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

Abstract

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

Introduction

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

---

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

1 S. Alexiou, Βασίλειος Διγενής Ακρίτης (κατά το μεσόγειο του Εσκορίαλ) (Athens 1985).


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

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

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

---

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

Clitics are small words which do not have phonological stress of their own and consequently have to lean -κλίνο in Ancient Greek- on another word: a phonological 'host'.

If this phonological host is the following word, we call it a proclitic, for instance the Greek definite article; if it selects a preceding word as phonological host, it is an enclitic, for example the Medieval and Modern Greek possessive pronoun. Both types are exemplified in το παράδειγμα μου. One of the most studied elements within the large class of Greek clitics (particles, possessive pronouns, indefinite pronouns, a few verbs), is the OCP, whose grammatical function is the (in)direct object and whose syntactic host is thus the verb, as in μανθάνω σε.

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

2) **Diachronic Outline**

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

1. Κύκλωψ, # ἐρωτάς μου νόμιμα κλιντόν, # αύτάρ ἐγώ τοι ἔξερπο # σὸ δὲ μοι δὸς ἧπιον, # ὁς περ ὑπέστησ. (Od. 9.364-365)

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

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

---

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

2. ἵλα κνῆ κεδεὶο ζπλεηδείε, # εἶ δι ηι ο ό πᾶς κίνδυνος ήν (Antipho 43.3)

3. τοῦτο μοι, ὦ φίλοι, εὖ δοκεῖ εἰχεῖν. (Pl. Ρ. 2.368a.5)\(^13\)

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

4. ὡς μὲν ἀφήκε με πάντων (D. 37.21.1)\(^16\)

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

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

5. ἡςαη οκνπ (Lc. 8.46)\(^18\)

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

6. Τίς μου ἐςατο; (Mc. 5.31)\(^20\)

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

---

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

\(^{14}\) Horrocks, op.cit., 38. Horrocks calls this phenomenon 'head-dependency'.

\(^{15}\) Janse, 'Clitic doubling' (Philadephia 2008) 176.

\(^{16}\) Horrocks, op.cit., 40.


\(^{18}\) Janse, op.cit., 87.

\(^{19}\) Horrocks, op.cit., 41.

\(^{20}\) Janse, op.cit., 90.
open the utterance and thus stand in P1, are often found in combination with a following OCP, holding its normal P2.

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

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

7. καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἦν ἐγώ, οὐκ ἦν ἐγὼν (Jn. 17.25)25 'And the world doesn't know you, but I know you'

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

In Medieval Greek, these remnants of Wackernagel’s Law take on a more compelling character: the tendencies for preverbal position detected in post-Classical Greek are now labelled 'rules' by Mackridge.28 In broad lines, preverbal OCPs are 'more or less obligatory' if the verb is preceded by what I have called function words (cf. 4.3.1).29 Besides this (quasi-)obligatory syntactic rule, preverbal position is regulated by a pragmatic principle, for after 'semantically emphasized' constituents preverbal OCPs are 'almost obligatory' (cf. 4.3.2).30

This principle refers to the above mentioned preverbal OCPs after preferential words and ad hoc focalized constituents (cf. 4.3.2.1-2). We may not forget, however, that postverbal position had become the unmarked order (cf. 4.2). Consequently, the Medieval distribution

---

21 In the sense of Janse, ‘Convergence and divergence’ (Amsterdam 2000).
23 Dover, Greek Word Order, 20.
24 Horrocks, op.cit., 41. This seems to be a cross-linguistic tendency: see T. Givón, Syntax: An Introduction. Volume I (Amsterdam 2001) 250: ‘the less predictable the information is or the more important, the more likely it is to be placed earlier in the clause (or in whatever relevant unit of structured information)’.
25 Janse, op.cit., 180. Note that καὶ is a prepositional word and as such does not count for the determination of P2, see Dover, op.cit., 13.
27 Demonstrative pronouns for example are considered preferential words by Dover (op.cit., 2), but at the same time they can of course be emphasized, cf. 3: ‘this, my friends, I think, was well said’.
29 Mackridge, op.cit., 340.
30 Mackridge, op.cit., 341.
seems to be a clear continuation of the post-Classical period, yet it also forms the steppingstone to the contemporary distribution of Greek OCPs.

