

DISTRIBUTION OF THE OBJECT CLITIC PRONOUNS IN THE GROTTAFERRATA
MANUSCRIPT OF THE *DIGENIS AKRITIS**

Abstract

The Grottaferrata manuscript of the *Digenis Akritis* may be of more interest to Medieval Greek linguists than previously assumed. This rather 'archaizing' version obeys the same Medieval distribution rules for object clitic pronouns postulated by Mackridge for the more 'vernacular' Escorial version. Moreover, it is shown that the Medieval rules -divided into a syntactic and a pragmatic principle- clearly constitute a gradual continuation of older -post-Classical- tendencies. Much attention is paid to the pragmatic principle in relation to verbs, which is invoked as an explanatory principle for apparent exceptions.

Introduction

In recent years, linguists have shown a remarkable interest in Medieval Greek clitics. The impetus for this increased interest is an article by Peter Mackridge entitled '*An Editorial Problem in Medieval Greek Texts. The Position of the Object Clitic Pronoun in the Escorial Digenes Akrites*'. In this article from 1993 Mackridge criticizes the editorial practice of Alexiou with respect to the object clitic pronouns (OCPs).¹ Contrary to Alexiou, Mackridge observes a clear regularity in the placement of these small unstressed words: 'the redactor and/or scribe of the Escorial *Digenis Akritis* displays a remarkable consistency in his application of the rules governing the position of the clitic pronoun'.² The statement of these rules has triggered an impressive number of publications on the distribution of Medieval Greek OCPs.³

* I would like to thank Mark Janse, Peter Mackridge and two anonymous referees of BMGS for their valuable and inspiring comments. My work was funded by the FWO (grant nr. B/10040/02).

¹ S. Alexiou, *Βασίλειος Διγενής Ακρίτης (κατά το χειρόγραφο του Εσκοριάλ)* (Athens 1985).

² P. Mackridge, 'An editorial problem in Medieval Greek texts. The position of the object clitic pronoun in the Escorial *Digenes Akrites*', in N. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della Letteratura Neograeca I* (Venice 1993) 338.

³ P. Mackridge, 'Η θέση τοῦ ἄδύνατου τύπου τῆς προσωπικῆς ἀντωνυμίας στὴ Μεσαιωνικὴ Δημώδη Ἑλληνικὴ', *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 15 (1995), 906-929; P. Mackridge, 'The position of the weak object pronoun in Medieval and Modern Greek', *Jazyk i řečevaja dejatel'nost'* 3.1 (2000) 133-151; I. Ramoutsaki, 'Η πρόταξη και επίταξη των προσωπικών εγκλιτικών αντωνυμιών σε κείμενα της μεσαιωνικής δημώδους λογοτεχνίας', in J.M. Egea & J. Alonso (eds.), *Prosa y Verso en Griego Medieval. Rapports of the International Congress "Neograeca Medii Aevi III" Vitoria 1994* (Amsterdam 1996) 317-320; P. Pappas, 'Weak object pronoun placement in Later Medieval Greek: Intralinguistic parameters affecting variation', *The Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 56 (2001) 79-106; P. Pappas, 'The imperative and weak object pronoun placement in Later Medieval Greek', *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 22 (2002) 234-248; C. Condoravdi & P. Kiparsky, 'Clitics and clause structure: The Late Medieval Greek system', *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5 (2004) 159-183; M. Janse, 'Convergence and divergence in the development of the Greek and Latin clitic pronouns', in R. Sornicola, E. Poppe & A.S. Ha-Levy (eds.), *Stability Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns over Time* (Amsterdam 2000) 231-258; M. Janse, 'Clitic doubling from Ancient to Asia Minor Greek', in D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages* (Philadelphia 2008) 165-202; P. Vejleskov, 'The position of the weak object pronoun in the *Greek Portulans* and in the *Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans*', in E. & M. Jeffreys (eds.), *Approaches to Texts in Early Modern Greek (Neograeca Medii Aevi V)* (Oxford 2005) 197-209; A. Revithiadou & V. Spyropoulos, *A Typology of Greek Clitics with Special Reference to their Diachronic Environment* (Rhodes 2006); A. Revithiadou & V. Spyropoulos, 'Greek object clitic pronouns: A typological survey of their grammatical properties', *Language Typology and Universals* 61 (2008) 39-53; C.A. Thoma, 'Distribution and function of clitic object pronouns in popular 16th-18th century Greek narratives. A synchronic and diachronic perspective', in J. Rehbein, C. Hohenstein & L. Pietsch (eds.), *Connectivity in Grammar and Discourse* (Amsterdam 2007) 139-163. In addition, A. Rollo ('L'uso dell'enclisi nel greco volgare dal XII al XVII secolo e la legge Tobler-Mussafia', *Italoellenica* 2 (1989) 135-146) must be mentioned in this list because

Of these scholars, Pappas was the first to undertake a quantitative analysis of the entire 'Later Medieval Greek Period'.⁴ Taking the pioneering study of Mackridge as his starting point, the earliest text from his corpus is the *Digenis Akritis*. This 12th century story is traditionally considered the 'earliest extended text in "vernacular" Greek'.⁵ More specifically, the Escorial manuscript (E) is thought to be closest to the colloquial language and is thus seen as the true point of departure of vernacular Medieval Greek.

The other important manuscript in which the *Digenis Akritis* is preserved, the Grottaferrata (G), is written in a more archaic and classicizing idiom and attempts to avoid 'vulgar writing'.⁶ As a consequence, none of the above studies on Medieval Greek OCPs has taken G into account: 'in the Grottaferrata version of *Digenis Akritis*, which contains a greater number of archaic features than the Escorial version (...) the order is not the proper medieval one, but a more archaic one'.⁷

However, in this paper I will show that G -despite some archaizing tendencies- generally does obey Mackridge's Medieval Greek rules. Moreover, these rules clearly constitute a natural continuation of the post-Classical period, as will be demonstrated in the diachronic outline of the Greek OCPs (section 2). To highlight this continuity, I will analyze the position of the Medieval Greek OCPs within their 'intonation units', a concept developed by modern linguists which I assume to be ideal for texts composed in the popular πολιτικὸς στίχος metre (section 3). The next chapter (section 4) presents my own research: abundant examples from G illustrate the similarities with the OCP distribution rules identified for E. In the last part (section 5), my conclusions are formulated. First, however, it is necessary to give a short definition of the term 'clitic' (section 1).

of his pioneering work, but it is the article of Mackridge -who obtained his results independently of Rollo- which has become standard due to its higher quality.

⁴ P. Pappas, *Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek. From Clitics to Affixes* (Basingstoke 2004).

⁵ G. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, 2nd edn (London 2010) 333.

⁶ E. Trapp, 'Learned and vernacular literature in Byzantium: Dichotomy or symbiosis?', *Dumbarton Oak Papers* 47 (1993) 121.

⁷ Mackridge, 'An editorial problem' (Venice 1993) 332.

