DE GRUYTER DOI 10.1515/bz.2012.0031 — BZ 2012; 105(2): 803–812

Jorie Soltic, Mark Janse & Klaas Bentein

Δηλώσω σοι γὰρ τὰς αὐτοῦ πράξεις (*DA* G 1.13)

A note on the order of clitic pronouns and particles in the Grottaferrata *Digenis Akritis*

Abstract: The *Digenis Akritis* is preserved in two important manuscripts: *Escorial* and *Grottaferrata*. Whereas the language of the former is traditionally considered vernacular or even vulgar, the scribe of the Grottaferrata manuscript is said to employ an archaizing style. The frequent occurrence of clitic particles like δέ, γάρ, μέν and οὖν is one of the more prominent archaizing features. In Ancient Greek, clitic particles and clitic pronouns tend to cluster together in second position in accordance with Wackernagel's Law. In this note, we examine the various distributional patterns of clitic particles co-occurring with clitic pronouns in the Grottaferrata manuscript. We argue that despite the occurrence of some apparently classical clusterings, the distribution of clitic pronouns and particles is clearly governed by contemporary rules.

Adresse: Dra. Jorie Soltic, Prof. Dr. Mark Janse & Dr. Klaas Bentein, Ghent University, Department of Linguistics (Greek), Blandijnberg 2, 9000 Ghent, Belgium; Jorie.Soltic@UGent.be, Mark.Janse@UGent.be, Klaas.Bentein@UGent.be

1 Introduction

The *Digenis Akritis* is considered to be one of the first Byzantine vernacular texts.[1] Like most vernacular literary texts from this period, this twelfth-century story is composed in the πολιτικὸς στίχος metre. The Escorial (E) and the Grottaferrata (G) are the two most important manuscripts in which the narrative of the border guard (Ἀκρίτης) of double race (Διγενής) has been preserved. Which of

1 G.C. Horrocks, Greek. A history of the language and its speakers. [2]Oxford 2010, 333.

the two versions is closest to the original is a much debated topic.[2] Traditionally, the versions are characterized 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".[3] The language of G is generally considered to be the result of a more vernacular text which has been subjected to an archaizing treatment.[4] However, the result is definitely not entirely homogeneous and several linguistic phenomena clearly reflect the contemporary language.

One of these phenomena is the position of object clitic pronouns (OCPs). Soltic has recently shown[5] that the archaizing G does not truly differ from the more vulgar E in this respect: the distribution of the OCPs in G follows the same rules established for E by Mackridge.[6] A prominent archaizing feature of G is the frequent occurrence of postpositive particles such as δέ, γάρ, μέν, οὖν. In Ancient Greek, OCPs and postpositive particles tend to cluster together in second position in accordance with Wackernagel's Law.[7] In this note, we examine the various distributional patterns of OCPs co-occurring with postpositive particles in G. We argue that, despite the presence of some apparently classical clusterings, the distribution of OCPs and postpositive particles is clearly governed by *contemporary* rules.

2 Clitics and particles in Ancient Greek

Clitics are small, unaccented words which are dependent on another word with which they form a phonological unity. In modern linguistic terminology, this

2 See S. Alexiou, Βασίλειος Διγενής Ακρίτης (κατά το χειρόγραφο του Εσκοριάλ). Athens 1985, and E. Jeffreys, Digenis Akritis. The Grottaferrata and Escorial versions. Cambridge 1998 for further references.

3 E. Trapp, Learned and vernacular literature in Byzantium: dichotomy or symbiosis? *DOP* 47 (1993) 115–129, 121.

4 Alexiou, Βασίλειος Διγενής Ακρίτης (as above).

5 J. Soltic, Distribution of the object clitic pronouns in the Grottaferrata manuscript of the Digenis Akritis. *BMGS* 36/2 (2012, in press).

6 P. Mackridge, An editorial problem in medieval Greek texts. The position of the object clitic pronoun in the Escorial Digenes Akrites, in N. Panayiotakis (ed.), Origini della Literatura Neogreca I. Venezia 1993, 325–342. Scholars after Mackridge generally agree with these rules or propose some slight modifications, e.g. P. Pappas, Variation and morphosyntactic change in Greek. From clitics to affixes. Basingstoke 2004. See Soltic (as above) for further references on the remarkably popular topic of Byzantine OCPs.

