

Loudová, Kateřina

[Discourse cohesion in ancient Greek. Edited by Stéphanie Bakker and Gerry Wakker]

*Graeco-Latina Brunensia*. 2010, vol. 15, iss. 1, pp. 138-140

ISSN 1803-7402 (print); ISSN 2336-4424 (online)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/114956>

Access Date: 30. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

BAKKER, STÉPHANIE – WAKKER, GERRY [EDS.]. *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*. Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2009, 284 p. ISBN 978–90–04–17472–6.

The sixteenth volume of the *Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology* book series presents, within a collective monograph named *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*, another contribution on the problem of discourse structure organisation of classical texts. Since the 1980's when functional grammar proved that sentence or discourse analysis can greatly surpass the boundaries of grammar analysis, the pragmatic functional approach has won full recognition in classical philology as well. The application of this method is a very progressive and popular branch in the classical texts linguistics of today. At the same time it is, however, necessary to mention that it was the "Dutch school" that pioneered the usage and the verification of this method in classical texts. The first fruit of that labour was reaped in the 1920's when first publications analysing Greek particles with the help of pragmatically oriented approaches emerged (for all, let us mention at least the monograph by SICKING – VAN OPHUIJSEN 1993<sup>1</sup>). The publishing of the conference proceedings *New Approaches to Greek Particles* in 1997<sup>2</sup> was an enterprise of a great significance; it dealt with Denniston's legacy<sup>3</sup> with dignity and, in the following decade, it started off a real "boom" in the field of discourse markers and discourse structure analysis and analysis of the principles which influence it, both in poetry from Homer onwards and in drama and classical Greek prose. The undoubted success in this field of research subsequently made possible linguistic analysis of narrative structure of classical texts and its "inter-growing" into the area of literary science – in 2007, another collective monograph, *The Language of Literature*,<sup>4</sup> emerged from the pens of – with one exception – solely Dutch scholars.

Now these series of works are enriched by another volume whose starting point was the *6th International Colloquium on Ancient Greek Linguistics* on the topic of discourse cohesion, which took place in Groningen in the Netherlands in 2007. This colloquium truly complied with the original meaning of the word, because, as editors Stéphanie Bakker and Gerry Wakker state in the Introduction (p. xi), it was held in the form of discussions on the papers which the authors had provided the participants of the meeting with in advance. Thus the final publication is not a typical example of conference proceedings, but, again, rather a collective monograph, although most of the published contributions were a part of the Groningen colloquium. The semantic content of the term "collective monograph" was also entirely fulfilled in the book presented: an achievement which is by no means to be taken for granted today. The book shows its collective spirit in the best sense of the word. It is obvious from the authors' notes and thank-you notes to colleagues that since the first version presented at the colloquium, the contributions underwent development or corrections, and the "acknowledgement" of the problems of the presented hypotheses which have not been solved so far seems fair. The topic of this volume also meets the requirements for a monograph if we understand it as a scholarly detailed study on a single subject, which in this case is discourse cohesion in Ancient Greek created by grammatical cohesion devices (e.g. pronouns, conjunctive particles or use of tenses), presented with an exceptional scope and depth of knowledge on the authors' part, including intra-disciplinary topics. Based on those, the book is divided into three thematic wholes.

1 SICKING, CHRISTIAAN M. J. – VAN OPHUIJSEN, JOHANNES M. 1993. *Two studies in Attic particle usage: Lysias and Plato*. Leiden et al.: Brill.

2 RIJKSBARON, ALBERT [ED.]. 1997. *New Approaches to Greek Particles. Proceedings of the Colloquium held in Amsterdam, January 4–6, 1996, to Honour C. J. Ruijgh on the Occasion of his Retirement*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.

3 DENNISTON, JOHN D. 1934. *The Greek Particles* (1950<sup>2</sup>. *The Greek Particles. Revised by K. J. Dover*). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

4 RUTGER, ALLAN J. – BUIJS, MICHEL [EDS.]. 1997. *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts*. Leiden et al.: Brill.