1) Definition

Clitics are small words which do not have phonological stress of their own and consequently have to lean -κλίνω in Ancient Greek- on another word: a phonological 'host'.⁸ If this phonological host is the following word, we call it a *proclitic*, for instance the Greek definite article; if it selects a preceding word as phonological host, it is an *enclitic*, for example the Medieval and Modern Greek possessive pronoun. Both types are exemplified in τὸ παράδειγμά μου. One of the most studied elements within the large class of Greek clitics (particles, possessive pronouns, indefinite pronouns, a few verbs), is the OCP, whose grammatical function is the (in)direct object and whose syntactic host is thus the verb, as in μανθάνω σε.

It is important to note that the syntactic host does not need to be the same as the phonological host. However, in the next section we will see that the history of the Greek OCPs is one of growing convergence between the two hosts and can thus be read as a steady process towards grammaticalisation.⁹

2) Diachronic Outline

In the oldest attested literary Greek, the epics of Homer, OCPs are obedient to the 'Law' of Wackernagel.¹⁰ Wackernagel has discovered that, in Indo-European, there was a strong tendency for *enclitics* - including the Greek OCPs - to stand in second position (P2), regardless of the position of their syntactic host, viz. the **verb**:

1. Κύκλωψ, # εἰρωτᾷς μ' ὄνομα κλυτόν, # αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τοι
ἐξερέω· # σὺ δέ μοι δὸς ξείνιον, # ὧς περ ὑπέστης. (Od. 9.364-365)

The OCPs μ(ε), τοι and μοι are all found in P2, which should, however, not be considered an absolute notion: αὐτὰρ is a so-called 'prepositive' word and does not count for the determination of P2, whereas the quasi-enclitic particle δέ can be called the opposite, a 'postpositive', and clusters together with μοι on P2.¹¹ Due to its preference for P2, the OCP τοι is indeed separated from its syntactic host ἐξερέω, which stands in enjambment in the next verse.

It has been argued that this second position must be interpreted as the attachment of the enclitic to the first word or constituent within the intonation unit rather than within a syntactic unit such as the sentence or the clause, although 'the two may and in fact often do coincide'.¹² This phonological unit is generally demarcated by boundary pauses and in poetry consequently coincides with the divisions made by the caesura (#) (cf. 3.2).

⁸ A. Zwicky, *On Clitics* (Bloomington 1977) 9.

⁹ D. Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (Malden 2003) 210.

¹⁰ J. Wackernagel, 'Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1 (1892) 333-446; cf. M. Janse, 'The prosodic basis of Wackernagel's Law', in A. Crochetière, J.-C. Boulanger & C. Ouelton (eds.), *Les langues menacées. Actes du XVI^e Congrès international des linguistes, Québec, Université Laval, 9-14 août 1992* (Québec 1993) 19-22.

¹¹ K.J. Dover, *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge 1960) 13.

¹² Janse, 'Clitic doubling' (Philadelphia 2008) 173; for more information on intonation units, see W.L. Chafe, 'Prosodic and functional units of language', in J.A. Edwards & M.D. Lampert (eds.), *Talking Data. Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research* (Hillsdale 1993) 32-43; for a successful application of this concept to the 'oral' epics of Homer, see H. Fraenkel, *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, 2nd edn (München 1960). E.J. Bakker, *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca N.Y. 1997); S.R. Slings, 'Written and spoken language: An exercise in the pragmatics of the Greek sentence', *Classical Philology* 87.2 (1992) 95-109; M. Janse, 'Homerische metrik. Orale poëzie in de praktijk', *Didactica Classica Gandensia* 38 (1998) 125-151;

In Classical Greek, Wackernagel's Law is still active, as the following two examples testify:

2. ἴνα μοι μηδεὶς συνειδείη, # ἐν ᾧ μοι ὁ πᾶς κίνδυνος ἦν (Antipho 43.3)
3. τοῦτό μοι, ᾧ φίλοι, εὖ δοκεῖ ἔχειν. (Pl. R. 2.368a.5)¹³

On the other hand, there is an increasing number of examples in which the OCP stands after the verb, its syntactic host.¹⁴ This tendency can be considered as 'natural', since 'the phonological dependence of the enclitic pronouns then coincides with their syntactic dependence',¹⁵ for instance:

4. ὧς μὲν ἀφήκέ με πάντων (D. 37.21.1)¹⁶

This is a truly illustrative sentence, since the quasi- enclitic particle μέν is still obedient to Wackernagel's Law.

These two different principles, though, do not necessarily conflict,¹⁷ since the original and the new system can of course concur, as was already apparent in the Homeric example (εἰρωτᾶς μ'). In the next example as well, the OCP is obedient to Wackernagel's Law but at the same time follows the verb, which opens the intonation unit. Again, phonological and syntactic host coincides.

5. ἦψατό μου τις (Lc. 8.46)¹⁸

With this example from the Gospels, we have reached the post-Classical period. The New Testament constitutes a suitable corpus to illustrate the development towards postverbal position: its language is close to the spoken Koine, in which simple sentences consisting of only a verb and an (in)direct object in the form of an OCP were without doubt many. The importance of such 'minimal sentences' can hardly be overestimated with regard to this evolution, which must have been 'based on statistically frequent patterning'.¹⁹ In sum, postverbal position becomes the unmarked order, yet preverbal OCPs are still present in large numbers, for instance:

6. Τίς μου ἦψατο; (Mc. 5.31)²⁰

The OCP μου is not phonologically attached to its verb, but encliticizes to the immediately preceding word τίς. This attraction of the OCP to the interrogative can be historically explained, for an important consequence of Wackernagel's Law is that words which prefer to

M. Janse, 'The metrical schemes of the hexameter. *Mnemosyne* 56 (2003) 343-348; R.J. Allan, 'Orale elementen in de Homerische grammatica: intonatie-eenheid en enjambement', *Lampas* 42 (2009) 136-151.

¹³ G. Horrocks, 'Clitics in Greek: a diachronic review', in M. Roussou & S. Panteli (eds.), *Greek outside Greece II* (Athens 1990) 41.

¹⁴ Horrocks, op.cit., 38. Horrocks calls this phenomenon 'head-dependency'.

¹⁵ Janse, 'Clitic doubling' (Philadelphia 2008) 176.

¹⁶ Horrocks, op.cit., 40.

¹⁷ M. Janse, 'La position des pronoms personnels enclitiques en grec néo-testamentaire à la lumière des dialectes néo-helléniques', in C. Brixhe (ed.), *La koiné grecque antique I* (Nancy 1993) 87.

¹⁸ Janse, op.cit., 87.

¹⁹ Horrocks, op.cit., 41.

²⁰ Janse, op.cit., 90.

open the utterance and thus stand in P1, are often found in combination with a following OCP, holding its normal P2.

These words can be divided into three categories: function words, preferential words and ad hoc focalized constituents. With function words I refer to words with a non-lexical meaning which are *syntactically* obliged to open a subordinate clause, viz. all sorts of subordinating conjunctions (complementation, condition, time, comparison, finality). Pronominal relatives are reckoned among the function words as well, since they behave as subordinate conjunctions. Speakers must regard these frequently occurring combinations as 'collocations'²¹ (2: ἴνα μοι). This reanalysis of course thwarts the evolution towards convergence between phonological and syntactic host, as the OCP encliticizes to the P1-word, but syntactically belongs to the verb.