7 J. Wackernagel, Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1 (1892) 333–446.

other word is called the clitic's phonological 'host'.[8] In Greek, the class of clitics includes object pronouns, possessive pronouns, indefinite pronouns and several others.[9] The class of clitics also includes enclitic particles such as τε and γε, traditionally written without an accent, and postpositive particles such as δέ, γάρ, μέν and οὖν, traditionally written with an accent. It is generally acknowledged that this accent is an orthographic convention rather than a phonological reality.[10] For this reason we will use the term 'clitic particle' regardless of whether the particle is orthographically accented or not.

In Ancient Greek, clitics are placed in clause-second position according to Wackernagel's Law (1892). This tendency applies to clitic particles (written in italics) as well as to OCPs (underlined):

ὃς *γὰρ* δεύτατος **ἦλθεν** Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων (Homer, *Odyssey* 1.286)
κλῦτε φίλοι· θεῖός μοι ἐνύπνιον **ἦλθεν** ὄνειρος (Homer, *Iliad* 2.56)

The effects of Wackernagel's Law are quite remarkable since, due to its preference for second position, OCPs are often separated from their syntactic host, the verb (written in boldface). In example (2), for instance, the OCP μοι attaches to its phonological host θεῖος, but not to its syntactic host ἦλθεν. Consequently, syntactic and phonological host do not necessarily coincide in Ancient Greek.

If several clitics are combined, they cluster together in second position. It has been observed that the position of a particular clitic within the resulting clitic cluster is not at all arbitrary: "l'ordre interne ... est déterminé par une règle assez stricte".[11] Especially with regard to Homeric clitic clusters, a detailed hier-

8 A. Zwicky, On Clitics. Bloomington, Indiana 1977, 9.

9 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, 73 f.

10 Wackernagel (as footnote 7 above) 377. A well-known example is the artificial orthographic distinction between the modal particles ἄν and κε(ν) whose grammatical function and positional distribution are identical. On theory versus practice in the accentuation of particles see B. Laum, Das alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem unter Zugrundelegung der theoretischen Lehren der Grammatiker und mit Heranziehung der praktischen Verwendung in den Papyri. Paderborn 1928, and also Noret in a series of articles in *Byzantion*, e. g. J. Noret / C. De Vocht, Une orthographe insolite et nuancé, celle de Nicéphore Blemmyde, ou à propos du δέ enclitique. *Byzantion* 55 (1985 – 86) 493 – 505.

11 C. J. Ruijgh, La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homere d'apres la loi de Wackernagel, in H. Eichner / H. Rix (eds.), Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jacob Wakkernagel und die Indogermanistik heute. Wiesbaden 1990, 213 – 233, 217.

archy has been established. If an OCP co-occurs with a clitic particle, the latter must precede the former:[12]

αὐτὸς *γάρ* σφιν **δῶκεν** ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων (Homer, *Iliad* 2.612)
πῶς *γάρ* μοι μύθῳ **ἐπιτέλλεαι** ἠδὲ κελεύεις; (Homer, *Iliad* 10.61)
δὸς *δέ* μοι ὤμοιιν τὰ σὰ τεύχεα θωρηχθῆναι (Homer, *Iliad* 16.40)

The same order is still canonical in later Greek,[13] as the following example illustrates:

ἐγὼ *γάρ* σοι ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου **ἀποκρινοῦμαι** (Plato, *Republic* 590a3)

3 Clitics and particles in Byzantine Greek

By the time G was written (around 1300), the use of clitic particles had been strongly reduced in texts, since they had fallen into disuse in the contemporary spoken language.[14] Nevertheless, δέ, γάρ, μέν and οὖν still abound in G, especially in comparison with its more vulgar counterpart E:

	G	E
δέ	434	43
γάρ	274	30
μέν	74	7
οὖν	18	1
total	800	81

The frequent occurrence of such particles is one of archaizing features of G. In what follows, we investigate to what extent the ancient order of clitic particles and OCPs is preserved in G.

12 Cf. Ruijgh (as above) 223; J. Wills, Homeric Particle Order. Historische Sprachforschung 106 (1993) 61–81, 73.
13 M. H. B. Marshall, Verbs, nouns and postpositives in Attic prose. Edinburgh 1987, 8.
14 Jannaris (as footnote 9 above) 400; Horrocks (as footnote 1 above) 297 f.

