CLITIC DOUBLING IN VERNACULAR MEDIEVAL GREEK[1]

By Jorie Soltic
University of Ghent

Abstract

This paper provides the first in-depth study of clitic doubling in vernacular Medieval Greek. First, it is shown that the four-part typology (topicalization; right-dislocation; backgrounding; left-dislocation) recently developed on the basis of Modern Greek is perfectly applicable to vernacular Medieval Greek. Moreover, clitic doubling serves the same pragmatic function in Medieval Greek as in many modern spoken languages: it marks an object as the topic of the utterance (as opposed to the focus). For this purpose, the notion of 'topic' is clearly defined and distinguished from the concept of (referential) 'givenness'. Special attention is paid to the distribution of the clitic pronouns, as their position is diagnostic for the topic/focus distinction. Innovatively, the frequent occurrence of clitic doubling in my corpus is associated with the oral discourse which the vernacular texts are acknowledged to adopt. In this regard, two other constructions are discussed: dislocated genitives and dislocated subjects.

1. Introduction

Clitic doubling is probably one of the most intensively studied issues in Modern Greek linguistics. While it has been noted that some instances of modern clitic doubling are already found in the vernacular language of the Greek Middle Ages (12–16th c.), a detailed analysis of the phenomenon in this period has not yet been undertaken.

In this paper, I show that clitic doubling serves the same pragmatic function in vernacular Medieval Greek as in Modern Greek, namely marking topics, as opposed to foci (in the sense of Gundel & Fretheim 2004). Moreover, the typology which has recently been developed by Janse (2008) on the basis of Modern Greek is also applicable to vernacular Medieval Greek. However, a difference with the contemporary language is constituted by the fact that in Medieval Greek the construction is considered particularly typical of colloquial and thus spoken language. As such, the very frequent occurrence of clitic doubling in my corpus (three substantial romances) provides further evidence for the oral discourse which the vernacular Medieval Greek texts are acknowledged to adopt. In this regard, I also discuss two other constructions related to clitic doubling (dislocated genitives and dislocated subjects), as they typically occur in spoken language as well.

The paper is organized as follows: the first section deals with a general definition of clitic doubling. As the construction is usually called a 'topic marker', the notion 'topic' is clarified in the second section. In the third section, the scope is limited to Modern Greek. The fourth section deals with Medieval Greek clitic doubling: I provide evidence that the modern function of topic marker can be adopted. Furthermore, various examples are given which all

fit into the modern four-part typology of Janse (2008). The fifth section innovatively associates clitic doubling with the oral discourse employed in the vernacular texts. In the last section, my conclusions are formulated.

2. DEFINITION

In modern linguistics, clitic doubling is defined as 'the co-occurrence of a direct and/or indirect object NP[2] and a co-referential clitic pronoun attached to the verb' (Janse 2008: 165). Especially in Balkan languages, clitic doubling is a common phenomenon[3] (Krapova & Cinque 2008: 278), as in the example from Albanian in (1):

(1) Ana   e   lexoi   librin   (Kallulli 2008: 230)[4]
     Ana_{NOM} 3s CL,ACC read   book-the$_{ACC}$
     'Ana read the book.'

   Many answers have been proposed to the question when exactly this construction is used: the object should be animate/definite/familiar/specific/etc. (Guentchéva 2008: 203). However, most suggestions can be indirectly related to the current standard view: clitic doubling serves a pragmatic function in information structure; it is used as a device to mark the objects as *topics*, for instance: 'In Bulgarian, CD [clitic doubling] depends on the speaker's discourse strategies and correlates with topicalization of the object argument' (Guentchéva 2008: 204).

3. THE TOPIC AS A CONCEPT

As is the case for many linguistic issues, much terminological confusion exists with regard to the notion 'topic(ality)'. Strictly speaking, the topic is the counterpart of the concept 'focus'. The topic/focus distinction captures the essence of the pair theme/rheme introduced by the Prague school (Guentchéva 2008: 211). Unfortunately, the concept 'topic' has often been equated with 'old', 'given' or 'known' information. Recently, Gundel & Fretheim (2004) have clearly pointed out this double use of the term 'topic' (and to a lesser extent of the term 'focus'). They distinguish two types of 'givenness/newness': *referential* givenness/newness and *relational* givenness/newness. The proper use of the term 'topic' must be sought at the latter level, as the term 'can only apply to linguistic expressions' and 'involves a partition of the semantic/conceptual representation of a sentence into two complementary parts, X and Y, where X is what the sentence is about [= topic, JS] (…) and Y is what is predicated about X [= focus, JS]' (Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 176f.).
   Referential givenness/newness, on the other hand, 'involves a relation between a linguistic expression and a corresponding non-linguistic entity in the speaker/hearer's mind, the discourse (model), or some real or possible world' (Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 176). It is important to note that referential givenness/newness is gradual rather than binary: 'we need a richer taxonomy than the simple "given/new" distinction' (Brown & Yule 1983: 182; see

---

[2] As an NP can also be based on a pronoun, (strong) object pronouns too can be subject to clitic doubling. From a cross-linguistic perspective, however, this definition presents a rather restricted view. In standard Italian, for instance, prepositional phrases too can be subject to clitic doubling; in Italian dialects, even subjects can be accompanied by a coreferential clitic pronoun (Cinque 1990). My data too seem to suggest that this definition is incomplete: I have found one example of a doubled prepositional phrase (cf. fn. 13) and possessive pronouns can also be doubled (cf. section 6.3.1).

[3] However, in many Romance varieties as well, clitic doubling occurs, for example, Spanish: Ferraresi & Lühr (2010).

[4] From now on, both the clitic pronoun and the doubled object are underlined.

Geluykens 1992: 12), since referents may be more or less new with respect to each other. Examples of referential givenness/newness continua are Chafe's (1994) 'activation statuses', Gundel, Hedberg & Zacharski's (1993) 'givenness hierarchy' and Geluykens's (1992) 'recoverability scale'.

Since referential givenness/newness and relational givenness/newness are logically independent (Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 179), it is possible that a *referentially old* piece of information is presented as the relationally most important information and thus as the *focus* of the utterance: 'it may well be the case that a focused constituent is given in the discourse' (Féry, Fanselow & Krifka 2006: 7; see Féry 2006: 4), for instance:

(2) – Who called?   (Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 179)
     – Pat said *she* called

While 'she' is referentially given, it constitutes the relationally most important information and consequently functions as the focus of the utterance (topic = 'called').

Nonetheless, a correlation seems to exist between the two types of givenness/newness, since it is natural that *referentially new* information coincides with the relationally most prominent and thus the *focalized* information. On the other hand, we expect *referentially given* information to constitute the *topic* of an utterance: 'there is, however, a good deal of empirical evidence for an independent connection between topic and some degree of referential givenness. Virtually the whole range of possible referential givenness conditions on topics has been suggested, including presupposition, familiarity, specificity, referentiality, and focus of attention' (Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 179: 1.2. 'Referential properties of topic'). As such, it should no longer come as a surprise that the notion topic has often been conflated with referential givenness. In practice, the concept of referential givenness can actually be quite a good, i.e. objective, means to identify the topic. Whereas *relational* givenness/newness is a rather *subjective* affair, for the *speaker* decides what he presents as the most salient (Dik 1997: 326),[5] with regard to *referential* givenness/newness, 'the speaker has no choice in the matter' (Gundel & Fretheim 2004: 178; see Geluykens 1992: 12).

4. MODERN GREEK

4.1. Topic marker

This ambiguous use of the notion 'topic' is also found in definitions of clitic doubling in Modern Greek, in which the construction is also acknowledged to function as a topicality device: 'It is well-established that clitic-doubled DP-objects acquire a topicality reading and resist focalization' (Revithiadou & Spyropulos 2008: 44),[6] for example:

(3) <u>tin</u>   aɣapái <u>ti</u>   <u>Yarimía</u>   (Janse 2008: 167)
     CL,ACC loves ART_{ACC} $Yarimía_{ACC}3s$
     Topic: 'He loves Yarimía'

     Versus

---

[5] See Prince's Hearer-Old information: 'an entity is Hearer Old if the speaker *believes* the hearer to be already familiar with it' (Seidl & Dimitriadis 1997: 377; footnote). Hearer Old can thus be equated with relational givenness or our topic. Prince also distinguishes Discourse-Old information, which is 'previously mentioned in the discourse'. This notion parallels our concept of referential givenness.

[6] See Philippaki-Warburton (1975; 1985); Haberland & Van der Auwera (1987); Holten et al. (2004: 230ff.).

(4) ti   Yarimía   aγapái   (Janse 2008: 171)
   ART_{ACC} $Yarimía_{ACC}$3s loves
   Focus: 'It is Yarímia he loves'

As just mentioned above, however, the topic reading is often mingled with the concept of referential givenness: 'Referentiality is the prerequisite for clitic doubling licensing' (Anagnostopoulou 1999: 761) and, less explicitly, 'the doubling of the in-situ direct object is, however, not free; only familiar, i.e. contextually bound direct, familiar direct objects are clitic-doubled' (Tomic 2006: 320).

Modern Greek, however, provides clear evidence that topicality is responsible for clitic doubling and that referential givenness is only an indirect, albeit natural, consequence of it. The mark of referential givenness is generally said to be definiteness: 'It has often been observed that, in English, new information is characteristically introduced by indefinite expressions and subsequently referred to by definite expressions (…). We find two predominant forms of expression used to refer to an entity treated as given, pronominals and definite NPs' (Brown & Yule 1983: 169ff.). As a consequence, the fact that doubled objects are sometimes not accompanied by the definite article in Modern Greek point to the fact that it is not definiteness and thus not referential givenness that constitutes the prerequisite for licensing clitic doubling, but topicality.[7] We can conclude that 'in Modern Greek, both definite and indefinite direct objects can be clitic-doubled if non-focused' (Tomic 2006: 323; cf. Philippaki-Warburton 1985; Iatridou 1995; Alexopoulou & Folli 2011). In section 5.5, I show that the same applies to vernacular Medieval Greek.