The same reanalysis must have been applied to words which often stand at the front of the intonation unit due to *emphatic* reasons, such as interrogatives (6: τίς μου), negations, demonstratives (3: τοῦτό μοι) and strong personal pronouns (7: ἐγὼ δέ σε; cf. 1: ἐγὼ τοι; σὺ δέ μοι).²² Dover calls these words with a natural preference for first position 'preferential words'.²³ By extension, ad hoc emphasized constituents optionally attract OCPs into preverbal position, since 'a characteristic position for items of emphasis or contrast in Greek is initial position'.²⁴ In another example from the Gospels, the noun phrase ὁ κόσμος, which is contrasted with ἐγὼ and thus emphasized, indeed occurs with a preverbal OCP:

7. καὶ ὁ κόσμος **σε** οὐκ **ἔγνω**, # ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνω (Jn. 17.25)²⁵
'And *the world* doesn't know you, but *I* know you'

This class only includes words with a lexical meaning. However, we cannot draw a sharp line between the last two categories, since preferential words are actually 'des mots qui sont, pour ainsi dire, emphatiques de nature'.²⁶ As a consequence, a continuum might constitute a more suitable way to present these P1-words,²⁷ yet the threefold classification is maintained here for the sake of clarity (cf. section 4).

In Medieval Greek, these remnants of Wackernagel's Law take on a more compelling character: the tendencies for preverbal position detected in post-Classical Greek are now labelled 'rules' by Mackridge.²⁸ In broad lines, preverbal OCPs are 'more or less obligatory' if the verb is preceded by what I have called function words (cf. 4.3.1).²⁹ Besides this (quasi-)obligatory syntactic rule, preverbal position is regulated by a pragmatic principle, for after 'semantically emphasized' constituents preverbal OCPs are 'almost obligatory' (cf. 4.3.2).³⁰ This principle refers to the above mentioned preverbal OCPs after preferential words and ad hoc focalized constituents (cf. 4.3.2.1-2). We may not forget, however, that postverbal position had become the unmarked order (cf. 4.2). Consequently, the Medieval distribution

²¹ In the sense of Janse, 'Convergence and divergence' (Amsterdam 2000).

²² Janse, 'Clitic doubling' (Philadelphia 2008) 180.

²³ Dover, *Greek Word Order*, 20.

²⁴ Horrocks, *op.cit.*, 41. This seems to be a cross-linguistic tendency: see T. Givón, *Syntax: An Introduction. Volume I* (Amsterdam 2001) 250: 'the less predictable the information is or the more important, the more likely it is to be placed earlier in the clause (or in whatever relevant unit of structured information)'.

²⁵ Janse, *op.cit.*, 180. Note that καί is a prepositive word and as such does not count for the determination of P2, see Dover, *op.cit.*, 13.

²⁶ Janse, 'La position des pronoms' (Nancy 1993) 94.

²⁷ Demonstrative pronouns for example are considered preferential words by Dover (*op.cit.*, 2), but at the same time they can of course be emphasized, cf. 3: 'this, my friends, I think, was well said'.

²⁸ Mackridge, 'An editorial problem' (Venice 1993) 325.

²⁹ Mackridge, *op.cit.*, 340.

³⁰ Mackridge, *op.cit.*, 341.

seems to be a clear continuation of the post-Classical period, yet it also forms the steppingstone to the contemporary distribution of Greek OCPs.

The transition to Modern Greek principally lies in the Medieval (quasi-)obligation of the OCP to be adjacent to its syntactic host, the verb: 'the clitic object pronoun ceased to be a freely moving part of the clause and instead became part of the verb phrase'.³¹ This constitutes an important difference with the earlier period, in which OCP and verb can still be separated. The question now arises whether a complete harmonization between the phonological and the syntactic host of the OCP is already accomplished in the Medieval period, or more accurately formulated: are the preverbal OCPs proclitic on the verb or do they still possess their enclitic nature, as in post-Classical Greek?³²

The obligatory adjacency between verb and OCP finally leads to the grammaticalisation of the OCPs in Modern Greek.³³ Phonological and syntactic host now always coincide: postverbal enclitics form the counterpart of preverbal proclitics. The exact position of the OCP is no longer regulated by the nature of the preceding constituent (and by syntactic and pragmatic principles), but depends on the mood of the verb.³⁴ If the verb is an imperative (8) or a gerund (9), the OCPs appear after the verb:

8. μίλα μας

9. μιλώντας μας

In combination with a finite verb (indicative or subjunctive), on the contrary, preverbal OCPs are required, for instance:

10. μας μιλά

With this perfect convergence between phonological and the syntactic host, I conclude the diachronic outline and pass to the real subject of this paper: the distribution of the OCPs in the Grottaferrata manuscript of the *Digenis Akritis*.

3) Metre & Methodology

3.1 Classicizing G & vulgarizing E

³¹ Mackridge, op.cit., 329..

³² Cf. Janse, 'Clitic doubling' (Philadelphia 2008) 181: 'Whether or not the Medieval Greek pronouns were still enclitic, as in Ancient Greek, or had become proclitic (...), is a moot question'. The postverbal OCPs are of course always enclitic.

³³ Some modern dialects such as Cypriot and Cappadocian have preserved the Medieval distribution; see A. Ralli, 'Syntactic and morpho-syntactic phenomena in Modern Greek dialects: The state of art', *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 7 (2006) 121-159; P. Pappas, 'Object clitic placement in the dialects of Medieval Greek', in M. Janse, B.D. Joseph & A. Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory (Mytilene 2004)* (Patras 2006) 314-328; M. Janse, 'Object position in Cappadocian and other Asia Minor Greek dialects', in M. Janse, B. Joseph & A. Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory* (Patras 2006) 115-129; S. Chatzikyriakidis, *Clitics in Four Dialects of Modern Greek: A Dynamic Account. PhD thesis* (London 2010).

³⁴ I. Philippaki-Warbuton, 'Verb movement and clitics in Modern Greek', in I. Philippaki-Warbuton, K. Nicolaidis & M. Sifianou (eds.), *Themes in Greek Linguistics* (Amsterdam 1994) 53-60.

The *Digenis Akritis*, Byzantium's only extant epic, has been preserved in two important manuscripts: G, written around 1300, and E, dating from the late fifteenth century.³⁵ Both versions represent a different branch of the manuscript tree and are typecast as follows: 'the redactor of the G-version strived to *Atticize* on the one hand and that of the E-version to *vulgarize* on the other'.³⁶ Although none of the two represent a pure idiom -they are rather typical manifestations of the Medieval Greek 'mixed or macaronic language incorporating vernacular and learned elements'³⁷ -, G is nonetheless not taken into account in linguistic analyses of vernacular Medieval Greek. Likewise, G is left out in studies on Medieval Greek OCPs, in which only E is taken into consideration.

