Parenthetical "I say (you)" in Late Medieval Greek vernacular

A message-structuring discourse marker rather than a message-conveying verb

Jorie Soltic

Ghent University, Belgium

In this paper, I argue that the first-person singular of the "ordinary" verb λέγω/λαλῶ ('I say') in the thirteenth- to fourteenth-century political verse narratives *Chronicle of Morea* and *War of Troy* does not always carry its "normal", representational content ('I inform/assure [you]'). Frequently, λέγω/λαλῶ structures the discourse rather than conveying conceptual meaning and, thus, has procedural meaning. In this respect, the verb can be compared to modern discourse markers, (i.e., semantically reduced items which abound in spoken language). An important – yet not decisive – criterion to distinguish the conceptual from the procedural use is the position of λέγω/λαλῶ: all "DM-like" examples are parenthetical. As for their precise pragmatic function, these forms are used, in particular, to signal a clarification towards the listener ("I mean") or, more generally, to grab the attention of the audience. Applied to the modern binary distinction between inter-personal and textual discourse markers, they thus belong to the former category. Finally, I tentatively relate the observation that the procedural parenthetical examples show a marked preference for pre-caesural position to the concept of "filled pauses", which makes sense given the adopted oral style of the Late Medieval Greek political verse narratives.

Keywords: discourse marker, filled pause, interpersonal function, Late Medieval Greek, political verse

1. Introduction

Verbs of speech seem to have been frequent in the spoken discourse of the past, as they are today. The Late Medieval Greek (LMG) period is especially illuminating

when it comes to the study of such phenomena, as the poets of the time deliberately adopted an oral style (E. Jeffreys 2011): consider, for example, narratives composed in the metre of the "political verse" (πολιτικὸς στίχος), which is the natural medium for vernacular poetry in this period (Horrocks 2010: 328). In these texts, forms of λέγω ('to say') also abound.

The first-person singular of the verbs that are traditionally called "reporting" constitutes an especially popular form:

(1)   War of Troy 3102–3103
       Λέγω σας τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀποκάτω
       πλέον ἀποκοτώτερος καβαλλάρης οὐκ ἦτον.
       [I tell you the truth, beneath heaven
       there was no more daring horseman'[1]]

Within a narratological framework, such forms have been related to the live oral composition which the poets of the political verse narratives attempted to evoke: the many references to the performing "I" and the listening "you" can be regarded as a strategy to "maintain a bond typical of orality" (Shawcross 2009: 157 ff.).

From a linguistic point of view, there is much more to be said with respect to the precise uses of this seemingly ordinary verb. In this paper, I will argue that we should distinguish between a purely conceptual use of λέγω and a more pragmatic one. In its conceptual use, λέγω retains its basic representational "message-conveying" meaning, such as in Example 1 in which the truth (τὴν ἀλήθειαν) of the poet's words is emphasized. In its pragmatic use, λέγω structures the discourse rather than conveying information. With regard to the latter, in which λέγω is consistently used parenthetically, I maintain that the verbal form should be related to the modern linguistic concept of discourse markers (DMs), thereby allowing for a more fine-grained analysis of the verb λέγω and, in turn, aiding our interpretation and translation of LMG literature.

This paper is structured as follows: in the next section, I will clarify the concept of DMs. In the third section, I will provide background information on my corpus (which consists of the thirteenth- to fourteenth-century *Chronicle of Morea* and *War of Troy*). The fourth section will contain my analysis. In the last section, I provide conclusions and suggestions for further research.

---

1. Translations into English are my own.

2.   Discourse markers

2.1   Term and definition

Much confusion exists in the terminology surrounding elements which contribute little to the conceptual content of the utterance and are subject to "semantic bleaching", which can be defined as "the partial effacement of a morpheme's semantic features, the stripping away of some of its precise content so it can be used in an abstracter, grammatical-hardware-like way" (Matisoff 1991: 384). Well-known "semantically bleached" examples from English are *you see*, *like, so*, *moreover* and *anyway* (Schiffrin 1987; Fraser 1999). These items are usually referred to as discourse markers: "*Discourse marker* is perhaps the most common name suggested for the seemingly empty expressions found in oral discourse, such as *actually*, *oh*, *right*, *well*, *I mean*, and *you know*" (Brinton 1996: 29; cf. Fischer 2006: 5). However, we find several other (near) synonyms, such as "pragmatic marker", "(discourse) connective", "discourse particle", etc. (Brinton 1996: 29; Fischer 2006).[2]

DMs all have in common that they have procedural rather than conceptual meaning: while conceptual elements, such as "book" or "bookshop", are easily brought to consciousness, items with procedural meaning do not enter into the representational content of an utterance, as Wilson and Sperber (1993: 16) state:

> Discourse connectives are notoriously hard to pin down in conceptual terms. If "now" or "well" encodes a proposition, why can it not be brought to consciousness? […] The procedural account suggests an answer to these questions. Conceptual representations can be brought to consciousness: procedures can not (cf. Carston 2002: 162; Schourup 2011: 2120).[3]

Far from being useless, the function of DMs must be sought on a pragmatic level: they help to process the message by structuring the discourse in one way or another.

2.2   Interpersonal and textual function

The pragmatic functions of DMs broadly fall into two categories: a textual and an inter-personal function (Brinton 1996: 29, 38 ff.; Fraser 1999). In their inter-personal function, DMs clarify the relation between the speaker and the hearer: DMs "help the speaker divide his message into chunks of information and hence they

---

2. Cf. Fischer (2006: 1): "There are very many studies on discourse particles, and by now it is almost impossible to find one's way through this jungle of publications".

3. Relevance Theory most clearly defines the conceptual vs. procedural distinction, which is to be distinguished from the truth-conditional vs. non-truth-conditional distinction (cf. Blakemore 1987; Wilson and Sperber 1993); see Carston (2002) for a clear theoretical overview.

also help the listener in the process of decoding these information units" (Brinton 1996: 31). This use thus refers to the nature of the social exchange. Frequently quoted examples of interpersonal DMs are *you know* and *I mean*. The textual function of DMs points to the fact that they can operate as conduits between different segments of a text (scenes, paragraphs, sentences, etc.): DMs "relate the message to prior discourse" (Fraser 1990: 387) or, somewhat differently, "signal sequential discourse relationships" (Fraser 1990: 392). This use is, thus, related to the way the speaker creates cohesive passages of discourse. *After all* and *furthermore* are regarded as typical textual DMs. However, we cannot draw a sharp distinction between these two categories: being extremely multi-functional, some DMs can play a part on both the interpersonal and the textual level because "They are multifunctional, operating on several levels simultaneously" (Jucker and Ziv 1998: 3; cf. Fischer 2006; Petukhova and Bunt 2009).[4]

2.3 Continuum conceptual–procedural

Given the difficulties of drawing a sharp line between the conceptual and the procedural meaning of an item, the distinction should be conceived as a continuum (Jucker and Ziv 1998: 2–3). This is a consequence of the origin of DMs: they usually evolve from fully representational elements to elements having procedural instead of conceptual meaning: conceptual expressions, thus, gradually become used as DMs. This development has been described as a process of "grammaticalization" (Brinton 1996: 65) or "pragmatic(al)ization" (Aijmer 1997). As is logical, the procedural meaning is often closely connected with the conceptual one (see Schourup 2011: 2126). Thus, even when having developed a procedural meaning, the element in question does not necessarily lose its conceptual meaning, so that both uses can co-exist (see Schiffrin 1987: 328; Fraser 1999: 931). As a consequence, it is often difficult to distinguish between the "normal" conceptual use and the "pure" use of a DM, as is the case with *now*, for instance. Its use as a temporal adverb ("Now Pearson is living on her oil investments", where *now* simply indicates the present moment) should be distinguished from its use as a DM ("Now, Pearson is living on her oil investments", in which *now* signals a next step in the discourse), a reading which Schourup (2011: 2116–17) has tried to suggest by adding a comma.

---

4. Moreover, ultimately, all textual DMs can also be said to have an interpersonal use, as their aim is to achieve successful communication and communication is interpersonal.

2.4 Parentheticals

The multi-functionality of the class of DMs is reflected in its syntactic diversity: it includes single-word items such as *so*, as well as phrases such as *you see* (Brinton 1996: 29–30). To complicate matters further, these phrasal DMs have often been labelled "parenthetical clauses" or "comment clauses" (Schneider 2007; Dehé and Wichmann 2010). Rouchota (1998), in turn, speaks of "parenthetical discourse markers".

2.5 Spoken discourse

A widely acknowledged feature of DMs is the fact that they are "characteristic of speech rather than of writing" (Lyavdansky 2010: 81). Schiffrin's (1987: 31) very general definition is as follows: a DM is an "element which brackets units of talk". In this respect, it is interesting to note that some DMs have been related to the concept of "filled pauses", which are, of course, typically found in natural spoken discourse.[5] In this context, the following statement of Östman (1981: 9) is relevant: "pause fillers, or 'hesitation markers', range in character from elongated vowels or nasals, to whole sentences […], with their prototypical category members being expressions like *I mean*, *you know*, *like*, *well*, *oh*, *uh* and *ah*".[6] DMs have even been compared to "editing markers" (Erman 2001: 1344): "some have functions that come close to e.g. those of punctuation or paragraphing in written texts" (Erman 2001: 1339) and "parenthetical clauses are usually inserted where there would be a punctuation mark in written language" (Schneider 2007: 40).

