

Pinpointing Linguistic Emphasis in Classical Greek

Alessandro Vatri | ORCID: 0000-0003-3190-5593

Department of Classics and Ancient History, Durham University,
Durham, United Kingdom
Alessandro.Vatri@durham.ac.uk

Received 4 November 2022 | Accepted 30 March 2023 |

Published online 8 May 2024

Abstract

Emphasis is a ubiquitous notion in classical scholarship, but its vagueness has repeatedly been criticized (and its usefulness, consequently, questioned) by Greek linguists. This brief study seeks to identify (and secure) a place for this notion in the analytical toolbox for the description of Classical Greek by applying the strict but nuanced definition of emphasis in Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008) to the identification and classification of linguistic devices in the ancient language. In particular, this study argues for a distinction between emphasis as a rhetorical effect and emphasis as a communicative intention. In the former understanding, emphasis may be produced secondarily by a number of linguistic and rhetorical devices. Conversely, linguistic emphasis *stricto sensu* would only be conveyed by linguistic devices used primarily to intensify linguistic entities of any level (discourse acts, propositional contents, subacts).

Keywords

emphasis – information structure – Functional Discourse Grammar – pragmatics – Greek linguistics

1 Introduction

The notion of emphasis has its root in classical rhetoric, where the term ἔμφασις/*emphasis* encompassed a variety of meanings (from ‘expressive representation’ to ‘allusiveness’) that do not correspond to the sense with which this term is commonly used in modern scholarship.¹ In classical studies, “emphasis” is a term of choice for describing an expression as particularly “intense”. This is often done on the basis of a commentator’s interpretation of a passage, but “intensity” is also frequently inferred from specific linguistic phenomena, most of which, however, are better captured by different notions. The purpose of this article is to verify the applicability of a strict definition of emphasis as a linguistic phenomenon to the description of Classical Greek.

In particular, this brief contribution will seek to disentangle emphasis from other pragmatic relations (e.g. focus). Such a distinction is clearly made by the theory of Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG, Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008), a typologically-based linguistic framework that assigns a prominent role to pragmatics and has proven especially effective in modelling a number of linguistic phenomena in Ancient Greek.² The identification of Ancient Greek structures that instantiate what FDG labels as emphasis presented in this study is intended as a primer for analytical investigation as well as a stimulus for further theoretical reflection.

2 Emphasis in Classical Scholarship: a Brief Survey

One of the features that are intuitively associated with emphasis is paralinguistic marking. The “intensity” that this notion is supposed to describe may be conveyed by means of intonation in speaking and (typo)graphically in writing. This type of information, however, was by and large not recorded in ancient literary texts since the earliest stages in their transmission and may not, as such, be used as a diagnostic for emphatic expressions in Classical Greek. As a consequence, modern readers are generally left to rely on their own sensitivities, which in a number of cases translates into the ascription of emphasis to linguistic patterns that foreground certain linguistic elements against the rest of the utterance.

1 See Salomone 1998; Chiron 2001, 201–204; Rijksbaron 2007, 122.

2 See e.g. Bakker 2009a, 22–23.

In some cases, commentators mention that words or expressions are emphatic without further elaboration.³ Otherwise, emphasis is connected explicitly to some sort of formal markedness, which may involve both linguistic and narratological/structural features. These include the deployment of specific narrative motifs⁴ or, for instance, the use of vocabulary, themes, and literary devices associated with a specific genre in texts of a different genre,⁵ whose (co-)occurrence is naturally foregrounded. A rhetorical device like litotes—a form of understatement—has also been regarded as potentially emphatic.⁶

Such identifications of emphasis seem to correspond to an understanding of this phenomenon as the effect of expressions that draw attention to themselves. In the scholarly literature, this has also been perceived to be the consequence of the positioning of linguistic expressions in the linear order of the sentence. As such, word order would provide an objective criterion for the identification of emphatic elements in Classical Greek. For example, emphasis was (notoriously) invoked as one of the conditions for the preposing of adjectives in noun phrases by Bergson.⁷ At a higher level, the position of sentence-initial constituents is often regarded as emphatic⁸ and so is the initial embedding of subordinate clauses.⁹