The transition to Modern Greek principally lies in the Medieval (quasi-)obligation of the OCP to be adjacent to its syntactic host, the verb: 'the clitic object pronoun ceased to be a freely moving part of the clause and instead became part of the verb phrase'. This constitutes an important difference with the earlier period, in which OCP and verb can still be separated. The question now arises whether a complete harmonization between the phonological and the syntactic host of the OCP is already accomplished in the Medieval period, or more accurately formulated: are the preverbal OCPs proclitic on the verb or do they still possess their enclitic nature, as in post-Classical Greek? The obligatory adjacency between verb and OCP finally leads to the grammaticalisation of the OCPs in Modern Greek. Phonological and syntactic host now always coincide: postverbal enclitics form the counterpart of preverbal proclitics. The exact position of the OCP is no longer regulated by the nature of the preceding constituent (and by syntactic and pragmatic principles), but depends on the mood of the verb. If the verb is an imperative (8) or a gerund (9), the OCPs appear after the verb:

8. μήλα μας
9. μήλόντας μας

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

10. μας μήλα

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

3) Metre & Methodology

3.1 Classicizing G & vulgarizing E

31 Mackridge, op.cit., 329.
32 Cf. Janse, 'Clitic doubling' (Philadelphia 2008) 181: 'Whether or not the Medieval Greek pronouns were still enclitic, as in Ancient Greek, or had become proclitic (...), is a moot question'. The postverbal OCPs are of course always enclitic.
The Digenis Akritis, Byzantium’s only extant epic, has been preserved in two important manuscripts: G, written around 1300, and E, dating from the late fifteenth century. Both versions represent a different branch of the manuscript tree and are typecast as follows: ‘the redactor of the G-version strived to Atticize on the one hand and that of the E-version to vulgarize on the other’. Although none of the two represent a pure idiom -they are rather typical manifestations of the Medieval Greek 'mixed or macaronic language incorporating vernacular and learned elements'-, G is nonetheless not taken into account in linguistic analyses of vernacular Medieval Greek. Likewise, G is left out in studies on Medieval Greek OCPs, in which only E is taken into consideration.

3.2 Πολιτικός στίχος and intonation units

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

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

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

36 Trapp, 'Learned and vernacular literature in Byzantium' (1993) 121 (my italics). The precise relationship between E and G and their relationship to the 'Urfassung', as well as the question of which nature this original text was, have caused heated discussions, but are of no concern here. For further bibliography, see R. Beaton & D. Ricks, Digenis Akritis: New Approaches to Byzantine Heroic Poetry (London 1993).
37 N. Toufexis (2008), 'Diglossia and register variation in Medieval Greek', BMGS 32.2 (2008) 204.
39 The average breathing capacity, the rare occurrences of elision between the eighth and ninth syllable and the fact that the ninth is the only syllable (next to the first) among the uneven ones which can occasionally receive an accent, all point in this direction; cf. P. Apostolopoulos, La Langue du Roman Byzantin Callimaque et Chrysorrhoë (Athens 1984) 211-214; H. Eideneier, Von Rhapsodie zu Rap: Aspekte der griechischen Sprachgeschichte von Homer bis heute (Tübingen 1999) 104.
another verb or other words—or even completely altered the formulation—to fit the metre.\textsuperscript{41} Although 'metri causa' is to me an unsatisfactory principle to explain the word order in the verse, I do not radically exclude the contribution of metrical factors to a certain placement of the OCP. As a matter of fact, some instability in the positioning of OCPs might be explained by the poet's idea that some poetic license is permitted.

