



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Interpreting particles in dead and living languages : a construction grammar approach to the semantics of Dutch ergens and Ancient Greek pou

Koier, E.

Citation

Koier, E. (2013, March 28). *Interpreting particles in dead and living languages : a construction grammar approach to the semantics of Dutch ergens and Ancient Greek pou*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Utrecht. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20679>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20679>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20679> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Koier, Elizabeth

Title: Interpreting particles in dead and living languages : a construction grammar approach to the semantics of Dutch *ergens* and Ancient Greek *που*

Issue Date: 2013-03-28

Interpreting particles in dead and living languages

A construction grammar approach to the
semantics of Dutch *ergens* and Ancient Greek *pou*

Published by

LOT
Trans 10
3512 JK Utrecht
The Netherlands

phone: +31 30 253 6006
e-mail: lot@uu.nl
<http://www.lotschool.nl>

For the cover illustration, parts of a photograph of the manuscript of E.D. Clarke 39 fol. 80v were used with permission of the copyright holder: The Bodleian Library, University of Oxford.

Translation of the Greek sentence from Plato's *Cratylus* 435b: Both convention and custom must contribute something towards the indication of our meaning when we speak. (Translation: Fowler, 1926)

ISBN: 978-94-6093-104-8

NUR: 616

Copyright © 2013 Elizabeth Koier. All rights reserved.

Interpreting particles in dead and living languages

A construction grammar approach to the
semantics of Dutch *ergens* and Ancient Greek *pou*

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van
de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,
op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof.mr. C.J.J.M. Stolker,
volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties
te verdedigen op donderdag 28 maart 2013
klokke 10.00 uur

door

Elizabeth Koier

geboren te Amsterdam
in 1982

Promotiecommissie:

Promotores: Prof. Dr. A. Verhagen (Universiteit Leiden)
Prof. Dr. I. Sluiter (Universiteit Leiden)

Commissieleden: Dr. R. J. Allan (Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam)
Dr. R. J. U. Boogaart (Universiteit Leiden)
Prof. Dr. E. E. Sweetser (University of California, Berkeley)

Contents

Acknowledgements	xi
List of Figures	xv
List of Tables	xvii
Abbreviations	xix
I Introduction and theoretical background	1
1 Introduction	3
1.1 Introduction	3
1.2 Research questions	8
1.3 Theoretical assumptions	8
1.3.1 Overview	8
1.3.2 A critical assessment of the primacy of the word: monosemy and polysemy approaches	9
1.4 Contextual knowledge in language use	17
1.4.1 The role of situational and social context in language use	18
1.4.2 Semantic change and what it tells us about interpretation	19
1.4.3 Evidence for the role of linguistic context	23
1.5 From theory to practice	26
1.5.1 The methods used	26
1.5.2 What is a modal particle?	28
1.6 Conclusion	29
II What information does a language user need to arrive at an in- terpretation? The case of Dutch <i>ergens</i>	33
2 Research questions and introduction to <i>ergens</i>	35

2.1	Introduction	35
2.2	Research questions	38
3	An experimental approach to the role of the context	41
3.1	Introduction	41
3.2	The experimental setup	42
3.2.1	Survey 1	43
3.2.2	Survey 2	44
3.2.3	Survey 3	45
3.3	A preliminary corpus study: Which interpretations does <i>ergens</i> get?	45
3.4	Results of survey 1: The interpretation of original corpus data	51
3.4.1	Introduction	51
3.4.2	The acceptance of the multiple choice options	52
3.4.3	The results with respect to the expectations	54
3.4.4	Agreement and confusion: Does ‘the correct interpretation’ exist?	56
3.4.5	Conclusion	64
3.5	Results of survey 2: The effect of a marginalized context	65
3.5.1	Introduction	65
3.5.2	Survey 1 and 2 compared	65
3.5.3	Variation and certainty	80
3.5.4	Conclusion	81
3.6	Results of survey 3: Changing the interpretation	82
3.6.1	Introduction	82
3.6.2	Survey 1 and 3 compared	82
3.6.3	Conclusion	96
3.7	Conclusions	97
4	A corpus study of <i>ergens</i>	99
4.1	Introduction	99
4.1.1	The corpora	99
4.1.2	Context, collocations and interpretation	102
4.2	A collocation analysis of <i>ergens</i> by category	104
4.2.1	Locative <i>ergens</i>	104
4.2.2	Temporal, scalar and about/around-functions of <i>ergens</i>	106
4.2.3	Modal <i>ergens</i>	107
4.3	Conclusion	114
5	The pragmatics of modal <i>ergens</i>	117
5.1	Introduction to Mental Space Theory	117
5.2	<i>Ergens</i> as a mental space builder	119
5.3	The connections between mental spaces, interpretations and collocations	124
5.4	Conclusion	127

