

'No Facting Way': Modern Greek Anti-Factive Exclamatories

Sixth Graduate Student Conference, Linguistics & Applied Linguistics,
University of Melbourne; 1997–8–2.

NICK NICHOLAS

Dept. of Linguistics & Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne
n.nicholas@linguistics.unimelb.edu.au

1. The Protagonists

- (a) **να** na
Irrealis particle (incl. equivalent of infinitive marker)
- (1a) Θέλω **να** φύγω
thelo na fiyo
I.want IRR I.leave
I want to leave
- (1b) **Να** φύγω
na fiyo
IRR I.leave
May I leave!/ Let me leave!/ I should leave
- (b) **που** pu
Factive particle (relativiser, complementiser, factive connective)
- (2a) Ο άνθρωπος **που** έφυγε
o anthropos pu efiye
the person REL left
The person who left
- (2b) Χαίρομαι/*Νομίζω **που** έφυγε
xerome/*nomizo pu efiye
I.am.glad/I.think COMP left
I am glad/*think that he left
- (2c) Νευρίασε τόσο πολύ, **που** έφυγε
nevriase toso poli, pu efiye
he.became.angered so much RES left
He got so angry, that he left
- (2d) Τι κέρδισε **που** έφυγε;
ti kerðise pu efiye?
what he.gained CAUS left
What did he gain by leaving?

(c) **θα** θα
Future/Conditional particle

(3a) **θα** φύγω
θα φύγο
FUT I.leave (Perfective Present)
I will leave

(3b) **θα** έφευγα
θα εφευγα
FUT I.was.leaving (Imperfective Past)
I would leave

(d) **άντε** 'ade
Hortative particle

(4a) **Άντε!**
ade!
HORT
Go on!
(i: Start moving!; ii: Begin an action!; iii: Exclamation of incredulity)

(4b) **Άντε** να κοιμηθείς
ade na kimiθiς
HORT IRR you.sleep
Get to bed!

2. ade na

Literal Meaning

(5a) **Ante** twra **na** kaθariseis kana kilo fasolakia gia na kaneis kai tipota xrhsimo shmera.
ade tora na kaθarisis kana kilo fasolakia gia na kanis ke tipota xrisimo simera.

Now go and peel a kilo of beans, just so you can at least do something useful today! (Perikles Konstantinides: *Apanthssh ston pfk (me mikra grammata fusika)*; *Hellas-L 1995-06-14*)

Ironic Meaning

(5b) Gia tis pio polles alitheies oute kan ftiaxnoume thewria giati apla den yparxei tyxi sto na aplopoiisoume to montelo. Gia paradeigma, "o Vassalos xtes efage mpritzola kai proxtes mpourito". **Ante** twra **na** ftiakseis thewria gia to ti trwei o Vassalos. Den ginetai.

gia tis pio poles alithies ute kan ftiaxnume theoria giati apla den iparxi tixi sto na aplopiisume to modelo. gia paraðiyma, "o vasalos xtes efaye bridzola ke proxtes burito". ade tora na ftiaksis theoria gia to ti troi o vasalos. den yinete.

For most truths we do not even construct a theory, because there is simply no chance of simplifying the model. For example, "Vassalos ate steak yesterday and a burrito the day before." Now just try and construct a theory on what Vassalos eats. It's not possible. (Yiannis Koutalos (originally from

Yannis Papakonstantinou): Re: Klaine ta biolia.... (fwd);
Hellas-L 1997-02-07)

Quasi-Minimal Pair: Literal Meaning

(5c) [Author cites the lyrics of a popular song]

Ante twra **na** paw na diabasw...
ade tora na pao na ðiavaso...

HORT now IRR I.go IRR I.read
...perisseye kaθolu ouzo h krasi?
...perisepse kaθolu uzo i krasi?

Well, I'm off to study now...

...Any ouzo or wine left? (Angelos Lazoudis: Re: Kanena Asma h
Penia?; *Hellas-L 1995-12-10*)

Quasi-Minimal Pair: Ironic Meaning

(5d) [Author enthuses over a posted scatological parody]

Einai ka-ta-plh-kti-ko! Oyte ta gamotragoyda toy
Seferh...;-) **Ante** twra **na** doyleceis...

ine katapliktiko! ute ta gamotrayuða tu seferi... ade tora na ðulepsis...