DMs are compared to filled pauses, because DMs present a point of low (conceptual) informativeness and thereby create time for both the speaker and the hearer to progress the message, just like silent pauses do. Both DMs and pauses thus help to structure the discourse instead of conveying conceptual meaning. Nevertheless, this comparison cannot become a safe-conduct to treat DMs as inter-changeable. Nuances between the different DMs must be distinguished, for it has been assumed that some core meaning of the DM always remains: "the VF [verbal filler] categories are inherently different" (Stenström 1990: 250; cf. Dehé and Wichmann 2010: 32). Depending on the context *I mean* will, for instance, be preferred to *you know*.

Given the fact that DMs are "predominantly a feature of oral rather than of written discourse" (Brinton 1996: 33), we should not be unduly surprised that

---

5. Other terms in use are "pause fillers", "lexical fillers", "verbal fillers" or even just "fillers" (cf. Stenström 1990: 214–15).

6. Cf. Bakker (1990: 9); Scheppers (2011: 211–12).

their study in a so-called "dead" language such as Late Medieval Greek (LMG) is still in its infancy.[7] Nevertheless, in what follows, I will argue that λέγω does not always convey its full conceptual meaning of *to say* or *to tell*, but can also serve pragmatic aims and should, in this respect, be compared to modern DMs. Before conducting my analysis, however, it is necessary to briefly describe my corpus.

3. Corpus

3.1 The *Chronicle of Morea* and the *War of Troy*

My corpus consists of two extensive texts which are generally considered to be among the first political verse narratives (thirteenth- to fourteenth-century) and which are written in an idiom very close to the vernacular: the *Chronicle of Morea* and the *War of Troy* (E. Jeffreys 2013). Together, they consist of more than 23,500 verses.

The *Chronicle of Morea* marks "the beginning of a new era in medieval Greek literature" (Anaxagorou 1998: 117). Indeed, it is, presumably, the first LMG narrative which exhibits the typical characteristics of the later political verse romances (E. Jeffreys 2013) and is sometimes considered to be the "closest to the vernacular" of all the preserved LMG political verse texts (Manolessou 2002: 125). In particular, manuscript H (Havniensis Fabricius 57), which is much older than the other manuscript in which the Greek version of the Chronicle has been preserved (P = Parisinus Graecus 2898), is said to resemble the spoken language of the period (Browning 1999: 73). I have, thus, relied on H to conduct my analysis. In the edition of Schmitt (1904), H counts as many as 9,219 political verses.[8] Its content covers the history of French feudalism on the Peloponnese ("Morea") after the fourth crusade in 1204 and seems to reflect a somewhat anti-Greek, pro-Frankish attitude (M. Jeffreys 1975: 305–6; Shawcross 2009: 263).

The *War of Troy* is the longest (preserved) text of the LMG political verse narratives: it consists of 14,401 verses in the edition which I have used (Papathomopoulos and E. Jeffreys 1996).[9] The Greek *War of Troy* is based on Benoit de Sainte Maure's *Roman de Troie*, which tells the famous story of the siege of Troy (E. Jeffreys 2013).

---

7. We can mention the articles by Egea (1993), Wahlgren (2003), Thoma (2007: 143–4), Loudová (2009) and Soltic (2013).

8. This edition, which is "old but nevertheless reliable" (Aerts 2005: 142), can be integrally found on the online *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

9. This edition can also be integrally found on the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* under its Latin name, *Bellum Troianum*. Hence, I will use the abbreviation "BT" when giving examples.

3.2 Political verse

As mentioned above, both texts are composed in the πολιτικὸς στίχος, which is "the standard accentual metre of folk songs, medieval and early modern vernacular poetry" (Horrocks 2010: 328). The English translation "political verse" is actually misleading, for the metre has nothing to do with politics: the adjective πολιτικός means no more than 'common, trivial' (Horrocks 2010: 368 n.1). This designation refers to the fact that the metre is based on the truly spoken word accent instead of on the (now extinct) difference between long and short vowels as in classical metres (which are, however, used artificially in the early Medieval period). Thus, "the political verse is a metre of the ear and not of the eye" (Papathomopoulos and E. Jeffreys 1996: lxxxvii). Each political verse contains fifteen syllables (hence also "fifteen-syllabic" or "decapentasyllable" verse). It has, in principle, an iambic rhythm, though a stress on the first and/or ninth syllables may occasionally occur (Lauxtermann 1999). The ninth syllable constitutes the first syllable after the fixed metrical pause or "strong caesura" (Horrocks 2010: 328), which from now on will be marked with a hash (#). Thus, each verse consists of two standard half-lines of eight and seven syllables respectively, for example:

(2) BT 827
     πάντων τὴν νίκην εἴχετε, # ὡς ἔδειξε τὸ πρᾶγμα·
     [you gained the victory over all, as the case showed]

Interestingly, elision (the omission of a vowel) is avoided between the eighth and the ninth syllable, whereas it is allowed elsewhere (Apostolopoulos 1984: 211; Lendari 2007: 132). In other words, a hiatus may occur between the vowels of the eighth (ε) and the ninth (ω) syllable. While the presence of elision seems to exclude the possibility of a breathing boundary, hiatus is a signal of discontinuous speech and, thus, of a breathing boundary. Eideneier (1999: 104) even relates the length of the half-lines to our average breathing capacity:

> Wenn wir von einem menschlichen Atemvolumen für den Vortrag von Versen zwischen 12 und 17 Silben ausgehen […] ist eine solche Mittelzäsur eine zusätzliche Möglichkeit zur Sinn-gliederung und Pausenmarkierung.
> [When we take 12 to 17 syllables to be the average human breathing capacity for the recitation of verses (…) then we could consider such a middle caesura a supplementary possibility for a division according to sense and for the marking of pauses']

Each verse usually consists of two autonomous units which constitute both a sense-unit and a grammatical unit: "each half-line comprises a self-contained unit, in terms of syntax and sense […] As a general rule, a line of political verse consists of two units" (Beaton 1980: 44). Consequently, it seems reasonable to equate not

only verse-end but also the fixed caesura with a breathing boundary or even with a breathing pause.[10] This assumption is supported by the origin of the political verse: a combination of two metres, namely an octosyllable (eight syllables) and a heptasyllable (seven syllables) (Lauxtermann 1999:18).

3.3 Oral style

Like all LMG political verse narratives, the two texts under scrutiny have been related to an oral tradition. Whether or not the narratives were orally recited (they were definitely not orally composed), it is widely acknowledged that an oral tradition has exercised an indisputable influence on their discourse and, thus, on their language: there exists "a tacit acceptance that the stylistic features and peculiarities of this group of late Byzantine verse texts are best explained against a background of orally composed and orally disseminated poetry" (E. Jeffreys 2011:474; cf. Mackridge 1990; Sifakis 2001). The poets are, thus, assumed to have deliberately adopted an oral style: though they are probably writing in an isolated room, the poets want to give the impression that they are moulding their verses on the spot. This view has mainly been based on the large number of formulas (memorized phrases which fit the metre) found in this type of text (M. Jeffreys 1973).

As has been mentioned in the introduction, the many meta-narrative expressions referring to the poet himself ("I") and his (imaginary) audience ("you") have been labelled oral style markers: "a constant urge is displayed by H to bring narrator and narratees into each other's mental presence (e.g., 'σὲ λαλῶ', v.381; 'σὲ λέγω', v.1651; 'εἶπα σε', v.3178; 'σᾶς ἀφηγοῦμαι', v.446)" (Shawcross 2009:157; cf. Anaxagorou 1998:64–5). Indeed, the first-person singular present of so-called "reporting" verbs ("I say/tell", possibly accompanied by "you") is a very popular form in the *Chronicle of Morea* and the *War of Troy*. In the next section, however, I will demonstrate that, from a linguistic point of view, not all instances may be classified in the same way.

4. Analysis

4.1 *Λέγω/λαλῶ (σε/σου/σας)*

This investigation focuses on the first-person singular present *λέγω*. The subject pronoun *ἐγώ* ('I') is usually not expressed, since Greek is a so-called "pro(noun)-drop"

---

10. However, we need to have a more explicit account of "the types of syntactical structure that may be interrupted at the midline caesura and at the end of a line" (Mackridge 1990:202).

language (Pappas 2004: 56). This means that an explicit subject pronoun is not necessary, for the subject can be derived from the rich verb morphology. I have also taken into account the synonym *λαλῶ*, which is used especially in the *Chronicle of Morea*. Very often, these verbs are followed or preceded by a second-person weak object pronoun, functioning as the indirect object ('to you'): *λέγω/λαλῶ σε/σου/σας* and *σὲ/σοῦ/σᾶς λέγω/λαλῶ*. The distribution of the LMG weak object pronouns, which is probably one of the best studied aspects of LMG syntax, is constrained: weak object pronouns have less positional freedom than their "strong" counterparts, such as *ἐσέ(ν)(α)(ν)* and *ἐσᾶς*. Being prosodically deficient, the weak object pronouns can never carry stress and have to lean (*κλίνω* in Ancient Greek) on a neighbouring word (hence also "clitic" pronoun), which in LMG has to be the verb (Mackridge 1993: 329). The default position is post-verbal, yet the *Chronicle of Morea* seems to foreshadow the situation of Standard Modern Greek, in which the weak object pronoun always occurs immediately before the verb if found in combination with a finite verb (cf. Mackridge 1993: 333 n.2; Chila-Markopoulou 2004: 210 n.6; Pappas 2004: 87; Soltic and Janse 2012). Note that the accent on pre-verbal weak object pronouns does not reflect a prosodic reality but is only a convention.