4.2. Typology

Recently, Janse (2008: 167f.) has developed a clear typology of clitic doubling on the basis of Modern Greek. He distinguishes two criteria: presence or absence of a boundary pause (#), and word order, more precisely: the position of the object (O) *vis-à-vis* the verb (V). This results in four different types of clitic doubling:

1. topicalization (OV; – boundary pause)
   ti Yarimía tin aγapái = O clitic pronoun V
2. topic left-dislocation (OV; + boundary pause)
   ti Yarimía # tin aγapái = O clitic pronoun V
3. backgrounding (VO; – boundary pause)
   tin aγapái ti Yarimía = clitic pronoun V O
4. topic right-dislocation (VO; + boundary pause)
   tin aγapái # ti Yarimía = clitic pronoun V O

---

[7] However, the question whether so-called bare indefinites can be doubled in Modern Greek, has not been answered unanimously. Generally, the doubling of NPs lacking an indefinite article is considered ungrammatical, possibly with the exception of mass nouns, for instance:

(i) φρούτα   τα   τρώει καμιά φορά
   'frouta   ta   trói kamiá forá'
   fruit_{ACC} *CL, ACC* *eats from time to time*
   'Fruit, he eats from time to time.'

It has also been suggested that the grammaticality of doubled bare NPs actually depends on the specific *type* of clitic doubling: with topicalization and topic left- or right-dislocation, bare NPs might be possible, whereas backgrounding resists them (cf. section 4.2).

It should be noted that these, albeit quite transparent, terms are not the standard ones. To begin with, 'clitic doubling' is usually not understood in this general sense, but commonly refers to what Janse calls 'backgrounding'. Janse's 'clitic left dislocation' and 'clitic right dislocation' are respectively called 'hanging topic left dislocation' and 'clitic right dislocation', while Janse's 'topicalization' is known as 'clitic left dislocation' in the syntactic literature (Cinque 1990; Anagnostopoulou 1994; Krapova & Cinque 2008). To further complicate the matter the term 'topicalization' is reserved for dislocated phrases that are topics, but linked to a gap rather than a pronoun (Dimitriadis 1994; Alexopoulou & Kolliakou 2002).

Furthermore, I am aware of the fact that the four categories present more subtle differences than is suggested here and that there are other, more fine-grained morphosyntactic criteria one may use in order to differentiate between them. It has been pointed out, for instance, that a lack of agreement between the NP and the clitic pronoun is normally not allowed in backgrounding constructions, while it is possible in topic right-dislocations. Thus, the four structures show in depth more dissimilarities than those acknowledged by Janse. Moreover, we should perhaps also recognize distinct properties according to the syntactic role of the doubled NP: direct objects and indirect objects seem to behave in a distinct way in the four constructions (see Cinque 1990; Krapova & Cinque 2008 for discussion).

Thus, I realize that the picture is much more complicated than presented here. Nevertheless, with regard to my aim, providing a first description and initial categorization of the phenomenon in Medieval Greek without becoming too theoretical, I consider the two (surface) criteria proposed by Janse (2008) sufficient. Moreover, as I am dealing with a so-called 'dead' language, it would make no sense to lay down criteria which cannot be tested in my corpus. For instance, the employment of a criterion such as presence/absence of pitch accent would be highly irrelevant. Thus, although I admit that Janse's typology may be too simplified for a categorization of clitic doubling in spoken living languages, I consider it ideal with regard to my corpus.

In section 5.4, I demonstrate that this four-part typology is indeed perfectly applicable to vernacular Medieval Greek. However, before moving to examples of each type, the application of a typology making use of a prosodic criterion, namely, the presence/absence of a boundary pause, to purely written texts needs to be justified. First, however, it is necessary to discuss my corpus.

5. MEDIEVAL GREEK

5.1. Corpus

The appearance of texts written in a vernacular idiom is in Medieval Greek inextricably connected with the use of the *politikos stichos* or fifteen-syllable metre. Thus, if one attempts to thoroughly examine the vernacular of the Greek Middle Ages (12–16th century), one is forced to include *politikos stichos* texts: it is 'the usual practice for compiling the corpus for this period, as the poetic vernacular texts are the most numerous' (Chila-Markopoulou 2004: 201). Despite their so-called 'poetic' character, however, the language of these texts feels quite natural, for the *politikos stichos* is a very flexible metre with a fluent, iambic rhythm: '"politischen Versen" (…) einem Versmaß, welches der natürlichen Aussprache und dem natürlichen Rhythmus der Volkssprache gut angepasst ist' 'the *politikos stichos* (…) a metre, which is well adapted to the natural pronunciation and the natural rhythm of the vernacular' (Rosenqvist 2007: 113). Given its enormous popularity and its predominance over prose, the *politikos stichos* has even been labelled the πεζὸς στίχος/pezós stíxos, i.e. the prosaic verse (Hinterberger 1993: 165).

My corpus consists of three substantial texts composed in the *politikos stichos*: Libistros & Rodamne (LR), Belthandros & Chrysandza (BC) and Achilleis Byzantina (AB). These three texts present a quite coherent whole: all date from the fourteenth century, the heyday of the Medieval Greek vernacular, and all can be labelled (original Greek) 'romances', the genre *par excellence* during the Middle Ages (Beaton 1996). Importantly, the three romances, which total about 7,300 *politikoi stichoi*,[8] also constitute a manageable corpus, i.e. large enough to be subject to statistical tests, but small enough to grasp the nuances of the texts, which constitutes a prerequisite for an analysis in terms of topic/focus.

5.2. Boundary pauses in politikos stichos texts

As mentioned above, the *politikos stichos* does not impose many metrical constraints. Beside the iambic pattern and the fixed number of fifteen syllables, a standard break (#) is required after the eighth syllable (Lauxtermann 1999), for instance:

(5) Ὡς   κρύσταλλον παρείκασε # ἐκείνην τὴν   ὡραίαν (LR 474)
    Os   krístallon paríkase # ekínin tin   oréan
    To_{PREP} $crystal_{ACC}$ compared $that_{ACC}$ ART_{ACC} $woman_{ACC}$
    'To crystal one compared that woman'

Note that only the even syllables (2, 6, 10, 14 in this example) can carry a lexical accent (hence 'iambic' pattern).

Since the vernacular texts were presumably orally performed, this so-called caesura can be equated with a true boundary pause (cf. section 6). First, elision is avoided between the eighth and the ninth syllable, i.e. between the two parts divided by the caesura, as in the above example (Apostolopoulos 1984: 211). Second, the length of each part (of respectively 8 and 7 syllables) does not exclude a boundary pause: '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 Pausenmarkie-rung' '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' (Eideneier 1999: 104). Furthermore, a boundary pause can be assumed, not only between the two parts divided by the caesura, but also between two verses.

As such, we can derive some prosodic information from purely written texts. This is an important fulfilment for a successful application of the prosodic criterion employed in the modern typology of clitic doubling (cf. section 5.4).

5.3. Distribution of clitic pronouns

However, before applying this typology to my corpus, a short overview on the distribution of clitic pronouns in Medieval Greek is required, for their behaviour differs from the Modern Greek clitic pronouns.[9] In Modern Greek, the position of clitic pronouns simply depends on the (non-) finiteness of the verbal form. In finite clauses, clitic pronouns appear before the verb (cf. section 3.2), whereas postverbal clitic pronouns are the norm after gerunds and imperatives (Philippaki-Warburton 1994).

---

[8] LR: 4013 verses, edition of Lendari (2007); BC: 1350, Egea (1998); AB: 1926, Agapitos, Hult & Smith (1999). All these editions can be found unabridged on the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.
[9] By Modern Greek, I actually mean *Standard* Modern Greek, for some Modern Greek dialects (e.g. Cappadocian, Pontic) present differences from the standard language with regard to the distribution of clitic pronouns.

In Medieval Greek, the situation is more complex, which probably explains the remarkable interest in Medieval Greek clitic pronouns in recent years.[10] The position of Medieval Greek clitic pronouns is regulated by a number of syntactic and pragmatic factors.[11] As pioneer Mackridge (1993; 1995; 2000) has observed, the default position for clitic pronouns in finite clauses is postverbal. However, the clitic pronoun can be attracted to preverbal position by certain elements immediately occurring before the finite verb. Briefly, these triggering elements consist of so-called 'function words' (especially subordinators) and 'preferential words' (e.g. demonstratives; see Dover 1960), but also 'ad hoc focalized constituents' can be responsible for preverbal clitic pronouns (see Soltic 2012). These last are purely lexical constituents which constitute the focus (as opposed to the topic) of the utterance (see Condoravdi & Kiparsky 2004; Revithiadou & Spyropulos 2006), for instance:

(6) Ἐβγαίνει ἡ   παράξενος # ὡς   μ'   ἔκουσεν, θωρεῖ με (LR 2861)
    Evjéni   i   paráksenos # os   m'   ékusen, θorí   me
    Comes out ART$_{NOM}$ *girl*$_{NOM}$ *when*$_{SUB}$ *CL,ACC heard   sees*   *CL,ACC*
    'The girl came out, when she heard me, she looked at me'

In this verse, a function word, i.e. the temporal subordinator ὡς/os, attracts the clitic μ(ε)/m(e) to preverbal position. If, however, no such triggering word precedes the verb, the pronoun stays postverbal, as is the case with the second με/me.

(7) Καὶ εἶδα καὶ ἐξενίσθην το # καὶ μέριμνα   μὲ   ἐσέβην (LR 147)
    Ke ída ke eksenísθin to # ke mérimna   me   esévin
    And saw and admired   *CL,ACC and anxiety*$_{NOM}$ *CL,ACC entered*
    'And I saw and admired it and anxiety took me'

In the first part of the verse, the clitic pronoun το/to is found in its normal postverbal position.[12] In the second part, μέ/me appears before the verb because of the *ad hoc* focalized subject μέριμνα/mérimna.