Such a use of the notion of emphasis in stylistic/linguistic analysis has been forcefully criticized for its vagueness and crudeness¹⁰ and is largely surpassed in linguistically-oriented research. What commentators may describe as “emphatic” for lack of a better term is often marked from the point of view of information structure, and its communicative effect is more accurately captured by analytical categories that refer to the pragmatic functions of linguistic

3 For example: Todd 2007, 469 on the emphatic use of the compound verb συντριπαρχέω at Lys. 6.47; Porter 2016, 94 on Longin. 9.2 (“the analysis concerns thought and it emphatically excludes language”; the expression Porter regards as emphatic would presumably be καὶ φωνῆς δῖχα, with emphasis being produced by “adverbial” καί, on which see below); Too 2008, 102 describing a sentence-final non-restrictive relative clause at Isoc. 15.14 as a “simple, emphatic sentence”.

4 E.g. what de Jong 2001, 83 calls the “there is a place X” motif (ἔστι δέ τις X) and describes as “an emphatic way of introducing a geographical description”.

5 See e.g. de Jong 2014, 90 on A.R. 4.1773–81: “the narrator emphatically marks the end of his narrative by saying farewell to his heroes in hymnic style, inserting the ending *topos* of the return, using the word ‘end’, and including a *sphragis* (‘may these songs ...’)”.

6 Cf. e.g. Too 2008, 158 on Isoc. 15.131.

7 Bergson 1960, 167–168; see Dik 1997, 59 for a thorough critical discussion.

8 See e.g. Braswell 1988, 150 on initial δὲ θρόνου φωνάς (and postponed interrogative τίς) at Pi. P. 4.63; Finglass 2011, 153 on “emphatically-positioned” ἐγὼ at S. Aj. 51.

9 See e.g. Lazaridis 2007, 211 on the emphatic “anticipation” of relative clauses in Greek proverbs (e.g. Men. 7 Liapis, Sextus *Sententiae* 179).

10 See Dover 1960, 32–34; cf. also Buijs 2005, 78.

elements in discourse. In her discussion of the position of the adjective in noun phrases, Dik, for example, replaces Bergson's "emphasis" with the notion of focus¹¹—a pragmatic relation that was itself defined as an "emphasis" of sorts in the early days of Functional Grammar.¹² Not all that is described as emphatic may be identified as focal though. As Dik herself has shown,¹³ much sentence-initial material in Classical Greek is topical¹⁴ and initial-embedded subordinate clauses may function as extra-clausal themes.¹⁵

On this point, Dik has argued that non-initial occurrences of nominative personal pronouns may not be regarded as emphatic,¹⁶ challenging the traditional view that the explicit use of such forms in a pro-drop language is intrinsically marked. Whether or not Dik is right—which we shall come back to later—the traditional interpretation of optional subject pronouns fits into the common intuition that if something is non-necessary or redundant, it must be "emphatic".¹⁷

Lastly, emphasis has also been recognized as a function of certain particles. In particular, Denniston describes an "emphatic" use of *γε*, *δή*, and *μήν*.¹⁸ The identification of "emphatic" particles is much more nuanced in more recent surveys. For example, the *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek* presents *δή* as an attitudinal particle indicating that the speaker considers the expression obvious or self-evident, while an emphasizing function is recognized for