3.2 Πολιτικός στίχος and intonation units

What G and E do have in common is their metre, for both versions are written in the popular πολιτικός στίχος. The πολιτικός στίχος is a verse containing fifteen syllables with a fixed caesura after the eighth, which divides each line into two hemistichs.³⁸ The metrical nature of the text has some implications for my theoretical framework, for I adopt a concept from modern linguistics to analyze the position of the OCPs, viz. the already mentioned intonation units (cf. section 2). I repeat that these phonological units are usually marked off by boundary pauses. Since the fixed caesura of the πολιτικός στίχος very likely implies a breathing pause,³⁹ I consider it convenient to equate the two hemistichs of each verse with two intonation units, respectively of eight and seven syllables.

Moreover, the application of such a concept -developed especially to underline the naturalness of spoken discourse- is definitely justified with regard to the genesis of the *Digenis Akritis*, for it is acknowledged that the text is presumably rooted in an oral tradition or is -at least- composed in an oral style, like the majority of vernacular Greek texts.⁴⁰ Besides this metrical and stylistic argument, a demarcation in intonation units seems appropriate, since it permits to observe the inherited preference for P2 within the intonation unit more carefully and thus not to lose sight of the continuity of the Greek OCPs (cf. section 2).

In view of the 'naturalness' of the πολιτικός στίχος and the extremely varied 'stock' of Medieval Greek, I assume that the verse structure represents a more or less natural word order. Anticipating my analysis of the OCPs, I believe that if the poet had wanted the reverse order (postverbal OCP instead of a postverbal one and vice versa), he would have chosen

³⁵ E. Jeffreys, *Digenis Akritis. The Grottaferrata and Escorial Versions* (Cambridge 1998) xx.

³⁶ Trapp, 'Learned and vernacular literature in Byzantium' (1993) 121 (my italics). The precise relationship between E and G and their relationship to the 'Urfassung', as well as the question of which nature this original text was, have caused heated discussions, but are of no concern here. For further bibliography, see R. Beaton & D. Ricks, *Digenis Akritis: New Approaches to Byzantine Heroic Poetry* (London 1993).

³⁷ N. Toufexis (2008), 'Diglossia and register variation in Medieval Greek', *BMGS* 32.2 (2008) 204.

³⁸ M.D. Lauxtermann, *The Spring of Rhythm: An Essay on the Political Verse and Other Byzantine Metres* (Vienna 1999).

³⁹ The average breathing capacity, the rare occurrences of elision between the eighth and ninth syllable and the fact that the ninth is the only syllable (next to the first) among the uneven ones which can occasionally receive an accent, all point in this direction; cf. P. Apostolopoulos, *La Langue du Roman Byzantin Callimaque et Chrysorrhoe* (Athens 1984) 211-214; H. Eideneier, *Von Rhapsodie zu Rap: Aspekte der griechischen Sprachgeschichte von Homer bis heute* (Tübingen 1999) 104.

⁴⁰ E. & M. Jeffreys, 'The style of Byzantine popular poetry: Recent work', in C. Mango & O. Pritsak (eds.), *Okeanos. Essays Presented to Ihor Ševčenko on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students* (Cambridge 1983) 309-343; R. Beaton, 'The oral traditions of Modern Greece: A survey', *Oral Traditions* 1.1 (1986) 110-133; D. Ricks, 'Is the Escorial Akrites a unitary poem?' *Byzantion* 59 (1989) 184-207; B. Fenik, *Digenis: Epic and Popular Style in the Escorial Version* (Herakleion 1991); G.M. Sifakis, 'Looking for the tracks of oral tradition in Medieval and Early Modern Greek poetic works', *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 27 (2001) 61-86.

another verb or other words -or even completely altered the formulation- to fit the metre.⁴¹ Although 'metri causa' is to me an unsatisfactory principle to explain the word order in the verse, I do not radically exclude the contribution of metrical factors to a certain placement of the OCP. As a matter of fact, some instability in the positioning of OCPs might be explained by the poet's idea that some poetic license is permitted.

3.3 Enclitic nature

Another issue related to metre, is the question of the phonological nature of the Medieval Greek OCPs (cf. section 2). I assume that the OCPs of G have preserved their *enclitic* nature, even if they are preverbal, as I have found no examples of an OCP opening the verse or following immediately after the caesura. According to me, the absence of intonation unit-initial OCPs points to a constant enclitic nature, since enclitics cannot open the intonation unit as they always need a preceding constituent to attach to.⁴²

4) Analysis

In the rest of this paper, I follow Mackridge's classification of the rules, based on E, and attempt to give comparable and representative examples from G.⁴³ Because of limits of space (and following Mackridge), I especially concentrate on OCPs in combination with *finite verbs*, though also imperatives are mentioned (cf. 4.4.1). For easy reference, I have included the concrete number of tokens and the corresponding percentages in an appendix. I begin with the unmarked postverbal OCPs (4.2) and then pass on to the preverbal ones (4.3). In the latter category a 'more or less obligatory' syntactic rule (4.3.1) will be distinguished from an 'almost obligatory' pragmatic principle (4.3.2): 'the rules are primarily a matter of syntactic context and secondarily a matter of pragmatics (in this case, emphasis)'.⁴⁴ Furthermore, I tentatively subdivide the pragmatic principle into a category of preferential words (4.3.2.1) and one of ad hoc emphasized constituents (4.3.2.2). This slight modification to Mackridge's presentation of the rules is in line with the more general terms described in the diachronic outline, in order to stress once more the continuity of the Greek OCPs (cf. section 2).

In the following section (4.4), I focus on the pragmatic principle in relation to verbs, as (a lack of) emphasis on the verb can account for some apparent exceptions. The last part (4.5) as well deals with rather exceptional examples, though all can be explained as archaic 'P2-collocations'.

4.1 Verb-adjacency

⁴¹ Mackridge, 'An editorial problem' (Venice 1993) 339; Pappas, *Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek* (Basingstoke 2004) 73ff.

⁴² Condoravdi & Kiparsky ('Clitics and clause structure' (2004) 172ff) favour the constant enclitic nature of the Medieval Greek OCPs, whereas Pappas (op.cit., 13) believes the OCPs are *in se* clitic: 'Late Medieval Greek weak pronouns are always phonologically attached to the verb, either as enclitics or proclitics'. Revithiadou & Spyropoulos ('*A Typology of Greek Clitics*' (Rhodes 2006) 30) agree with the latter: 'In this respect, we are in total agreement with Pappas that in the language of the texts of the 12th century and beyond pronominal clitics can be either proclitics or enclitics, depending on the structure'.

⁴³ The most recent edition of E and G is used: Jeffrey, *Digenis Akritis* (Cambridge 1998). Jeffrey's translations are only given if I consider them indispensable (especially in contexts with ad hoc emphasized constituents). The demarcation in intonation units and the italics in the translated passages are my own.

⁴⁴ Mackridge, 'An editorial problem' (Venice 1993) 326.