The fact that the position of Medieval Greek clitic pronouns is regulated by other mechanisms than that of the Modern Greek ones has consequences for the application of Janse's typology (cf. sections 3.2; 5.4). Whereas in Janse's clitic-doubling typology of Modern Greek only one possible position for the pronoun is given (preverbal because finite verbs follow), in Medieval Greek more variation is found (preverbal and postverbal). This difference, however, is of course merely superficial. As a matter of fact, my corpus contains exactly the same four structures of clitic doubling which have been identified for Modern Greek.

5.4. Typology

5.4.1. Statistics

My corpus abounds with clitic doubling: of a total of 2,194 clitic pronouns, more than 10 per cent are found in a doubling structure.[13] Table 1 reveals that the dislocation type is more

[10] Among others: Ramoutsaki (1996); Condoravdi & Kiparsky (2004); Pappas (2004); Thoma (2007); Vejleskov (2005); Revithiadou & Spyropoulos (2006; 2008); for a detailed bibliography, see Soltic (2012).

[11] As pointed out by an anonymous referee, these pragmatic factors cannot be completely detached from syntax, since the fact that the preverbal triggering word must precede the verb is a very important *syntactic* restriction. Pappas (2004) in particular minimizes the impact of pragmatics on the position of the Medieval Greek clitic pronouns. He believes a number of preverbal constituents may or may not trigger preverbal clitic pronouns, independently of whether they are focalized or not.

[12] An anonymous referee brought to my attention that this construction, in which the clitic pronoun seems to scope over both parts of the co-ordination, is not possible in Modern Greek.

[13] Beside 219 clauses with finite verbs, this table includes 21 imperatives and three infinitives.

Table 1. Total doubled NPs: 241

Topicalization	53 (22%)
Topic left-dislocation	110 (45.6%)
Backgrounding	39 (16.2%)
Topic right-dislocation	39 (16.2%)

popular than the structure without a boundary pause (topic left-dislocation and topic right-dislocation: 61.8%). Moreover, the doubled objects occurring at the left side of the verb prevail over those found at the right side (VO: topicalization and topic left-dislocation: 67.6%).

5.4.2. Examples

Below I give two examples of each structure: first one with a postverbal clitic pronoun, then one with a preverbal one.

Topicalization

(8) Ἰδού, <u>τὸ</u> <u>κάστρον</u> ηὗρες <u>το</u>, # τί ἀκαρτερεῖς, εἰπέ μας (LR 762)
Iðú, <u>to</u> <u>kástron</u> évres <u>to</u>, # tí akarterís, ipé mas
Look$_{IMP}$ ART$_{ACC}$ castle$_{ACC}$ found CL,ACC why$_{INTER}$ wait tell$_{IMP}$ CL,GEN
'Look, <u>the castle</u>, you found <u>it</u>, what are you waiting for, tell us'

(9) καὶ <u>ἐσὲν</u> οὐδὲν <u>σὲ</u> ἐντρέπεται # χωρὶς τῆς βασιλείας (AB 60)
ke <u>esén</u> uðén <u>se</u> endrépete # xorís tis vasilías
and you$_{ACC}$ NEG CL,ACC suits without$_{PREP}$ ART$_{GEN}$ queen$_{GEN}$
'and <u>you</u>, nothing suits <u>you</u> without the queen'

Topic left-dislocation[14]

(10) ἐκείνη δὲ <u>τὸν</u> <u>Βέλθανδρον</u> # ἐκατεσκόπησέν <u>τον</u> (BC 818)
ekíni ðe <u>ton</u> <u>Vélθanðron</u> # ekateskópisén <u>ton</u>
she$_{NOM}$ PTCL ART$_{ACC}$ Belthandros$_{ACC}$ saw CL,ACC
'and <u>Belthandros</u>, she saw <u>him</u>'

(11) <u>τὸν</u> <u>Βέλθανδρόν</u> <u>μου</u> <u>τὸν</u> <u>ὡραῖον</u> # να μὴ <u>τὸν</u>
<u>ton</u> <u>Vélθanðrón</u> <u>mu</u> <u>ton</u> <u>oréon</u> # na mi <u>ton</u>
ART$_{ACC}$ Belthandros$_{ACC}$ CL,GEN ART$_{ACC}$ beautiful$_{ACC}$ PTCL$_{MOD}$ NEG CL,ACC
εὐλογήσῃ (BC 983)
evlojísi
marries
'<u>my beautiful Belthandros</u>, he may not join <u>him</u> in matrimony'

---

[14] I have found one example in which a prepositional phrase (instead of an NP) is doubled:

(i) Ὁ Λίβιστρος <u>πρὸς</u> <u>Κλιτοβὸν</u> # ἤρκεψεν νὰ <u>τὸν</u> λέγῃ (LR 3293)
O Lívistros <u>prós</u> <u>Klitovón</u> # írkepsen na <u>ton</u> léji
ART$_{NOM}$ Libistros$_{NOM}$ to$_{PREP}$ Klitibos$_{ACC}$ began PTCL$_{MOD}$ CL,ACC says
'<u>To Klitobos</u>, Libistros began to say <u>to him</u>'

In this example, the preposition πρός/prós + accusative replaces the former dative in its function of indirect object. More often, however, the dative is replaced by the accusative or genitive case, which has probably caused this construction (see Manolessou & Stamatis 2006).

Backgrounding

(12) ἐδέσποζές <u>το</u>   τὸ   <u>βεργὶν</u> # καὶ μόνη   σου   να   τὸ
     eδéspozés <u>to</u>   to   <u>verjín</u> # ke móni   su   na   to
     own   *CL,ACC ART_ACC stick_ACC and alone_FEM CL,GEN PTCL_MOD CL,ACC*
     'χῃς (BC 585)
     'xis
     have
     'you own <u>it</u>, <u>the stick</u>, and you alone have it'

(13) Καὶ τί   <u>τὰ</u>   θέλω <u>τὰ</u>   <u>πολλά</u>, # φίλε   μου,   τὰ
     Ke tí   <u>ta</u>   θélo <u>ta</u>   <u>pollá</u>, # fíle   mu,   ta
     And why_INT CL,ACC want ART_ACC great_ACC friend_VOC CL,GEN ART_ACC
     ἐν   μέσῳ; (LR 2036)
     en   méso?
     in_PREP middle_DAT
     'And why would I want (to tell) <u>them</u>, <u>the great things</u>, my friend, the things
     (that happened) in the meantime?'

Topic right-dislocation

(14) Ἀφήνω, παρατρέχω <u>τα</u> #   <u>τὰ</u>   <u>τότε</u>   <u>λαληθέντα</u> (LR 3564)
     Afíno, paratréxo <u>ta</u> #   <u>ta</u>   <u>tóte</u>   <u>laliθénda</u>
     pass on leave   *CL,ACC ART_ACC then_ADV said_PART*
     'I pass on, I leave <u>them</u>, <u>the things said at that moment</u>'

(15) Καὶ ὁ   Ἀχιλλεὺς   <u>τὴν</u>   ἔλεγεν #   <u>τὴν</u>   <u>ἡλιογεννημένην</u> (AB 1356)
     Ke o   Axilléfs   <u>tin</u>   élejen #   <u>tin</u>   <u>iliojenniménin</u>
     And ART_NOM Achilles_NOM CL,ACC spoke ART_ACC sun born_ACC
     'And Achilles spoke <u>to her</u>, <u>the sun born girl</u>'

In a number of examples, the co-referential clitic pronoun shows no agreement in gender or number with the right-dislocated object, more concretely: with the second object, which is added to the first one (usually an emphatic pronoun). This seems to point to a corrective function of the doubled NP (cf. section 6.3), for example:

(16) Ὡς   βασιλέαν <u>μὲ</u>   εὐφήμισαν # <u>ἐμὲν</u>   <u>καὶ</u> <u>τὴν</u>   <u>Ροδάμνην</u> (LR 2247)
     Os   vasilían <u>me</u>   efímisan # <u>emén</u>   <u>ke</u> <u>tin</u>   <u>Roðámnin</u>
     As_PREP king_ACC CL,ACC honoured   me_ACC and ART_ACC Rodamne_ACC
     'As a king they honoured <u>me</u>, <u>me and Rodamne</u>'

(17) καὶ ἀτοί   τους   <u>τὸν</u>   ἐνδύσασιν # <u>ἐκεῖνον</u> <u>καὶ</u> <u>τὴν</u>   <u>κόρην</u> (AB 1502)
     ke atí   tus   <u>ton</u>   enðísasin # <u>ekínon</u>   <u>ke</u> <u>tin</u>   <u>kórin</u>
     and they_NOM CL,GEN CL,ACC dressed   him_ACC and ART_ACC girl_ACC
     'his men dressed <u>him</u>, <u>him and the girl</u>'

Interestingly, this mismatch between clitic pronoun and NP only occurs in my corpus in structures of topic right-dislocation and not in examples of backgrounding. This confirms the observation that the lack of agreement between the NP and the clitic pronoun is normally not allowed in backgrounding constructions, while it is possible in topic right-dislocations (Krapova & Cinque 2008: 260; cf. section 4.2).

5.5. Function: topic marker

It is not only the modern typology of clitic doubling that can be applied to vernacular Medieval Greek; its modern function as a topic marker can be adopted as well. As mentioned above, I use the term 'topic' in the sense of Gundel & Fretheim (2004): as relationally given information opposed to 'focus'. As we saw in section 5.3, Medieval Greek clitic pronouns can be attracted to preverbal position by *ad hoc* focalized constituents among others. Hence, their position is diagnostic for the topic/focus pair. Therefore, in section 5.5.2, I illustrate by means of the position of the clitic pronouns that doubled objects require a topical reading.

First, however, it is shown that doubled objects are almost always referentially given in my corpus and applied to Chafe's (1994) referential continuum, constitute active or semi-active information (section 5.5.1), which is confirmed by the frequent doubling of demonstratives referring back to the preceding context. Since a logical correlation exists between referential and relational givenness (cf. section 3), this constitutes a second, albeit more tentative, argument for the interpretation of doubled objects as topics.