11 Dik 1997, 57; cf. Bakker 2009b, 42.

12 Cf. Lambrecht 1994, 201 and 207 with further references.

13 See Dik 1995 for a model of Greek word order based on information structure (revised by Matić 2003).

14 So e.g. *δυσθρόου φωνάς* at *Pi. P.* 4.63, with the interrogative *τίς* instantiating focus (cf. n. 8).

15 Cf. Dik 2007, 34–37.

16 Dik 2003.

17 Cf. Pardal Padín 2012, 190. See e.g. the three occurrences of *βούλοιο* in *Pl. R.* 2.360b7–c2, for which "alternative modes of utterance" are envisaged by Dover 1997, 139–140: "plainly the first *βούλοιο* must be spoken with emphasis, but after that we have a choice between reiterated emphasis and minimal emphasis". Cf. also Braswell 1988, 32 on *Pi. P.* 4.118 (... *οὐ ξείναν ἰκάνω γαίαν ἄλλων*): "*ἄλλων* is pleonastic after *ξείναν* but makes the statement more emphatic". Less explicitly Finglass 2011, 166 on *S. Aj.* 96 (*κόμπος πάρεστι κοῦκ ἀπαρνοῦμαι τὸ μή*): "the emphatic formulation 'I say it and do not deny it'", with other literary examples; Todd 2007, 342 on *Lys.* 3.45 (*μόνος Ἀθηναίων ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν ἐξεαυρύχθη*): here *Ἀθηναίων* "may be emphatic, but need not necessarily imply that non-Athenians were so punished on this occasion; simply that it was a particular disgrace for an Athenian" (in Todd's view, the ethnonym would thus be redundant). One may also add the use of *δμως* in the apodosis of concessive clauses; cf. Rijksbaron 2002, 74.

18 Denniston 1954. See also the respective entries in Beekes 2010, who also identifies *ῆ* and the suffix *-χι* as emphatic particles. According to this dictionary, *-χι* and *γε* continue old Indo-European emphatic particles. Cf. also e.g. Bonifazi 2009, 18 on a conjectural emphatic pronunciation of *δ* *γε* at *Il.* 3.409.

ῆ (an “objective emphasizer” indicating “a high level of commitment on the part of the speaker to the truth of the content of an utterance, which is considered to be objectively true”) and μήν (a “subjective emphasizer” indicating “that the speaker is committed to the truth or relevance of his/her utterance, and anticipates or assumes a possible lack of commitment on the part of the addressee”).¹⁹ Analogously, the use of μέντοι in answers is described as that of an emphasizer indicating “that the speaker is committed to the truth or relevance of his statement”,²⁰ with οὐχουν ... γε being its negative counterpart.²¹ In turn, γε is described as a scope particle with a restrictive value, drawing attention on the word it follows and expressing that other things do not matter, which results in its ability to “emphasiz[e] words, phrases or clauses”²² but implies marking contrast as an information-structural function.²³

Based on this survey, the notion of “emphasis” emerges as an umbrella term describing the cognitive effect of expressions that somehow stand out and express “special” communicative intentions. The “markedness” of such expressions may be the product of a variety of rhetorical²⁴ and linguistic²⁵ mechanisms which increase the pragmatic saliency (that is, the cognitive activeness in discourse)²⁶ of the “emphasized” referents. Since pragmatic saliency is heightened for referents that are presented linguistically as instantiating pragmatic relations such as focus and contrast, “emphasis” tends to be intuitively associated with such functions. The use of paralinguistic devices (such as pitch/volume rises or special typography) for “emphasis”, whether or not in combination with such linguistic marking, may be interpreted as an iconic representation of the intended saliency peaks. In the absence of clear linguistic marking, paralinguistic devices alone may serve the purpose of raising a referent’s saliency.²⁷

Now the question arises whether emphasis is to be retained as a viable tool for linguistic description. If emphasis is an effect of linguistic phenomena that admit different, more precise descriptions, should it not rather be confined to the domain of rhetorical analysis?