### 3.3 Enclitic nature

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

### 4) Analysis

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

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

#### 4.1 Verb-adjacency

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{44} Mackridge, 'An editorial problem' (Venice 1993) 326.
First, however, the adjacency between verb and OCP, a particularly Medieval development crucial for the further course of events, is investigated. The OCPs in G are nearly always adjacent to their verb, either in postverbal (11) or in preverbal position (12):

11. Ἀρα, υἱὲ μου Διγενές, # διδάξαω σε κοντάριν (2.291)

12. σοὺς ὀδελφοὺς ἡμάγκασσος # ἵνα μοι θανατώσουν (2.186)

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

13. ἔξεις δέ μοι καὶ συνεργόν # εἰς τοὺς ὑπεναντίους. (6.770)

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

14. πείθει μοι γάρ τὸ συνειδός # τηρεῖν τὰ ἐναντία (4.741)

4.2 Postverbal

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

15. οὐ λυπήσω σε πῶποτε, # ὡς πανευγενεστάτη (4.579)

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

16. ἃν τὴν οὐχ ὑποστρέψωμεν, # καὶ οἱ πάντες νὰ σφοδρῷμεν. (1.112)

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

---

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


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

⁴⁹ Janse, 'Convergence and divergence' (Amsterdam 2000) 240.
17. Γνώρισόν μοι, κοράσιον, # εἰς ἔχεις με εἰς νοῦν σου (4.316)

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

18. Καὶ λέγει μοι ὁ πρόκριτος: # ‘πῶς ἔχωμεν πιστεύσαι (6.192)

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

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

4.3 Preverbal

4.3.1 Syntactic rule

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

19. καλέ, ἀν σε νοήση ὁ κύρης μου # νά σε κακοδικήσῃ (4.442)

20. ὁπότε μοι ἐκόπλωσαν # οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἀγρίως (3.68)

21. ἵνα τοῦ ἐπιέσωμεν # ἐν νυκτὶ ἀδοκήτως (6.348)

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

22. νά σε καταζητήσωμεν # ὅπου δ’ ἀν καὶ τυργίνης; (1.281)

---

50 Janse, op.cit., 235.
52 G. De Boel, 'The Genesis of Clitic Doubling from Ancient to Medieval Greek', in D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages (Philadelphia 2008) 95. Mackridge (1993: 327) also associates the complementizer ὅτι and the causal conjunction διότι with postverbal OCPs, but this cannot be confirmed by G because of the lack of (suitable) examples.
53 With the exception of ἐ (cf. 4.2).
Together with và, Mackridge mentions the modern concessive and future particles ἀς and θά: both require preverbal OCPs, yet the former occurs only twice in combination with an OCP and the latter is completely absent from G.\(^{55}\)

23. ἀς τὸ φορᾶ, καλόγνωμε, # ἔως οὗ ὑποστρέψω. (2.270)

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

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

24. Ἐπελόθου τὸν ἁγαθὸν # ὄν σοι ἐνεδειξάμην; (5.128)

### 4.3.2 Pragmatic principle

Since Pappas claims that emphasis hardly plays a part in the determination of the position of OCPs, more attention will be paid to the pragmatic principle than to the syntactic one. Pappas’ most extreme point of view reads as follows: ‘previously proposed parameters such as emphasis or discourse constraints do not have a demonstrable effect on the variation’.\(^{57}\)

Nevertheless, I agree with Mackridge and with many others that information structure is relevant with regard to the Medieval OCP distribution.\(^{58}\) Condoravdi & Kiparsky warn us that ‘focus structure is not automatically fixed by the textual context, or even by the extralinguistic context, because it depends on what the speaker has in mind and wants to express’.\(^{59}\) Since we do not have access to the mind of the Medieval Greeks, we should nevertheless rely on the textual context.

#### 4.3.2.1 Preferential

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

25. Πῶς σε παραμυθήσομαι; # Ποῦ σε ἀφῶ τὴν ξένην; (8.130)\(^{61}\)

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

26. Ἀγωνίζου, ψυχίτζα μου, # μή μου ἄποχρίσον (4.626)

---


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

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

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


\(^{61}\) In E, πῶς is also used as a complementizer which attracts OCPs into preverbal position. In G, it solely functions as an interrogative. Of course, both have to be considered as different items.
The negation δέν, also associated with pre-position by Mackridge, does not occur in G, as it is probably felt too modern. The composite negations are difficult to judge, since μηδέείς does not occur with OCPs in G, while μηδέν is only once found in combination with an OCP, viz. before an imperative (cf. 4.4.1: example 41). Οὐδέες and οὐδέν occur once in combination with a postverbal OCP (4.553 and 2.16), yet in both cases this can be a consequence of emphasis on their verb (cf. 4.4.2: example 44).

