

Recent work in Greek and Latin linguistics has been particularly influenced by advances in the field of pragmatics, emphasizing the role that context plays in determining the form that language takes. This trend has led to a renewed interest in the study of particles in the classical languages, as these are words that are receptive to pragmatic analysis because of their role as signposts guiding the addressee along the line of thought expressed by the speaker. What is not clear, however, is whether this central function of particles was more characteristic of the written or of the spoken language. While Denniston maintained that Greek conversation was rich in particles, Duhoux has argued that they were in fact more common in non-dialogical texts and therefore more typical of written Greek. Although these two views might at first seem irreconcilable, a closer look at the figures presented by Duhoux can lead to a more nuanced intermediate position.

To reach such a synthesis, one must first consider which particles are used in which discourse types. Duhoux's own figures show that it is a handful of nearly exclusively connective particles (δέ, καί, μέν, οὐδέ, οὔτε, τε) that occur more often in non-dialogical texts than in dialogical texts. By contrast, the particles that are found more frequently in dialogical texts are much wider in range: the inferential particles οὐκοῦν, οὖν, τοίνυν, and ἄρα; the interrogative particle ἄρα; the focus particle γε; and the modal particles δή, δήτα, and ἦ. Duhoux gives more weight to the non-dialogical particles because they include the three particles that are the most common in all types of text: καί, δέ, and μέν. Because these particles are so much more common, the overall particle frequency is skewed higher in non-dialogical texts, even though a greater number of *distinct* particles occur more often in dialogical texts. Furthermore, Denniston's comments did not refer to all particles as a whole, but specifically to a handful of modal and focus particles. Duhoux is right to point out that καί and δέ are more typical of non-dialogical text, but Denniston is equally justified in saying the opposite of γε and δήτα.

A further refinement in our understanding of the various particles' proclivity to dialogue can be achieved by subdividing discourse types into finer gradations than Duhoux's dichotomy of dialogical and non-dialogical texts. In particular, following Kroon, one may introduce the concept of diaphony: a discourse type that is monological, but nevertheless has dialogical elements, such as the presence of first- and second-person pronouns, vocatives, metadiscursive expressions (e.g. *as I was saying*) and rhetorical questions. As it happens, two particles, μήν and μέντοι, that had come across in Duhoux's study as being particularly prone neither to dialogical nor to non-dialogical texts are in fact found commonly in such diaphonic discourse. To give one example, μήν, according to Duhoux, is said to occur in Xenophon's *Symposium* twenty-five times in non-dialogical passages, but only eight times in dialogical passages. It is true that only seven examples of μήν in this work occur in the first sentence of a speaker's turn and are therefore clear examples of a dialogical use. But three more times, it occurs in the second or third sentence of a turn, and should also be considered dialogical; furthermore, there are twelve examples of μήν in sentences that, though in the middle of a turn, nevertheless contain a first-person pronoun or verb form. In a further eight passages, there is other evidence for diaphony, such as the fact that the host-unit is a rhetorical question. In only three examples does μήν occur in a truly monological context. A similar situation obtains with μέντοι. In short, with an only slightly broader conception of what constitutes the sort of interactional speech that would have been typical of spoken Greek, particles that might otherwise have been characterized as non-dialogical instead seem as conversational as Denniston would have them be.

## Bibliography

- Duhoux, Y. (1997a) “Grec écrit et grec parlé: Une étude contrastive des particules aux V<sup>e</sup>–IV<sup>e</sup> siècles,” in *New Approaches to Greek Particles*, ed. A. Rijksbaron. Amsterdam: 15–48.
- Duhoux, Y. (1997b) “Quelques idées reçues, et néanmoins fausses, sur les particules grecques,” *L’antiquité classique* 66: 281–8.
- Kroon, C. (1995) *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. Amsterdam.