BOOK REVIEW


This volume, the most recent addition to the Fondation Hardt’s elegant series Entretiens sur l’Antiquité classique is the first to deal with an explicitly linguistic topic. In keeping with the series’ aim of addressing those issues that have the widest significance to all classicists, editor Andreas Willi organized the proceedings around a suitably ambitious question: What do the linguistic forms we find in Ancient Greek texts—especially those associated with a particular dialect or register—tell us about the broader society in which those texts were being written? How would, say, an Athenian audience have experienced the non-Attic features of the language of tragedy? Or a layperson the technical terms characteristic of scientific writing? Or educated readers of the Second Sophistic the varying degrees of Atticism they would encounter in practically any text? All these questions, and more, are addressed in this collection, and if the overall impression is one of detached snapshots, rather than a cohesive picture, it is only because Willi has ably identified so significant a lacuna in our understanding of Greek linguistic history that it will take many more studies like this to fill the gap.

The nine contributions fall into three groups of three, according to a combination of genre and time period. The opening triad, covering Archaic and Classical poetry, begins with Albio Cassio’s chapter, which considers how epigraphic hexameter engages with Homeric language, first in the Hipponion Tablet, the earliest of the Orphic Totenpäse, then in the relationship between the Simonidean FGE 45 and the epigram from Gergis’ obelisk in Xanthos (CEG 177). Lucia Prauscello likewise works with two contrasting poems, arguing that even the limited number of features of Pindar’s Olympian I that have been seen as Boeotian should not in fact be taken as such, and that CEG 114, a four-line 5th-century epigram from Kopai, with its -o00participle, shows a wider familiarity with Aeolic
lyric language than one might have expected. Willi’s own contribution boldly (and convincingly) gives an overview of the entire panoply of linguistic features of tragedy to work out the effect this register as a whole would have had on its audience. It emerges that the combined result of, especially, syntactic and lexical peculiarities of tragedy (e.g. verbal periphrases, avoidance of the definite article, πρὸς for ἀν) is to create a linguistic register that, on the one hand, prefers to use nominalizations and treat things as examples of types rather than as specific individuals, and, on the other, places high cognitive demands on the audience by, for instance, deploying a compound word when a simplex might do, or by engaging in pragmatically taxing exchanges of stichomythia.

In the second set of contributions, the discussion turns to prose of the Classical period. Alessandro Vatri’s stylistic analysis of Lysias, Isocrates, Aeschines and Demosthenes plots their speeches according to two axes, one running from spontaneous to planned, the other from emotionally involved to detached. Demosthenes scores high on spontaneity and emotional involvement, while Isocrates falls at the other end of the spectrum. The graphs are thought-provoking but some readers may not be convinced by all his criteria: for example, does ἔργο really signal detachment just because it’s impersonal? Next, Luuk Huitink examines the arrival scenes in Xenophon’s Anabasis to show that the historian is a narratological innovator. To a greater extent than his predecessors, Xenophon presents events through the eyes of characters in the story (the “reflector mode”), employing such linguistic features as an increased use of the imperfect, in a way that ultimately looks forward to Fabrice’s confused experience of Waterloo in Stendhal’s Charterhouse of Parma. Francesca Schironi rounds out the section by contrasting the technical lexicon of mathematics with that of other scientific fields. While all specialized terminology draws on the metaphorical use of everyday words together with common Greek derivational morphology, mathematics is somewhat different in being not only more economical, but also more dependent on abstract visualization of the objects described by the terms.

The final triad takes a broader chronological perspective, focusing on post-Classical sociolinguistic attitudes towards different varieties of Greek. Douglas Olson examines the language in four of Alciphron’s Letters of Farmers, suggesting that their Atticizing features derive more from lexicographical handbooks than from careful close reading of canonical texts. Francesca dell’Oro selects three epigrams from widely different sociolinguistic and historical contexts—from CEG 830, a 4th-century BC epigram from a statue of Gorgias of Leontini at Olympia,
to GV 1907, a funerary epigram in honor of an Egyptian doctor who moved in Ambrose’s circle in Milan—to show inter alia the use of Attic as a prestige dialect and continued engagement with Homeric language. In the last contribution, Olga Tribulato surveys the ancient sources that attribute different ethical and psychological characters to the various dialects.

As this overview of the volume’s contents indicates, the range of material covered is very broad indeed—so broad, in fact, that the individual chapters, even when supplemented by the discussion sections characteristic of the series, do not all interconnect as closely as one might like. However unified Willi’s overarching idea for the volume was, it remains a challenge to bring Alciphron, Orphic tablets, and statistical analyses of Attic speeches and all into dialogue with one another. But even if the whole does not quite manage to be greater than the sum of the parts, readers will still profit from the individual studies it contains.
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