The phrases *λέγω/λαλῶ (σε/σου/σας)* and *(σὲ/σοῦ/σᾶς) λέγω/λαλῶ* may occur in character text (characters addressing each other), but are predominantly found in narrator text (the storyteller addressing his audience). This explains why Shawcross (2009: 157 ff.) has related them to the "live oral composition" which the poets of the political verse narratives attempt to evoke (cf. Anaxagorou 1998: 64–5; cf. Section 3.3).

In what follows, I will show that it is appropriate to distinguish between a conceptual and a procedural "DM-like" use of the verbal forms *λέγω/λαλῶ*.

4.2 Frequency

A prerequisite for a conceptual expression to become a DM is its frequency: "When a single word or feature is used with such enormous frequency, […] it diminishes in its semantic and functional load, taking on a more generalized meaning" — or even better: a pragmatic meaning (Anaxagorou 1998: 141; cf. Brinton 1996: 22).

Table 1. Total occurrences the first-person singular present "I say"

Total	406
Λέγω	346
Λαλῶ	60

We can conclude from these numbers that λέγω/λαλῶ satisfies this preliminary criterion.[11] However, not all instances of λέγω/λαλῶ can of course be regarded as DMs. The majority have "retained" their conceptual meaning:

Table 2. Conceptual vs. procedural

Total λέγω and λαλῶ	406
Conceptual	214
Procedural	192

Interestingly, in its procedural use, λέγω/λαλῶ is consistently used parenthetically, so there exists an important – yet not decisive – correlation between the position of the verbal form and its function. However, before outlining the criteria used to distinguish between the conceptual and procedural use, it should be remembered that we cannot make a very sharp distinction between the two uses: simply put, since DM use normally finds its origins in the conceptual meaning, some core meaning will remain (cf. Dehé and Wichmann 2010: 32; cf. Section 2.3).[12] Rather than constituting two strictly separated categories, then, the two uses are best viewed as being part of a continuum, with the result that some examples will be more prototypical than others (e.g., Aijmer 1997: 6 ff.; Dehé and Wichmann 2010: 39).

4.3 Conceptual use

In 214 instances, λέγω/λαλῶ carries its full semantic load: 'I say (to you)' or 'I tell (you)'. From a grammatical point of view, this is clear from the use of arguments: if the form in question has an argument such as a direct object (either a simple constituent, as in the first example, or a completive clause, as in the second), the

---

11. To give an impression, the first-person singular present ἔχω ('I have') occurs only 146 times; λέγω/λαλῶ even surpasses the number of instances of θέλω ('I want') (168 instances), which is not only used as a main verb, but also as an auxiliary.

12. I assume that the procedural DM use of parenthetical λέγω/λαλῶ finds its origins in the conceptual use, but — as an anonymous referee warns — this claim should need to be supported by a thorough diachronic analysis based on independent data, which might also uncover its precise evolution (which structure is the origin of the parenthetical? e.g. the matrix clause hypothesis, cf. Brinton 2008). However, the shift from conceptual to procedural use seems the normal, widely reported development for DMs (see Section 2.3). Moreover, it is not hard to imagine that the pragmatic use of λέγω/λαλῶ is derived from the conceptual one, for the functions of clarifying (Section 4.4.1) and grabbing attention (Section 4.4.2) nicely fit in with the act of reporting.

verb under scrutiny possesses without doubt verbal and, thus, conceptual value as in these examples:[13]

(3) BT 1098
Καὶ τί νὰ **λέγω** τὰ πολλά; # Κανεὶς οὐχ ὑπελείφθη.
[What more shall I say? No-one was spared]

(4) BT 4531
Λέγω σας ὅτι ὁ Ἕκτορας # ἔπεσεν ἐκ τὴν σέλλαν
[I tell you that Hektor fell from his saddle]

The conceptual content of the verb is very often reinforced by lexical means. To begin with, the verb is frequently co-ordinated with other verbs of informing (also in the first person singular: *πληροφορῶ* 'I inform', *συμβουλεύω* 'I advise', *γράφω* 'I write', *ἀφηγοῦμαι* 'I narrate'):

(5) Morea H 7753–7756
Μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ πρίγκιπας, # ἐκεῖνος ὁ Γυλιάμος,
τὰ πάντα ὅπου σὲ **λαλῶ**, # γράφω καὶ ἀφηγοῦμαι
καὶ ἄλλα πλεῖστα καὶ πολλά, # τὰ οὐκ ἠμπορῶ σὲ γράφει,
ἐποίησεν καὶ ἐδιόρθωσεν # κι ἀπεκατέστησέν τα.
[Thereafter, the princeps, that Guillaume,
all the things which I say to you, write and tell
and many other things, which I cannot write you,
he did and arranged and established them]

Often, the truth and trustworthiness of what he is telling is stressed (*θαρρῶ* 'I believe confidently', *ὁρκίζω* 'I swear' and *ἀλήθεια* 'truly'), so that the translation 'I assure (you)' sometimes even becomes appropriate; for example:

(6) Morea H 1849
ἐγὼ ἐξεύρω εἰς πληροφορίαν, # μὲ ἀλήθειον σὲ τὸ **λέγω**
[I have been informed, truthfully I say it to you]

This emphasis on the reliability of his words is indubitably caused by "the anxiety of the medieval story-teller that the audience should believe his narration" (Anaxagorou 1998: 137). Considerations of the length/duration (*πλατύνω* 'I amplify', *μακρολογεῖν* 'I expand' and *παύομαι* 'I stop') of his story are also often found in the context:

---

13. As mentioned in Section 4.1, the second-person weak object pronoun forms a unit with the verb in LMG: "the clitic object pronoun ceased to be a freely moving part of the clause and instead became part of the verb phrase" (Mackridge 1993: 329); therefore, it is not considered to be a true argument.

(7)   BT 8561

Οὐκ ἠμπορῶ μακρολογεῖν, # **λέγω σας** ἐν συνόψει

[I cannot extend, I tell you briefly]

Sometimes, a reference to the (opposite) act of listening (ἀκούω) is made:

(8)   Morea H 5743–5744

κι οὐδὲν ἦτον εἰς τὸν Μορέαν # στὴν μάχην τῶν Ρωμαίων

εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ὅπου λαλῶ, # κι ἀκούσετε τὰ **λέγω.**

[and he was not in Morea during the war with the Romans

at the time I am speaking of, and listen to what I say]

In sum, in all of these examples the speech act is emphasized and the verb possesses its "original" conceptual value. This cannot be said of the procedural instances, to which I now turn.

4.4 Procedural use

The remaining 192 examples seem to have a deviating use in that they have developed pragmatic functions. It does not make sense to interpret these instances of λέγω/λαλῶ as verbs with the fully conceptual meaning of 'to say' or 'to tell'. Rather, the function of these forms must be sought on the pragmatic plane: they help to process the message by structuring the discourse in one way or another, precisely as DMs in modern spoken languages do. Simply put, their primary role is to structure information rather than to convey information.

As modern research has shown, not all conceptual expressions are equally qualified for developing a pragmatic meaning and, thus, for receiving DM status. As mentioned in Section 4.2, items which frequently occur in speech are much more likely to undergo this evolution. We have seen that this requirement is met by λέγω/λαλῶ. Moreover, cross-linguistically, the verb *to say* seems an appropriate candidate to become "pragmatic(al)ized".

Which indications can now facilitate the identification of procedural λέγω/λαλῶ? First, the procedural forms of λέγω/λαλῶ lack arguments (apart from a possible second-person weak object pronoun σε/σου/σας) as well as other modifiers such as adverbs. Moreover, they are consistently used parenthetically. Parentheticals are expressions which are syntactically independent from the clause to which they are attached; Dehé and Kavalova (2007: 1) define parentheticals as "expressions that are linearly represented in a given string of utterance (a host sentence), but seem structurally independent at the same time". In modern spoken languages, this syntactic independence is normally reflected prosodically (pauses in speech). With respect to my corpus of narrative texts, however, we are forced to rely on

the context to attribute parenthetical status to an expression: the parenthetical verbs differ from their surrounding verbs. More concretely, they have a different personal ending (first-person singular instead of third-person) and do not follow sequence of tense (present instead of past) (cf. Brinton 2008: 7). The parenthetical forms are usually also recognized by the editors, by whom the verbs are then put between commas (punctuation is not common in the manuscripts); for instance:

(9)   BT 3550
Ὁ δοὺξ Ἀθήνας, **λέγω σας**, # πολλὰ ἦτον θυμωμένος
[The dux of Athens, I say to you, was very furious]

The tendency of parenthetical expressions to become DMs has been noted in languages such as English (see Section 2.4), where parenthetical phrases such as *I mean*, *you see* and *you know* have been regarded as true DMs. Lewis (2006: 55) even states that "discourse markers are often realised as parentheticals".[14] This is not surprising, since parentheticals are extra-sentential elements which can be removed from the utterance without disturbing its correctness — at least not from a purely syntactic point of view (cf. Astruc 2005).[15] They can easily become semantically bleached and adopt pragmatic functions, as Aijmer (1997: 7), who discusses *I think*, notes:

> According to Plank (1981), the process [of "parentheticalization"] is an example of syntactic-pragmatic reduction […]. The functional precondition for the change is that the verb does not belong to the main part of the message, but expresses in a general way the speaker's attitude to the utterance […].