3.1 X-P-OCP-V[15]

When an OCP and a clitic particle are combined, the particle often *precedes* the OCP, just as in Ancient Greek. First some examples with γάρ:

μὴ *γάρ* σε **κατηνάγκασα** ἢ παρεβίασά σε; (2.182)[16]
ψυχὴν *γάρ* με **ὠνόμαζε**, φῶς ὀφθαλμῶν ἐκάλει (5.107)
πλείονα *γάρ* μοι **προξενεῖς** σιωπῶν τὴν ὀδύνην (8.46)

The same applies to δέ:

ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἀντεστάθησαν στρατηγοί, οὐ φουσσᾶτα
γυνὴ *δέ* με **ἐνίκησε** πάνυ ὡραιοτάτη (1.297–298)
οὕτως *δέ* μοι **ὑπέπεσαν** ὡς γῦπες εἰς τὸ βρῶμα (5.180)

G even contains one verse in which the clitics περ and τις are also included in the clitic cluster in total conformity with the ancient ordering hierarchy:[17]

εἴπερ *δέ* τις μ' **ἐβάσκανε**, μή με τὴν καταρᾶσαι (4.394)

In Ancient Greek, indefinite pronouns indeed follow clitic particles, but precede OCPs, as Herodian's extreme example illustrates:

εἴ πέρ τίς σέ μοί **φησί** ποτε (Hdn. 563.15)

The distributional pattern in (11) clearly reproduces the order found in ancient clitic clusters.

3.2 X-Particle-(Y)-Verb-OCP

However, clitic particles and OCPs do not necessarily cluster together in Byzantine Greek. As a matter of fact, they can be split, as in the following examples:

οὐ *γὰρ* **συμφέρει** μοι τοῦ ζῆν πάντων ἀποτυχούσῃ (5.146)

---

15 X stands for any word or constituent in first position. See Soltic (2012) on what exactly counts as a word or constituent. Statistics for each distributional pattern are given in the appendix.

16 Examples are taken from the recent edition of G by Jeffreys (1998).

17 Cf. Ruijgh (as footnote 11 above) 217); Wills (as footnote 12 above) 72.

ἄλλο *γὰρ* οὐ **θεάσεις** με τὸν σὲ πολλὰ ποθοῦντα (8.67)
ἕτεροι *δὲ* τοῖς βέλεσιν αὐτῶν **ἐξένυττόν** με (6.689)

The above examples suggest that the distribution of clitic particles and OCPs is governed by different mechanisms. The particles, which are no longer used in the contemporary language, have preserved their ancient position and are thus still placed in second position in accordance with Wackernagel's Law. OCPs, on the other hand, have been subject to a diachronic evolution. Whereas in Homeric Greek, OCPs are more often than not separated from their syntactic host, the verb, one can observe an increasing tendency towards verb adjacency which has reached its conclusion in Modern Greek, where it has become an obligatory syntactic rule. In Byzantine Greek, this evolution towards contiguity between verb and OCP is taking place at full force. In the words of Mackridge,[18] a pioneer in the study of Byzantine OCPs: "the clitic object pronoun ceased to be a freely moving part of the clause and instead became part of the verb phrase".

What distinguishes the Byzantine OCPs from the modern ones is their position vis-à-vis the verb. In Modern Greek, the position of the OCP is determined syntactically: a finite verb requires preverbal OCPs, an imperative or a gerund postverbal ones. In Byzantine Greek, on the other hand, the choice for pre- or postverbal position is regulated by a set of syntactic rules on the one hand and a number of pragmatic principles on the other.[19] The unmarked position of the Byzantine OCPs is immediately postverbal, but if the verb is preceded by function words such as μή (7), the OCP is attracted into preverbal position. The attraction of OCPs to such function words is obligatory and thus governed by a syntactic rule. However, OCPs can optionally be attracted to preverbal 'preferential words'[20] or to preverbal constituents which constitute the focus of the utterance. Examples of such preferential words, i.e. words which are preferentially placed in first position (X), are πλείονα (9) and οὕτως (11). Ψυχήν (8) and γυνή (10) are examples of *ad hoc* focalized constituents.[21]

18 Mackridge (as footnote 6 above) 339.

19 For detailed accounts see Mackridge (as footnote 6 above) and Soltic (as footnote 5 above). For the Post-Classical stage of this evolution see 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, 83–121; idem, Convergence and Divergence in the Development of the Greek and Latin Clitic Pronouns, in R. Sornicola, E. Poppe & A.Shisha-Halevy (eds.), Stability variation and change of word-order patterns over time. Amsterdam 2000, 231–258.

20 K.J. Dover, Greek word order. Cambridge 1960, 20f.

21 The distinction between 'preferential' and ad hoc focalized is inevitably a fuzzy one, since preferential words are actually "emphatiques de nature" (Janse 1993, as footnote 19 above, 94).