Chapters 1–3 consist of studies devoted to various devices marking familiarity of information provided by an utterance: Anna Bonifazi focuses on third person pronouns in Homer, above all the difference in the usage of *κεῖνος* and *αὐτός* which depends on specific communicative intentions; Luuk Huitink reveals the pragmatic distinction between participles and *ᾄτι*-clauses dependent on cognitive verbs: the first provide pragmatically presupposed information while the second provide asserted information; and Stéphanie Bakker reanalyses the function of the particle *οὖν* in *γὰρ οὖν* in Plato's dialogues. In her opinion, here the *οὖν* indicates that the information provided is generally accessible or to be expected from the preceding discourse.

The second topic presented in the chapters 4–8 is the analysis of Greek particles as a grammatical cohesion device that is also capable of structuring texts and thus takes part in creating cohesion. Gerry Wakker analyses the function of connective particles *οὖν* and *τοίνυν* in Lysias and although she characterizes both of them as POP-particles, they carry different semantic value – the first one is a presentational text structuring particle, the second one is both a presentational (i.e. text structuring particle) and an attitudinal particle (i.e. modal particle). Antonio Revuelta Puigdollers describes, in his revised and slightly modified version of the paper published in the conference proceedings from the *ICGL-8* (Ioannina 2007),<sup>5</sup> the use of particles *αὖ* and *αὖτε* as topicalising devices contributing to discourse cohesion and marking discourse boundaries. Marietje van Erp Taalman Kip discusses the entry-marking particles *καὶ μὴν* and *καὶ δὴ* in tragedy (Sophocles, Euripides) and comedy (Aristophanes), assuming that *καὶ δὴ* marks an entry prepared in the foregoing lines, while *καὶ μὴν* seems to imply a shift in the focus of attention and marks some kind of incision, i.e. an entry which was not prepared for by the preceding words. Annemieke Drummen also stays in the area of drama and undertakes the task to investigate the function of turn-initial *ἀλλά* in the large corpus of Attic drama (Aristophanes, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides). At turn beginnings, she interprets it as a correction of the preceding words or actions, most often (about 70 % of all instances) as a correction of an implication. This discourse-boundaries oriented section appropriately closes the more general study by Coulter George, who on the basis of the polemics with Duhoux's conclusions that particles are more typical of written than of spoken Greek reanalyses this question. He concludes that particles are in fact more typical of dialogical Greek than it has been argued until now. The more dialogical particles are generally interactional (*δή*, *τοίνυν*, *δῆτα*) while the particles which occur more frequently in non-dialogical Greek function primarily at the representational and presentational levels of discourse (*καί*, *τε*, *οὖτε*).

The following three chapters, 9–11, deal with tense and aspect usage in Ancient Greek texts and they show that these also play an important role in text structuring, just like particles. Rutger Allan introduces a typology of four distinct narrative modes in Ancient Greek (displaced and immediate diegetic mode, descriptive mode and discursive mode) and argues that tense-aspect-marking is the most important distinctive linguistic feature of narrative modes. At the end of the paper, an excellent analysis of the messenger speech in Euripides' *Andromache* follows where the function of narrative modes within the larger organisation of the narrative is demonstrated. Louis Basset deals with the aspectual opposition between the present and the aorist stem when a Greek verb in a narrative is accompanied by an adverbial expression of duration. In Herodotus' *Histories*, he observes that the present stem may be used without an imperfective meaning when the state of affairs in question is inserted into a natural narrative sequence. Then it may be called continuative and opposed to a discontinuative aorist. According to Basset, this use of the present stem is related to the structure of the narrative and reinforces the narrative cohesion. Sander Orriens shows that the perfect may be used

<sup>5</sup> REVUELTA PUIGDOLLERS, ANTONIO R. 2009. „Particles and discourse cohesion in Ancient Greek“ [document in PDF format]. In GIANNAKIS, GIORGOS K. – BALTAZANI, MARIA – TSANGALIDIS, TASOS – XYDOPOULOS, GIORGOS J. [EDS.]. *8th International Conference of Greek Linguistics (Ioannina 2007)*, 2009, 394–405. Available from URL <[http://www.linguist-uoι.gr/cd\\_web/docs/english/030\\_RevueltaICGL8.pdf](http://www.linguist-uoι.gr/cd_web/docs/english/030_RevueltaICGL8.pdf)> [cit. 2010–02–28].

as a situating cohesion device for the explicit marking of an extra-textual coherence relationship between a past state of affairs and the present communication.