This also applies to parenthetically used reporting verbs, such as *I say*. Brinton (2008: 73) observes that "verbs of communication can function parenthetically as comment clauses". Brinton (2008) even devotes a whole book chapter to English comment clauses with the verb *to say*, in which she distinguishes different procedural uses. Introducing a question is one of them; for instance: "Say, can you lend me a dime?" (Lee 2003: 134; cf. Brinton 2008: 76–7).

It should be stressed that, although parenthetical position is a very strong criterion by which to identify DM-like forms, we cannot automatically assign DM-status to parenthetically used examples of λέγω/λαλῶ. To be perfectly clear: all procedural instances of λέγω/λαλῶ are parenthetical in nature, but this does not hold the other way round: not all parenthetical instances have procedural

---

14. Cf. Brinton (1996: 212): "it will become clear that these first-person know-parentheticals have many of the characteristics of pragmatic markers. They are optional items of high frequency and fairly fixed form. They occur outside the syntactic clause and contribute little to its propositional meaning".

15. See Brinton (1996: 34) for the apparent optionality of DMs.

meaning, as Examples 6 (Morea H 1849) and 7 (BT 8561) show (cf. 4.3: where we have parentheticals, yet conceptual meaning).

If we are forced to classify our procedural examples of λέγω/λαλῶ according to the modern binary distinction between inter-personal and textual DMs, they rather belong to the former category (see Section 2.2). Procedural λέγω/λαλῶ does not purely operate as a conduit between different segments of a text (textual function), for example, but also guides the listener, as the addition of the explicit reference to the listener in the form of a second-person pronoun shows (cf. Shawcross 2009: 157 ff.).

The main pragmatic function of procedural λέγω/λαλῶ seems to signal a clarification on behalf of the speaker towards the listener. Of the 192 procedural examples, 60 have a clear clarification-signalling purpose: they signal an apposition (Section 4.4.1). With regard to the other procedural examples, the poet "merely" wants to grab the attention of his audience (real or imaginary). In these cases, λέγω/λαλῶ especially occurs when "heavy" information is conveyed (be it heavy in form or meaning; see Section 4.4.2). Although these DM uses cannot, of course, be separated from each other, I have classified my examples into these two categories for the sake of convenience. Both types can be compared, albeit tentatively, to DMs functioning as filled pauses (see Section 4.4.3).

4.4.1   *Clarification-signalling function*

In this category, it seems that the poet realizes too late — or at least wants to give that impression — that (a part of) his utterance is not completely straightforward or is ambiguous for the listener, so that a clarification is required if he wants his audience to understand his message properly. *Λέγω/λαλῶ* signals this clarification, which normally takes the form of an apposition (i.e., a constituent is added to a constituent in the same case — both constituents are underlined in the examples below). Interestingly, appositions are considered to be typical of spoken language:

> Apposition is one of the ways in which the "adding style", associated with orality, expresses itself. The type of apposition in which a word is reformulated with a synonymous one […] can be seen as a feature of the repetitious nature of speech. This is one of the marked features of the oral story-telling tradition at its best.
>
> (Anaxagorou 1998: 139).

Since re-reading is not possible, the oral poet wants to be sure his message is clear enough. The apposition can take the accusative case (28 examples):[16]

---

16. This includes three accusatives which clarify a prepositional phrase, for instance (cf. BT 9768 infra):

   (i)   Morea H 948 οὐδὲν εὑρίσκω <u>εἰς ἐμέν</u>, # **λέγω** <u>στὸν ἐνιαυτόν μου</u>
       [I do not find it <u>in me</u>, I say, <u>in myself</u>]

(10)   BT 5148–5149
Ὁ Ἀνθενὼρ μὲ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, # <u>τὸν καλὸν στρατιώτην</u>,
λέγω σας <u>τὸν Πολυδαμᾶν</u>, # ἦλθαν μὲ τὸν λαόν τους
[Anthenor with his son, <u>the beautiful soldier</u>,
I tell you, <u>Polydamas</u>, came together with their people]

(11)   BT 8809
στρέφονται <u>εἰς τὴν κεφαλήν</u>, # **λέγω** <u>τὸν Ἀγαμέμνων</u>
[they returned <u>to their head</u>, I say, <u>Agamemnon</u>]

Note that in the two above examples λέγω (σας) is not surrounded by the typical parenthetical commas in the edition. The reason for this is presumably the fact that the clarifying accusative constituents τὸν Πολυδαμᾶν ('Polydamas') and τὸν Ἀγαμέμνων ('Agamemnon') can be interpreted as direct objects of λέγω ('I speak about'). However, since exactly the same phenomenon is observed in the examples involving other cases than the accusative, I would argue in favour of a comma, as in the following example:

(12)   BT 9767–9768
Καλὰ τυχαίνει ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς # νὰ θλίβεται πολλάκις
τί <u>ἀπὸ ἐκεῖνον</u>, **λέγω σας**, # τί <u>ἀπὸ τὸν λαόν του</u>,
ὅτι καλὰ τοῦ ἐσκότωσαν # ἐκλεκτοὺς πεντακόσιους
[It happened that Achilles mourned often
because <u>from him</u>, I tell you, <u>from his people</u>,
they killed 500 exquisite men]

A genitive constituent too can need clarification (eight examples):

(13)   BT 10827
ὁ πατὴρ <u>τῆς πανέμνοστης</u>, # **λέγω**, <u>τῆς Δηϊδάμας</u>
[the father <u>of the beautiful one</u>, I say, <u>Deïdama</u>]

Procedural λέγω/λαλῶ can also mark an elucidating subject, in which case we find an apposition in the nominative (14 examples):

(14)   BT 3175
Ὅταν δὲ ἐκατέλαβεν # <u>ὁ βριαρόχειρ γίγας</u>,
λέγω σας δὲ <u>ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς</u> # ὁ θαυμαστός, ὁ μέγας
[When <u>the giant with the robust hands</u> arrived,
I tell you, <u>Achilles</u>, the marvelous one, the big one (…)]

In this example, the paraphrase ὁ βριαρόχειρ γίγας ('the giant with the robust hands') is the subject of ἐκατέλαβεν ('arrived'). The phrase λέγω σας then introduces the proper name (ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς) to which this description refers. However, we

should also take into account examples in which the subject is not expressed, but in which a so-called "zero" pronoun is present. Note that English indispensably needs an explicit subject pronoun (underlined in my translations). In the next three examples, the subject is present in the immediate context (in italics), yet in the meantime other possible subjects have been mentioned. In order to avoid confusion, the poet then deems it necessary to make the subject explicit again (10 examples):

(15)   BT 6216–6219
Πολυδαμᾶς ἐσύγκρουσε # μετὰ τὸν Διομήδην,
ἔπεσε ὁ Διομήδιος # ἐντάμα μὲ τὸν ἵππον•
ἐμπρὸς παρὰ νὰ σηκωθῇ, # ἐπῆρε του τὸν ἵππον,
λέγω σας, <u>ὁ Πολυδαμᾶς</u>• # τὸν Τρώϊλον τὸν στέλνει.
[*Polydamas* came to blows with Diomedes,
Diomedes fell together with his horse,
before <u>he</u> stood up, he took from him the horse,
I tell you, <u>Polydamas</u>; he gave it (the horse) to Troïlos]

(16)   Morea H 2878–2881
Τὴν χάριν, ὅπου ἐχάρισεν # ὁ πρίγκιπας, τὸ Ἀνάπλι
κ' εἶθ' οὕτως τὸ Ἄργος ἐνομοῦ # τότε *τὸν Μέγαν Κύρην*,
ἦτον διὰ τὴν συνδρομὴν # ὅπου ἔποικεν ἐτότε
<u>ὁ Μέγας Κύρης</u>, **σὲ λαλῶ**, # στὸ πιάσμα τῆς Κορίνθου
[The gift, which the princeps had given at that time to *the Great Lord*,
namely (the city) Nauplion — together with Argos — was in return for the
aid which <u>he</u> had given at that moment, <u>the Great Lord</u>, I say to you, in the
capture of Corinth]

The same applies to the next example: the subject is present in the immediate context (2225: τὸ κάτεργο *τῆς Βενετίας*, ὅπου εἰς τὴν Κρήτη ἐδιάβη 'the galley of Venice that was sailing to Crete'; 2227: κι ὡς τοῦ ἤφερε ὁ *Βενέτικος* ἐκεῖνα τὰ πιττάκια 'and when *the Venetian* brought him those letters'):

(17)   Morea H 2235–2238 (cf. Morea H 629–630)
Ἀφότου γὰρ ἐγνώρισεν # ἐκεῖνος ὁ Ρουμπέρτος
τὸν τρόπον τῆς δημηγερσίας, # ὅπου τὸν ἀπεργῶσαν
<u>οἱ Βενετίκοι</u>, **σὲ λαλῶ**, # ὡσὰν σὲ τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι,
ἐβιάστηκεν πολλὰ νὰ εὑρῇ # βάρκαν τοῦ νὰ ἀπερά<σ>η
[When that Robert now learnt
the manner of deceit, with which <u>they</u> misled him,
<u>the Venetians</u>, I say to you, as I tell it to you,
he hurried to find a boat to cross over]