19 Van Emde Boas et al. 2019, 689 and 696-697 for the combination ῆ μήν.

20 Van Emde Boas et al. 2019, 677-678.

21 Van Emde Boas et al. 2019, 681.

22 Van Emde Boas et al. 2019, 692.

23 See Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008, 96.

24 E.g. litotes, hendiadys, pleonasm, repetition, stylistic variation, etc.

25 E.g. topicalization, the expression of contrast or of speaker commitment, etc.

26 Lambrecht 1994, 41.

27 Cf. Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008, 97 and 441.

3 A Linguistic Definition

One way to address this question is to approach it from the point of view of the speaker's communicative intentions. If a linguistic device is primarily meant to increase the pragmatic saliency of a referent, we may call it "emphatic", whereas if such an increase is the by-product of other communicative devices, emphasis would rather need to be described as a secondary effect. An instructive case in point in this connection is offered by the analysis of the grammaticalization of English emphatic "do" as described by Lambrecht.²⁸ This construction originates as a way to reinstate propositions that were questioned in the discourse context (e.g. "I *did* pay him") or that the speaker feels could have been silently questioned by the interlocutor (e.g. "I wasn't hungry, but I *did try* the cake"). The construction extended to cases where no such presupposition is possible (e.g. "I *do hope* things are fine") and became a fully grammaticalized intensifier—a way to express emphasis alone, roughly corresponding to an adverb like *really*.

The relationship between emphasis and information structure may be clarified if we consider an English pair of sentences like:²⁹

- a) I didn't.
- b) I did *not*.

In spoken English, one may use intonation to stress the word "not" in the uncontracted form, much in the same way as one would stress elements instantiating focus. However, the two sentences express the same pragmatic relations—both "didn't" and "did not" instantiate focus, as the new piece of information both sentences convey corresponds to the referent of the verb phrase as a whole. What the intonation profile and lack of contraction convey is thus not focus, but an intensification of the negative, which we may well primarily describe as "emphasis".

As Bakker notes, this notion is quite useful for the description of word order within noun phrases in Greek. For one thing, focus may not always be invoked to explain the preposing of modifiers; for another, much as different focus types and structures may be identified,³⁰ focus is a binary feature ([±FOCAL]) and may not be graded, which makes it unsuited for the description of the relative order of multiple modifiers, whereas emphasis may well be conceived

²⁸ Lambrecht 1994, 71-72.

²⁹ This example and the ensuing discussion are drawn from Lambrecht 1994, 253-254.

³⁰ Lambrecht 1994, 231-238. Interestingly, there does not seem to be a one-to-one correlation between focus types and possible formal (prosodic, lexical, or grammatical) markings, cf. Zimmermann and Onéa 2011, 1668.

of as gradable as it corresponds the relative level of pragmatic saliency along a continuum.³¹

In this understanding, emphasis has been included as an operator in the language model of FDG. This theory of language identifies a number of levels in the production of a linguistic expression, ranging from pre-linguistic communicative intentions to the final linguistic output (articulation). These levels include the representation of the non-linguistic world (semantics, or Representational Level in FDG terms), the linguistic encoding of aspects of the interaction (pragmatics, or Interpersonal Level), as well as the morpho-syntactic and the phonological encoding of the expression (Morphosyntactic and Phonological Levels). Internally, levels are hierarchically organized. In particular:

The Representational Level comprises the following semantic layers. From hierarchically lowest (inner) layer to the (outer) highest, these are: *property* (the concept expressed by a lexical element); *configurational property* (the lexical element and its arguments); the *state-of-affairs* (the real or hypothesized situation, located in place and relative time); *episode* (the thematically coherent combination of states-of-affairs, characterized by unity or continuity of time, location, participants) and *proposition* (mental construct entertained about an episode). The Interpersonal Level encompasses the following layers, ordered from lower to higher: the *ascriptive* and *referential* subact (evocation of a property or a referent, respectively); *communicated content* (message transmitted by the utterance, consisting of ascriptive and referential subacts); *illocution* (specification of the speaker's intention); *discourse act* (basic unit of communication) and *move* (largest autonomous unit of interaction relevant to grammatical analysis, typically corresponding to a turn in conversation).³²

FDG regards emphasis as an operator at the Interpersonal Level, where it may play a role at a number of layers—that is to say, different types of linguistic entities may be “intensified”—through either paralinguistic, lexical, or grammatical means.³³ In particular, emphasis may apply to discourse acts, to the communicated content, and to subacts. When a discourse act is emphasized, it is the whole expression *qua* linguistic action that is intensified:

31 Bakker 2009a, 29–31.

32 Allan 2017, 105.

33 The following classification, along with most examples, is based on Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008, 65–9, 83, 102–6, 111–113, 123.