6	The diachronic development of modal <i>ergens</i>	129
6.1	Introduction	129
6.1.1	Research questions, theoretical assumptions and hypotheses	129
6.1.2	The diachronic corpus and its limitations	131
6.2	The secondary literature and the development of <i>ergens</i> in the 20 th century	134
6.3	The 19 th century	137
6.4	The 18 th century	143
6.5	The 17 th century	144
6.6	The Middle Ages	148
6.7	Conclusion	150
7	Conclusion part II	153
7.1	Conclusions synchronic <i>ergens</i>	154
7.1.1	General results	154
7.1.2	Results specific to <i>ergens</i>	155
7.1.3	Synchronic indications for the diachronic development of <i>ergens</i>	156
7.2	Conclusions on the diachrony of modal <i>ergens</i>	157
III	Comparing Dutch <i>ergens</i> and Ancient Greek $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	159
8	Introduction to the comparative study of Ancient Greek $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	161
8.1	Comparing languages	162
8.2	Comparing a dead language with a living language	165
8.3	Introduction to Ancient Greek $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	166
8.4	Synchronic and diachronic corpora	172
8.5	Methods and choices	173
9	The contextual features of Ancient Greek $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ in classical prose (480-323 BC)	177
9.1	Introduction	177
9.2	Controversial and non-controversial locative $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	179
9.2.1	Ambiguity versus compatibility	181
9.2.2	Controversial locative $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	183
9.3	Modal $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	187
9.3.1	Contextual characteristics of modal $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	187
9.3.2	Argumentative orientation and argumentative strength	193
9.3.3	Accessible information in $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ -clauses	196
9.3.4	General contextual characteristics of modal $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ in classical prose	205
9.4	Back to controversial locative $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	206
9.5	Conclusion	210

10	The diachronic development of που	217
10.1	Introduction	217
10.1.1	The diachronic corpus	218
10.1.2	Scholars on Homeric που	219
10.2	Differences in the use of που between epic poetry and classical Greek prose	221
10.2.1	Introduction to epic που	221
10.2.2	Variation between locative and modal που in translations of the epics	224
10.2.3	δή που and ἤ που in epic texts	228
10.2.4	εἰ που and τίς που in epic texts	235
10.2.5	The collocation ἢ που...ἢ... ‘either που... or...’	242
10.2.6	General contextual characteristics of modal που in the epics	246
10.2.7	Conclusion on epic που	251
10.3	The use of που in tragedy and comedy	252
10.3.1	Translations and collocations of που in tragedy and comedy	252
10.3.2	The status of δή που and ἤ που	254
10.3.3	Verbs of knowing	258
10.3.4	εἰ πού τις, μή πού τις and ἢ που (τις)...ἢ...	259
10.3.5	General contextual features of modal που	261
10.3.6	Conclusion on που in tragedy and comedy	263
10.4	The diachronic development of που from Homer to Isocrates	264
10.5	Conclusion	268
11	A comparison between Dutch <i>ergens</i> and Ancient Greek που	271
11.1	Pathways from locative to modal	272
11.2	Non-modal που versus non-modal <i>ergens</i>	276
11.3	Modal <i>ergens</i> versus modal που	281
11.3.1	Comparing modal <i>ergens</i> to modal που	281
11.3.2	Comparing modal που to modal <i>ergens</i>	286
11.4	<i>Ergens</i> and που compared	288
11.5	Conclusion	291
12	Conclusion part III	293
12.1	The description of synchronic που	293
12.2	The development of modal που	295
12.3	A comparison of Dutch <i>ergens</i> and Ancient Greek που	296
13	Back to the literature	299
13.1	Introduction	299
13.2	The observations in the secondary literature in the light of the new findings	300
13.2.1	The epistemic domain	300
13.2.2	The evidential domain	303
13.2.3	The domain of irony	304