It was amazing! Not even Seferis' bonking-songs [were this good]! ;-)
Now one (=I) can just try and get back to work... (Lambrini Thoma: Re: TO
EPOS!! Rapswdies tou kwlou!; *Hellas-L 1996-02-15*)

Ironic example cited in literature

(5e) **Αντε** τώρα **να** μπούν αυτοί [οι Τούρκοι] στο πνεύμα το αρχαίο το ελληνικό!

ade tora na bun afti sto pnevma to arxeo to eliniko!

I'd like to see them [the Turks] entering into the ancient Greek spirit!
(Mackridge 1985:289)

- Selection between literal and ironic meaning is entirely a matter of conversational implicature. If the na-clause is an impossibility, then the ironic meaning must be intended.

- Ironic ade na-clauses express “contemptuous disbelief in the possibility that an occurrence could happen in the future” (Mackridge 1985:289). They also have a connotation of futility, particularly in first or second person (5b, 5d). The following chain of implicature should account for this:

“Go and do X!”

But X is impossible.

The speaker must know that X is impossible.

So “Go and do X!” cannot have been literally meant.

The speaker must have wished to draw my attention
to the fact that “Go and do X!” is impossible.

To pick the specific linguistic form “Go and do X!”,

the speaker must have wished to exploit the entailments resulting from it.

“Go and do X!” entails that an attempt is to be made to do X.

So the speaker must be implying,

not only that X is impossible (which is known),

but also that X should not be attempted.

Ergo, X is futile.

3 . ade pu θα

- pu is in complementary distribution with na throughout Greek grammar.
- pu is consistently realis and factive (give or take some complications in complementation)

One of the adjunct functions of pu is to introduce circumstance clauses justifying the illocution of some exclamation:

- (6a) —'Αγιε Πελάγιε! Με τους αφορισμούς οι στόλοι δεν καταστρέφονται. Θέλουνε και μάχη.
—Να χαθήτε **που** δεν πιστεύετε στην παντοδυναμία του Κυρίου ημών.
—ayie pelayie! me tus aforismus i stoli den katastrefode. thelune ke maxi.
—na xathite pu den pistevete stin padoδinamia tu kiriu imon.
['May you become lost that you don't believe...']
“Saint Pelagius! Fleets are not destroyed by excommunication. They need battle, too.”
“Get lost, for not believing in the omnipotence of Our Lord!” (TsifC 275)

- Unlike many other instances, pu is not paradigmatically related to na in introducing a complement of hortative ade. An action encouraged to be done with ade must still be unrealised, whereas pu entails that the action is already realised:

- (6b) ??'Αντε **που** κοιμάσαι
??ade pu kimase
HORT you.sleep (Imperfective Present)
??Go and be already sleeping!

- But ade pu clauses do exist in Greek. In these cases, pu introduces adjuncts rather than complements. Here ade is more an interjection of disbelief or discontent than a hortative, and belongs to the same paradigm as other such interjections, like as sto diaolo 'go to hell' and a paene 'get lost'.

Consider first those clauses where pu contains the future particle θα:

- (7a) [Context: 'Abdullah the Butcher' refutes Kosmetatos' arguments by referring to particulars of the US Air Force in World War II]
Ante re xasapi **που θα** mas pouliseis kai mourι gia WWII :-).
ade re xasapi pu θα mas pulisis (Perfective Present) ke muri για [World War Two] [smiley].
['Go on, hey Butcher, that you will sell us face, too, about WWII']
Oh, go on, 'Butcher'—Show off about World War II, would you? (Paul Kosmetatos (response to 'Abdullah the Butcher'): Re: Xwrika Ydata: TURKEY/GREECE; *Hellas-L* 1995-06-06)

The speaker expresses some discontent or reproof (mild in this case), triggered by the content of the pu θα-clause. This is reminiscent of (6a), where the exclamation is triggered by the pu-clause.

Oddity 1: the *pu* *θα*-clause is in Future tense. Yet its referent is not in the future, but the past.

• Furthermore, as the gloss ‘would you’ shows, the Conditional would make more sense for this clause: ‘You would show off? Go on!’ However, *θα* is Volitive in origin; perhaps the actual import of the *pu* *θα*-clause is ‘you want to talk about WWII’—it is Abdullah’s will which the speaker holds in contempt.