The monograph closes with a paper by Albert Rijksbaron (chapter 12) who discusses various cohesion devices that occur in the proem of Hesiod's *Theogony*. Rijksbaron shows that although at first glance the proem does not seem to be a very coherent passage, the correct understanding of various tenses and adverbs leads to a much more coherent interpretation than is usually assumed.

The presented volume by its scholarly qualities confirms and even exceeds the expectations of anyone who deals with Greek linguistics, and thanks to its overlaps into the interpretation of Greek narrative as a whole it may be useful to literary scholars too, because it makes better interpretation of classical texts possible. Apart from the scholarly qualities of the individual contributions, it is also necessary to appreciate the graphic design of the book, including the attached *Index Locorum* (p. 279–282) and the *General Index* containing the core terminology of the subject discussed and a separate list of the particles included in the research (p. 283–284). Taking into account the demandingness of the edition of the 284-paged publication, it is possible to leave aside the occasional typos (e.g. p. 80: ayndetic, p. 179, footnote 22: *θέαματα*). However, the relatively frequent disharmony between the bibliographic references in the text and the bibliography listed collectively on pages 267–278 appears to be more problematic. This “disharmony” lies in, above all, wrongly quoted works, e.g. p. 172, footnote 6: De Jong (1990), but in *Bibliography* there is no such item – probably De Jong (1991) was meant; p. 175–176, footnotes 15 and 16: Rijksbaron (2006: 5) or (2006: 6) respectively, but the paper in the cited volume ranges from p. 127 to p. 149 as stated in the *Bibliography*; p. 218, footnote 24: Basset (2003a: 1–7), but the paper in the cited volume ranges from p. 173 to p. 187 etc. Mistakes of formal character are frequent too: e.g. p. 175, footnote 14: Rijksbaron (2002b), but the *Bibliography* includes neither this item, nor Rijksbaron (2002<sup>3</sup>a), which is referred to on the same page in the example 1); cp. also the resignation towards the unity in stating reprinted editions (e.g. p. 182: Bal 1997 and Bal 1997<sup>2</sup>) or the incomplete bibliographic details (p. 277: Tomachevski 2001, there is no reference to the range of pages). Despite these slightly confusing drawbacks of mostly formal character, it must be said that, taken as a whole, the volume represents an invaluable aid for everyone who intends to analyse Greek texts within the framework of the functional-cognitive approach, to continue the research on the subject or to simply understand Ancient Greek better.

Kateřina Loudová\*

\* This contribution was written under the auspices of the *Centre for Interdisciplinary Research into Ancient Languages and Early Stages of Modern Languages* (MSM 0021622435) at Masaryk University in Brno, Czech Republic.

BARTONĚK, ANTONÍN. *Ancient Greek Dialects*. Brno: Masaryk University, 2009, 294 pages. ISBN 978–80–210–4993–2.

The publication *Ancient Greek Dialects* describes the development of the Greek dialects from the very beginning of the Greek history till the Hellenistic period. As professor Bartoněk states in the preface, the book deals with a summary of this issue in a form which is more coherent than the form present in his previous work. The book also newly contains features such as explanations of the origins of the Greek alphabet, dialect differences in the declension of Greek nouns and the conjugation of Greek verbs, ethnic and dialect character of the Greek colonisation areas, various types of Greek pre-Hellenistic and even Hellenistic Koine, and the dialects of the main Ancient Greek genres of literature. The book reflects the author's long-term research interest in this topic which initiated the rise of a range of previous studies, some of the most important ones being *Development of the Long-Vowel System in Ancient Greek Dialects*, Prague: Spisy UJEP, 1966; *Classification of the*