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

27. 'Αὔτη ἐνὶ ἥ ἀγάπῃ σοῦ # καὶ οὕτως μοι ὑπέσχου; (2.179)

28. καὶ δέδοικα μὴ κίνδυνος # ἐκ τοῦτοῦ μοι ἐπέλθῃ (4.738)

The same applies to strong personal pronouns:

29. σὺ μόνος μὲ ἐνίκησας, # σὺ μὲ ἀποκερδίσεις (6.769)

30. καὶ ἄντ' αὐτῆς σοι δώσομεν # πλούτων ὃσον κελεύεις. (1.107)

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

31. εἰ γὰρ λαλήσω, κράζοντος # ἔτεροι μοι ἀκούσουν, δώσουν, ὑπονοήσουν με # οἱ φυλάττοντες ὄδε (4.419-420)

32. Οἱ πάντες σὲ ἐφρόνησον # τῆς Αἰγύπτου κρατήσαι, σὺ δὲ τούχης τῆς ἐπώτου # ἐμποδιστῆς ἐγένου, (3.155-156)

33. Πολλάκις τὸν ἐμὴνος, # γλυκύτατε νεῖ μου ἄλλον ὦδε ὅλος πείθεται εἰς τοῦτο κατανεύσαι. (4.308-309)

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

4.3.2.2 Ad hoc emphasized

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

34. ὅσχὴν γὰρ μὲ ὄνομαξ. # φῶς ὀφθαλμῶν ἐκάλει καὶ μετ᾽ ὅλγον γαμετήν # ἐξεργε καὶ φίληταν (5.107-108)

`for he named me his soul, he called me the light of his eyes,

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

63 Mackridge ranks subjects -together with temporal adverbs- among environments where the position of OCPs is relatively free.
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and after a while he said I was his wife and his dearest'.

35. Ἐμοί οὖκ ἄντεσταθήσαν # στρατηγοῖ, οὐ φουσάτα, γυνὴ δὲ μὲ ἐνίκησε # πάνω ὀρασίων: (1.297-298)
'The generals could not withstand me, nor the armies, but a most lovely woman has completely conquered me'.

36. "Ἐκδεξάμεν δὲ εἰς πρόσωπον, # ἐάν ἦς στρατιώτης, καὶ μὴ ὀστερ κυνάριον # λυσσῶν λάθρα μὲ δάκης. (6.515-516)
'Confront me face to face, if you are a soldier and don't snap at me behind my back like a rabid puppy'.

37. Αἰχμάλωτον σέ ἡρπαξα, ἐτίμων ως κυρίαν. (2.188)
'I seized you as my prisoner, but I honoured you as my lady'.

38. Ἡμεῖς δεσπόζουσαν σὲ εἰκόμεν # καὶ σπαθοκοπημένην, ἄλλον τὰ κάλλη ζῶσαν σὲ # ἐπίθημασαν. φυλήτη. (1.324-325)
'We thought you were dead and hacked by a sword, but your beauty, dear, has kept you alive'.

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

4.4 Verbs and (lack of) emphasis

4.4.1 Imperatives

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

39. Δόσ μοι λόγον, αὐθέντρια, # δόσ μοι σόν δακτυλίδιν (2.269)

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

40. εὐθυς ἀνταπεκρίνατο: # 'Αὐριόν μὲ ἐκδέχομαι'. (4.367)
'and immediately replied: 'Expect me tomorrow''

41. Συγχώρησόν μοι, αὐθέντα μου, # μηδέν μὲ καταμέμφος (4.676)

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

65 For clitic placement and emphasis on verbs, see M.C. Janssen, 'Ἡ πρόταξι καὶ ἐπίταξι του αὐτόν μοι τῆς προσωπικῆς αντωνυμίας της εποχῆ του Ἑροδότου καὶ της Θωσίας του Ἀρακάμπτη', Cretan Studies 6 (1998) 129-144.