Oddity 2: In (7a), the content of the *pu* *θα*-clause is held in contempt, but it is not denied. For some such clauses, however, the *pu* *θα*-clause is denied—despite there being no overt signals of either negation or irrealis mood (other than the future tense marker *θα*):

(7b) Ο Κονράδος του Μομφερά ξύνισε τα μούτρα.
—Τι ζητείτε, περικαλώ;
—Την Τύρο, απάντησε ο Γκυ. [...]
Ο Κονράδος σηκώθηκε απάνω.
—**Α πάγαινε** ρε, λέει, **που θα** σου δώσω την Τύρο. Εγώ πολέμησα ρε κοκονιόρκο να την κρατήσω και θα στην δώσω εσένα του κιοτή; Α πάγαινε.
o konraðos tu momfera ksinise ta mutra.
“ti zitite, perikalo?”
“tin tiro,” apadise o gi. [...]
o konraðos sikoθike apano.
“a payene re,” lei, “pu θα su ðoso tin tiro. eyo polemisa re kokonioriko na tin kratiso ke θα stin ðoso esena tu kioti? a payene.”
[“Be going, you,” he says, “that I will give you Tyre.”]
Conrad of Montferrat scowled.
“And what would you be after?”
“Tyre”, Guy replied. [...]
Conrad got up.
“Get lost!” he said. “As if I’m going to hand Tyre over to you! I fought to hold on to it, you great big girl’s blouse, and you want me to give it to you now, you coward? Get lost.” (TsifC 228)

In (7a), Kosmetatos does not deny that Abdullah has ‘shown off’ about World War II. In (7b), however, Conrad does deny that he will hand over Tyre to Guy.

The difference between (7a) and (7b) is that the *pu* *θα*-clause lies within the power of the speaker in the former, but not the latter. This seems to be once more a matter of conversational implicature:

I. The speaker is unhappy about the content of the *pu* *θα*-clause.

The *pu* *θα*-clause is a situation outside the speaker’s remedy.

Therefore, the speaker can do nothing about the situation,
but can belittle it or hold it in contempt.

II. The speaker is unhappy about the content of the *pu* *θα*-clause.

The *pu* *θα*-clause is a situation within the speaker’s remedy.

As a maxim of behaviour,

people do not perform actions they don’t like to perform.
Since the speaker can do something about the situation,

the speaker is presumed to have indeed done something about it.
So the pu θα-clause content will not take place.

So there are two pu θα-clause types: Uncontrolled, as in (7a), and Controlled, as in (7b).

- Control is a pragmatic matter, and is independent of grammatical coding. In (7c), although the addressee is the subject of the pu θα-clause, the speakers are still in control of the situation (Coron and Modon are theirs to allow to be gobbled up or not); so the pu θα-clause is Controlled:

(7c) [Context: the French own the forts of Coron and Modon. They are visited by a representative of Venice.]

—Περικαλώ κάντε πέρα καθόσο περί τα Κορωνομεθώνη ενδιαφέρεται ο μπαμπάς [δόγης της Βενετίας].

—*A páaine* re, ékantan oi Fráγκοι, *που θα* μας φας τον τόπο.

“perikalo kante pera kathoso peri ta koronomethoni endiaferete o babas.”

“a paene re,” ekanan i fragi, “pu tha mas fas ton topo.”

[“Be going, you,” said the Franks, “that you will devour the land from us.”]

“Do kindly step aside, as Daddy [the doge of Venice] is interested in Coron and Modon.”

“Get lost!” the French said. “As if you’re going to gobble up our land from under us!” (TsifFU 35)

- The Uncontrolled reading of pu θα is factive: it presupposes (or asserts) the truth of its complement, and is thus consistent with all other usage of pu. But the Controlled reading is anti-factive: it presupposes (or asserts) the falsity of its complement. This is without precedent in Greek.

- Although the choice between factive and anti-factive readings of ade pu θα is still a matter of conversational implicature, the denial consequence of the negative reading is conventionalised. Under no circumstances can an ade pu θα clause communicate grudging acquiescence. If the pu θα-clause is preventable by the speaker, the pu θα-construction signifies that it will in fact be prevented:

(7d) Αει στο διάολο, (Ø/??*και*/**που*) θα σου δώσω την Τύρο!

ai sto diaolo, (Ø/??*ke*/**pu*) tha su doso tin tiro!