- a. Paralinguistically: intonation/exclamation mark (e.g. *Hurry up!*).
- b. Lexically: e.g. Engl. *Give it to me, dammit!* (or *will you?*), Esp. *¡Que no me gusta nada esa película!* 'I don't like that movie at all!'
- c. Grammatically: e.g. Engl. *-ing* forms of performative verbs (*I am hereby informing you ...* vs *I hereby inform you ...*); suffixes (e.g. in Evenki).

Emphasis may also intensify the content of the expression rather than the expression as a linguistic action itself:

- a. Paralinguistically.
- b. Lexically: intensifiers (e.g. Engl. *really*, emphatic *do*, etc.).
- c. Grammatically: cleft-like constructions (e.g. in Scottish Gaelic, Mandarin).

When a subact is emphasized, it is the pragmatic "action" by which an entity is evoked or a property is ascribed to an entity that is intensified:

- a. Paralinguistically.
- b. Lexically: particles (e.g. in Tibetan Kham); intensifiers (e.g. Engl. *really* with adjectives, etc.).
- c. Grammatically: e.g. Engl. *A day off? The boss gave me a whole week* (focus) vs *A day off? A whole week the boss gave me!* (focus + emphasis).

Let us now attempt to apply this classification to Classical Greek.

4 Linguistic Emphasis in Classical Greek

In the following subsections, we shall seek to identify phenomena that may fall under the rubric of "emphasis" at each of the levels distinguished by FDG. In the absence of direct records of paralinguistic information, we will only discuss lexical or grammatical devices.

4.1 Discourse Acts

Imprecations like $\mu\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \Delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$, $\nu\eta\ \Delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$, $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omega\acute{\nu}$, $\omega\ \gamma\eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\iota$, etc. may all be described as lexical means for the intensification of discourse acts *qua* communicative actions (much in the same way as "dammit!" or "will you?" intensify English statements/commands and requests as such, regardless of their communicated content). We may perhaps include an attitudinal particle like $\delta\eta$ (and its mitigated derivative $\delta\eta\pi\omicron\upsilon$),³⁴ but it may be objected that intensification is a by-product of its primary communicative function.

34 E.g. $\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho\ \delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\ \mu\omicron\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \delta\eta\pi\omicron\upsilon$ (D. 18.117) 'For I definitely have the same rights as the others under the same conditions!' (all translations are by the author unless otherwise specified). As the anonymous reviewer rightly remarks, it is

Greek has a number of constructions that may be interpreted as grammatical means to intensify discourse acts. Rijksbaron, for example, describes the use of (τί) οὐ with the present indicative, τί οὐ with the aorist indicative, and οὐ with the future indicative in questions as manners of emphasizing requests or commands, with οὐ μή with the future indicative expressing emphatic prohibitions.³⁵ Independent or dependent ὅπως (μή) with the future indicative may also be described as a discourse-act modifier introducing “an emphatic exhortation or warning”.³⁶

4.2 *Communicated Content*

The “emphatic” particles ἦ and μὴν may in principle be interpreted as lexical means to intensify the communicated content of discourse acts; however, the analogous objection may be raised as with regard to δὴ—is emphasis primary or a by-product of the expression of the speaker’s commitment to the truth value of the proposition?

Grammatical devices include the construction of the aorist optative with οὐ and ἄν to express “an emphatic negation”,³⁷ the construction of declarative infinitives with μὴ to express “an emphatic denial” (which was grammaticalized after verbs of denying),³⁸ as well as direct questions introduced by ἔσθ’ ὅτι—a cleft-like construction:³⁹

possible that -που expresses sarcasm here; this may result precisely from the intensification of a discourse act that is presented as stating the obvious.