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

67 However, many elements which trigger pre-position are incompatible with imperatives (e.g. subordinating conjunctions). This fact naturally contributes to the dominance of postverbal OCPs.
However, like the first imperative in this last verse (41), συγχώρησον μοι, the overwhelming majority of imperatives in G is associated with postverbal OCPs, for the imperative generally opens the intonation unit as most emphasized item.

### 4.4.2 Competing motivations

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

42. ἀλλὰ δὲν παροδηγήσης μὲ # καὶ ἔλθω μετὰ σένα
καὶ γνώσουν τὸ τὰ ἀδέλφια μου # καὶ τὸ συγγενικόν μου
καὶ καταφθάσῃ σὲ ὁ πατὴρ # ὁ ἐμὸς μετὰ πλήθους
πῶς ἔχεις ἐξηβάλειν μὲ # καὶ σώσαι τὴν ψυχήν σου; (4.452-455)

43. Ποία μήτηρ συγκλαύσει σοι; # Τίς πατὴρ ἐλεήσει
ἡ νουθετήσει ἀδέλφος; # τινὰ μὴ εὐποροῦσα; (8.131-132)

44. καὶ οὐδὲς ὄνειδίσει σε, # μᾶλλον δὲ μακαρίσει. (4.553)

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

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

45. ὁ Μουσοῦρ ἐστασίασε # καὶ σπαθέαν τοῦ ἔδωκε: (5.168)
   'had a disagreement with Mousour who had struck him with his sword'

46. κονταρέαν μοι δέδωκεν # ξιστὴν εἰς τὸ λουρίκιν (6.585)
   'and struck me a glancing blow on the breast-plate with her spear'

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

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

A similar verse is found in E:

48. Τρεῖς ἕκλας μοῦ τοῦ ἕκλασε # καὶ τρεῖς ἐμπροστελίνες (E 800; Mackridge 1993: 330)
   'Gird on for me three saddle girths and three martingales'

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

49. ἑρίσεων τὸ κοντάριν τοῦ # καὶ δύκτυλον τοῦ δείχυε (E 53)
   'he threw away his spear and showed him his finger'

---

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

Ποίν δὲ γε περίτοις νυμεὶς ξυρίσει με σοῦ πόθου; (2.122)
   'What circumstances will separate me from your desire?'

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

70 Crystal, A Dictionary (Malden 2003) 270.

71 Cf. 1.291; 3.99; 4.38; 6.688.

72 Crystal, op.cit., 79.

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

4.5 P2-collocations

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

50. ἵλ’ ὅπως σῇ ἐν τῇ κρυπτῇ # τοῦ λόφου ἐπαγάγω (6.526)

51. μή μὲ τοσσαύτην κατιδείν # παρασχορήσῃς θλίψιν (8.179 = E 1858)

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

5) Conclusion

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

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

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

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

75 Jeffreys, Digenis Akritis (Cambridge 1998) xxix.
76 Mackridge, op.cit., 332.
77 Mackridge, op.cit., 338 (my italics).
78 In some cases, metre cannot be excluded as a factor contributing to the postverbal position of the OCP.
be considered the reverse of ad hoc focalized verbs. These frequently used verbs, which have a weak or predictable lexical meaning, almost always occur with preverbal OCPs if they are preceded by some -not necessarily emphasized- constituent.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VERB-ADJACENCY</th>
<th>SEPARATION 79</th>
<th>TOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINITE VERBS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.78%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

79 I have not reckoned quasi-enclitic particles intervening between verb and OCP among the separations.
80 The verb opens the intonation unit.
81 As mentioned, θα is completely absent from G.
82 A constituent preceding the verb does not necessarily carry emphasis and can thus not automatically be called an 'ad hoc emphasized constituent'.