

Eleanor Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address From Herodotus to Lucian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, xxi + 335 pp., ISBN 0-19-815054-7.

Let me begin by congratulating Ms. Dickey for producing what is a highly successful study of Greek forms of address. The kernel of the work is embodied in chapter 3, where Dickey presents the forms of address in her corpus, and discusses them in ten sections classified on a lexical or semantic basis (cross-sections of age, relationship, gender, and attitudes such as respect, insult, and politeness). She gives a reasoned declaration of her departure from the traditional classification based on grammatical categories. This chapter is complemented by an exhaustive appendix of references to all passages with addresses (except those in the form of proper names), a conspectus which enables a critical reading of the evidence and D.'s interpretation of it. This generous offering of carefully collected data which the author shares with the reader has the added value of enabling him, provoked to thoughts throughout this stimulating book, to pursue these independently. The inclusion of such appendices has sporadic precedents, but has recently been developing into something of a trend (see for example the appendices in Sicking and Stork's 1996 book *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*) and D.'s book sets a good example. In addition to a very convenient and organized collection of the various addresses, D.'s work accounts for discrepancies between address and non-address use of each word treated. Reference is made to the usage of lexically analogous addresses in English, both when this usage is similar, and when different. Comparisons and contrasts are also drawn with notable phenomena in other languages, mostly in their modern colloquial form. This central chapter goes far beyond a catalogue of forms and a series of tables; it contributes not only to our understanding of individual terms, but to the system of address as a whole.

Apart from Chapter 3, I found Chapter 2 — discussing method and scope — the most stimulating and thought-provoking chapter, even though I do not agree entirely with all of Dickey's opinions. My preference is a matter of taste and individual interests and in no way suggests criticism of the other chapters. D. suggests that the strict division between written and spoken language must be reassessed and prefers to distinguish genres within a language (pp. 30f.). Without resolving this question, D. reminds us of its complex nature. I shall return to this later. Chapter 4 was, perhaps because of the focus and scope of the work, very brief in its treatment, but raised interesting points about the use of the vocative in the sentence and in the text rather than the address system and its lexical reflections.

The work as a whole succeeds in describing the address system of classical Greek prose as reflected in a corpus which includes most of the important authors. In addition, the work raises — and overwhelmingly resolves — many questions which go beyond a synchronic description of a closed corpus that often typifies studies of a purely philological nature. Simply stated, this work is essential for those philologists of classical Greek who want an exhaustive, deep understanding of the address system of Greek, to complement other specialized monographs which not only supplement, but redefine our picture of classical Greek as drawn by the *Lexica* and *Grammars*. This study is equally informative for and accessible to students of sociolinguistics, ancient history, and Greek literature, and offers the added value of exposing scholars in all of these disciplines to methods and modes of argumentation with which they might have been less familiar before encountering the book. To give just one example, historians could benefit from the

discussion in section 3.2 where a highly illuminating application is made of the principle that a word used in address may have an entirely different meaning than when used not in address (referentially).

Dickey manages to account for the entire evidence of the rather large corpus she has chosen, in itself no small accomplishment, and at the same time to refer to the evidence for other important *Textsorte*, such as poetry, collected by Wendel and others (including D. herself), for the sake of comparison and contrast, in order to put the evidence for prose into a broader perspective of Greek. She does this not by mechanically quoting findings of earlier scholars, but by checking them and in a sense embracing them into her study. This is one of the advantages of the book, but also highlights one of the difficult problems in this type of research, inevitably reflected also in D.'s study on the Greek address system. The tradition of drawing a division (sometimes impermeable) between poetry and prose has become more or less canonical, and indeed D. battles with this both in her *projet méthodique* (notably on pages 20 and 40) and in her treatment of the evidence. Although she decides in principle to exclude all metrical material, she has in fact meticulously checked the evidence from Aristophanes and Menander. In practice she admits on many occasions the similarity between patterns and usage of Menander and those of prose; for example on page 49 she concludes that Menander and prose share the norm of the speaker using the name of the addressee when he knows the name and the addressee belongs to the category of people who are named. These and other similarities (observed by D. *passim*) suggest that D.'s inclusion of evidence from non-prose authors into her overall picture of the description of a phenomenon of conversational Greek is not only instinctively correct, but needs to be taken into a reworked account of the lines along which divisions of register and genre ought to be made. I find it problematic to define a corpus of conversational register which excludes drama and perhaps here I differ with D. (pp. 40f.). Is the border dividing metrical from non-metrical material less penetrable than that which divides conversation from non-conversation? D. herself admits a need for caution with long monologues in a corpus of conversational material, and also admits the flexibility of metre in Comic texts. Even without these caveats, in a work discussing not merely register, but the quintessentially dialogic features of address, the line of demarcation I would prefer for defining the corpus would be one of dialogue versus non-dialogue rather than one of prose vs. non-prose (as reflected in non-metrical versus metrical material, respectively).

