιά, και πάει η ψυχή μου στην κούλουρη διακόσιους παλμούς

- Τελοσπάντων στρίβω, πλαγιάζω όσο μ'έπαιρνε ...

(4) Π: και θέλανε τώρα να δούνε το Χαρδαβλάκα ((instead of Χαρδαβέλλα)), η μάνα μου ξέρω γω, .. να δει τι απέγινε ο ξάδερφος, εγώ να θέλω να δω το έργο, κι έγινε Ο ΧΑΜΟΣ στο σπίτι.

- Τελοσπάντων, βγήκανε κάτι τύποι, άλλος έλεγε το έχω δει στη Μυτιλήνη ...

In (3) and (4) above, in addition to marking hypotactic relations, *τελοσπάντων* also marks shifts out of the teller's experiential subjectivity. The narrator briefly steps out of his story to encode his retrospective attitudes and emotive reactions to the events and then cues his stepping back into with *τελοσπάντων*.

A difference between *λοιπόν* and *τελοσπάντων* in the nuances of their sequential function is that *λοιπόν* is more associated with the framing of discourse units while *τελοσπάντων* with their closure. The framing capacity of *λοιπόν* is very evident in cases like (5) below where *λοιπόν* prefaces the telling of a story:

- (5) K: Λοιπόν. Τι έγινε τώρα τη δεύτερη φορά στη Σκιάθο, που ήρθε κι ο Γιάννης.

This difference is also reflected in the positioning of the two markers. As suggested, *τελοσπάντων* frequently keeps a turn on its own to emphasize the closing boundary of a segment. Evidence for this is its occasional co-

occurrence with *λοιπόν* which emphasizes the initial point of the upcoming unit:

(6) ... και μετά σταματάμε για καφέ ... ((five lines later))
πίνουμε το φραπέ, πάω να πληρώσω, πόσο του λέω,
εκατόν πενήντα μου λέει, εκατόν πενήντα του λέω;
εκατόν πενήντα μου λέει .. και οι δύο.

Εντωμεταξύ ΧΟΝΤΡΟ τώρα, πού να πληρώσεις εβδομήντα
πέντε δραχμές το φραπέ, δεν έχει ξαναγίνει. Εδώ τον
πληρώνουμε στο Κολωνάκι εφτακόσιες

→ κι είμαστ' ευχαριστημένοι. Τελοσπάντων..

→ Λοιπόν του σκάμε εκεί δυο κατοστάρικα, του αφήνουμε
και πουρμπουάρ να πούμε ...

As can be seen, *τελοσπάντων* marks the closure of the segment which encodes the narrator's reactions to the events narrated, while *λοιπόν* follows it as an opening signal for the new upcoming action unit.

Discussion and Conclusion

Our variationist analysis of connectives as discourse markers suggested that certain placement and function patterns are valid across discourse types. The most significant of these involves the lack of discourse marker functioning in the case of *όμως* as well as its clause-second position. The study, however, yielded more differences than similarities between discourse types. These are mostly the outcome of variation in the spoken-written dimension. One of our major working assumptions was that discourse markers would be strategically positioned at lower- and higher-level units. While this was undoubtedly the case in the data, there was a more overwhelming tendency for discourse markers to be fronted in spoken discourse than in written discourse which showed a preference for their second or, more generally, medial positioning. We suggested that this is partly due to modality-associated connectivity patterns and norms for the linguistic marking of transitions and perspectival shifts. Our contention is that this finding is intertwined with the functional roles and salience attributed to the forms in different discourse types. Specifically, it was found that discourse markers in spoken discourse are as a rule more versatile and powerful signals of discourse organization, embracing mainly non-ideational uses. We demonstrated this by focusing on *λοιπόν* and *τελοσπάντων*, the two salient discourse markers in spoken discourse, in particular narrative. We showed how their uses there are mostly sequential and interpersonal rather than resultative.

This finding can be aligned with Redeker's (1990) view that there is a trade-off in the frequency with which ideational and pragmatic markers are used: if speakers choose to use many pragmatic markers, they should not find it necessary to be as explicit about the ideational relations. This play between implicitness and explicitness is interrelated with the listeners's participation and constant feedback in spoken discourse. By contrast, written discourse, due to the lack of immediate feedback from the addressee, tends to be more explicit in the signalling of ideational relationships between units.