5.5.1. Chafe's activation statuses (referential givenness)

Since topics, as relationally given information, are largely determined by the speaker (cf. section 3), it seems that we should resort to the concept of referential givenness in order to objectively investigate written texts: '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' (Condoravdi & Kiparsky 2004: 166). Therefore, I have analysed the doubled objects in my corpus in terms of referential givenness/newness, i.e. 'through the actual presence or derivability of an element in the context. Whether this reflects the speaker's assumptions is not really relevant here' (Geluykens 1992: 12). For this purpose, I have relied on the well-known continuum of 'activation statuses' developed by Chafe (1994), according to which information can be active, semi-active or inactive, which correlates with a tripartite given-accessible-new distinction.

However, the attribution of a doubled object in one of these three categories still involves personal interpretation. In order to reduce the subjectivity of the task, I have outlined clear criteria: all objects which have been mentioned in the preceding two verses, either literally or as a synonym, are considered active information. Inactive concepts, on the other hand, are neither present in nor derivable from the preceding context. The intermediate category of semi-active information presents the most difficulties if one attempts to define it in a formal way: as for my corpus, I have decided that objects which have been mentioned in (approximately) the last thirty lines are to be considered semi-active. Objects which are somehow derivable from other concepts mentioned in the context are also reckoned among this category (e.g. tired → a bed).[15]

The results of this investigation are straightforward: in more than 90 per cent of cases, the doubled object constitutes active or semi-active information: 'clitic doubling marks the clitic-doubled NPs (see Table 2) as active (given) or at least semi-active (accessible) information'

---

[15] The idea that newly introduced referents may be tied to previously uttered referents is known as 'accommodation' (Heim 1982: 238ff.). In this regard, an anonymous referee suggests that the theoretical concept of 'links' in the sense of Vallduví (1992) or Hendriks & Dekker (1995), which has been applied to analyse Modern Greek topics subject to clitic doubling, might be revealing (Alexopoulou & Kolliakou 2002). A crucial aspect of these analyses is that these definitions of topic necessitate picking a referent that is related to a discourse set either by means of set membership or relationally. Especially with regard to my semi-active examples, this suggestion might be useful because the doubled NP indeed often picks a referent from a discourse set rather than just a strongly activated referent.

Table 2. Total doubled NPs: 241

Active	69 (28.6%)	Literal repetition (within last two verses)	29 (12%)
		Synonym (within last two verses)	40 (16.6%)
Semi-active	151 (62.7%)	Literal repetition in context (approx. within last 30 verses)	39 (16.2%)
		Concept derivable from context (approx. within last 30 verses)	112 (46.5%)
Inactive	21 (8.7%)		

Table 3. Total doubled NPs: 241

	Topicalization: 53	Topic left-dislocation: 110	Backgrounding: 39	Topic right-dislocation: 39
Active: 69	13 (24.5%)	33 (30%)	13 (33.3%)	10 (25.6%)
Semi-active: 150	37 (69.8%)	65 (59.1%)	20 (51.3%)	29 (74.4%)
Inactive: 22	3 (5.7%)	12 (10.9%)	6 (15.4%)	0 (0%)

(Janse 2008: 170).[16] Moreover, it should come as no surprise that semi-active information prevails over truly active concepts, as this latter kind of information is characteristically expressed by weak pronouns instead of by NPs (see Ziv 1994: 634; Givón 2001: 418; Estigarribia 2006: 133). If we relate the three categories of referential givenness/newness to the attested four types, no striking differences are detected in Table 3. In the backgrounding type, slightly more fully active NPs are found, yet this construction also contains the highest number of inactive NPs.

5.5.1.1. Examples
In this section, it makes no sense to quote only the verse containing the doubled NP. Therefore, I provide enough contextual information and the relevant passages are italicized: Active information – literal repetition

(18) ἀπῆρεν καὶ εἰς τὰ χέρια του *σκουτάριν* καὶ κοντάριν.
apíren ke is ta xéria tu skutárin ke kondárin.
took and in$_{PREP}$ ART$_{ACC}$ arms$_{ACC}$ CL,GEN shield$_{ACC}$ and sword$_{ACC}$
'he took in his arms a shield and a sword.'
<u>Τὸ</u> <u>δὲ</u> <u>σκουτάριν</u> ἐκ παντὸς # τίς νὰ <u>τὸ</u>
<u>To</u> <u>δe</u> <u>skutárin</u> ek pandós # tís na <u>to</u>
ART$_{ACC}$ PTCL shield$_{ACC}$ from$_{PREP}$ everything$_{GEN}$ who$_{INT}$ PTCL$_{MOD}$ CL,ACC
ἀνιστορήσῃ; (AB 138; cf. AB 762)
anistorísi?
describes
'<u>The shield</u>, who could describe <u>it</u> in detail?'

(19) *oi* *Ἔρωτες* *μὲ* *ἐφόνευσαν* *καὶ* *κατετρώσασίν* *με.*
i *Érotes* *me* *efónefsan* *ke* *katetrósasín* *me.*
ART$_{NOM}$ *Cupids$_{NOM}$* *CL,ACC* *killed* *and* *hurt* *CL,ACC*
'The Cupids killed me and hurt me.'
Ἐγὼ πάλιν <u>τοὺς</u> <u>Ἔρωτας</u> # νὰ <u>τοὺς</u> παρακαλέσω (AB 973)
Eγó pálin <u>tus</u> <u>Érotas</u> # na <u>tus</u> parakaléso
I$_{NOM}$ again$_{ADV}$ ART$_{ACC}$ Cupids$_{ACC}$ PTCL$_{MOD}$ CL,ACC implore
'I again, <u>the Cupids</u>, I will implore <u>them</u>'

---

[16] Note, however, that this quotation confuses the true prerequisite for clitic doubling, i.e. topicalized objects, with the indirect and logical consequence of this prerequisite, i.e. referentially given objects.

Active information – synonym:

(20) Ἔγραψεν τὸ πιττάκιν της, πέμπει το πρὸς ἐμένα
Égrapsen to pittákin tis, pémbi to prós eména
Wrote ART_ACC letter_ACC CL,GEN sends CL,ACC to_PREP me_ACC
'She wrote her letter, she sent it to me'

καὶ ἀπάνω ἀντὶ δέματος εἶχε τὸ δακτυλίδιν.
ke apáno anðí ðématos íxe to ðaktilíðin.
and above_ADV instead_PREP string_GEN had ART_ACC ring_ACC
'and on top of the string it had the ring.'

Ἐπέτασά <u>την</u> <u>τὴν</u> <u>γραφήν</u>, # ἐπῆρα, ἐφίλησά την (LR 1745)
Epétasá <u>tin</u> <u>tin</u> <u>γrafín</u>, # epíra, efílisá tin
Took CL,ACC ART,ACC letter_ACC held kissed CL,ACC
'I took <u>it</u>, <u>the letter</u>, I held (it), I kissed it'

(21) μέρος ἐπαπειλήσατο ἐμὲν ὡς συγγενήν του.
méros epapilísato emén os singenín tu.
on the other hand_ADV threatened me_ACC as_PREP relative_ACC CL,GEN
'on the other hand, he threatened me as his relative.'

Εἶχεν <u>τας</u> ἡ καρδία μου, # φίλε, <u>τὰς</u> <u>ἀπειλάς</u> <u>του</u> (LR 2428)
Íxen <u>tas</u> i karðía mu, # fíle, <u>tas</u> <u>apilás</u> <u>tu</u>
Had CL,ACC ART_NOM heart_NOM CL,GEN friend_VOC ART_ACC threats_ACC CL,GEN
'My heart retained <u>them</u>, friend, <u>his threats</u>?'

Semi-active information – literal repetition in context:

(22) ἐψὲ εἰς τὸν ὕπνο μου εἶδα τον ἐντάμα
epsé is ton ípno mu íða ton endáma
yesterday_ADV in_PREP ART_ACC sleep_ACC CL,GEN saw CL,ACC together_ADV
μὲ τὴν κόρην
me tin kórin
with_PREP ART_ACC girl_ACC
'yesterday in my sleep I saw him together with the girl'

καὶ ὡς ἐξύπνησα, φίλε μου, τοὺς ἐδικούς μου τὸ εἶπα
ke os eksípnisa, fíle mu, tus eðikús mu to ípa
and when_SUB awoke friend_VOC CL,GEN ART_ACC own_ACC CL,GEN CL,ACC told
'and when I awoke, my friend, I told it to my men'

καὶ τοῦτο μὲ ἀπιλογήθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐδικοί μου"
ke túto me apilojíθisan pándes i eðikí mu"
and that_ACC CL,ACC answered all_NOM ART_NOM own_NOM CL,GEN
'and all my men answered me that"'

Τὸν Λίβιστρον ἐδώκασιν βουλὴν οἱ ἐδικοί του
Ton Lívistron eðókasin vulín i eðikí tu
ART_ACC Libistros_ACC gave advice_ACC ART_NOM own_NOM CL,GEN
'His men gave Libistros advice'

ἐπεὶ τὸ κάστρον ἔφτασεν, # <u>τὴν</u> <u>κόρην</u> ηὕρηκέν <u>την</u> (LR 752)
epí to kástron éftasen, # <u>tin</u> <u>kórin</u> évrikén <u>tin</u>
after_SUB ART_ACC castle_ACC reached ART_ACC girl_ACC found CL,ACC
'after he had reached the castle, <u>the girl</u>, he found <u>her</u>'

Concept derivable from context:

(23) βοτάνια   νὰ   ἔχω ἀντὶ   τροφῆς, # νερὸ   νὰ   τὸ
     votánia   na   éxo anðí   trofís, # neró   na   to
     plants$_{ACC}$ PTCL$_{MOD}$ have instead$_{PREP}$ food$_{GEN}$ water$_{ACC}$ PTCL$_{MOD}$ CL,ACC
     ὑστεροῦμαι (LR 2671)[17]
     isterúme
     lack
     'I had plants instead of food, water, I was lacking it'

Inactive information: even in this category of objects containing inactive information, one can doubt whether the doubled NPs are truly 'irrecoverable' from the context. In some cases, one could tentatively argue that the NPs do present information derivable from the preceding context, for instance:

(24) μαραίνει το   τὸ   κάλλος   σου, # νεκρώνει τὴν   μορφήν
     maréni   to   to   kállos   su, #   nekróni   tin   morfín
     wilts   CL,ACC   ART$_{ACC}$ beauty$_{ACC}$ CL,GEN kills ART$_{ACC}$ form$_{ACC}$
     σου (LR 3068)
     su
     CL,GEN
     'it [the constant crying] wilts it, your beauty, it kills your body'

The ladies-of-the-bedchamber of the king who has abducted Rodamne are trying to comfort the girl by flattering: Rodamne's beauty (τὸ κάλλος/to kállos) has not been mentioned in the context and there seems no word present referring to her beauty, yet one could say the concept 'beauty' is inextricably connected with the appearance of the girl (cf. use of the definite article τό/to). Rodamne is constantly described in terms of beauty in LR (cf. adjectives ἠθικήν/iθikín, ἐρωτικόν/erotikón, λαμπράν/lambrán, ἔμορφην/émorfin, ὡραίαν/ oréan, ἐξαιρετόπλαστον/ekseretóplaston and her quasi-epithet τὴν παράξενον/tin parákse-non) and her beauty is of course the reason why she has been abducted.