13.2.4	The accessibility of the content of the proposition for the addressee (obviousness/triviality)	306
13.2.5	The domain of interpersonal relations between speaker and addressee	307
13.2.6	The amount of specification/detail provided	308
13.3	Conclusion	308
IV	Summary, conclusion and further research	309
14	Summary	311
14.1	Introduction and research questions	311
14.2	The assumptions underlying this dissertation	314
14.2.1	Contextual knowledge in language use	314
14.2.2	From theory to practice	316
14.3	What is the role of the context in the disambiguation and development of the poly-interpretable Dutch form <i>ergens</i> ?	317
14.3.1	Are speakers as a group consistent in their interpretations?	317
14.3.2	How much context do speakers need to be consistent in an interpretation?	317
14.3.3	What linguistic cues guide the choice of an interpretation?	318
14.3.4	Can we influence the interpretation of a speaker by manipulating the context?	319
14.4	What is (are) the function(s) of modal <i>ergens</i> and how did these functions develop?	319
14.4.1	<i>Ergens</i> : a mental space builder and viewpoint marker	319
14.4.2	The development of modal <i>ergens</i>	321
14.5	What are the functions of Ancient Greek $\pi\omicron\upsilon$, how did these functions develop and are they comparable to Dutch <i>ergens</i> ?	321
14.6	A comparison between Dutch <i>ergens</i> and Ancient Greek $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	327
14.7	Back to the literature	327
15	Conclusion, theoretical implications and further research	329
15.1	Conclusion and theoretical implications	329
15.2	Further research	330
A	The surveys	333
A.1	Survey 1: <i>Ergens</i> in slightly modified contexts from corpora	333
A.2	Survey 2: <i>Ergens</i> in a two word window	352
A.3	Survey 3: <i>Ergens</i> in modified contexts	372
B	The statistics of survey 1	393
C	By-products of this dissertation	395

Bibliography	397
Secondary Literature	397
Translations	407
General index	413
Index of Greek words	415
Index locorum	417
Samenvatting in het Nederlands	419
Curriculum vitae	427

Acknowledgements

Humans are social animals. We live in groups and we need other people to survive and to stay healthy, both physically and mentally. This implies that whatever a human being does, it almost never is an achievement of only that individual. Many other people have contributed to it in direct and indirect ways.

Especially a dissertation, which is written over several years, has many contributors. I will start by the direct and recent contributors to this dissertation. First there are my supervisors, Arie, Ineke and, for the first part of this dissertation, Michel. Thanks for devoting so much of your time to me and my work and for continuing to express confidence in the completion of this dissertation.

Another word of thanks I owe to LUCL. Thanks Gea, Merel and Alice for the smooth organization and support. I am also grateful for the decision to continue the yearly meetings with a member of the MT. I also benefitted a lot from the high quality training for PhD candidates offered by LOT (Netherlands graduate school of linguistics) and OIKOS (the national research school in classical studies).

Thanks also to Becky, Robert and Oana for correcting my Dungleish. All remaining bad phrases and grammatical errors are of course my own.

This dissertation could not have been written without all the participants in the survey on *ergens*. Thanks to all participants at dansschool Kluver and elsewhere. A special word of thanks to Gerard and Marianne Kluver for allowing me to bother the dancers in their school and for even encouraging them to participate (and of course for their great lessons and for running the most open minded dancing school in Amsterdam). Another large part of the participants came from Ismay's extensive network. Thanks, Ismay, for helping me and letting me be part of the family.

During the time I spent in Berkeley¹, many people made me feel that I was welcome there, both academically and socially. I am very grateful and I feel privileged that I was able to spend a whole year in this great environment. Thank you Eve and Andrew for your willingness to accept me as your visitor. Thanks also to Eve for the inspiring classes and for being there with a cup of tea when I needed advice. A word

¹This stay was partly made possible by the Leiden University Fund.

of thanks also to Belén for your help, for making me feel welcome and for all your valuable advice.