Noteworthy among forms of address discussed in chapter 3 is the section on the use of Roman names (3.1.4) and especially the *cognomen* element, which we learn does not have a Greek counterpart. D.'s treatment of differing use among authors of different periods and styles is sensitive and consistent throughout.

The lack of *cognomen* in classical Greek brings me to D.'s comparison (pp. 45f.) of classical Greek with modern Egyptian Arabic. For Greek she states that 'in address as in reference, the usual form was the given name alone'. D. contrasts this finding with English usage, where title and last name ('TLN') as well as first name ('FN') are used, in different, identifiable, contexts. As with other forms of address or other phenomena, where there is a discrepancy with English, D. notes here a similarity with another language. This comparison made me think of classical literary Arabic, where there is a tradition of using patronymics and what I might call paedonymics ('father of x', 'mother of x') as well as other names (the common term for such substitutes being *kunya*), and nicknames (termed *laqab*). In fact classical literary Arabic features complex systems of

nomenclature and of address (the four dimensions are *ism*, *kunya*, *laqab* and *nasb*) in which a wide range of combinations is open. The use of the *kunya* in some genres (e.g. the written corpus of originally oral traditions, the *hadith*), where genealogy and identity are paramount motivations and the mode is referential, is different from the *kunya*'s use in the rhetorical and sociolinguistically rich contexts of literary rhesis and dialogue and in recreations of everyday speech. The discrepancy between classical literary Arabic and classical Greek prose should perhaps have been mentioned alongside the surprising similarity D. discovers between modern Arabic and classical Greek. The relationship between the normal terms for a given dyad in the two languages perhaps needs further study. Classical literary Arabic is not the only language which perhaps could afford more study in this respect, but comparison with research in other classical literary languages (sometimes referred to as 'dead' languages) ought also to be included.