To hell with it, I’ll hand Tyre over to you!

This requirement of prevention—that a Controlled pu θα-clause is necessarily false—does not follow from conversational implicature. So it represents a conventional implicature—the first step towards the lexicalisation of this anti-factive sense.

4 . ade pu

There are analogous ade pu-clauses in which θα is absent. The controllability parameter does not apply here: ade pu-clauses are anti-factive, whether or not the pu-clause lies within the power of the speaker. So in (8a), the speaker is

clearly not in control of the addressee's beliefs; nonetheless, the speaker does attempt to deny the truth of the pu-clause:

(8a) «Και μόλις πέθανε, άνοιξε η ψειροθήκη της και την έφαγαν οι ψείρες.»—«**Άντε**, βρε κυρα-Εκάβη,» της λέω, «**που** πιστεύεις σε τέτοιες προλήψεις!»—«Και βέβαια πιστεύω...».

“ke molis pethane, anikse i psirotiki tis ke tin efagan i psires.” “ade, vre kira ekavi,” tis leo, “pu pistevis se teties prolipsis!” “ke vevea pistevo...”.

[“Go on, hey Mrs Hecuba,” I tell her, “that you believe in such superstitions!”]

“And as soon as she died, her louse-case opened up and the lice ate her away.” “Oh come on, Mrs Hecuba,” I told her, “As if you believe in such supersitions!” “Of course I do...”. (Tah 261)

- A second difference from *ade pu tha* is that the content of *ade pu*-clauses are not actions, but facts. As a result, copula clauses can be the argument of *ade pu*, but not *ade pu tha*:

(8b) **άντε να χαθήτε** ρε ρεμάλια, **που** είσαστε σεις για προκοπή
ade na xathite re remalia, pu isaste sis gia prokopi
HORT get lost hey scum that you are you for progress
Get lost you scum! As if any good will ever come of you! (TsifC 247)

- With *ade pu*, the lexicalisation of anti-factivity appears to be complete. There is no context under which *pu* retains its factivity.

But there is a factive exclamatory counterpart to *ade pu*. With *ade pu*, the *pu*-clause is semantically subordinate, and represents a trigger or justification for the matrix exclamation. There is a factive exclamatory construction, in which the *pu*-clause introduces a second exclamation, in parallel with the matrix, and factive though denigrated:

(9) «Φτου σου να χαθείς!» της φωνάζω έξαλλη. «**Που** μας παριστάνεις και την οσία!»
“ftu su na xathis!” tis fonazo eksali. “pu mas paristanis ke tin osia!”

“Get the hell out of here!” I yelled at her in a fury. “And you pretend to us to be a saint!” (Tah 194)

In (9), the referent Erasmia is Pharisaically Christian—she has indeed been ‘pretending to be a saint’. So the *pu*-clause is affirmed, not denied.

The difference between this class of *pu* (Bare *pu* exclamatories) and *ade pu*-constructions is that bare *pu* forms its own independent intonation unit, whereas *ade pu* is still preceded by a non-final intonation break. This is consistently indicated in punctuation: bare *pu* exclamatories are preceded by an exclamation point, while the *pu*-clause in *ade pu*- and *ade pu tha*-constructions are preceded by commas.

Were these two classes of construction to be variants of the same phenomenon—as was the case with *ade pu tha*—there would need to be an identifiable semantic or morphological factor conditioning between the two, which in all other respects should be the same. This seems not to be the case.

In summary:

ade na Affirmative or Negative—conditioned by plausibility of complement
ade pu θa Affirmative or Negative—conditioned by speaker control over
 complement
ade pu Negative—unconditioned, and fully conventionalised

Corpus

Hellas-L: Hellas Electronic Mailing List (achived on <http://www.dejanews.com> as
USENET newsgroup bit.listserv.hellas)

Tah: Tahtsis, K. 1971 [1963]. *Το Τρίτο Στεφάνι* (The Third Wedding). 2nd ed. Athens: Ερμής.

TsifC: Tsiforos, N. 1964. *Σταυροφορίες* (Crusades). Athens: Ερμής.

TsifFU: Tsiforos, N. 1979 [1965]. *Εμείς και οι Φράγκοι* (The Franks and Us). Athens: Ερμής.

References

Mackridge, P. 1985. *The Modern Greek Language: A Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.