This is also an interesting example from another point of view, for the co-occurrence of σὲ λαλῶ with the phrase ὡσὰν σὲ τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι ('as I am telling it to you') can be regarded as an argument in favour of the semantic reduction of the former expression.[17]

Often, the clarifying constituent contains the anaphoric demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος (in italics):

(18)   BT 3378
       Ὁ λαὸς δὲ τῆς Πύλαρχου # θρηνοῦσι <u>τὸν αὐθέντην</u>,
       λέγω <u>τὸν Πρωθεσέλαον</u>, # <u>*τὸν πάμφουμον ἐκεῖνον*</u>,
       [The people of Pylarchos mourned <u>the leader</u>,
       I say, <u>Protheselaos, *that* famous man</u>]

(19)   Morea H 1102
       ποῦ ἐλάλησαν καὶ εἴπασιν # ὅτι ἦλθαν τὰ φουσσᾶτα
       <u>τοῦ Καλοϊωάννη</u>, **σὲ λαλῶ**, # <u>*ἐκεινοῦ τοῦ δεσπότῃ*</u>.
       [who talked and said that the armies were coming
       (the armies) <u>of Kalojohn</u>, I tell you, <u>*that* despot</u>]

Demonstratives distinguish certain entities from others and, thus, clearly exert a clarifying role in discourse. It is revealing that, when comparing manuscript H with the much younger manuscript P, the latter sometimes contains λέγω/λαλῶ where the former has only the demonstrative pronoun:[18]

---

17. Note that this example is of a different nature than the examples in which conceptual λέγω/λαλῶ is co-ordinated with another verb of informing (such as ἀφηγοῦμαι), which reinforces the act of speaking (cf. Section 4.3; Morea H 7754), for instance:

(i)   Morea H 4581–4582
      Οὕτως ὡσὰν σὲ τὸ **λαλῶ** # κι ὡσὰν σὲ τὸ ἀφηγοῦμαι
      ἄρχισε ἡ μάχη στὸν Μορέαν # νὰ μάχωνται οἱ δύο
      [In this way, as I say it to you and as I tell it to you,
      the war began in Morea, in which the two fought]

18. A relative clause (in italics) serves the same purpose; consider the following parallel pair:

(i)   Morea P 6826–6827
      Γουργὸν σπουδαίως ἀπέστειλεν # ἐκεῖ <u>εἰς τὸν ἀδελφόν του</u>,
      λέγω στὸν <u>ῥῆγαν Φράτσας</u> τε # καὶ νὰ τὸν βοηθήσῃ
      φουσσᾶτα ἐκ τὸν τόπον του, # παιδευτικοὺς στρατιῶτες
      [Quickly, he hurriedly sent <u>to his brother</u>,
      I say, <u>to the king of France</u> and to help him,
      armies form his region, experienced soldiers]
      cf. Η Γοργὸν σπουδαίως ἀπέστειλεν # ἐκεῖ εἰς τὸν ἀδελφόν του
      ὅπου ἦτον ῥῆγας τῆς Φραγκίας # διὰ νὰ τοῦ ἔχῃ βοηθήσει
      φουσσᾶτα ἀπὸ τὸν τόπον του, # παιδευτικοὺς στρατιῶτες

(20) Morea P 6097 καὶ λέγει οὕτως <u>πρὸς αὐτόν</u>, # **λέγω** <u>τὸν ἀδελφόν του</u>·
[and he spoke thus <u>to him</u>, I say, <u>his brother</u>]
cf. H καὶ λέγει οὕτως πρὸς αὐτὸν # τὸν ἀδελφόν του *ἐκεῖνον*
[and he spoke thus to him, *that* brother of him]

(21) Morea P 8064–8065
ὅπου ἦτον δὲ αὐτάδελφη # ἐκείνου τοῦ Δεσπότου,
<u>τοῦ Νικηφόρου</u>, **λέγω σε**, # <u>ἀφέντου δὲ τῆς Ἄρτας</u>.
[she was the sister of that Despote,
<u>Nikephoros</u>, I tell you, <u>lord of Arta</u>]
cf. H ἐνῷ ἦτον αὐταδέλφισσα # ἐκεινοῦ τοῦ Δεσπότου,
κὺρ Νικηφόρου *ἐκεινοῦ*, # τοῦ ἀφέντη γὰρ τῆς Ἄρτας
[she was the sister of that Despote,
that Kyr Nikephoros, the lord of Arta]

These examples undeniably demonstrate the clarification-signalling function of *λέγω/λαλῶ*. Moreover, the fact that *λέγω/λαλῶ* is regarded as an appropriate equivalent for a pronoun constitutes a strong argument for an interpretation of *λέγω/λαλῶ* in terms of a DM; it shows that the word class of *λέγω/λαλῶ* is no longer relevant and that *λέγω/λαλῶ* has to a certain extent lost its verbal value.

It should have become clear that the translation 'I tell/say (you)' sounds very artificial and is thus far from ideal to render the Greek. Although it is often difficult to translate DMs into other languages as a result of their "semantic shallowness" (Brinton 1996:33), the phrase *I mean* seems a more appropriate English candidate. Interestingly, *I mean* is also considered a(n interpersonal) DM in conversational English (Watts 1989:208; Brinton 1996:6; Schiffrin 1987; Tree and Schrock 1999:280; Brinton 2007). In relation to *I mean*, Chafe (1988:14) notes that "While this phrase is not traditionally regarded as one of the English connectives, in fact it does occur most often at the beginning of an intonation unit, where it signals an amplification or clarification of the idea that preceded it" (cf. Schiffrin 1987:295 ff.).[19] This description clearly parallels the above examples.

[Quickly, he hurriedly sent to his brother,
who *was king of France*, in order to help him,
armies from his region, experienced soldiers]

19. Cf. Brinton (2008:111–32); Forchini (2010:326): "'I mean' is basically used either to guide the listener in the interpretation of the utterance by clarifying, telling or commenting, or to allow the speaker time to find an appropriate way of expressing him/herself in order to appear less committed. In the first case (i.e. guiding the listener), 'I mean' is mostly used within a 'clarifying function' […] in that it explicates, corrects, reformulates previous utterances".

4.4.2 *Attention-grabbing function*

It is more difficult to pinpoint the exact pragmatic function of the remaining (132) procedural examples of *λέγω/λαλῶ*, as is the case with many modern DMs. By uttering *λέγω/λαλῶ*, it seems that the poet wants to grab — or hold — the attention of his audience. *Λέγω/λαλῶ* thus "merely" functions as a "pay attention!"-marker.[20] This attention-grabbing function is confirmed by the distribution of the phrase, for it tends to occur after "heavy" information. Heavy information must be understood as heavy both in meaning and in form (see Section 4.4). I will begin with some examples in which *λέγω/λαλῶ* is provoked by information which is heavy in form, namely by a long sentence or an expanded explanation. *Λέγω σας* appears in such a long passage in the following example: we get two main verbs (*ἔχεις* 'you have' and *οὐκ ἠμπορεῖ νὰ λείψῃ* 'it is not possible that it is left undone'), a conditional clause (*ἐὰν βασταχθῇ* 'if it endures') and another main verb, which repeats the former one (*οὐ μὴ νὰ λείψῃ* 'it will not be left undone'):

(22) BT 4925–4928
　　Υἱοὺς ἔχεις, φίλους πολλούς· # οὐκ ἠμπορεῖ νὰ λείψῃ,
　　ἐὰν βασταχθῇ ὁ πόλεμος # ἕως ὀκτὼ ἡμέρας,
　　οὐ μὴ νὰ λείψῃ, **λέγω σας**, # τινὰς νὰ μὴ ἐπιάσθη
　　καὶ εἰς κακὸν ἀππλίκευμα # ἤθελεν ἀππλικεύσει.
　　[You (Priam) have sons, many friends; it is not possible that it is left undone,
　　if the war endures another eight days,
　　it will not be left undone, I tell you, that no-one is taken
　　and that he will get a bad 'welcome']

In the next two examples, *σὲ λέγω* is uttered in a clause which constitutes a further explanation of the previous one:

(23) Morea H 1809–1810
　　ὡς φρόνιμος νεούτσικος # μεγάλως ἐλυπήθη,
　　ἔκλαψε εἰς σφόδρα, **σὲ λαλῶ**, # εἰς θλίψιν μεγάλην ἐμπῆκεν
　　[he was greatly sorrowed as a prudent young man,
　　he wept intensively, I tell you, he entered deep grief]

(24) BT 7282–7285
　　Οἱ Τρῶες τὸν αὐθέντην τους # κλαίουν, οὐχ ὑπομένουν•
　　εἰς τὸν ναὸν Διόνυσου, # ἐκεῖ τὸν ἐφυλάξαν,
　　πέντε καὶ δέκα, **λέγω σας**, # ἡμέρας τὸν κρατοῦσιν,
　　ὁποὺ ποτὲ οὐκ ἔπαυσεν # ὁ θρῆνος τους εἰς αὗτον.

---

20. Interestingly, Brinton (2008:77) considers the task of calling or evoking the hearer's attention one of the procedural functions of the English DM "(I) say".