I was pleased to find the distinction D. drew (p. 192) between the high rate of address forms in short interactions (in Herodotus) and the low rate in continuous dialogue in Plato (she checked *Rep.IV*). I would take this further and suggest that in Herodotus the speech is quoted whereas in Plato the exchange is presented in a more intricate form of quotation. It would be interesting to know whether Dickey found that in quoted speech forms of address are particularly common. This seems to have been the case for Homer, for example, and for oral literature or literature written in that tradition (I have found interesting distributions of address frequency in Apollonius of Rhodes). Within her discussion of address frequency, D. raises a few possibilities, and I agree with her that addresses may be used for rhetorical purposes as well as for identification (in her words: marking climaxes rather than a change of interlocutors). After giving the (extremely rhetorical) example of the Melian dialogue in Thucydides, D. quotes a passage from an article on sex-related differences in address systems (C. Kramer, *Anthropological Linguistics*, 17 (1975) p. 207) which may of course support her argument that terms of address may be used for rhetorical effect. However, Kramer's frequent coupling of terms of address with exclamation-points or question-marks rather than with 'calm' sentences like 'The snow is pretty, Jane.' is, in my opinion, more specifically an observation on the sentence-types, or illocutionary modes most compatible with terms of address rather than on rhetorical effect: exclamations and questions (as well, I might add, as expressive sentences in declarative form) are put into opposition with non-expressive statements. The distinction made by Kramer is on the level of the sentence, whereas D. makes it on the level of the discourse. It would be highly interesting, I think, to study the correlation between the frequency of address forms (vocatives in Greek) and sentences *not* oriented to the addressee. A precedent of sorts in the context of exclamations and interjections in a dead language is offered by Hermann Grapow (*Wie die Alten Ägypter sich anredeten, wie sie sich grüssten und wie sie miteinander sprachen*² (Berlin, 1960)) on page 79, where addresses in exclamations are studied in their syntactic environment. Further remarks on possible syntactic roles for vocatives in Latin, another dead language, are made by Riselada (*Imperatives and Other Directive Expressions in Latin* (Amsterdam, 1993)) whose study also includes a broad range of sentence-forms which share illocutionary modes and some orientation to an addressee. To carry this further, at the risk of grossly overstepping the professed scope of D.'s study (e.g. page 5 inclusion of 'free' forms and exclusion of 'bound' forms from the discussion), but with the benefit of illustrating how stimulating it is, I suggest that a highly interesting line of inquiry would be to study the use — or effect — of Greek forms of address in non-second person environments. Leaving the syntactic

question, and returning to the scope of D.'s book, perhaps inclusion of the phenomenon of phatic speech in her discussion of address frequency (4.1), and its ramifications in literary versus conversational registers, would be an interesting dimension to pursue, a dimension introduced in passing in Risselada's discussion of register and work with a dead literary language.

Let me conclude by repeating that it is one of the merits of D.'s book, and particularly of chapters 2 and 4, that questions which do not directly serve to answer the main thrust of her work (chapter 3 which is superlative, and chapter 5) are raised — but of equal importance are the questions Dickey's work stimulate in the reader. I apologize for illustrating how stimulating this book was by overcrowding the review with such questions, many of which would not have been born had I not read the book.

Donna Shalev

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

M.L. Clarke, *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey*, revised and with a new introduction by D.H. Berry, London and New York: Routledge, 1996, 206 pp.

M.L. Clarke's book came out in 1953, and the first edition has a certain look of wartime 'utility'. It was reprinted with corrections in 1966, and many a teacher has recommended it with confidence to students in need of an accessible and interesting introduction to Roman rhetoric in its historical context. It has stood the test of time, and now appears in paperback. It has not been reset or substantially revised. Instead, Dr Berry, who has himself produced a fine commentary on Cicero's *Pro Sulla*, has supplied a new introduction (whose notes give some account of two topics passed over by Clarke, memorisation and prose rhythm), and what was lacking before, a Bibliography. The latter is 'free-standing', and does not reflect any updating of Clarke's notes. It is perhaps a pity that the opportunity has not been taken to direct readers towards the best editions, commentaries and translations of the major rhetorical texts (for instance, Harry Caplan's invaluable Loeb of the *Ad Herennium*). But it is good to see this excellent survey refurbished to take us, as they say, into the twenty-first century. How about a similar injection of new life into S.F. Bonner's remarkable *Roman Declamation*, which came out not long before Clarke's book and makes an admirable companion volume to it?

Michael Winterbottom

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

Robert Wardy, *The Birth of Rhetoric*, London and New York: Routledge, 1996, viii + 197 pp.

Roman Eloquence, edited by William J. Dominik, London and New York: Routledge, 1997, xii + 268 pp.

Dire L'Évidence, textes réunis par Carlos Lévy et Laurent Pernot, Paris and Montreal: Éditions L'Harmattan, 1997, 448 pp.

Wardy's title, *The Birth of Rhetoric*, gives no very clear idea of what his book is about. In fact, he is concerned to tell, but also to rethink, the familiar story of the early stages of the quarrel between rhetoric and philosophy: the story of how Plato's contempt for the