First, however, the adjacency between verb and OCP, a particularly Medieval development crucial for the further course of events, is investigated. The OCPs in G are nearly always adjacent to their verb, either in postverbal (11) or in preverbal position (12):

11. Ἄρα, υἷέ μου Διγενές, # **διδάξω** σε κοντάριν (2.291)
 12. σοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἠνάγκασας # ἵνα με **θανατώσου**ν (2.186)

Quasi-enclitic particles such as δέ and γάρ, however, are common 'intruders':⁴⁵

13. ἔξεις δέ με καὶ συνεργὸν # εἰς τοὺς ὑπεναντίους. (6.770)

However, the opposite order is also attested in G, which points to a very strong sense of unity between OCP and verb, since such quasi-enclitic particles obligatorily preceded the OCPs in Ancient Greek:⁴⁶

14. **πεῖθει** με γὰρ τὸ συνειδὸς # τηρεῖν τὰ ἐναντία (4.741)

4.2 Postverbal

As can be seen from examples 13 and 14, *postverbal* position is required if the verb 'stands at the beginning of a clause' or 'sentence'.⁴⁷ In view of my theoretical framework, I prefer to rephrase this rule into: 'if the verb opens the intonation unit' (cf. 11). As Mackridge has pointed out for E, the OCPs in G also appear after the verb if it is immediately preceded by the negation οὐ(κ):

15. οὐ **λυπήσω** σε πώποτε, # ὦ πανευγενεστάτη (4.579)

However, negations -as items on Dover's list of preferential words⁴⁸ - normally occur with preverbal OCPs (cf. 4.3.2.1). The exceptional character of οὐ(κ) can be explained by the fact that it has turned into a proclitic since the post-Classical period.⁴⁹ As a consequence, the enclitic OCP is not able to intervene between the proclitic οὐ(κ) and the verb and as such usually appears postverbally. If the OCP is nonetheless 'forced' into preverbal position, οὐ(κ) disrupts the adjacency between OCP and verb (cf. 7: ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω):

16. ἂν τῆν οὐχ **ὑποστρέψω**μεν, # καὶ οἱ πάντες νὰ σφραγῶμεν. (1.112)

As can be seen from this example, the subordinate conjunction of condition (ἂν/ἔάν) attracts the OCP into preverbal position (cf. 4.3.1). Though a conditional conjunction as well, proclitic εἰ is associated with postverbal OCPs by Mackridge:

⁴⁵ The use of particles has strongly diminished and can thus be considered as an archaising characteristic, see A.N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect: As Written and Spoken from Classical Antiquity down to the Present Time* (London 1897) 400. G has 274 instances of γάρ, whereas E gives only 30 tags. The same applies to δέ: G: 434 versus E: 43.

⁴⁶ C.J. Ruijgh, 'La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel', in H. Eichner & H. Rix (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute* (Wiesbaden 1990) 213-233; J. Wills, 'Homeric particle order', *Historische Sprachforschung* 106.1 (1993) 61-81.

⁴⁷ Mackridge, 'An editorial problem' (Venice 1993) 340; Mackridge, 'The position of the weak object pronoun' 134.

⁴⁸ Dover, *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge 1960) 20ff.

⁴⁹ Janse, 'Convergence and divergence' (Amsterdam 2000) 240.

17. Γνώρισόν μοι, κοράσιον, # εἰ ἔχεις με εἰς νοῦν σου (4.316)

Coordinating conjunctions such as καί are in any case followed by postverbal OCPs:

18. Καὶ λέγει μοι ὁ πρόκριτος: # ‘πῶς ἔχομεν πιστεῦσαι (6.192)

Καί was subject to the same evolution as οὐ(κ): it has become a proclitic conjunction after which OCPs can no longer follow.⁵⁰ When immediately following an item that normally triggers pre-position, καί even has the force to remove this trigger.⁵¹

Mackridge also adds clitic doubling -the use of a resumptive OCP- to the environments which require postverbal OCPs, yet at this point the author of G manifests his archaizing intention. According to De Boel, the doubling construction is felt vulgar and consequently G avoids it: 'I haven't found any example of clitic doubling, whereas the Escorial manuscript abounds with this kind of construction'.⁵²

4.3 Preverbal

4.3.1 Syntactic rule

Among the function words which normally trigger preverbal position of the OCPs, conditional (19)⁵³, temporal (20) and final (21, cf. 12) subordinating conjunctions are listed:

19. καλέ, ἄν σε νοήση ὁ κύρης μου # νά σε κακοδικήση (4.442)
20. ὁπότε μας ἐκύκλωσαν # οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀθρόως (3.68)
21. ἵνα του ἐπιπέσωμεν # ἐν νυκτὶ ἀδοκίτως (6.348)

The subjunctive particle νά is etymologically derived from the final conjunction ἵνα,⁵⁴ so it should come as no surprise that in this environment as well preverbal OCPs are standard (22, cf. 19). In combination with ἵνα/νά, not one postverbal counterexample occurs in G, so we can rightly assume the grammaticalisation of the collocation ἵνα/νά + OCP:

22. νά σε καταζητήσωμεν # ὅπου δ' ἂν καὶ τυγχάνης· (1.281)

⁵⁰ Janse, op.cit., 235.

⁵¹ Cf. Mackridge (1993: 329): 'καί removes the force of the preceding subordinating conjunction'; cf. example 42. The Cypriot coordination conjunction 'tze' has the same effects, see Y. Agouraki, 'The position of clitics in Cypriot Greek', in A. Ralli, B.D. Joseph and M. Janse (eds.), *Proceedings of the First International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory* (Patras 2001), 1–18; P. Pappas, 'Object clitic placement in the history of Cypriot Greek', in B. Heselwood & U. Clive (eds.), *Proceedings of Methods XIII: Papers from the Thirteenth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology, 2008* (Frankfurt 2010) 260-269

⁵² G. De Boel, 'The Genesis of Clitic Doubling from Ancient to Medieval Greek', in D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages* (Philadelphia 2008) 95. Mackridge (1993: 327) also associates the complementizer ὅτι and the causal conjunction διότι with postverbal OCPs, but this cannot be confirmed by G because of the lack of (suitable) examples.

⁵³ With the exception of εἰ (cf. 4.2).

⁵⁴ R. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* (Cambridge 1999) 43; cf. Horrocks, 'Clitics in Greek' (Athens 1990) 49.

Together with *vá*, Mackridge mentions the modern concessive and future particles *ἄς* and *θά*: both require preverbal OCPs, yet the former occurs only twice in combination with an OCP and the latter is completely absent from G.⁵⁵

23. ἄς τὸ φορῶ, καλόγνωμε, # ἕως οὔ ὑποστρέψω. (2.270)

The lesser frequency of these modern particles in G testifies to its more classicizing idiom and naturally exercises some influence on the distribution patterns.⁵⁶

Although the preference for preverbal OCPs is here not as clear-cut as in E, the class of relatives must also be discussed under this section:

24. Ἐπελάθου τῶν ἀγαθῶν # ὧν σοὶ ἐνεδειξόμην; (5.128)

4.3.2 Pragmatic principle

Since Pappas claims that emphasis hardly plays a part in the determination of the position of OCPs, more attention will be paid to the pragmatic principle than to the syntactic one. Pappas' most extreme point of view reads as follows: 'previously proposed parameters such as emphasis or discourse constraints do not have a demonstrable effect on the variation'.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, I agree with Mackridge and with many others that information structure is relevant with regard to the Medieval OCP distribution.⁵⁸ Condoravdi & Kiparsky warn us that 'focus structure is not automatically fixed by the textual context, or even by the extralinguistic context, because it depends on what the speaker has in mind and wants to express'.⁵⁹ Since we do not have access to the mind of the Medieval Greeks, we should nevertheless rely on the textual context.