5.5.1.2. Demonstrative pronouns
However, more secure evidence on the referentially given character of (most) objects is given by the use of anaphoric demonstrative pronouns. As these demonstrative pronouns refer back to the preceding context, they can be conceived of as signs of old information. The fact that no less than 31 doubled objects (12.9%) consist of a demonstrative (autonomous use) or are accompanied by a demonstrative (adjectival use) corroborates the observed tendency that doubled objects constitute (semi-)active information.

Autonomous use:

(25) ἀπελατίκιν ἔσυρεν, # τοῦτο   οὐ   ψεύδομαί το (BC 231)
     apelatíkin ésiren, # túto   ou   pséðomé   to
     stick$_{ACC}$ hauled   that$_{ACC}$ NEG invent   CL,ACC
     'he hauled his stick, that, I do not invent it'

---

[17] This example of topicalization involves a bare indefinite. The other four examples of doubled bare NPs in my corpus all present cases of topic left-dislocation. Interestingly, this fits the observation made for Modern Greek that the grammaticality of a doubled bare NP may depend on the specific type of clitic doubling, more specifically, that a doubled bare NP is ungrammatical with backgrounding (cf. fn. 6).

Adjectival use:

(26) καὶ <u>ταῦτα</u> <u>τὰ</u> <u>καμώματα</u> # μάθη <u>τα</u> ὁ πατήρ σου (BC 1071)
 ke <u>táfta</u> <u>ta</u> <u>kamómata</u> # máθi <u>ta</u> o patír su
 and those$_{ACC}$ ART$_{ACC}$ deeds$_{ACC}$ learns CL,ACC ART$_{NOM}$ father$_{NOM}$ CL,GEN
 'and <u>those deeds</u>, your father will learn <u>them</u>'

(27) καὶ λέγει <u>τας</u> ὁ Βέλθανδρος # <u>αὐτὰς</u> <u>τὰς</u> <u>τρεῖς ὡραίας</u> (BC 602)
 ke léji <u>tas</u> o Vélθanðros # <u>aftás</u> <u>tas</u> <u>trís oréas</u>
 and speaks CL,ACC ART$_{NOM}$ Belthandros$_{NOM}$ those$_{ACC}$ ART$_{ACC}$ three beautiful$_{ACC}$
 'and Belthandros spoke <u>to them</u>, <u>those three beautiful girls</u>'

5.5.1.3. Apparent exception: addition in the form of a relative clause?

In some 10 per cent of the examples, the NP is modified by a relative clause. NPs + relatives are not confined to a certain type of clitic doubling; they are found in all four types, although topic left-dislocation is prevalent.[18] At first sight, these constructions might seem to contradict the thesis that doubled NPs consist of topicalized and thus –given the correlation between the two concepts– usually referentially given information, since relative clauses might be expected to contain new, additional information (see Table 4).

 I give an example of each type:

(28) <u>πάντα</u> <u>τὰ</u> <u>πάσχει</u> ἡγεῖται <u>τα</u> # ὡσὰν νὰ μὴ τὰ
 <u>pánda</u> <u>ta</u> <u>pásxi</u> ijíte <u>ta</u> # osan na mí ta
 all$_{ACC}$ REL$_{ACC}$ suffers considers CL,ACC as if$_{SUB}$ PTCL$_{MOD}$ NEG CL,ACC
 πάσχη (LR 1997)
 pásxi
 suffers
 '<u>all that he has suffered</u>, he considers <u>it</u> as if he has not suffered it'

(29) <u>τοῦτον</u> <u>τὸν</u> <u>κόσμον</u> <u>τὸν</u> <u>βαστᾶς</u>, # ληστεύεις καὶ κρατεῖς
 <u>túton</u> <u>ton</u> <u>kósmon</u> <u>tón</u> <u>vastás</u>, # listévis ke kratís
 that$_{ACC}$ ART$_{ACC}$ land$_{ACC}$ REL$_{ACC}$ possess plunder and dominate
 <u>τον</u> (LR 3102)[19]
 <u>ton</u>
 CL,ACC
 '<u>that land that you possess</u>, you plunder and dominate <u>it</u>'

Table 4. Total doubled NPs modified by relative clause: 24

Topicalization	1 (4.2%)
Topic left-dislocation	19 (79.2%)
Backgrounding	2 (8.3%)
Topic right-dislocation	2 (8.3%)

---

[18] I have also found 35 examples in which the relative clause does not modify an NP, but is 'headless'. An example of the doubling of a so-called free relative clause is the following:

(i) καὶ <u>οἶος</u> <u>νικήση</u> <u>ἀπὲ</u> <u>τοὺς</u> <u>δύο</u> # ἄνδρα νὰ <u>τὸν</u> ἐπάρω (LR 2055)
 ke <u>íos</u> <u>nikísi</u> <u>apé</u> <u>tus</u> <u>ðío</u> # ándra na <u>ton</u> epáro
 and REL$_{NOM}$ wins from$_{PREP}$ ART$_{ACC}$ two husband$_{ACC}$ PTCL$_{MOD}$ CL,ACC take
 'and <u>the one of the two who will win</u>, <u>him</u> I will take as my husband'

These examples were not included in my statistics, as they do not involve NPs but clauses (cf. section 5.4.1). As is the case for the NPs modified by a relative clause, the majority (25 = 71.4%) involves topic left-dislocation.

[19] Cf. section 5.5.1.2: demonstrative pronoun.

(30) ἀρνεῖσαι <u>τον</u>   <u>τὸν</u>   <u>Ἔρωταν #</u>   <u>τὸν</u>   ἐκατεδουλώθης (LR 3711)
     arníse <u>ton</u>   <u>ton</u>   <u>Érotan #</u>   <u>ón</u>   ekateðulóθis
     deny CL,ACC ART_{ACC} $Cupid_{ACC}$ REL_{ACC} *enslaved*
     'you deny <u>him</u>, <u>the Cupid, who enslaved you</u>'

(31) Ἰδόντες   δὲ   τὸ   θέαμαν,   τὴν   ἀπειλὴν   ἐκείνην,
     Iðóndes   ðe   to   θéaman,   tin   apilín   ekínin,
     Having seen$_{PART}$ PTCL ART$_{ACC}$ spectacle$_{ACC}$ ART$_{ACC}$ threat$_{ACC}$ that$_{ACC}$
     'After they had seen the spectacle, that threat,'
     εὐθὺς   ἀποαρματώνουνται, πίπτουσιν, προσκυνοῦν τον.
     efθís   apoarmatónunde,   píptusin,   proskinún   ton.
     immediately ADV disarmed$_{REFL}$ fall   worship   CL,ACC
     'they immediately disarmed themselves, they fell, they worshipped him [Achilles].'
     Ὁρίζει αἰχμαλωτίζουν τους   καὶ σιδηρώνουσίν τους
     Orízi exmalotízun   tus   ke siðirónusín   tus
     Orders emprison   CL,ACC and chain   CL,ACC
     'He ordered to make them prisoners of war and to chain them'
     αἰχμαλωσίαν ἐπήρασιν ἀμέτρητην,   μεγάλην.
     exmalosján epírasin amétritin,   meɣálin.
     captivity$_{ACC}$ took   immeasurable$_{ACC}$ enormous$_{ACC}$
     'they took an immeasurable, enormous captivity.'
     Ὡς   τὸ   εἶδεν καὶ <τὸ>   ἤκουσεν #   ὁ   βασιλεὺς ἐκεῖνος[20]
     Os   <u>to</u>   íðen ke <to>   íkusen #   o   vasiléfs ekínos
     When$_{SUB}$ CL,ACC saw   and CL,ACC heard   ART$_{NOM}$ king$_{NOM}$ that$_{NOM}$
     'When he saw <u>it</u> and heard <u>it</u>, that king'
     <u>τὸ</u>   <u>θαῦμαν</u>   <u>τὸ</u>   <u>ἐγένετον εἰς   ὅλον   τὸν   λαόν   του</u> (AB 630)
     <u>to</u>   <u>θávma</u>   <u>tó</u>   <u>ejéneton is   ólon   ton   laón   tu</u>
     ART$_{ACC}$ wonder$_{ACC}$ REL$_{ACC}$ happened to$_{PREP}$ whole$_{ACC}$ART$_{ACC}$race$_{ACC}$CL,GEN
     <u>'the wonder which happened to his whole race'</u>

However, in all these examples, the NP is modified by a *restrictive* relative clause, which by definition renders the noun definite. Moreover, the information provided in the relative clause is usually already known. As Table 5 reveals, the doubled NPs + relative clause do not present more inactive information than the 'normal' doubled NPs do.