[The Trojans wept over their leader, they couldn't bear it,
in the temple of Dionysos, there they watched over him,
five or ten, I tell you, days they held him,
their grief over him didn't stop]

Heavy information in meaning can also trigger the use of *λέγω/λαλῶ*. In 32 cases, *λέγω/λαλῶ* appears after a new topic (usually exercising the grammatical role of subject):

(25)   BT 8214
Ὁ Παλαμήδης, **λέγω σας**, # ζημίαν μεγάλην κάμνει
[Palamedes, I tell you, caused huge damage]

Note that this example is right-indented in the edition. Although this editorial practice does not reflect the original manuscripts, it does signal that the editors intuitively feel that these verses involve a shift in discourse. The same applies to the following example, where we get a switch from the Trojans (Deïfobos and his company) to the Greeks ("the ones outside"):

(26)   BT 5981–5984
Ἀπ' αὗτου ὁ Δηΐφοβος # μετὰ τρεῖς βασιλεῖες,
φρικτούς, μεγάλους, φοβερούς, # ἅρμα δοκιμασμένους·
ἀπ' αὗτου πάλιν οἱ ἔτεροι # πλέον ἑκατὸν χιλιάδες.
Ἀπὸ τοὺς ἔξω, **λέγω σας**, # τίποτε οὐδὲν ἀργοῦσιν.
[Then Deïfobos (followed) together with three kings,
frightening, big, terrifying ones, experienced in arms,
then the rest (followed): more than 100,000 men.
From the ones outside, I tell you, no-one tarried]

The topic switch is sometimes explicitly signalled by an archaic particle such as *γάρ* and *δέ* or by the adverb *πάλιν*, which has been regarded as a LMG topic switch marker (Soltic 2013), for instance:

(27)   BT 10579
<Η> Ἀνατολὴ δέ, **λέγω σας**, # ἐννέα νησία ἔχει[21]
[Anatolia, I tell you, has nine islands]

The next example proves that this function of *λέγω/λαλῶ* does not necessarily exclude its clarifying use:

(28)   BT 2064–2065
Ἡ Ἑλένη πάλιν, **λέγω σας**, # ἡ τούτων αὐταδέλφη,
τὰ κάλλη τοῦ προσώπου της # τίς νὰ τὰ ἱστορήσῃ;

---

21. Note that this example too is right-indented in the edition.

[<u>Helen</u> in turn, I tell you, <u>the sister of them</u>,
who could describe the beauties of her face?]

However, information which is heavy in meaning not only includes topical information. *Λέγω/λαλῶ* may also involve other important, emphasized and sometimes even surprising information:

(29)   BT 3769–3770
γυμνὸν ἐκράτει τὸ σπαθίν, # ὅλον καταβαμμένον
ἐκ τὸ αἷμα καὶ ἀπὸ τὰ πλευρά, # **λέγω**, τῶν Τρωαδίτων
[he held only the unsheathed sword, completely soaked
with the blood and the ribs, I say, of the Trojans]

(30)   BT 6797
πολλὰ γοργὸν νὰ ἔχασε, # **λέγω σας**, τὸ κεφάλιν
[he would very quickly have lost, I say to you, his head]

A structure which is often said to have a surprising effect is enjambment (i.e., the continuation of a sentence or clause over a verse-end). Enjambment is a rather unusual structure in the political verse poetry, in which metrical structure and syntactic structure normally correspond, in that one verse usually contains one clause (see Section 3.2). *Λέγω/λαλῶ* may accompany constituents added in enjambment, as if to signal that the amount of information which is normally stored in the political verse is contravened. Since enjambment typically involves an extended clause, these examples are also related to the examples involving information which is heavy in form.[22]

(31)   BT 3869–3870
Προσέχετε ἀπὸ σᾶς τινὰς # μὴ ἐξέλθη τοῦ πολέμου
δίχως ἐμένα, **λέγω σας**, # καὶ εὐθὺς τὸν θανατώσουν.
[Take care that no-one from you will leave the war
without me, I tell you, or they will kill him immediately]

(32)   BT 8261–8262
Οἵ Ἕλληνες ὡς εἴδασι # τὸν ἑαυτῶν δεσπότην
ἀποθαμένον, **λέγω σας**, # οἱ πλέον καλοὶ ἐξ αὖτους
πολλὰ ἐδειλιάσασιν, # ἐχάσαν τὴν ἀνδρείαν.
[The Greeks, when they saw their own despot (Palamedes)
dead, I tell you, the most noble of them
feared a lot, they lost their courage]

---

22. As a matter of fact, several clarification-signalling examples (especially those specifying a zero pronoun; e.g., BT 6216–6219; Morea H 2878–2881; Morea H 2235–2238) also involve an enjambment.

In all the above examples, a translation with 'I say' or 'I tell' does not make much sense. It seems even more difficult to find an appropriate English translation for these parentheticals than for the clarifying ones (*I mean?*), which may point to the fact that they carry even less conceptual meaning (cf. Section 4.4.1).

4.4.3   *Filled pauses?*

It attracts attention that the procedural examples of λέγω/λαλῶ, all parenthetically used, tend to "circle around" the boundaries of the political verse, namely the verse-end and especially the fixed caesura, which can both be equated justifiably with a breathing boundary/pause (cf. Section 3.2). We should thus compare the position of the procedural examples with the position of the conceptual examples (i) in order to examine whether this impression is confirmed by frequency counts and (ii) in order to prove that the single reason for this distribution is not "metri causa" — for one may object that we should simply attribute this positional preference to the metrical value of the forms.

Table 3. Metrical position of procedural (parenthetical) λέγω/λαλῶ (σε/σου/σας)

Total: 192		
Half-line initial: 41 (21%) X … # X …	Verse-initial X … # …	8 (4%)
	Post-caesural … # X …	33 (17%)
Half-line final: 138 (72%) … X # … X	Pre-caesural … X # …	114 (60%)
	Verse-final … # … X	24 (12%)
Half-line interrupting: 13 (7%) … X … # … X …	Inside first half-line … X … # …	13 (7%)
	Inside second half-line … # … X …	0 (0%)

The figures are telling: they indeed confirm that there is a striking tendency for the procedural forms to appear next to either the verse-end (verse-initial + verse-final = 4 percent + 12 percent = 16 percent) or — preferably — the caesura (post-caesural + pre-caesural = 17 percent + 60 percent = 77 percent). In 60 percent of the procedural cases, λέγω/λαλῶ occurs immediately before the caesura, so we can conclude that the procedural instances show a distinct preference for pre-caesural position. Contrary to the conceptual examples, the procedural instances of λέγω/λαλῶ do not easily occur inside the half-line (35 percent "interrupting" conceptual instances versus only 7 percent procedural ones).

Table 4. Metrical position of conceptual λέγω/λαλῶ (σε/σου/σας)

Total: 214		
Half-line initial: 45 (21%) X … # X …	Verse-initial (possibly preceded by a monosyllable, such as καί and νά) X … # … Postcaesural (possibly preceded by monosyllable) … # X …	18 (8%) 27 (13%)
Half-line final: 95 (44%) … X # … X	Pre-caesural … X # … Verse-final … # … X	32 (15%) 63 (29%)
Half-line interrupting: 74 (35%) … X … # … X …	Inside first half-line … X … # … Inside second half-line … # … X …	64 (30%) 10 (5%)

This observation can be related, tentatively, to modern DMs functioning as filled pauses (see Section 2.5). Assuming that we can equate the fixed caesura and the verse-end with a breathing boundary/pause (see Section 3.2), the procedural forms seem to constitute one long (partly filled) pause together with the caesura/verse-end. In this regard, the following statement of Dehé and Wichmann (2010: 3, 14), who use the term "comment clauses" instead of "DMs", is very interesting: "It has also been previously indicated that comment clauses may be part of a transitional, hesitant phase" and that comment clauses often "co-occur with silent or filled pauses". In her analysis of pauses in the London–Lund Corpus of Spoken English, Stenström (1990) also noticed that verbal fillers and silent pauses often cluster together.[23]

Indeed, one cannot escape the impression that the poet — rather than attempting to convey any conceptual meaning — seemingly runs out of breath and consciously makes an appeal to these "stock" phrases in order to fill a beat in the flow of sound and so apparently win time. Aijmer (1997: 24), who focuses on the parenthetical DM *I think*, makes a similar observation: "*I think* is inserted where it is natural for the speaker to stop to plan". Interestingly, the DM *I mean*, which

---

23. Cf. Heeman and Allen (1999: 531): "Discourse markers tend to be used at utterance boundaries, and hence have strong interactions with intonational phrasing"; Scheppers (2011: 8, 199): "It has been observed — already by Fraenkel — that in very many cases these short parenthetical expressions occur on the boundary between 'natural' cola".

has been proposed as a possible English equivalent of the clarifying instances of λέγω/λαλῶ (see Section 4.4.1), has also been called a prototypical filled pause (cf. Östman 1981:9; see Section 2.5).[24]

However, the perspective of the listener may not be disregarded, as (successful) communication always involves two parties. While giving himself a breathing pause, the poet is perhaps also conscious of the limits of the listener's attention span: by uttering a grammaticalized/pragmatic(al)ized phrase such as λέγω/λαλῶ, which creates a phase of low (conceptual) informativeness, he simultaneously helps the listener to register his message. An obvious example in which we get the impression that the poet wants to give himself and/or his audience a break is the following:

(33)   Morea H 984–992
Ἠφέρασιν τοῦ βασιλέως # τὸ στέμμα καὶ τὸν σάκκον,
ἐστέψασιν κ᾽ ἐντύσαν τον # ὡς βασιλέαν, **σὲ λέγω**,
κ᾽ εὐφήμησαν κ᾽ ἐδόξασαν, # ὡς πρέπει κι ὡς λαχάνει.
Κι ἀφότου τὸν ἐστέψασιν # κ᾽ ἐγίνη βασιλέας,
σκάνταλον μέσα ἐγίνετον # καὶ ταραχὴ μεγάλη
εἰς τοὺς Λουμπάρδους, **σὲ λαλῶ**, # ὁμοίως καὶ εἰς τοὺς Φραγκίσκους,
ὅπου ἀγαποῦσαν καὶ ἤθελαν # νὰ γένη ὁ μαρκέσης
ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τοῦ Μουφαρᾶ, # ὅπου ἦτον καπετάνος
εἰς τὰ φουσσᾶτα καὶ λαόν, # καθὼς σὲ τὸ ἐπροεῖπα
[They brought the king the crown and the mantle,
they crowned and clothed him as a basileus, I tell you,
and they acclaimed and praised him, as is the right and proper way.
And when they had crowned him and he had become king,
a quarrel broke out and a serious disagreement
among the Lombards, I tell you, and also among the French,
who wished and desired that the marquis would become (emperor)
the one of Monteferrat, who was captain
of the armies and the people, as I have told you before]

The parenthetical σὲ λέγω leads up to a pause and is — "in collaboration" with the caesura/verse-end — part of a hesitant phase. Consequently, it is not too far-fetched to suppose that λέγω/λαλῶ co-operates with and, thus, reinforces the effect of the caesura/verse-end. The need for a (prolonged) breathing pause is also conceivable in the following passage:

---

24. Forchini (2010:328) speaks of the "time stalling function" of "I mean".

(34) Morea H 58–65

Οἱ φράγκοι ἐπωμόσασιν, # τὸν ὅρκον ἐκρατῆσαν,
ἐπῆραν τὴν Ἀνετολήν, # τὸν τόπον ἐκερδίσαν,
εὐθέως τὸν παράδωκαν # Ἀλέξῃ τοῦ Βατάτζῃ,
ἐνῷ ἦτον τότε βασιλεὺς # τῆς Ρωμανίας, **σὲ λέγω**.
Κι ἀφότου ἐπαράλαβε # τὰ κάστρη καὶ τὰς χώρας,
βουλὴν ἐπῆρε δολερὴν # μετὰ τοὺς ἄρχοντάς του,
τὸ πῶς νὰ εὕρουν ἀφορμὴν # καὶ πῶς νὰ ἀπομείνουν
ἐκ τὸ ταξεῖδι τῆς Συρίας, # καὶ νὰ μὴν κιντυνέψουν.

Revealingly, Lurier (1964: 68–9), who has translated the Greek *Chronicle of Morea* into English, leaves *σὲ λέγω* here simply untranslated: "The Franks, having sworn, kept their oath; crossing into Asia Minor, they conquered the land and immediately surrendered it (the land) to Alexios Vatatzes, who was at that time basileus of all Romania [σὲ λέγω]. Now when he received the castles and the towns, he took sly counsel with this archons as to what pretext they might find and withdraw from the Syrian expedition and not run any risks".[25]

5.   Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that the first-person singular *λέγω/λαλῶ* (possibly followed by the second-person weak object pronoun *σε/σου/σας*) can structure rather than convey information in the lengthy thirteenth- to fourteenth-century *Chronicle of Morea* and *War of Troy*. Here, *λέγω/λαλῶ* functions like DMs in modern spoken languages, such as *I see* and *you know*, which are active on a pragmatic level rather than on a purely representational one. The identification of DMs, sometimes considered to be "one of the most perceptually salient features of oral style" (Watts 1989: 208) in LMG political verse narratives should not come as a surprise, though, given the poets' imitation of an oral discourse.

Whereas the "normal" examples of *λέγω/λαλῶ* express a conceptual content ('I inform (you)'; 'I assure (you)'), which is often reinforced by lexical means, the procedural ones lack adverbs and arguments (apart from a possible second-person weak object pronoun *σε/σου/σας*) and are consistently used parenthetically. Their parenthetical (i.e., syntactically independent) status is reflected in the fact that they have a different personal ending from their surrounding verbs and, also, do not follow sequence of tense.

---

25. Usually, however, Lurier (1964) simply translates the parentheticals λέγω/λαλῶ (σε/σας) as "I tell (you)" and "I say (to you)" without distinguishing any further semantic nuances.

More precisely, procedural λέγω/λαλῶ can be regarded as an inter-personal DM, as its main function is to signal a clarification (i.e., an apposition) towards the listener (*I mean?*), which is proven by the fact that the phrase as a whole is sometimes replaced by an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun in parallel manuscripts. However, procedural λέγω/λαλῶ may also be used as a "mere" "pay attention!"-marker. By uttering the phrase, the poet wants to grab the attention of his (presumably imaginary) audience. Unsurprisingly, this especially happens when the poet is conveying "heavy" (in form: expanded; in meaning: emphasized, cf. enjambment) information.

Moreover, the observation that procedural λέγω/λαλῶ shows a marked preference for a position next to a breathing boundary, the pre-caesural position in particular, has led to the tentative suggestion that the phrase can be related to the modern linguistic concept of "filled pauses", which facilitate the progress of information for both speaker and listener. I would argue that such a DM-like use is not limited to the two extensive political verse narratives I have analysed, but, rather, has a wider application. Consider the following examples from two other LMG political verse narratives, in which λέγω signals an apposition:

(35)   LR 2598–2600[26]
Ὁ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ὁ βασιλεύς, # **λέγω**, <u>ὁ Βερδερίχος</u>,
μετὰ τοῦ μηχανήματος # καὶ μετὰ πανουργίας
τὴν κόρην ἐπεχείρησεν # νὰ πάρη καὶ νὰ φύγη.
[<u>The king of Egypt</u>, I say, <u>Verderichos</u>,
with his trickery and craftiness
attempted at taking the girl and escaping]

(36)   PP 1255–1256[27]
Ὀπόταν βλέπω <u>τὴν μορφήν</u>, # **λέγω** <u>τὴν ἐδικήν σου</u>,
νομίζω ἐκείνην ἀπατᾶ # βλέπω, νὰ μὴ ἔναι λόγος".
[When I see <u>the form</u>, I say, <u>your form</u>,
I think I truly see her, there are no words for it]

Furthermore, a DM-like use does not seem restricted to the verb λέγω/λαλῶ: imperatives of knowing (ἤξευρε; (ἐ)γνώριζ/σε; πρόσεχε), which are also often used parenthetically, seem plausible candidates, too.

In general, I hope that this paper will trigger more studies on the pragmatics of the LMG narratives, which constitute an ideal corpus for conducting this type of research, because the political-verse poets have deliberately adopted an oral style. More fine-grained discourse analyses are an enormous help for our interpretation

---

26. LR = *Livistros and Rodamni*; edition of Lendari (2007).

27. PP = *Phlorius and Platzia Phlora*; edition of Salas (1998).

of the texts and are a desideratum for future translators of the LMG narratives, which often still lack a decent (English) translation.[28]

Acknowledgements

Sources

Livistros and Rodamne. The Vatican Version. Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary and Index-Glossary. 2007. Edited by Tina Lendari. Athens: Μορφωτικό Ἴδρυμα Ἐθνικῆς Τραπέζης.

Ὁ Πόλεμος τῆς Τρωάδος: Κριτικὴ ἔκδοση μὲ εἰσαγωγὴ καὶ πίνακες [The War of Troy: Critical edition with introduction and indices]. 1996. Edited by Manolis Papathomopoulos and Elizabeth Jeffreys. Athens: Μορφωτικό Ἴδρυμα Ἐθνικῆς Τραπέζης.

Florio y Platzia Flora: una novela bizantina de época paleólogica. 1998. Edited by Francisco Javier Salas. Madrid: Universidad de Cádiz.

The Chronicle of Morea: A History in Political Verse, Relating the Establishment of Feudalism in Greece by the Franks in the Thirteenth Century. 1904. Edited by John Schmitt. London: Methuen.

References

Aerts, Willem. 2005. "The Lexicon to the Chronicle of Morea as a Tool for Linguistic Studies". In Elizabeth Jeffreys and Michael Jeffreys (eds), *Approaches to Texts in Early Modern Greek* (Neograeca Medii Aevi V), 141–51. Exeter College: University of Oxford.

Aijmer, Karin. 1997. "I think – An English Modal Particle". In Swan Toril and Olaf Westvik (eds), *Modality in Germanic Languages: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, 1–47. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110889932.1

Anaxagorou, Nadia. 1998. *Narrative and Stylistic Structures in the Chronicle of Leontios Machairas*. Nicosia: A.G. Leventis Foundation.

Apostolopoulos, Photis. 1984. *La langue du roman Byzantin Callimaque et Chrysorrhoé*. Athens: Academy of Athens.

Astruc, Lluisa. 2005. "The Form and Function of Extra-Sentential Elements". *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 2: 100–20.