4.3.2.1 Preferential

As mentioned, Dover has drawn up a detailed list of what he considers as preferential words.⁶⁰ Interrogatives are typical examples of words which prefer to open the utterance and as such have become associated with preverbal OCPs:

25. Πῶς σε παραμυθήσομαι; # Ποῦ σε ἀφῶ τὴν ξένην; (8.130)⁶¹

The negation *μή* can be added to this list as well:

26. Ἀγωνίζου, ψυχίτζα μου, # μή μὰς ἀποχωρίσουν (4.626)

⁵⁵ Cf. T. Markopoulos, *The Future in Greek: From Ancient to Medieval* (Oxford 2009): *θά* does not appear in the Greek language until the 16th century.

⁵⁶ For example: *vá* is far more common in E (330) than in G (47), despite the greater length of the latter. As such, there is statistically more chance for preverbal OCPs in E, since *vá* attracts OCPs into preverbal position without exception.

⁵⁷ Pappas, *Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek* (Basingstoke 2004) 44.

⁵⁸ Cf. Condoravdi & Kiparsky, 'Clitics and clause structure' (2004); Revithiadou & Spyropoulos, *A Typology of Greek Clitics* (Rhodes 2006); Janse, 'Convergence and divergence' (Amsterdam 2000); Thoma, 'Distribution and function of clitic object pronouns' (Amsterdam 2007). Unfortunately, no uniform terminology is used: some linguists for example work with the topic-focus distinction (e.g. Janse); I use the somewhat vague term 'emphasis', under which I understand 'marked information' (cf. Thoma).

⁵⁹ Condoravdi & Kiparsky, 'Clitics and clause structure' (2004) 166.

⁶⁰ Dover, *Greek Word Order* (Cambridge 1960) 20ff.

⁶¹ In E, *πῶς* is also used as a complementizer which attracts OCPs into preverbal position. In G, it solely functions as an interrogative. Of course, both have to be considered as different items.

The negation δέν, also associated with pre-position by Mackridge, does not occur in G, as it is probably felt too modern. The composite negations are difficult to judge, since μηδεῖς does not occur with OCPs in G, while μηδέν is only once found in combination with an OCP, viz. before an imperative (cf. 4.4.1: example 41). Οὐδεῖς and οὐδέν occur once in combination with a postverbal OCP (4.553 and 2.16), yet in both cases this can be a consequence of emphasis on their verb (cf. 4.4.2: example 44).

Demonstratives are also popular candidates for P1: as in E, ὅδε, οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος, as well as their derived adverbs, more often than not attract OCPs into preverbal position:

27. Ἀύτη ἔνι ἡ ἀγάπη σου # καὶ οὕτως μοι ὑπέσχου; (2.179)
 28. καὶ δέδοικα μὴ κίνδυνος # ἐκ τούτου μοι ἐπέλθῃ (4.738)

The same applies to strong personal pronouns:

29. σὺ μόνος με ἐνίκησας, # σὺ με ἀποκερδίσεις; (6.769)
 30. καὶ ἀντ' αὐτῆς σοι δώσομεν # πλοῦτον ὅσον κελεύεις. (1.107)⁶²

In the first hemistich of 29, we cannot indicate the exact trigger for pre-position, as σὺ is reinforced by the emphasized adjective μόνος. Indeed, certain adjectives carry emphasis by nature and are thus able to attract OCPs into preverbal position, for instance (derivations from) distinctive adjectives such as ἄλλος and ἕτερος (31); quantitative adjectives such as ὅλος, πᾶς (32) and πολὺς (33):

31. εἰ γὰρ λαλήσω, κράζοντος # ἕτεροὶ μου ἀκούσουν,
 δώσουν, ὑπονοήσουν με # οἱ φυλάττοντες ὧδε (4.419-420)
 32. Οἱ πάντες σε ἐφρόντιζον # τῆς Αἰγύπτου κρατῆσαι,
 σὺ δὲ τύχης τῆς ἑαυτοῦ # ἐμποδιστῆς ἐγένου, (3.155-156)
 33. Πολλάκις τον ἐμήνυσα, # γλυκύτατε υἱέ μου
 ἄλλ' οὐδὲ ὅλως πείθεται εἰς τοῦτο κατανεῦσαι. (4.308-309)

Since the presence of contrast is one of the most straightforward circumstances in which emphasis can be assigned to constituents, the last two examples (οἱ πάντες-σὺ δέ; πολλάκις-ἄλλ' οὐδὲ ὅλως) are clearly linked with the next section and as such show the signalled continuous character of the classification (cf. section 2).

4.3.2.2 Ad hoc emphasized

All words with a lexical meaning are possible candidates for this category. I successively give an example of an emphasized noun (in 34 functioning as an object; in 35 as a subject⁶³), an adverb (36) and of an adjective (37):

34. ψυχὴν γὰρ με ὠνόμαζε, # φῶς ὀφθαλμῶν ἐκάλει
 καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον γαμετὴν # ἔλεγε καὶ φιλότατην (5.107-108)
 'for he named me *his soul*, he called me the light of his eyes,

⁶² Cf. 4.4.3: this example could also be listed among the so-called 'light verbs'.

⁶³ Mackridge ranks subjects -together with temporal adverbs- among environments where the position of OCPs is relatively free.

and after a while he said I was his wife and his dearest'

35. Ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἀντεστάθησαν # στρατηγοί, οὐ φουσσᾶτα,
γυνὴ δέ με ἐνίκησε # πάνυ ὠραιοτάτη· (1.297-298)
'The generals could not withstand me, nor the armies,
but a most lovely *woman* has completely conquered me'
36. Ἐκδεξαί με δὲ εἰς πρόσωπον, # ἐὰν ᾗς στρατιώτης,
καὶ μὴ ὥσπερ κυνάριον # λυσσῶν λάθρα με δάκῃς. (6.515-516)
'Confront me face to face, if you are a soldier
and don't snap at me *behind my back* like a rabid puppy'
37. Αἰχμάλωτόν σε ἤρπαξα, ἐτίμουν ὡς κυρίαν· (2.188)
'I seized you *as my prisoner*, but I honoured you *as my lady*'
38. Ἡμεῖς θανοῦσαν σε εἶχομεν # καὶ σπαθοκοπημένην,
ἀλλ' οὖν τὰ κάλλη ζῶσαν σε # ἐτήρησαν, φιλάτη· (1.324-325)⁶⁴
'We thought you were *dead* and hacked by a sword,
but your beauty, dearest, has kept you *alive*'

This last example (38), in which the participles θανοῦσαν and ζῶσαν are contrasted and thus emphasized, actually constitutes a logical transition to the next subsection, in which the pragmatic principle in relation to verbal forms is examined.

