Exclusive anaphora: the function of ὅγε in Homer

In this paper, I propose to study the uses and functions of ὅγε in Homeric Greek (HG). I claim that this collocation has to be considered a full-fledged anaphoric pronoun, and that its particular function is to create an 'exclusive anaphora' with a previously evoked referent. To support that claim, I make use of two different corpora: first, a hand-tagged list of all 425 instances of ὅ and γε in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (double-checked with the instances given by the Chicago Homer and WordHoard); second, for particular queries about information structure, a reference corpus of 2828 lines (containing books E, X, α, ι and υ), hand-tagged for pragmatic functions according to Matić's (2003) functional template, with a number of qualifications (Bertrand 2010). My arguments for such a claim are the following. First of all, a statistical comparison of the repartition of case forms of ὅγε and ὅ without γε shows that ὅγε is very unlikely to be a simple subclass of anaphoric ὅ with the mere addition of an independent particle γε. Besides, prosody provides further evidence: the 'liaison' rate (i.e. elision and resyllabification) of γε is very different when the particle is preceded by ὅ than otherwise, which means that it does not behave prosodically as independent instances of γε. Third, and most importantly, contrary to what one would expect, there is no concurrent form *ὅσγε, although such a form would have been metrically convenient (cf. the alternating forms of the relative in ὅς/ὅ περ, ὅς/ὅ τε, and ὅς/ὅ τις).

As to the precise function of ὅγε, traditional lexica (e.g. LSJ or Autenrieth) are very disappointing: whenever they do provide a distinct entry for ὅγε, they generally state that its function tantamount to simple anaphoric ὅ, with a slight 'emphasis' added. But this elusive notion of 'emphasis' is ruled out in the frequent instances where ὅγε is used in disjunctive contexts, as in (1).

(1) *(Penelope voices her fears about Telemachos.)*
Τοῦ δ' ἀμφιτρομέω καὶ δείδια μή τι πάθῃσιν
ἢ **ὅγε** τῶν ἐνὶ δήμῳ, ἵν' οἴχεται, ἢ ἐνὶ πόντῳ. δ 820–821
"I tremble for him, and I fear something should happen to him, either from those in the land he's going to, or in the sea."

Such instances obviously call for another explanation. Starting with Denniston's (1954:114) definition of the function of γε as determinative marker, I propose that it adds to the process of anaphora resolution a notion of *exclusivity*, i.e. a specification that the entity referred to is the only one possible. The 'emphasis' would then be not on the pronoun itself, but on the reference, and ὅγε could be seen as an anaphoric pronoun marking the exclusive nature of the reference. Such an anaphoric process would be specific in Dik's (1997:188) sense of the term, requiring that the hearer identifies (or construes) a referent corresponding to the one the speaker has in mind, but with the qualification that all other possible referents are explicitly excluded. The various contexts where ὅγε is actually used in the Homeric epic can be explained with such a definition:

▸ In many cases, ὅγε is used similarly to latin *idem* as an 'anaphorique d'insistance' (Touratier 1994:44–47): since the hearer has to find (or to construe) a unique referent in the common ground to resolve the anaphora, this process may give rise to the idea of IDENTITY, because the referent is interpreted as being the same as a prominent referent in the previous discourse. Hence the uses in disjunctions.

- A second category of uses is the taking over of an interrupted narrative thread: after a speech, a description or a comparison, the specific anaphora helps identifying the referent when it comes back onto the narrative scene.

- ὅγε may also be used to introduce a description or an explanation about its referent, a function typical, in later Greek, of Continuous Topic (ConTop) expressions (Matić 2003:592–593).

- ὅγε is also frequently found in paragraph conclusions: since it indicates that a new predication is made about the same referent, it may suggest that there is a (unspecified) logical relationship between this new predication and the precedent one.

- Finally, there are a few marginal uses (less that 10% of all occurrences), mainly cataphoric uses of τόγε. It is likely that those exceptions are to be explained as instances of independent ὅ and γε (cf. ὅδε vs. ὁ δέ).

In the third and final part of this paper, I analyze the relationship between ὅγε and ConTop expressions, by showing that their near-postpositive behaviors are similar. This correlation is, of course, not one-to-one, since focal ὅγε may occur.

(2)   (*'Zeus gives happiness and unhappiness as he wishes.'*)
Καί που σοὶ **τάγ'** ἔδωκε, σὲ δὲ χρὴ τετλάμεν ἔμπης.   ζ 190
"And you, I presume, THAT is just what he gave you, and you just have to endure it."

However, the positional properties of ὅγε indicate that it has a ConTop function most of the time, which squares very well with ConTops used to track a particular referent in larger stretches of discourse. To conclude, the use of large corpora, with an exhaustive analysis of the contexts where ὅγε occurs, provides a solid basis for a better understanding of its function.

Corpora

CRANE, Gregory R. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: a digital library of Greek literature*, http://www.tlg.uci.edu/.
KAHANE, Ahuvia and MUELLER Martin. *The Chicago Homer*, http://digital.library.northwestern.edu/homer/.
MUELLER, Martin. *WordHoard: An application for the close reading and scholarly analysis of deeply tagged texts*, http://wordhoard.northwestern.edu/userman/index.html.

References

BERTRAND, Nicolas 2010. *L'ordre des mots chez Homère: structure informationnelle, localisation et progression du récit*. PhD thesis, Université de Paris–Sorbonne.
BONIFAZI, Anna 2009. "Discourse cohesion through third person pronouns: the case of κεῖνος and αὐτός in Homeric Greek", *Discourse cohesion in ancient Greek*, ed. by S. J. Bakker and G. C. Wakker, 1–19. Leiden & Boston.
DENNISTON, John D. 1954. *The Greek particles*. Oxford.
DIK, Simon C. 1997. *The theory of functional grammar. Part 1 : The structure of the clause*. Berlin & New York.
MATIĆ, Dejan 2003. "Topic, focus, and discourse structure : ancient Greek word order", *StudLang* 27:573–633.
TOURATIER, Christian 1994. *Syntaxe latine*. Louvain-la-Neuve.

Nicolas BERTRAND
Université Lille 3 — UMR « Savoirs, Textes, Langages »
nicobertrand@free.fr