The context of our last example above, for instance, describes how Achilles conquers the whole army of a hostile king and makes them prisoners of war. Thus, τὸ θαῦμαν/to θávman (the wonder) is already implied by αἰχμαλωσίαν ἀμέτρητην, μεγάλην/exmalosján amétritin, meɣálin (immeasurable, enormous captivity). A comparable example is the next one:

Table 5. Total doubled NPs modified by relative clause: 24

Active	5 (20.8%)
Semi-active	15 (62.5%)
Inactive	4 (16.7%)

[20] Cf. section 6.3.2: dislocated subject.

(32) Ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ μεσάνυκτον ἐκείνης τῆς ἑσπέρας
Allá prós to mesánikton ekínis tis espéras
*But around*_{PREP} *ART*_{ACC} *midnight*_{ACC} *that*_{GEN} *ART*_{GEN} *evening*_{GEN}
'But around midnight of that evening'

ἀκούομεν ὄχλησιν πολλὴν ἔξω τοῦ καλυβίου,
akúomen óxlisin pollín ékso tu kalivíu,
hear *tumult*_{ACC} *great*_{ACC} *outside*_{PREP} *ART*_{GEN} *hut*_{GEN}
'we heard *a great tumult* outside the hut,'

φωνὰς γλωσσῶν ἀγνώριστων, πολλὰ νὰ συντυχαίνουν·
fonás γlossón aγnóriston, pollá na sintixénun
*voices*_{ACC} *tongues*_{GEN} *uncountable*_{GEN} *constantly*_{ADV} *PTCL*_{MOD} *speak*
'*voices* of uncountable tongues, they were constantly speaking'

νὰ πῆς εἰς πόσον ἔπεσεν περίστασιν ὁ νοῦς μας
na pís is póson épesen perístasin o nús mas
*PTCL*_{MOD} *say* *in*_{PREP} *such*_{ACC} *fell* *distress*_{ACC} *ART*_{NOM} *mind*_{NOM} *CL,GEN*
'you would have said our mind had fallen into *great distress*'

καὶ <u>φόβον</u> ὁπού εἴχαμεν διὰ <u>τὰς</u> <u>φωνὰς</u> <u>ἐκείνας</u>,
ke <u>fóvon</u> opú íxamen ðiá <u>tas</u> <u>fonás</u> <u>ekínas</u>,
*and fear*_{ACC} *REL* *had* *because of*_{PREP} *ART*_{ACC} *voices*_{ACC} *those*_{ACC}
'and (the) <u>fear which we had because of those voices</u>,'

οὐκ ἠμπορῶ νὰ σὲ <u>τὸ</u> εἰπῶ, # φρίττω ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου (LR 2721)
uk imboró na se <u>to</u> ipó, # frítto apó tu lóγu
NEG *can* *PTCL*_{MOD} *CL,ACC* *CL,ACC* *tell* *shiver* *at*_{PREP} *ART*_{GEN} *thought*_{GEN}
'I am not able to tell <u>it</u> to you, I shiver at the thought'

The (bare) NP φόβον/fóvon (fear) can be derived from the preceding context, i.e. ὄχλησιν πολλήν/óxlisin pollín (great tumult) and περίστασιν/perístasin (distress); the NP in the relative clause, τὰς φωνάς/tas fonás, is even a literal repetition of φωνάς/fonás (without article). The weakly used verb εἴχαμεν/íxamen connects the two concepts, but can actually be left out: φόβον διὰ τὰς φωνὰς ἐκείνας/fóvon ðiá tas fonás ekínas would be a perfectly understandable utterance. I give two other examples of NPs + relative clauses in which the verbs are quite natural and can actually be predicted:

(33) <u>τοὺς</u> <u>λόγους</u> <u>ὁπού</u> <u>ἤλεγεν</u> # πόθεν νὰ <u>τοὺς</u> 'πεικάσης (LR 457)
<u>tus</u> <u>lóγus</u> <u>opú</u> <u>ílejen</u> # póθen na <u>tus</u> 'pikásis
*ART*_{ACC} *words*_{ACC} *REL* *uttered* *from* *where*_{INT} *PTCL*_{MOD} *CL,ACC* *judge*
'<u>the words he uttered</u>, from where you should have judged <u>them</u>'

(34) Καὶ <u>τὴν</u> <u>βουλὴν</u> <u>τὴν</u> <u>ἔταξες</u> # ἵνα <u>τὴν</u> κατελύσης (AB 61)
Ke <u>tin</u> <u>vulín</u> <u>tín</u> <u>étakses</u> # ína <u>tin</u> katelísis
And *ART*_{ACC} *plan*_{ACC} *REL*_{ACC} *schemed* *in order that*_{SUB} *CL,ACC* *cancel*
'And <u>the plan you schemed</u>, in order that you cancel <u>it</u>'

Thus, these examples are in no way exceptions.

5.5.2. Position clitic pronouns in OV-doublings (relational givenness)

However, the strongest evidence that doubled objects constitute topics is given by the position of the co-referential clitic pronouns. We have seen that constituents occurring immediately

Table 6. Total OV doubling without intervening constituent: 68

	Preverbal pronoun (OclV): 3	Postverbal pronoun (OVcl): 65
Topicalization: 37	3[21]	34
Topic left-dislocation: 31	0	31

Note: cl = clitic pronoun.

Table 7. Total OV doubling with intervening constituent: 95

	Preverbal pronoun ([X]OXclV): 87	Postverbal pronoun ([X]OXVcl): 8
Topicalization: 16	16	0
Topic left-dislocation: 79	71	8

before the verb can attract clitic pronouns into preverbal position, but only if these constituents – including objects – function as focus of the utterance (cf. section 5.3). If doubling is indeed linked to topicality, we expect that all doubled objects occur with postverbal pronouns, since preverbal pronouns are associated with focalized objects. This expectation can of course only be checked for those types of clitic doubling in which the object stands to the left of the verb (OV), i.e. topicalization and topic left-dislocation (see Table 6). Moreover, the examples in which another constituent intervenes between the preposed object and the verb must be excluded, as this constituent can be focalized and as such attract the pronouns into preverbal position. The expectation is borne out: no less than 95.5 per cent of the doubled objects occur with a postverbal clitic pronoun. However, it is also interesting to have a look at the examples in which another constituent does intervene between the doubled object and the verb (OXV),

In 91.6 per cent of the examples, preverbal clitic pronouns are found. Often, the intervening element (X) is a function word or a preferential word, which is responsible for the preverbal position of the clitic pronoun (cf. section 5.3), for example: (Table 7)

(35) <u>Tὸ</u>   <u>κάστρο</u>   ὡς   <u>τὸ</u>   ἔφτασαν, # στέκουν καὶ θεωροῦσι (LR 783)
     <u>To</u>   <u>kástro</u>   os   <u>to</u>   éftasan, # stékun   ke   θeorúsi
     ART_{ACC} $castle_{ACC}$ $when_{SUB}$ CL,ACC reached   stand   and watch
     'the castle, when they reached it, they stood and watched'

As mentioned above (section 5.3), it is not only function/preferential words that attract clitic pronouns into preverbal position. Preposed *ad hoc* focalized constituents are also associated with preverbal clitic pronouns (see Condoravdi & Kiparsky 2004; Revithiadou & Spyropulos 2006; Soltic 2012). This is the case for the examples below: the intervening element (in bold) is a lexical constituent which constitutes the focus of the utterance. Usually, it constitutes the subject of the sentence, for example:

[21] The three exceptions (LR 3147, LR 3241, LR 3343) all concern ὅλος/ólos 'whole', of which the deviant behaviour in doubling constructions has been pointed out, for instance Pappas (2004: 72): 'Furthermore, it was shown for the first time that within the factor *reduplicated object*, the adjective ὅλος behaves contrary to the general pattern since one finds pronouns in the preverbal position when ὅλος is reduplicated', see Condoravdi & Kiparsky (2004: 171ff.). In Modern Greek too, ὅλος/ólos exhibits some idiosyncrasies: it is the only adjective which has to be doubled, yet it is stressed like a focus (Pappas 2004: 167).

(36) Εἰδ'   ἴσως   τὴν   καρδία   σου #   **φόβος**   τὴν   παρατρέχει (LR 2789)
      Ιð'   ísos   tin   kardía   su #   **fóvos**   tin   paratréxi
      If$_{SUB}$ *maybe*$_{ADV}$ *ART*$_{ACC}$ *heart*$_{ACC}$ *CL,GEN* *fear*$_{NOM}$ *CL,ACC* *passes through*
      'If maybe <u>your heart</u>, (if) **fear** passes through <u>it</u>'

However, the intervening element can also exercise other syntactic functions: I give an example of a focalized indirect object, two predicative adjuncts (an NP and a prepositional phrase) and an attributive adjunct (in the form of an adverb):

(37) Καὶ   νὰ   καὶ   τοῦτο   τὸ   βεργίν, #   Βέλθανδρε,   **ἐσὲ**   τὸ
      Ke   na   ke   túto   to   verjín, #   Vélθanðre,   **esé**   to
      And *PTCL*$_{MOD}$ *and* *that*$_{ACC}$ *ART*$_{ACC}$ *stick*$_{ACC}$ *Belthandros*$_{VOC}$ *you*$_{ACC}$ *CL,ACC*
      δίδω (BC 539)[22]
      δίðo
      give
      'And <u>that stick</u>, Belthandros, **to you** I give <u>it</u>'

(38) καὶ   ἐμὲ   **δεσπότην**   μ'   ἔταξες #   καὶ   ἀρκεῖ   με   ἐτοῦτο,   αὐθέντη (AB 177)
      ke   emé   **ðespótin**   m'   étakses # ke   arkí   me   etúto,   afθéndi
      and *me*$_{ACC}$ *master*$_{ACC}$ *CL,ACC* *appointed* *and* *suffices* *CL,ACC* *that*$_{NOM}$ *lord*$_{VOC}$
      'and <u>me</u>, **as a master** you appointed <u>me</u> and that is sufficient to me, lord'