4.4 Verbs and (lack of) emphasis

4.4.1 Imperatives

As seems regularly overlooked, verbs can also be the most emphatic representatives of the idea of the verse.⁶⁵ A prototypical example is the imperative, a verbal form which prefers to open the intonation unit and after which the OCPs normally follow (39, cf. 17, 36):⁶⁶

39. Δός μοι λόγον, αὐθέντρια, # δός μοι σὸν δακτυλίδιν (2.269)

The rare examples of OCPs in front of the imperative in G can all be attributed to one of the outlined principles.⁶⁷ I give an example in which an ad hoc emphasized adverb attracts the OCP (40) and one in which a negation is responsible for the preverbal OCP (41):

40. εὐθὺς ἀνταπεκρίνατο: # Ἀὔριόν με ἐκδέχου'. (4.367)
'and immediately replied: 'Expect me *tomorrow*'
41. Συγχώρησόν μοι, αὐθέντα μου, # μηδέν με καταμέμφου· (4.676)

⁶⁴ Note that in 1.325 the trigger for pre-position acts even across the caesura. As such, this verse is elucidating with regard to the phonological character of the OCPs in G (cf. 3.3): if we accept the caesura to constitute a breathing pause, σε can only form a phonological unit with the preceding word ζῶσαν and is thus an *enclitic*. Cf. for example 6.688.

⁶⁵ For clitic placement and emphasis on verbs, see M.C. Janssen, 'Η πρόταξη και επίταξη του αδύνατου τύπου της προσωπικής αντωνυμίας την εποχή του Ερωτόκριτου και της Θυσίας του Αβραάμ', *Cretan Studies* 6 (1998) 129-144.

⁶⁶ Janse, 'La position des pronoms' (Nancy 1993) 90.

⁶⁷ However, many elements which trigger pre-position are incompatible with imperatives (e.g. subordinating conjunctions). This fact naturally contributes to the dominance of postverbal OCPs.

However, like the first imperative in this last verse (41), *συγχώρησον μοι*, the overwhelming majority of imperatives in G is associated with postverbal OCPs, for the imperative generally opens the intonation unit as most emphasized item.

4.4.2 Competing motivations

More interestingly, the principle of emphasis on a verbal form can perhaps explain certain exceptions, viz. verses in which a preverbal OCP might be expected (according to the outlined syntactic or pragmatic principles), but a postverbal OCP emerges because of emphasis on the verb. Moreover, we may not forget that the postverbal position of the OCP had become the unmarked order. Linguists refer to this phenomenon as 'competing motivations'.

42. ἄλλ' ἂν **παροδηγήσης** με # καὶ ἔλθω μετὰ σένα
καὶ **γνώσουν** το τὰ ἀδελφία μου # καὶ τὸ συγγενικόν μου
καὶ **καταφθάση** σε ὁ πατήρ # ὁ ἐμός μετὰ πλήθους
πῶς ἔχεις ἐξηβάλειν με # καὶ σῶσαι τὴν ψυχὴν σου; (4.452-455)⁶⁸
'but if you *lead me astray* and I *come* with you,
and my brothers and my kinsmen *learn* of this,
and my father with his troop *catches* you,
how can you extricate me and save your life?'

Considering the subordinate conjunction of condition ἂν, we would expect *με* to occur in preverbal position (cf. 4.3.1); the other OCPs *το* and *σε* occupy their normal position, as the coordinating conjunction *καί* precedes the verb twice (cf. 4.2). All the verbs in this long conditional sentence (*παροδηγήσης*, *ἔλθω*, *γνώσουν*, *καταφθάση*) express successive - hypothetical- actions, feared by the speaker, and are as such probably emphasized. In this respect it is worthwhile to note that each verb precedes its complement (respectively the prepositional phrase *μετὰ σένα*, the object *τὰ ἀδελφία μου καὶ τὸ συγγενικόν μου* and the subject *ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐμός*).

43. Ποία μήτηρ **συγκλαύσει** σοι; # Τίς πατήρ ἐλεήσει
ἢ νουθετήσει ἀδελφός, # τινὰ μὴ εὐποροῦσα; (8.131-132)
'What mother will *weep* with you? What father will *pity* you
or brother *give you counsel* when you lack for something?'

Again, we find a list of emphasized verbs: *συγκλαύσει*, *ἐλεήσει* and *νουθετήσει*. *Σοι* follows its verb *συγκλαύσει*, although *ποία μήτηρ* precedes. However, it will be obvious that this interrogative constituent has no true interrogative value, since no answers are expected in this exclamation of pity.

44. καὶ οὐδεὶς **ὀνειδίζει** σε, # μᾶλλον δὲ μακαρίζει. (4.553)
'and no one will *reproach* you, but rather will *congratulate* you'

Negations -with the exception of *οὐ(κ)* (cf. 4.2)- normally exert attraction on OCPs (cf. 4.3.2.1). However, in this verse, it seems unmistakable that the verb is put into relief, for *ὀνειδίζει* stands in opposition to *μακαρίζει*, as is confirmed by the use of *μᾶλλον δέ*.⁶⁹

⁶⁸ As an anonymous referee indicates, the behaviour of OCPs in periphrastic constructions, like in the main clause of this example, provides interesting material for future research.

4.4.3 Light verbs

The reverse phenomenon, verbs which are almost never emphasized, are also relevant within this scope. 'Light verbs' is the label attributed to such frequently used verbs with no concrete content, such as 'to make, to have, to give'.⁷⁰ Consequently, one could say the objects actually specify the verbs' exact meaning. In G now, an OCP is sometimes attracted by a preceding constituent (mostly a direct object) of which we can hardly claim it carries emphasis. Nonetheless, in view of the weak meaning of the verb, this preceding constituent seems to be the main representative of the idea expressed in the intonation unit and as such confirms our pragmatic principle. I have found most examples with δίδωμι:

45. ὁ Μουσούρ ἐστασίασε # καὶ σπαθέαν τον ἐδῶκε· (5.168)⁷¹
'had a disagreement with Mousour who had struck him with his sword'
46. κονταρέαν μοι δέδωκεν # ξυστήν εἰς τὸ λουρίκιν (6.585)
'and struck me a glancing blow on the breast-plate with her spear'

Verbs with cognate objects must be presented here as well, considering their predictable content.⁷²

47. δύο κίγκλας τον κίγκλωσον # καὶ δύο ἐμπροσθελίνας (4.377)
'Gird on for me two saddle-girths and two martingales'

A similar verse is found in E:⁷³

48. Τρεῖς ἵγκλες μοῦ τὸν ἵγκλωσε # καὶ τρεῖς ὀμπροστελίνας (E 800; Mackridge 1993: 330)
'Gird on for me three saddle girths and three martingales'

Mackridge considers the preverbal OCPs as a result of a preceding 'semantically emphasized constituent',⁷⁴ but according to me μοῦ and τὸν precede their verb not so much because of the emphasis on the object τρεῖς ἵγκλες as because of the *lack* of emphasis on the predictable verb ἵγκλωσε. The same applies to the following verse from E:

49. ἔριψε τὸ κοντάριν του # καὶ δάκτυλον τοῦ δείχνει (E 53)
'he threw away his spear and showed him his finger'

⁶⁹ Other examples in which the competing motivations are solved in favour of postverbal position are 6.817; 4.387; 2.59. In some of these exceptional examples, *metre* probably reinforced the choice for postverbal OCPs; one example (cf. 8.138; 4.776):

Ποία δέ γε περίστασις # χωρίσει με σοῦ πόθου; (2.122)

'What circumstances will *separate* me from your desire?'