Bakker, Egbert. 1990. "Homeric Discourse and Enjambment: A Cognitive Approach". *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 120: 1–21. DOI: 10.2307/283975

---

28. The *War of Troy* for instance has not yet been translated.

Beaton, Roderick. 1980. *Folk Poetry of Modern Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511554131

Blakemore, Diane. 1987. *Semantic Constraints on Relevance*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Brinton, Laurel J. 1996. *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110907582

Brinton, Laurel J. 2007. "The Development of 'I mean': Implications for the Study of Historical Pragmatics". In Susan Fitzmaurice and Irma Taavitsainen (eds), *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*, 37–79. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110197822.37

Brinton, Laurel J. 2008. *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511551789

Browning, Robert. 1999. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Second edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carston, Robyn. 2002. *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. Malden: Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9780470754603

Chafe, Wallace. 1988. "Linking Intonation Units in Spoken English". In John Haiman and Sandra Thompson (eds), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, 1–27. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.18.03cha

Chila-Markopoulou, Despina. 2004. "Review of Pappas 'Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek: From Clitics to Affixes'". *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5 (1): 199–212. DOI: 10.1075/jgl.5.13chi

Dehé, Nicole and Anne Wichmann. 2010. "The Multifunctionality of Epistemic Parentheticals in Discourse: Prosodic Cues to the Semantic–Pragmatic Boundary". *Functions of Language* 17 (1): 1–28. DOI: 10.1075/fol.17.1.01deh

Dehé, Nicole and Yordanka Kavalova (eds). 2007. *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.106

Egea, José Maria. 1993. "Les Particules en grec médiéval". In Nikolaos Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della letteratura neogreca I*, 109–17. Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia.

Eideneier, Hans. 1999. *Von Rhapsodie zu Rap: Aspekte der griechischen Sprachgeschichte von Homer bis heute*. Tübingen: Narr.

Erman, Britt. 2001. "Pragmatic Markers Revisited with a Focus on 'You know' in Adult and Adolescent Talk". *Journal of Pragmatics* 33 (9): 1337–59. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00066-7

Fischer, Kerstin. 2006. "Towards an Understanding of the Spectrum of Approaches to Discourse Markers: Introduction". In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 1–20. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Forchini, Pierfranca. 2010. "'I mean, what was that about?': Spontaneous and Movie Conversation Compared". *L'Analisi Linguistica e Letteraria* 17: 323–34.

Fraser, Bruce. 1990. "An Approach to Discourse Markers". *Journal of Pragmatics* 14 (2): 383–95. DOI: 10.1016/0378-2166(90)90096-V

Fraser, Bruce. 1999. "What are Discourse Markers?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 31 (7): 931–52. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00101-5

Heeman, Peter and James Allen. 1999. "Speech Repairs, Intonational Phrases, and Discourse Markers: Modeling Speakers' Utterances in Spoken Dialogue". *Journal of Computational Linguistics* 25 (4): 527–71.

Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*. Second edn. London: Longman. DOI: 10.1002/9781444318913

Jeffreys, Elizabeth. 2011. "Medieval Greek Epic Poetry". In Karl Reichl (ed.), *Medieval Oral Literature*, 459–84. Berlin and Boston: Walter De Gruyter.

Jeffreys, Elizabeth. 2013. "Byzantine Romances: Eastern or Western?" In Marina Brownlee and Dimitri Gondicas (eds), *Renaissance Encounters: Greek East and Latin West*, 217–34. Leiden: Brill.

Jeffreys, Michael. 1973. "Formulas in the Chronicle of the Morea". *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 27: 163–95. DOI: 10.2307/1291339

Jeffreys, Michael. 1975. "The Chronicle of Morea – A Greek Oral Poem?" In Mihai Berza and Eugen Stănescu (eds), *Actes du XIVe Congrès international des études byzantines II*, 153–8. Bucarest: Editura Academiei republicii socialiste Romania.

Jucker, Andreas and Yael Ziv. 1998. "Discourse Markers: Introduction". In Andreas Jucker and Yael Ziv (eds), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*, 1–12. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/pbns.57.03juc

Lauxtermann, Marc. 1999. *The Spring of Rhythm: An Essay on the Political Verse and Other Byzantine Metres*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Lee, Chun-Hee. 2003. "The Use of the Discourse Marker 'Say' in Conversational English". *SNU Working Papers in English Language and Linguistics* 2: 133–56.

Lewis, Diana. 2006. "Discourse Markers in English: A Discourse-Pragmatic View". In Kerstin Fischer (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, 43–59. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Loudová, Kateřina. 2009. "Discourse Markers in Early Byzantine Narrative Prose". *Studies in Greek Linguistics 29: Proceedings of the 29th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, School of Philology, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki* (10–11 May 2008, Thessaloniki), 296–312.

Lurier, Harold. 1964. *Crusaders as Conquerors: The Chronicle of Morea*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Lyavdansky, Alexey. 2010. "Temporal Deictic Adverbs as Discourse Markers in Hebrew, Aramaic and Akkadian". *Journal of Language Relationship* 3: 79–99.

Mackridge, Peter. 1990. "The Metrical Structure of the Oral Decapentasyllable". *Byzantine Modern and Greek Studies* 14 (1): 200–12. DOI: 10.1179/byz.1990.14.1.200

Mackridge, Peter. 1993. "An Editorial Problem in Medieval Greek Texts. The Position of the Object Clitic Pronoun in the Escorial Digenes Akrites". In Nikolaos Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della literatura Neogreca I*, 325–42. Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia.

Manolessou, Io. 2002. "The Evolution of the Demonstrative System in Greek". *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 2 (1): 119–48. DOI: 10.1075/jgl.2.05man

Matisoff, James. 1991. "Areal and Universal Dimensions of Grammaticalization in Lahu". In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds), *Approaches to Grammaticalization II*, 383–454. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.19.2.19mat

Östman, Jan-Ola. 1981. *You Know: A Discourse–Functional Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/pb.ii.7

Pappas, Panayiotis. 2004. *Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek: From Clitics to Affixes*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan.

Petukhova, Volha Viktarauna and Harry Bunt. 2009. "Towards a Multidimensional Semantics of Discourse Markers in Spoken Dialogue". In Harry Bunt, Volha Viktarauna Petukhova and Sander Wubben (eds), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Workshop on Computational Semantics (IWCS)*, 157–68. Tilburg: Tilburg University.

Rouchota, Villy. 1998. "Procedural Meaning and Parenthetical Discourse Markers". In Andreas Jucker and Yael Ziv (eds), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and Theory*, 97–126. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/pbns.57.07rou

Scheppers, Frank. 2011. *The Colon Hypothesis: Word Order, Discourse Segmentation and Discourse Coherence in Ancient Greek*. Brussels: VUBPress.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. London: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511611841

Schneider, Stefan. 2007. *Reduced Parentheticals as Mitigators: A Corpus Study of Spoken French, Italian and Spanish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/scl.27

Schourup, Lawrence. 2011. "The Discourse Marker 'now': A Relevance–Theoretic Approach". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (8): 2110–29. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2011.01.005

Shawcross, Teresa. 2009. *The Chronicle of Morea: Historiography in Crusader Greece. Oxford Studies in Byzantium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sifakis, Grigoris. 2001. "Looking for the Tracks of Oral Tradition in Medieval and Early Modern Greek Poetic Works". *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 27 (1–2), 61–86.

Soltic, Jorie. 2013. "Late Medieval Greek πάλιν: A Discourse Marker Signaling Topic Switch". *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 53 (2): 390–419.

Soltic, Jorie. 2014. "Γνώριζε in the Greek *War of Troy*: A Peremptory Command or just a Filled Pause?" *Byzantion* 84: 329–55.

Soltic, Jorie and Mark Janse. 2012. "From Enclisis to Proclisis in Medieval Greek: Σε λέγω and its Uses in the Chronicle of Morea". *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 52 (2): 240–58.

Stenström, Anna-Brita. 1990. "Pauses in Monologue and Dialogue". In Jan Svartvik (ed.), *The London-Lund Corpus of Spoken English: Description and Research*, 211–52. Lund: Lund University Press.

Thoma, Chrystalla. 2007. "Distribution and Function of Clitic Object Pronouns in Popular 16th–18th Century Greek Narratives: A Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective". In Jochen Rehbein, Christiane Hohenstein and Lukas Pietsch (eds), *Connectivity in Grammar and Discourse*, 139–63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/hsm.5.09tho

Tree, Jean and Josef Schrock. 1999. "Discourse Markers in Spontaneous Speech: 'Oh' What a Difference an 'Oh' Makes". *Journal of Memory and Language* 40 (2): 280–95. DOI: 10.1006/jmla.1998.2613

Wahlgren, Stephan. 2003. "Particles in Byzantine Historical Texts". In Anders Piltz, et al. (eds), *For Particular Reasons: Studies in Honour of Jerker Blomqvist*, 333–40. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.

Watts, Richard. 1989. "Taking the Pitcher to 'well': Native Speakers' Perception of their Use of Discourse Markers in Conversation". *Journal of Pragmatics* 13 (2): 203–37. DOI: 10.1016/0378-2166(89)90092-1

Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. 1993. "Linguistic Form and Relevance". *Lingua* 90 (1): 1–25. DOI: 10.1016/0024-3841(93)90058-5

Author's address

Jorie Soltic
Blandijnberg 2
9000 Ghent
Belgium

jorie.soltic@ugent.be

About the author

Jorie Soltic is a PhD student from the Department of Greek Linguistics at Ghent University. The main goal of her project is to apply the modern framework of Information Structure to the Late Medieval Greek Vernacular, as these texts are acknowledged to have assumed an oral discourse. She deals with issues such as the topic/focus distinction and the concept of the Intonation Unit. She also has a special interest in particles and clitics.