If we now reconsider the above examples, it is clear that the OCP is always adjacent to its verb.[22] In the examples with an apparently archaic cluster order (3.1), the OCP *immediately precedes* the verb: X-Particle-OCP-Verb. In the so-called split examples (3.2), the OCP *immediately follows* the verb: X-Particle-(Y)-Verb-OCP. The exact position of the OCP depends on the nature of the element before the verb: in examples (14)– (16), the OCP stands in its normal postverbal position,[23] whereas in examples (7)–(12) the OCP is attracted either by function words or by ad hoc focalized constituents.

3.3 X-Particle-Y-OCP-Verb

If OCP and clitic particle are separated, the OCP does not necessarily come immediately after the verb (3.2). It can also occur in preverbal position, particularly if another constituent (Y) intervenes between the sequence X-Particle and the verb:

ἡμεῖς θανοῦσαν σε εἴχομεν καὶ σπαθοκοπημένην
ἀλλ' *οὖν* τὰ κάλλη ζῶσαν σε **ἐτήρησαν**, φιλτάτη (1.324–135)
ἄλλοι *δὲ* κονταρέας μοι **ἐδίδων** κατὰ κράτος (6.688)
σὺ *δὲ* φωνήν μοι **ἔπεμψας** βοηθοῦσα τῷ λόγῳ (8.111)

It is very likely that these preverbal constituents are focalized *ad hoc* and therefore responsible for the preverbal position of the OCPs. In (17) ζῶσαν sharply contrasts with θανοῦσαν. In (18) and (19) both ἐδίδων and ἔπεμψας are semantically rather weak verbs, so the objects κονταρέας and φωνήν presumably constitute the most salient information of the utterance, i. e. the focus. The particle, on the other hand, remains in its normal second position.

22 In one isolated example the OCP is not adjacent to its verb: ὁ Χάρων *δέ* με ἐκ παντὸς τὸν ἀήττητον **τρέπει** (8.125). The order in this verse is quite archaic, as both OCP and clitic particle cluster together in second position, regardless of the position of the verb in accordance with Wackernagel's Law, as in examples (3)–(6).

23 In examples (14) and (15), the verb is preceded by the negation οὐ which, contrary to μή, does not attract OCPs in preverbal position (Mackridge, as footnote 6 above, 328, and Soltic, as footnote 5 above). Already in Post-Classical Greek, οὐ(κ) had developed into a proclitic negation (Janse 2000, as footnote 19 above, 240), unlike its compounds, cf. οὐδέν > Modern Greek δέ(ν).

3.4 Verb-Particle-OCP

It is very interesting to consider now those examples in which the verb itself is in initial position. In those cases, there arises a potential conflict between Wackernagel's Law, which dictates that clitic particle and OCP cluster together *in that order* in second position, and the diachronic drift towards verb adjacency, which dictates that the OCP should immediately follow the verb when the latter is in initial position. There are eleven examples in G in which the two word order principles run into conflict. In six cases, the OCP is not *immediately* adjacent to its verb, for the particle, standing in second position, intervenes. This order again reflects the ancient cluster order:

εἶδον *γάρ* με καθήμενον εἰς τοῦ δένδρου τὴν ῥίζαν (6.179)
οἰκτείρω *γάρ* σε ὡς γυνὴν καὶ κάλλους πεπλησμένην (6.757)
ἔξεις *δέ* με καὶ συνεργὸν εἰς τοὺς ὑπεναντίους (6.770)
ὁρῶντες *δέ* με εὐτυχῆ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πολέμους (1.289)
ἰδοῦσα *δέ* με πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀπερχόμενον μόνον (5.195)

Note that the OCP is semantically and grammatically connected with the following constituent, i.e. καθήμενον (20), ὡς γυνήν (21), καὶ συνεργόν (22), εὐτυχῆ (23) and πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀπερχόμενον μόνον (24). This connection possibly explains why in these examples this order is preferred to the order in the next section (3.5). In only one of the six examples, there is no such connection:

ἐξεῖπε *γάρ* μου τὴν βουλήν, ἔδειξε καὶ τὸ γράμμα (2.230)

3.5 Verb-OCP-Particle

The above examples seem to suggest a priority of Wackernagel's Law over the modern principle: the archaic particles are consistently placed in second position, even if this prevents the OCPs to appear in their expected place, i.e. immediately postverbal. However, this is not always the case. There are five examples in G where the order of clitic particle and OCP is reversed. This results in the highly remarkable and very unclassical sequence OCP-Particle, e.g.:

πείθει με *γὰρ* τὸ συνειδὸς τηρεῖν τὰ ἐναντία (4.741)

Since we are dealing with a poetic text, it is necessary to invalidate the potential criticism that this variation is simply determined *metri causa*. In the πολιτικὸς στίχος, only the even syllables (and sometimes the first and ninth syllables)

can be accentuated.[24] However, as mentioned above (section 2), the accents on particles are rather artificial and thus cannot influence the accentual pattern; in the words of Apostolopoulos: "l'accent des mots 'synnomes' n'ayant aucune valuer métrique".[25] As such, the normal, i.e. classical, cluster order, OCP-Particle, would not have any effect on the structure of the πολιτικὸς στίχος. From a metrical point of view, **πείθει** *γάρ* με would also have been perfectly possible, as in example (20): **εἶδον** *γάρ* με. The examples in which the OCP precedes the particle are:

ἔκδεξαί με *δὲ* εἰς πρόσωπον, ἐὰν ᾖς στρατιώτης (6.515)
δάκνει με *δὲ* τῆς Μαξιμοῦς ἡ πάντολμος βραδύτης (6.814)
Ἀπόστρωσε τὸν βοῦλχαν μου, **στρῶσον** μου *δὲ* τὸν μαῦρον (4.376)
δηλώσω σοι *γὰρ* τὰς αὐτοῦ πράξεις ἄρτι
ἃς εἰργάσατο ἐν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ (1.13–14)[26]

These striking examples constitute the exact mirror images of the examples quoted in section 3.1. This alternation between Verb-OCP-Particle versus Particle-OCP-Verb is obviously caused by the increasing tendency towards convergence between syntactic and phonological host, or more concretely: by the contemporary inclination of the OCP towards verb adjacency. In this respect, the above 'slips of the pen' are thus very revealing: despite the clear archaizing style of G, the conflict between the two positioning principles is here clearly resolved in favour of the *contemporary* rules for OCP distribution.

4 Conclusion

In this note, we have examined the various distributional patterns of OCPs co-occurring with archaic clitic particles in the Grottaferrata manuscript of the *Digenis Akritis*. The latter occur much less frequently in the more vulgar Escorial version and can thus be said to testify to the archaizing character of G. Contrary to Ancient Greek, the placement of Byzantine OCPs is no longer regulated by the same principle as the particles, i.e. Wackernagel's Law, but follows the contemporary

24 M.D. Lauxtermann, The spring of rhythm. An essay on the political verse and other Byzantine metres. Wien 1999.

25 P. Apostolopoulos, La langue du roman byzantin Callimaque et Chrysorrhoé. Athens 1984, 213.

26 Note that the prologue of G, from which this example is taken, is not written in the usual πολιτικὸς στίχος fifteen-syllable metre, but in twelve-syllable verse (Jeffreys, as footnote 2 above, 3).

tendency towards verb adjacency. Various possibilities have been identified: X-Particle-OCP-Verb and Verb-Particle-OCP, which apparently reflect the classical cluster order; X-Particle-(Y)-Verb-OCP and X-Particle-Y-OCP-Verb, in which particle and OCP are split and the OCP is placed immediately before or after the verb in accordance with the rules postulated by Mackridge and Soltic[27] for E and G respectively. However, the sequence Verb-OCP-Particle constitutes the most revealing pattern: the classical cluster order Particle-OCP seems to have been reversed and the particle no longer occupies its traditional second position. Hence, these examples look very awkward from a classical perspective.

The reason for this apparent reversal has to be sought in the contemporary tendency towards contiguity of OCP and verb. As such, this order clearly anticipates the Modern Greek distribution, in which the OCP obligatorily stands next to its verb, i.e. its syntactic and thus natural host. This interpretation is actually confirmed by the numerous other examples in which the OCP is adjacent to its verb as well. In general, this observation provides further evidence for the view that G, despite its intentionally archaizing style, displays a number of contemporary linguistic features, including the distribution of the OCPs.[28]

5 Appendix: Statistics

X-Particle-OCP-Verb	12
X-Particle-Y-Verb-OCP	18
X-Particle-X-OCP-Verb	4
V-Particle-OCP	5
Verb-OCP-Particle	6
OCP separated from verb	1
Total	46

27 Mackridge (as footnote 6 above) and Soltic (as footnote 5 above).
28 Soltic (as footnote 5 above).