(39) τὸ   πῶς   τὸν   εὐνουχόπουλον # **ὡς**   **φίλον**   τὸν   ἐποῖκεν (LR 1038)
      to   pós   ton   evnuxópulon #   **os**   **fílon**   ton   epíken
      ART *how*$_{INT}$ *ART*$_{ACC}$ *eunuch*$_{ACC}$ *as*$_{PREP}$ *friend*$_{ACC}$ *CL,ACC* *made*
      'and how <u>the eunuch</u>, (how) he made <u>him</u> **a friend**'

(40) Στρατιώτη,   τὸ   γατάνι   μου, #   τὸ   τριχογάτανό   μου
      Stratióti,   to   γatáni   mu, #   to   trixoγátanó   mu
      Soldier$_{VOC}$ *ART*$_{ACC}$ *hairlock*ACC *CL,GEN* *ART*$_{ACC}$ *hairlock*ACC *CL,GEN*
      'Soldier, <u>my lock of hair</u>, <u>my lock of hair</u>'
      σύρριζον   τὸ   ἐνέσπασαν #   οἱ χεῖρες   μου   ἀπ'   ἐμένα (LR 3751)
      sírrizon   to   enéspasan #   i xíres   mu   ap'   eména
      utterly$_{ADV}$ *CL,ACC* *tore* *ART*$_{NOM}$ *hands*$_{NOM}$ *CL,GEN* *from*$_{PREP}$ *me*$_{ACC}$
      '**utterly** my hands tore <u>it</u> from me'

Thus, in the structure OXclV, which prevails over OXVcl, the object O is doubled by a clitic pronoun and must thus be conceived as the *topic* of the utterance, while the preverbal constituent X is responsible for the preverbal position of the clitic pronoun and should thus be interpreted as the *focus*. This pattern actually perfectly matches the scheme developed by Helma Dik (1995; 2007) with regard to Ancient Greek information structure 'topic > focus > verb' and consequently reinforces our thesis that doubled objects constitute topical information in Medieval Greek too.[23]

---

[22] Cf. section 5.5.1.2: demonstrative pronoun.
[23] Note, however, that the notions in Dik's scheme are not completely consistent: 'topic' and 'focus' are pragmatic categories, while 'verb' is a grammatical word class. In other words: verbs can also be topicalized or focalized.

6. RELATION WITH ORAL DISCOURSE

In this section, the frequent use of clitic doubling in my corpus is related to the oral discourse which the Medieval Greek vernacular *politikos stichos* poetry is acknowledged to adopt. Until now, the foremost studied 'oral style marker' has been the large number of formulas (section 6.1). I argue that the linguistic phenomenon of clitic doubling can also be considered a true sign of an adopted oral discourse, for the construction is still felt typical of colloquial and thus spoken language in the Greek Middle Ages, as shown by De Boel (2008) (section 6.2). Furthermore, two constructions related to clitic doubling, especially to topic right-dislocation, are mentioned as further proof of the vernacular romances' intended oral style (section 6.3).

6.1. Oral style markers: formulas

The vernacular *politikos stichos* poetry has been related to an oral tradition. In the early days of Medieval Greek studies, enthusiastic scholars even saw a parallel between their texts and the Homeric epics (e.g. Trypanis 1963), which are acknowledged to be the result of an oral tradition. Main arguments for this comparison were the numerous formulas and the existence of the same story in various – anonymous – versions. Nowadays, a more moderate stance is taken: oral composition of the Medieval Greek *politikos stichos* texts is excluded, but oral performance is very likely and an oral tradition has certainly exercised a formative influence on poets who had no other models of poetic composition in the vernacular (Beaton 1986: 115; Mackridge 1990: 125).[24] A distinction should thus be made between 'the physical means by which a piece of literature is composed and the type of discourse employed in that composition' (Shawcross 2005: 312). The adopted oral discourse naturally has consequences for the language of the texts: it is said to possess 'signs of the style of traditional folk poetry' (Sifakis 2001: 67). Indeed, the *politikos stichos* is also the common metre of the modern folk-songs, which have been recorded only from the nineteenth century on. Moreover, some verse patterns of these songs are similar to the ones found in the medieval written poetry (cf. section 6.3). How exactly, if at all, the two genres, i.e. medieval poetry and modern folk-song, are related has not yet been clarified (cf. Michael Jeffreys in personal communication 26 June 2011).[25]

The so-called 'style markers of orality' have especially been sought and found in the frequent formulas in the Medieval Greek poetry (e.g. Jeffreys 1973). An example of a famous intra- and intertextual formula in my corpus is the following (in italics):

(41) ὅλοι νὰ τὸν ἀκούγουσιν, # *μικροί* *τε* *καὶ* *μεγάλοι* (LR 635)
óli na ton akúɣusin, # *mikrí* *te* *ke* *meɣáli*
all$_{NOM}$ PTCL$_{MOD}$ CL,ACC listen *small$_{NOM}$ PTCL and big$_{NOM}$*
'all listen to him, *small and big*'

γέροντες, νέοι, ἅπαντες, # *μικροί* *τε* *καὶ* *μεγάλοι* (LR 2111)
jérondes, néi, ápandes, # *mikrí* *te* *ke* *meɣáli*
elderly$_{NOM}$ youngsters$_{NOM}$ all$_{NOM}$ *small$_{NOM}$ PTCL and big$_{NOM}$*
'old men, young men, all, *small and big*'

---

[24] See Sifakis (2001) for further bibliography; see Beaton (1996: 222ff.): 'The Oral Substratum of the Vernacular Romances', which specifically deals with my corpus.

[25] See Jeffreys (personal communication 26 June2011): 'Some striking but isolated examples of similar patterns may be found in many longer vernacular Greek poems of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (…) we have been repeatedly struck by their similarity to those of Modern folk-song (…). If a link is to be considered, what might it be? A simple conclusion would be that Modern Greek folk-song is the direct descendant of a written Byzantine genre (…). This seems to me extremely unlikely, as well as ideologically horrific'.

καὶ πᾶσα   πόλις   καὶ λαός, # μικροί τε   κα μεγάλοι (AB 1877)
ke   pása   pólis   ke laós, # mikrí   te   ke meγáli
and every$_{NOM}$ city$_{NOM}$ and race$_{NOM}$ small$_{NOM}$ PTCL and big$_{NOM}$
'and every city and race, *small and big*'

However, the language of the *politikos stichos* texts also contains other indications – from a linguistic point of view – which testify to an intended oral discourse. The linguistic phenomenon of clitic doubling seems to be one of them.

6.2. *Colloquial character of clitic doubling*

In order to understand why clitic doubling can be associated with an oral, vernacular discourse in Medieval Greek, it is necessary to shed light on the history of the phenomenon. It has been hypothesised that Modern Greek clitic doubling has its origins in older Greek: 'the genesis of clitic doubling through the history of Greek (…) is a natural evolution within the language' (De Boel 2008: 103; see Janse 2008). In Ancient Greek, a rather ambiguous or distant object could be clarified by means of a resumptive co-referential clitic pronoun, for example:

(42) ἐμοὶ   μέν, εἰ καὶ μὴ   καθ'   Ἑλλήνων   χθόνα
      emí   mén, i ke   mí   kaθ'   Ellínon   xthóna
      me$_{DAT}$ PTCL as if$_{SUB}$ NEG on$_{PREP}$ Greeks$_{GEN}$ ground$_{ACC}$
      'To me, although I was not on Greek ground'
      τεθράμμεθ', ἀλλ' οὖν ξυνετά   μοι   δοκεῖς
      teθrámmeth', all' un   ksinetá   mi   ðokís
      was fed   but   PTCL meaningful$_{ACC}$ CL,DAT seem
      λέγειν (Eur. Phoen. 497f.; Janse 2008: 183)
      léjin
      say$_{INF}$
      'born and bred, you seem to me saying words full of sense'

As the indirect object is separated from its verb δοκεῖς/ðokís by a long subordinated clause, it is repeated in the form of its clitic counterpart μοι/mi for the sake of clarity.

An NP functioning as (in)direct object is thus occasionally 'doubled' by a clitic pronoun as a purely clarifying and mnemonic device in Ancient Greek. Later on, this construction presumably gets used in a more systematic way, so that in Modern Greek clitic doubling has become an obligatory 'grammatical device to signal topicalization' (Janse 2008: 166).[27]

In Medieval Greek, however, the construction is still fairly optional: although a tendency towards grammaticalization is detected, a co-referential clitic pronoun is not automatically present in case of a topicalized object until ca. 1600 (De Boel 2008: 89ff.). In this regard, De Boel (2008) presents an interesting case-study: he compares the frequency of clitic doubling in the two most important manuscripts of the *Digenis Akritis*, the first extensive vernacular text (12th century).[28] Whereas the 'rather vulgar' Escorial manuscript abounds with instances of clitic doubling, the construction is completely absent from the 'more archaizing' Grottaferrata manuscript. Compare the following pair:

---

[27] It should be noted, however, that Modern Greek clitic doubling only seems obligatory in the case of topicalized objects *preceding* the verb, since *post*verbal objects without a coreferential pronoun are not necessarily interpreted as foci (Holton et al. 2004: 230).

[28] As far as I know, De Boel (2008) is the only study which exclusively deals with clitic doubling in vernacular Medieval Greek.

(43) τὴν   ἀδελφήν   μας   ἄφις   την, # τὸν   παῖδα   σου
      tin   aðelfín   mas   áfis   tin, # ton   péða   su
      ART_{ACC} $sister_{ACC}$ CL,GEN $leave_{IMP}$ CL,ACC ART_{ACC} $child_{ACC}$ CL,GEN
      ἀπαρνήσου (E 346; De Boel 2008: 96)
      aparnísu
      $deny_{IMP}$
      'our sister, leave her, deny your child'
      τὴν   ἀδελφήν   μας   ἔασον, # τὸ   τέκνον   σου
      tin   aðelfín   mas   éason, # to   téknon   su
      ART_{ACC} $sister_{ACC}$ CL,GEN $leave_{IMP}$ ART_{ACC} $child_{ACC}$ CL,GEN
      ἀρνήσου (G 2.168; ibid.)
      arnísu
      $deny_{IMP}$
      'leave our sister, deny your child'

De Boel (2008) convincingly concludes that the scribe of the Grottaferrata version avoids clitic doubling in his attempt to maintain strict – written – standards, because clitic doubling is considered typical of the colloquial and thus spoken idiom: 'The clitic doubling construction is characteristic of popular Greek' (Horrocks 2010: 365).[29] This popular character is presumably due to the seemingly redundant nature of clitic doubling: the clitic pronoun actually repeats an already expressed NP: 'As far as their syntactic function is concerned, Doubling Clitics are redundant, since this syntactic function is also marked in the NP' (Haberland & Van der Auwera 1987: 330). The fact that my corpus abounds with instances of clitic doubling thus strongly confirms –from a linguistic perspective – that the authors of the verse romances deliberately adopted an oral style.