If we accept the constant enclitic nature of the OCPs in G (cf. 3.3), it is not possible to position *με* before *χωρίσει* (and thus after the interrogative constituent), since it would immediately follow the caesura and thus would have no word preceding to lean on. However, I assume that if the poet had really wanted a preverbal OCP, he would have chosen a different formulation (cf. 3.2).

⁷⁰ Crystal, *A Dictionary* (Malden 2003) 270.

⁷¹ Cf. 1.291; 3.99; 4.38; 6.688.

⁷² Crystal, *op.cit.*, 79.

⁷³ Note that 47 and 48 do not contain a finite verb, but an imperative, which is -as mentioned (cf. 4.4.1)- typically emphasized and thus associated with postverbal OCPs.

⁷⁴ Mackridge, 'An editorial problem' (Venice 1993) 330.

4.5 P2-collocations

I conclude by giving some -at first sight conspicuous- examples which contradict the typical Medieval Greek requirement of verb-adjacency (cf. 4.1). Until now, the OCP immediately preceded or immediately followed its verb, but in the examples below, it is separated from its verb. Interestingly, in almost all these cases, the OCP is found in P2. More specifically, the OCP is attracted into the Wackernagel position by a function word, a preferential word or (more rarely) an ad hoc focalized constituent. In the first example (50), a double final conjunction exerts attraction on the OCP:

50. ἴν' ὅπως σε ἐν τῇ κρυπτῇ # τοῦ λόφου ἐπαγάγω (6.526)

51. μή με τοςάυτην κατιδεῖν # παραχωρήσης θλίψιν (8.179 = E 1858)

This last example is one of the fourteen verses which G and E have in common.⁷⁵ Mackridge has noticed this line as well: 'In these cases the order is not the proper medieval one, but a more archaic one'.⁷⁶ We can rightly label these -nonetheless rare- examples as 'archaic collocations', but rather than as distorting the Medieval Greek OCP distribution rules, I prefer to consider them as corroborating our statement that the history of the Greek OCPs exhibits a high degree of continuity. Indeed, almost all -atypically Medieval Greek- separations between OCP and verb are triggered by exactly the same categories of words which require preverbal OCPs according to the Medieval Greek rules.

5) Conclusion

I have shown that the G version of the *Digenis Akritis* is somewhat erroneously disregarded in the numerous recent studies on Medieval Greek OCPs, for G generally obeys Mackridge's distribution rules, based on the more vernacular E manuscript. Despite some archaizing influences (e.g. avoidance of clitic doubling; lesser frequency of the modern particles *νά*, *ἄς*, *θά*; non-occurrence of *δέν*), the small unstressed words in G clearly behave in a Medieval Greek way (verb-adjacency; syntactic rule & pragmatic principle).

Moreover, these Medieval principles truly constitute a gradual continuation of older -post-Classical- tendencies. Therefore, a statement such as 'the Grottaferrata *Digenis Akritis*, where the medieval rules are *mixed* with the rules of ancient and Hellenistic Greek'⁷⁷ perhaps gives a false impression, for the history of the Greek OCPs reads as a natural development, viz. a grammaticalisation process towards convergence between phonological and syntactic host (accomplished in Modern Greek).

Apparent exceptions in G -postverbal OCP where a preverbal one is expected- can often be explained by a principle which has stayed largely unnoticed with regard to the Medieval Greek OCPs: competing motivations. Since verbs have lexical meaning, they can be subject to ad hoc focalization as well (typical example: imperative). This might lead to OCPs immediately occurring after the verb despite the presence of a possible trigger for preverbal position.⁷⁸

The fact that information structure is relevant to the distribution of Medieval Greek OCPs, seems confirmed by the OCP-behaviour in combination with light verbs, which could

⁷⁵ Jeffreys, *Digenis Akritis* (Cambridge 1998) xxix.

⁷⁶ Mackridge, op.cit., 332.

⁷⁷ Mackridge, op.cit., 338 (my italics).

⁷⁸ In some cases, metre cannot be excluded as a factor contributing to the postverbal position of the OCP.

be considered the reverse of ad hoc focalized verbs. These frequently used verbs, which have a weak or predictable lexical meaning, almost always occur with preverbal OCPs if they are preceded by some -not necessarily emphasized- constituent.

In future research, these light verbs definitely deserve more attention. In general, it seems useful to study the relationship between OCPs and information structure in the popular πολιτικὸς στίχος. For this purpose, I consider the intonation unit as an ideal methodological tool, for the πολιτικὸς στίχος lends easily to a division into intonation units, since this metre (presumably) contains a fixed breathing pause after the eighth syllable. Moreover, most vernacular medieval works contain style markers of orality. Lastly, the application of intonation units allows to identify easily the P2-traces of Wackernagel's Law and thus the continuity of the Greek OCPs.

Appendix

	VERB-ADJACENCY	SEPARATION ⁷⁹	TOT
FINITE VERBS	211 93.78%	14 6.22%	225

		POST	PRE	TOT
FINITE VERBS		96 42.67%	129 57.33%	225
\emptyset ⁸⁰ , καί, οὐ(κ), εἰ		52 98.11%	1 1.89%	53
function word		7 14.29%	42 85.71%	49
	subordinate conjunction	4 15.38%	22 84.62%	26
	particle (νά, ἄς) ⁸¹	0 0%	15 100%	15
	relative	3 37.50%	5 62.50%	8
preferential word		13 24.07%	41 75.93%	54
	interrogative	5 31.25%	11 68.75%	16
	negations, except οὐ(κ)	3 21.43%	11 78.57%	14
	demonstrative	1 12.50%	7 87.50%	8
	strong personal pronoun	1 20%	4 80%	5
	distinctive/quantitative adjective	3 27.27%	8 72.73%	11
fronted constituent ⁸²		24 34.78%	45 65.22%	69
IMPERATIVES		23 74.19%	8 25.81%	31

⁷⁹ I have not reckoned quasi-enclitic particles intervening between verb and OCP among the separations.

⁸⁰ The verb opens the intonation unit.

⁸¹ As mentioned, θά is completely absent from G.

⁸² A constituent preceding the verb does not necessarily carry emphasis and can thus not automatically be called an 'ad hoc emphasized constituent'.

Jorie Soltic
University of Ghent