

Citation style

Perdicoyianni-Paléologou, Hélène: Rezension über: Jana Mikulová, Evolution of Direct Discourse Marking from Classical to Late Latin, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2022, in: Plekos. Elektronische Zeitschrift für Rezensionen und Berichte zur Erforschung der Spätantike, 26 (2024), S. 709-711, heruntergeladen über Website



copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

Jana Mikulová: *Evolution of Direct Discourse Marking from Classical to Late Latin*. Leiden/Boston: Brill 2022 (*The Language of Classical Literature* 37). IX, 147 p., 11 ill., 20 tables. € 126.26/\$ 142.00. ISBN: 978-90-04-52499-6.

The present volume examines the non-classical system of direct discourse marking as it appears in selected texts dating from time of Cicero up to the end of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century CE. Jana Mikulová touches on the following questions: 1) identifying changes in the choice and frequency of methods of direct discourse marking; 2) investigating the start date of the application of new methods, their increased frequency and grammaticalization; 3) determining factors that could lead to the changes, distribution and variation in the methods for marking direct discourse.

Chapter 1 (pp. 1–8) represents a short introduction in which Mikulová briefly explains the aim of her work, its organization, the corpus of selected texts and data set for the analysis.

Chapter 2, “Theoretical Preliminaries” (pp. 9–37), provides a discussion about the definition of direct discourse (pp. 11–18), an examination of structures similar to direct discourse (pp. 19–27) as well as an overview of direct discourse markers (pp. 27–35). First, Mikulová admits that she generally follows approaches based on cognitive linguistics that are grounded in shifts and the relationship between deictic centers of the current and represented speakers. She, however, combines different perspectives and a complete cognitive approach with syntactic characteristics, the compatibility with certain expressions excluded from indirect discourse (e.g. imperatives, vocatives) and the number of speech situations. Second, she explores the structures similar to direct discourse. She highlights main characteristics of pure quotations, mixed quotations as well as the strengthening of the illocutionary force of an utterance. This leads her to show that the classification of an instance can be ambiguous and unclear. Next, she outlines the variety of means for marking direct discourse, such as pauses, intonation and gestures through verbs, nouns, pronouns, adverbs, conjunctions, particles and punctuation. Finally, she divides explicit markers into two groups: 1) verbal markers, which include different markers and support verb constructions; 2) non-verbal markers, i. e. expressions that indicate direct discourse but do not contain any verbal form, such as proper names, nouns, pronouns referring to speaking characters. Unmarked quotations, that is represented dialogues,

make up the category of zero markers. Their interpretation as quotations relies mostly on the context. According to Mikulová, the absence of quotation marks is connected to the identification of zero-marked quotations and might have influenced the use of overtly expressed markers. The chapter ends with author's remarks on how new quotative markers appear and how they can have an impact of a marking system (pp. 35–37).

Chapter 3, “The Marking of Direct Discourse in the Examined Texts” (pp. 38–106), investigates the development of direct discourse markers from three points of view: 1) the choice of marker type and individual markers; 2) the frequency of individual markers; 3) the characteristics of individual markers. First, Mikulová examines verbal markers (pp. 39–85). She considers generic verbs with the meaning ‘to say’, ‘to tell’, ‘to speak’ (p. 39; *inquit, ait, dicere, loqui*), specific and frequent verbs, such as *respondere* ‘to answer’ and *clamare* ‘to shout’ (ibid.) and its compounds as well as less frequent specific verbs with the meaning ‘to add’ (p. 71; *adicere, addere, subicere*). Second, she outlines non-verbal markers including expressions in reporting clauses that contain a verb that can mark a quotation, which is introduced only by a nominal expression (pp. 85–90). Next, she studies zero markers, e.g. the absence of an overt marker (pp. 90–94). Zero-marked quotations are examined by taking in consideration the immediate context, common knowledge, and the grammatical characteristics of direct discourse. After that, she lays the stress on multiple marking of one and the same quotation by two verbs of speech, its use and its degrees of redundancy (pp. 94–106). The examination of direct discourse markers is based on the following criteria: 1) the frequency of markers in different texts and periods; 2) the morphological forms in which markers appear; 3) their use in monologue and/or dialogue; 4) their syntactic construction. Indeed, verbal markers are modified by adverbials, or cataphoric elements that introduce a quotation; 5) their position and adjacency to direct discourse; 6) the type of subject that verbal markers take; 7) the use of typical and repeated patterns.

Chapter 4, “Discussion” (pp. 107–127), analyzes the use and main characteristics of direct discourse markers. In fact, the use of markers changed over time but there is no replacement of the old system by a new one (pp. 107–112). Furthermore, an enlargement of available means and a decrease in frequency and change in use of some classical markers and marking strategies are revealed. Then, Mikulová deals with the factors that could have influenced the use of markers (pp. 112–124). Those factors are subdivided into

two categories: 1) factors for diachronic trends, e.g. those that could contribute to the development from classical to late Latin; 2) “[s]ubjective [f]actors” (p. 118) referring to the style and choices of individual authors.

The last chapter summarizes the development of markers over centuries, which is characterized by a greater diversity of markers as well as by greater differences among individual authors for individual purposes (pp. 128–131).

In sum, the book represents the first approach of the evolution of direct discourse marking system from classical to late Latin. In the light of well-chosen texts and marking means, Mikulová describes thoroughly the dynamics of change and the factors that could have led to it. The book is also so rich in fineness and precision that it constitutes an excellent piece of scholarly work, which is highly recommended to students and learned persons interested in Latin syntax.

Hélène Perdicoyianni-Paléologou, University of Johannesburg
Department of Languages, Cultural Studies and Applied Linguistics
Senior Research Associate
hperdicpal@gmail.com

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Hélène Perdicoyianni-Paléologou: Rezension zu: Jana Mikulová: Evolution of Direct Discourse Marking from Classical to Late Latin. Leiden/Boston: Brill 2022 (The Language of Classical Literature 37). In: Plekos 26, 2024, S. 709–711 (URL: <https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2024/r-mikulova.pdf>).

Lizenz: Creative Commons BY-NC-ND