As noted, our study has been centrally concerned with the ways in which grammatical items function in discourse and interact with contextual parameters. There are numerous applied areas in Greek language where accounts like ours are vital. To mention only one, the area of teaching Modern Greek as a foreign language could be significantly profited. Variationist studies of real data are the only means for testing assumptions about language use and creating pedagogical material which is not divorced from everyday usage (see discussion in Biber et al 1994). A glance at the most common introductory textbooks for Modern Greek suffices to show how such significant elements for discourse production and comprehension as discourse markers receive no discussion in their own right. Furthermore, their actual patterns of use in different genres as revealed in this paper are by no means reflected. Thus, the student is not offered any insights into their unmarked structures and functions. This is easily illustrated in the case of *λοιπόν* and *τελοσπάντων*. "Communicate in Greek" 2 and 3 (Arvanitakis et al. 1994), one of the most communicative existing textbooks, includes only six instances of *λοιπόν* in texts, with no metalinguistic explanation or guidance on its use. Four occurrences exemplify closing of conversations (topic closure) and the other two abrupt topic shift. Similarly, *τελοσπάντων* is only used in two cases for topic shift. The treatment of both items is not informed by an awareness of the unmarked patterns of positioning and function in different discourse types (spoken vs. written, narrative vs. non-narrative) which were unravelled in this paper. More importantly, there is no way that the student can grasp the difference between ideational and non-ideational uses of the two connective forms. This brief example illustrates the necessity and usefulness of discourse analytic studies in Greek which will explore the various forms and functions of discourse construction and the ways in which they interact with immediate and wider contextual constraints. This study is intended as a contribution to a growing line of research with this emphasis.

Bibliography

- Arvanitakis K. & Arvanitakis F. 1994. *Communicate in Greek (II, III)*. Athens.
- Bamberg M. & Marchman V. 1991. Binding and unfolding: towards the linguistic construction of discourse. *Discourse Processes* 14: 277-305.
- Berman R.A. & Slobin D. 1994. *Relating events in narrative: a crosslinguistic developmental study*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Biber D., Conrad S. & Reppen R. 1994. Corpus-based approaches to issues in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics* 15: 169-89.
- Chafe W.L. 1980. The deployment of consciousness in the production of a narrative. In W.L. Chafe (ed.), *The pear stories: cognitive, cultural and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. 9-50.
- Gee J.P. 1989. Two styles of narrative construction and their linguistic and educational implications. *Discourse Processes* 12: 287-307.
- Georgakopoulou A. 1993. *Binding, Unfolding and Evaluating Modern Greek Personal Storytelling: A Discourse-Analytic Study*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Edinburgh.
- . 1994a. Contextualizing Modern Greek storytelling: the case of Historical Present and Constructed Dialogue. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 12: 203-19.
- . 1994b. Modern Greek oral narratives in context: cultural constraints and evaluative ways of telling. *Text* 14: 371-99.
- . 1995. Narrative organization and contextual constraints: the case of Modern Greek storytelling. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 5: 161-89.
- Goutsos D. 1994. *Sequential Relations and Strategies in Expository Discourse: A Topic Structure Model for English and Greek*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Birmingham.
- . Hatziadaki, R. & King, P. 1994a. Towards a Corpus of Spoken Modern Greek. *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 9 (3): 215-223.
- . King, P. & Hatziadaki, R. 1994b. Η χρήση των corpus στη λεξικογραφία και περιγραφή της Νέας Ελληνικής. Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα: Πρακτικά της 15ης Ετήσιας Συνάντησης του Τομέα Γλωσσολογίας της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Α.Π.Θ. Θεσσαλονίκη 843-854.
- Halliday M.A.K. & Hasan R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Joseph B. & Philippaki-Warbuton I. 1987. *Modern Greek*. London: Croom Helm.
- Karmiloff-Smith A. 1985. Language and cognitive processes from a developmental perspective. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 1: 61-85.
- Labov W. 1972. *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Longacre R.E. 1989. Two hypotheses regarding text generation and analysis. *Discourse Processes* 12: 413-60.
- Mackridge P. 1985. *The Modern Greek language. Descriptive analysis of Standard Modern Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Redeker G. 1990. Ideational and pragmatic markers of discourse structure. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 367-81.
- . 1991. Linguistic markers of discourse structure: review of *Discourse Markers* by D. Schiffrin. *Linguistics* 29: 1139-72.
- Schiffrin D. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Traugott E.C. 1982. From propositional to textual to expressive meanings; some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalisation. In W.P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (eds.), *Perspectives in historical linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 245-71.
- Tzartzanos A. 1946 [1991] *Νεοελληνική Σύνταξις*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Αφοι Κυριακίδη.

Key-words: Discourse Analysis, discourse markers, conjunctions, functions, form-function relation, positioning, contextual variation

Μ Ε Λ Ε Τ Ε Σ
ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΓΛΩΣΣΑ

Π Ρ Α Κ Τ Ι Κ Α
ΤΗΣ 16ης ΕΤΗΣΙΑΣ ΣΥΝΑΝΤΗΣΗΣ
ΤΟΥ ΤΟΜΕΑ ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ
ΤΗΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΚΗΣ ΣΧΟΛΗΣ
ΤΟΥ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΕΙΟΥ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟΥ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ

4 - 6 Μαΐου 1995



S T U D I E S
IN GREEK LINGUISTICS

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE 16th ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY
ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI

4 - 6 May 1995

ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ 1996