Several members of the faculty in Berkeley were willing to read parts of my work and comment on them, even though I was only a visiting phd candidate. Thanks to Andrew Garrett, Gary Holland and Donald Mastrorarde for their valuable comments. And last, but absolutely not least, thanks to the Berkeley PhD students, who were open enough to take me in their midst and share their research and thoughts with me. I enjoyed the discussions in the lounge immensely as well as the weekly syntax and semantics circle and our drinks at Jupiter's. A special word of thanks to Oana and Christine for inspiring discussions on linguistics, being friends and many other things!

Also in Leiden I would not have made it without my fellow PhD students, both in the classics department and in the linguistics department. Thanks to Roland H., Christiaan and Bora, my officemates, for coping with me. Thanks for listening to my presentations and commenting on ongoing research. Thanks also for all the lunches and for sharing the occasional ups and downs. A special word of thanks for Kathrin for her help with LaTeX and for sharing the fate of having a mathematician boyfriend abroad. Also special thanks to Franziska for many nice lunches and sharing a passion for ballroom dancing.

Anna Bonifazi and her Emmy-Noether research group consisting of Annemieke Drummen en Mark de Kreij invited me to give a lecture in Heidelberg and we had a very inspiring discussion afterwards. Thank you very much, it is so good to know that other people share the interest in Greek particles. Special thanks also to Annemieke for sharing so many interests: Greek linguistics, particles, mathematicians and ecology.

Another valuable experience was my time at the Promovendi Netwerk Nederland (PhD network of the Netherlands), first only as a board member and later as the chair. I learned a lot from my fellow board members in our attempts to lobby, organize career fairs and many many other things : Thanks Gertjan, Lisette, Marlies, Marieke, Céline, Malou, Ron, Frank, Sonja, Arie, Sylvia, Kirsten and Nora! I would also like to thank the people who introduced me into the wondrous world of policy making, professional lobbying and political decision making during our struggle to save the national research schools: Tom Zwart and Oliver van Loo. You opened up a new world for me.

However, one does not become a PhD candidate out of nothing and many people helped and inspired me to study and to do research during my bachelor and master studies. Thanks to all my teachers, but especially to Rutger Allan, for showing me how exciting Ancient Greek linguistics can be, to Geert Booij for being a very inspiring teacher and for being interested in his students, even if they officially are not his students anymore. Thanks also for allowing me into the MPhil program in linguistics with a non-standard background and for making it possible to learn more about grammaticalization at an international conference. Thanks to Ronny Boogaart for his enthusiasm, his love for linguistics and his support and to Olga Fischer for her very thorough class in grammaticalization without which this would have been a

very different dissertation, her encouragement to question standard assumptions in linguistic theory and for her support during my search for a PhD position. I also am grateful for my time at the Indo-European department in Leiden: thank you Sasha and Michiel.

I learned many things from my fellow students: Thanks to Elena, for being a great example and also for asking me to help organize the semantics in the Netherlands day, Tessa, Ruth and Liana from the MPhil in linguistics and to Maruulke, Paulien, Martine en Lisette from classics.

Even a PhD candidate also has a life before and outside of academia, although during the last phases of writing this dissertation some of my family members and friends may have wondered whether I could think of anything else. Thanks for being patient with me. Maruulke thank you for being such a loyal and good friend, for being critical once in a while and for coming to visit us in Berkeley. Vera thanks for being a good friend, sharing the love for singing and for keeping me tuned in many ways. Ismay, Robert, Waldemar and Mamiko thanks for all your support and for including me in the family, even if Roland is not there.

Without my mother I would not be who I am and the older I grow the more I see of her in me. Thanks for raising me, encouraging me and just for being my mother. Ook wil ik graag mijn Omi bedanken, bij wie ik vaker op bezoek had willen gaan de afgelopen tijd.

A last word is for Roland. Dank je wel voor je interesse, hulp, enthousiasme, steun en liefde. Ik wil er ook altijd voor jou zijn.