35 Rijksbaron 2002, 9–10, 31, 34.

36 Rijksbaron 2002, 60. Such constructions may be regarded as the intensified counterpart to simple jussive/exhortative future indicatives (which may also be coordinated with an imperative), e.g. ὦς οὖν ποιήσετε, καὶ πείθεσθέ μοι (Pl. *Prt.* 338a7) ‘Do so, and listen to me’; see Kühner and Gerth 1898, 176.

37 Rijksbaron 2002, 41–42, 48.

38 Rijksbaron 2002, 106–107.

39 As the anonymous reviewer remarks, such constructions may in principle be interpreted as intensifiers of yes/no questions as discourse acts rather than of their content. As far as ἔσθ’ ὅτι is concerned, I would be inclined to interpret (analytically) the semantics and syntax of this expression as a sign that it does intensify the content, if only because ὅτι introduces the clause that expresses it. Synchronically, the fixation of this construction into a pragmatized marker could be regarded as incomplete, if one may read questions of the type τί ἔσθ’ ὅτι ‘why is it that’ (e.g. Ar. *Eq.* 183), where the expression may still be interpreted analytically, as evidence in this direction. This could suggest that grammaticalization does not play a decisive role in the linguistic marking of emphasis, much as emphasis markers may in principle undergo pragmatization (cf. Lambrecht 1994, 71–72 on Engl. emphatic *do*). On the other hand, ἔσθ’ ὅτι appears to be invariable (ἦν ὅτι is not attested with this function), which does indicate grammaticalization, and counterexamples to the type τί ἔσθ’ ὅτι may be impossible to construct (the expression ἔσθ’ ὅτι

ἐὰν δὲ μὴ μισθὸς αὐτῇ προσγίγνηται, ἔσθ' ὅτι ὠφελεῖται ὁ δημιουργὸς ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης;⁴⁰

So, wages aside, is there any benefit that craftsmen get from their craft?⁴¹
(= Do craftsmen **really** benefit from their craft?)

Here, ὅτι is a conjunction and may not be construed as an argument of ὠφελεῖται.

ΚΛ. καὶ τί τοιοῦτον φαίμεν ἄν, ὦ ξένε, ἐν ἀνθρώποις γεγενέσθαι πῶμα;
ΑΘ. οὐδέν· εἰ δ' οὖν ἐγένετό ποθεν, ἔσθ' ὅτι πρὸς ἀνδρείαν ἦν ἄν νομοθέτη
χρήσιμον;⁴²

[CLEINIAS] And what drink on earth could we say does that, sir?
[ATHENIAN] None. But if one had cropped up, would a legislator **really**
have been able to make use of it to promote courage?⁴³

Analogously, ὅτι is a conjunction and should not be construed as a pronoun referring to πῶμα and functioning as the subject of ἦν.

4.3 Subacts

Overall, pure subact emphasizees are quite difficult to identify in Classical Greek. A good candidate for a lexical marker of subact-level emphasis would be the particle γε but, as mentioned above, its primary pragmatic function could be interpreted as contrast rather than intensification:

ὑπερβολὴ γὰρ ἀδικίας τοῦτό γε.⁴⁴

This in particular is the extreme of injustice!

Here τοῦτο is presupposed rather than new, and ὑπερβολὴ ἀδικίας is focal. At the same time, γε might imply contrast with all other possible entities that may be conceived of as being the extreme of injustice. On top of this, it may

would remain grammatical in combination with any question word). At any rate, a full exploration of this question lies beyond the scope of this contribution.

⁴⁰ Pl. *R.* 1.346d6-8.

⁴¹ Translation by C.D.C. Reeve.

⁴² Pl. *Lg.* 1.648a6-7.

⁴³ Translation based on that of T.J. Saunders.

⁴⁴ D. 18.16.

also be objected that γε, as a clitic, would indicate that its prosodic host is the first prosodic word of a new intonation unit as per Wackernagel's law, which implies that it may be marked as topical or focal.

As we have seen, non-initial nominative personal pronouns may be interpreted as purely emphatic, given that they are unmarked in terms of information structure while being syntactically redundant.⁴⁵ For example, one may compare:

πόλλ' ἂν ἐγὼ ἔτι τούτων ἔχοιμι δεῖξαι.⁴⁶

Many more are the instances of this behaviour that I, **for one**, could cite.

with:

πόλλ' ἂν ἔτι τούτων ἔχοιμι δεῖξαι.

Many more are the instances of this behaviour that I could cite.

Accordingly, non-initial ἔγωγε would express contrast and emphasis after a focal element:⁴⁷

ὕμᾱς ἂν ἔγωγε ἠξίωσα μάρτυράς μοι γενέσθαι.⁴⁸

It is you that I myself, **for one**, would have required to be my witnesses.

However, non-initial nominative personal pronouns are not *emphasizers*: their being *emphatic* results from their optionality and is thus the effect of a rhetorical device (pleonasm). The same applies to “redundant” ὅμως in the apodosis of concessive clauses. “Adverbial” καί (‘even’) comes closer to a subact lexical *emphasizer* but, again, emphasis may be a by-product of its additive function.⁴⁹

45 See Dik 2003 and (*contra*) Pardal Padín 2012.

46 D. 18.138.

47 According to Wackernagel's law, this form would be intrinsically colon-initial; Scheppers 2011, 213–214 suggests regarding it as a quasi-parenthetical colon or as part of the clitic chain as a whole.

48 Aeschin. 1.89.

49 Van Emde Boas et al. 2019, 693–694.

As to grammatical means for intensifying subacts, one may mention the preposing of the modifiers in noun phrases (when not expressing contrast).⁵⁰ Possibly, the construction of εἰμί with a substantivized participle in lieu of an equivalent synthetic form may also be interpreted in this direction:⁵¹

“ἔστι δ’ ἔφη Ἐρατοσθένης Ὁῦθεν ὁ ταῦτα πράττων”.⁵²

“The man who did this”, she said, “is Eratosthenes of Oa”.⁵³

In comparison with a lexical verb construction (e.g. Ἐρατοσθένης Ὁῦθεν ταῦτα ἔπραξε), copula plus nominalization could turn a simple predicate into the ascription of a permanent feature to the referent, which would arguably increase the saliency of the subact of ascription corresponding to the predicate itself.

5 Closing Remarks

This list does not aim to be exhaustive, but it still suggests that a rigorously defined concept of emphasis as the pragmatic operator capturing the primary intention of increasing the saliency of an expression has room in the toolbox of Greek linguists and commentators. The framework of FDG seems particularly suited to capturing the domains and nuances of this concept, provided that a clear distinction is made between emphasis as a cognitive effect—which may be the (by-)product of e.g. narratological, stylistic, or rhetorical devices and would not be connected to specific linguistic structures—and emphasis as a well-defined, linguistically-expressed communicative intention.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ Bakker 2009a, 38–52.

⁵¹ Cf. Björck 1940, 89–92 and Aerts 1965, 42.

⁵² Lys. 1.16.

⁵³ Translation by C.H. Kahn.

⁵⁴ I wish to thank the participants in the *Emphasis & Co.* seminar at the University of Oxford (2022) as well as the anonymous *Mnemosyne* reviewer for their helpful comments and observations.