Amsterdam, October 2012

List of Figures

1.1	The development of new meanings from a monosemic viewpoint . . .	12
1.2	Related forms in a polysemy network	14
1.3	The hypothetical development of a poly-interpretable form	20
1.4	The symbolic structure of a construction (Croft and Cruse, 2004, 258, Figure 10.1)	24
1.5	A part of a hierarchical construction network	24
9.1	The collocates of $\pi\upsilon\upsilon$ with a specification of the overlaps with other collocates	212
9.2	The proposed construction network of $\pi\upsilon\upsilon$ ‘somewhere’	214
9.3	The proposed construction networks of modal $\pi\upsilon\upsilon$	215
14.1	A hypothetical construction network for locative $\pi\upsilon\upsilon$ and generaliz- ing locative $\pi\upsilon\upsilon$	324
14.2	A hypothetical construction network for modal $\pi\upsilon\upsilon$	326
B.1	The statistical results of a χ^2 test for all sentences of survey 1	394

List of Tables

3.1	Survey 1: Highest agreement rate per category	52
3.2	Survey 1: Percentage of agreement of the subjects	57
3.3	Survey 1: The amount of variation above chance level	57
3.4	The four groups within which there is variation	58
3.5	The variation per category	59
3.6	The interpretations of survey 2 which changed with respect to survey 1.	66
3.7	Percentage of agreement of the subjects: survey 1 and 2 compared .	80
4.1	The components of the CGN and the frequency of <i>ergens</i>	100
4.2	The components of the Eindhoven corpus and the frequency of <i>ergens</i>	101
4.4	The frequencies of the types of interpretations of <i>ergens</i> in three cor- pora	102
4.5	The number of locative word classes five words before and five words after <i>ergens</i>	105
4.6	Person of the predicate in clauses with modal <i>ergens</i>	108
4.7	The types of verbs in the three corpora split by modal category . . .	109
6.1	The frequencies of the modal interpretations of <i>ergens</i> in three corpora	136
8.1	Argumentative orientation and strength	171
9.1	The particles that form a collocation with <i>που</i> with their frequencies	189
9.2	The top ten most frequent translations of <i>δή που</i> in English, French and German	190
9.3	The top ten most frequent translations of <i>ή που</i> in English, French and German	192
9.4	The top ten most frequent translations of modal <i>που</i> without <i>δή</i> and <i>ή</i> in English, French and German	193

10.1	The frequency of collocations and verbs with $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	223
10.2	The distribution of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \pi\omicron\upsilon$ compared to the distribution of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \pi\omicron\upsilon$. .	236
10.3	The top ten translations of modal $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ in tragedy and comedy compared to the synchronic prose corpus	253
10.4	The frequency of collocations and verbs with $\pi\omicron\upsilon$	254
10.5	The top ten translations of modal $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ in the different parts of the diachronic corpus	265
10.6	The frequencies of the contextual characteristics of modal $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ in the different parts of the diachronic corpus in percentages of the instances of modal $\pi\omicron\upsilon$ in each respective corpus.	268

Abbreviations

Abbreviation ²	Full form	Abbreviation	Full form
1	first person	LOC	locative
2	second person	LSJ	dictionary of Liddell et al. (1940)
3	third person	M	masculine
ACC	accusative	MED	middle
CL	clitic	N	neuter
CGN	corpus of spoken Dutch	NEG	negation
DAT	dative	NOM	nominative
DU	dual	OPT	optative
IMPF	imperfect	PASS	passive
RPRN	relative pronoun	PERF	perfect
ACT	active	PL	plural
AOR	aorist	PLUP	pluperfect
ART	article	PRS	present
CO	coordinator	PST	past
COMP	comparative	PTC	participle
CONJ	conjunction	PTCL	particle
F	feminine	REL	relative clause marker
FUT	future	RPRN	relative pronoun
GEN	genitive	SG	singular
IMP	imperative	SUBJ	subjunctive
IMPV	imperfective	VOC	vocative
INF	infinitive	WNT	Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal

² Most of these abbreviations follow the list provided by the *Framework for Descriptive Grammars*-project (Bernard Comrie, William Croft, Christian Lehmann, Dietmar Zaefferer).