Bibliography

- Aerts, W.J. (1965). *Periphrastica. An Investigation into the Use of εἶναι and ἔχειν as Auxiliaries or Pseudo-auxiliaries in Greek from Homer Up to the Present Day.* Amsterdam.
- Allan, R.J. (2017). The Grammaticalization of Greek Particles. In: F. Logozzo and P. Poccetti, eds., *Ancient Greek Linguistics. New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*, Berlin/Boston, pp. 103-118.
- Bakker, S.J. (2009a). *The Noun Phrase in Ancient Greek. A Functional Analysis of the Order and Articulation of NP Constituents in Herodotus.* Leiden/Boston.
- Bakker, S.J. (2009b). On the Curious Combination of the Particles γάρ and οὖν. In: S.J. Bakker and G.C. Wakker, eds., *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*, Leiden/Boston, pp. 41-61.
- Beekes, R.S.P. (2010). *Etymological Dictionary of Greek.* Leiden/Boston.
- Bergson, L. (1960). *Zur Stellung des Adjektivs in der älteren griechischen Prosa.* Stockholm/Göteborg/Uppsala.
- Björck, G. (1940). *Ἡν διδάσκων. Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen.* Uppsala.
- Bonifazi, A. (2009). Discourse Cohesion through Third Person Pronouns. The Case of κείνος and αὐτός in Homer. In: S.J. Bakker and G.C. Wakker, eds., *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*, Leiden/Boston, pp. 1-19.
- Braswell, B.K. (1988). *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar.* Berlin/New York.
- Buijs, M. (2005). *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse. The Distribution of Subclauses and Participial Clauses in Xenophon's Hellenica and Anabasis.* Leiden/Boston.
- Chiron, P. (2001). *Un rhéteur méconnu : Démétrios (Ps.-Démétrios de Phalère). Essai sur les mutations de la théorie du style à l'époque hellénistique.* Paris.
- Denniston, J.D. (1954). *The Greek Particles.* Oxford.
- Dik, H. (1995). *Word Order in Ancient Greek. A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus.* Amsterdam.
- Dik, H. (1997). Interpreting Adjective Position in Herodotus. In: E.J. Bakker, ed., *Grammar as Interpretation. Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*, Leiden/New York, pp. 55-76.
- Dik, H. (2003). On Unemphatic "Emphatic" Pronouns in Greek. Nominative Pronouns in Plato and Sophocles. *Mnemosyne* 56, pp. 535-550.
- Dik, H. (2007). *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue.* Oxford/New York.
- Dover, K.J. (1960). *Greek Word Order.* Cambridge.
- Dover, K.J. (1997). *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style.* Oxford/New York.

- van Emde Boas, E., Rijksbaron, A., Huitink, H., and de Bakker, M. (2019). *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge/New York.
- Finglass, P.J. (2011). *Sophocles, Ajax*. Cambridge/New York.
- Hengeveld, K., and Mackenzie, J.L. (2008). *Functional Discourse Grammar. A Typologically-Based Theory of Language Structure*. Oxford/New York.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2001). *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge/New York.
- de Jong, I.J.F. (2014). *Narratology and Classics. A Practical Guide*. Oxford.
- Kühner, R., and Gerth, B. (1898). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre*, Vol. 1. 3rd ed. Hannover/Leipzig.
- Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information Structure and Sentence Form. Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge/New York.
- Lazaridis, N. (2007). *Wisdom in Loose Form. The Language of Egyptian and Greek Proverbs in Collections of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Leiden/Boston.
- Matić, D. (2003). Topic, Focus, and Discourse Structure. *Ancient Greek Word Order. StudLang* 27, pp. 573-633.
- Pardal Padín, A. (2012). *ἐξέω y σύ no enfáticos? El problema del sujeto nulo en griego antiguo*. In: A.C. Nebot and P.I. Ríos, eds., *Lingüística XL. El lingüista en el siglo XXI*, Madrid, pp. 185-191.
- Porter, J.I. (2016). *The Sublime in Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- Rijksbaron, A. (2002). *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*. 3rd ed. Amsterdam.
- Rijksbaron, A. (2007). *Plato, Ion, or, On the Iliad*. Leiden/Boston.
- Salomone, S. (1998). Una chiarezza ben poco chiara (σαφήνεια, ἔμφασις, ἐνάργεια nel *De elocutione* di Demetrio). *Maia* 50, pp. 81-88.
- Scheppers, F. (2011). *The Colon Hypothesis. Word Order, Discourse Segmentation and Discourse Coherence in Ancient Greek*. Bruxelles.
- Todd, S.C. (2007). *A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches 1-11*. Oxford.
- Too, Y.L. (2008). *A Commentary on Isocrates' Antidosis*. Oxford/New York.
- Zimmermann, M. and Onéa, E. (2011). Focus Marking and Focus Interpretation. *Lingua* 121, pp. 1651-1670.