6.3. Related structures

Other 'oral style markers' of a more linguistic nature than the traditionally quoted formulas are dislocated genitives (cf. section 6.3.1) and dislocated subjects (cf. section 6.3.2). Both constructions are reminiscent of topic right-dislocations, especially of the special subcategory of corrective examples (cf. section 5.4.2).

6.3.1. Dislocated genitives

The class of dislocated genitives contains genitive NPs which clarify a co-referential possessive pronoun, i.e. a genitive clitic pronoun, standing before the boundary pause (i.e. caesura or verse end). As such, this construction clearly resembles topic right-dislocation. In the first example, the NP occupies the whole part after the caesura:

(44) Ηὐξήνθη   δὲ   τὸ   κράτος   του #   τοῦ   βασιλέως   ἐκείνου (AB 83)
      Efksínθi   ðe   to   krátos   tu #   tu   vasiléos   ekínu
      $Increased$ $PTCL$ ART_{NOM} $power_{NOM}$ CL,GEN ART_{GEN} $king_{GEN}$ $that_{GEN}$
      'His power increased, (the power) of that king'

<hr>

[29] Interestingly, the same observation has been made with regard to some modern languages in which clitic doubling has not yet been fully grammaticalized but is still optional, for instance Bulgarian: 'C[litic] D[oubling] constructions in formal and written Bulgarian are very rare, whereas they are very common in spoken and informal Bulgarian' (Guentchéva 2008: 216).

In the following two examples, a parenthetic expression is found immediately after the boundary pause (respectively a verb of saying and a vocative):[31]

(45) εἰς θέλημάν <u>του</u> νὰ ἐλθῆ, # λέγω, <u>τοῦ</u> <u>Βερδερίχου</u> (LR 2750)
    is thélimán <u>tu</u> na elthí, # légo, <u>tu</u> <u>Verðeríxu</u>
    to_{PREP} $will_{ACC}$ CL,GEN $PTCL_{MOD}$ comes say ART_{GEN} $Berderichos_{GEN}$
    'she would bend herself to <u>his</u> will, I mean, (the will) <u>of Berderichos</u>'

(46) ὄλες οἱ συγγενίδες <u>του</u>, # ξένε, <u>τοῦ</u> <u>Βερδερίχου</u> (LR 3087)
    óles i singeníðes <u>tu</u>, # kséne, <u>tu</u> <u>Verðeríxu</u>
    all_{NOM} ART_{NOM} $relatives_{NOM}$ CL,GEN $stranger_{VOC}$ ART_{GEN} $Berderichos_{GEN}$
    'all <u>his</u> relatives, stranger, (the relatives) <u>of Berderichos</u>'

I conclude with two examples in which the verb intervenes between the clitic pronoun and the NP:

(47) Λατινικὰ τὰ ροῦχα <u>της</u> # ὑπῆρχαν <u>τῆς</u> <u>ὡραίας</u> (LR 1983)
    Latiniká ta rúxa <u>tis</u> # ipírxan <u>tis</u> <u>oréas</u>
    $Latin_{NOM}$ ART_{NOM} $clothes_{NOM}$ CL,GEN were ART_{GEN} $beautiful_{GEN}$
    '<u>Her</u> clothes were Latin, (the clothes) <u>of the beautiful one</u>'

(48) καὶ παρευθὺς τὰ δάκρυα <u>της</u> # ἐκατέβαιναν <u>τῆς</u>
    ke parefthís ta ðákria <u>tis</u> # ekaténenan <u>tis</u>
    and $immediately_{ADV}$ ART_{NOM} $tears_{NOM}$ CL,GEN came down ART_{GEN}
    <u>κόρης</u> (AB 1350)
    <u>kóris</u>
    $girl_{GEN}$
    'and immediately <u>her</u> tears streamed down, (the tears) <u>of the girl</u>'

6.3.2. Dislocated subjects

In this construction, an NP functioning as subject is postponed after the boundary pause instead of standing next to its verb (in bold). Again, this construction bears resemblance to topic right-dislocation, despite the absence of a co-referential pronoun. The lack of a nominative pronoun functioning as provisional subject is normal, since Greek is a so-called pro-drop language: subject pronouns are only expressed if used emphatically, for one can derive the subject from the verb-morphology.[32] I tentatively consider the following examples as right dislocations:

(49) καὶ **λέγει** πρὸς τὸν πενθερόν του # <u>ὁ</u> <u>Ἀχιλλεὺς</u>
    ke **léji** prós ton penθerón tu # <u>o</u> <u>Axilléfs</u>
    and says to_{PREP} ART_{ACC} $father-in-law_{ACC}$ CL,GEN ART_{NOM} $Achilles_{NOM}$
    <u>ὁ</u> <u>μέγας</u> (AB 1587)
    <u>o</u> <u>mégas</u>
    ART_{NOM} $great_{NOM}$
    'and <u>he</u> **said** to his father-in-law, <u>the great Achilles</u>'

[31] Note that parentheticals too are typical of spoken discourse, see Wichmann (2001: 177): 'Parenthetical comments, typically thought of as incidental asides, are a common feature of conversation'.

[32] Moreover, nominative *clitic* pronouns are only used in a very limited way, e.g. να τος/na tos ('there he is!'). As English is non-pro-drop language, I have underlined the coreferential subject pronoun in my translation.

(50) χρόνους,   ὡς   μέ   **᾽παν**, τέσσερεις, # <u>οἱ</u>   <u>δαίμονες</u>   <u>οἱ</u>
      xrónus,   os   me   **'pan**, tésseris, # <u>i</u>   <u>ðémones</u>   <u>i</u>
      years_ACC as_SUB CL,ACC told four_ACC   ART_NOM demons_NOM   ART_NOM
      <u>πρῶτοι</u> (LR 2747)
      <u>próti</u>
      first_NOM
      'four years, as <u>they **told**</u> me, <u>the leading demons</u>'

(51) ἐκάθητο ὁ   Βέλθανδρος   μόνος   εἰς   τὸ   παλάτιν,
      ekáθito o   Vélθanðros   mónos   is   to   palátin,
      sat   ART_NOM Belthandros_NOM alone_NOM in_PREP ART_ACC palace_ACC
      'Belthandros sat down on his own in the palace,'
      μικρὸν   καὶ   ἐπαρέκυψεν ἐφ᾽   ἕνα   παραθύρι
      mikrón   ke   eparékipsen ef'   éna   paraθíri
      a while_ADV and   bended   from_PREP one_ACC window_ACC
      'he peeped a while from one window'
      Βλέπει   ὅτι   **ἐξέβηκε**   καὶ   **πάγει**   εἰς   περιβόλιν
      vlépi   óti   **eksévike**   ke   **páji**   is   perivólin
      sees   that_SUB came outside and   goes   to_PREP garden_ACC
      'he saw that <u>she **came outside**</u> and **went** to the garden'
      <u>Χρυσά<ν>τζα,   κόρη   τοῦ   ῥηγός,   ἡ   πολυπόθητή</u>
      <u>Xrisá<n>dza,   kóri   tu   riɣós,   i   polipóθití</u>
      Chrysandza_NOM girl_NOM ART_GEN king_GEN ART_NOM much desired_NOM
      <u>του</u> (BC 830)
      <u>tu</u>
      CL,GEN
      '<u>Chrysandza, girl of the king, his much desired girl</u>'

Rather than purely marking the NPs as topics, these constructions seem to serve a clarifying, even corrective, purpose. As such, they resemble the special instances of corrective topic right-dislocations (cf. section 5.4.2). In the last example, for instance, the verb βλέπει/vlépi still has ὁ Βέλθανδρος/o Vélθanðros as its subject, while the subject of ἐξέβηκε/eksévike and πάγει/páji has changed to Χρυσάντζα/Xrisándza. This impression is reinforced by a number of examples in which the verb does not agree in number with the postponed subject. While a multiple subject has been added, the verb stays singular in the following verses:

(52) **ἔκλαυσεν,**   **ἐθρηνήθηκεν** # <u>αὐτὸς   καὶ   ἡ   Χρυσά<ν>τζα</u> (BC 1278)
      éklafsen, **eθriníθiken** # <u>aftós   ke   i   Xrisá<n>dza</u>
      cried   lamented   he_NOM and   ART_NOM Chrysandza_NOM
      '<u>he **cried, lamented**, he and Chrysandza</u>'

(53) Μίαν   ἡμέραν   **βούλομαι** # νὰ   **ἔβγω**   εἰς   τὸ   κυνήγιν,
      Mían   iméran   **vúlome** #   na   **évɣo**   is   to   kiníjin,
      One_ACC day_ACC want   PTCL_MOD go out   in_PREP ART_ACC hunt_ACC
      'one day <u>I</u> **want** to **go out** hunting,'
      <u>ἐγὼ   καὶ   ἡ   παράξενος   ἡ   ἐρωτικὴ   Ροδάμνη</u> (LR 2308)
      <u>eɣó   ke   i   paráksenos   i   erotikí   Roðámni</u>
      I_NOM   and   ART_NOM marvelous_NOM ART_NOM erotic_NOM Rodamne_NOM
      '<u>I and the marvelous, erotic girl Rodamne</u>'

These examples are clearly reminiscent of the examples in which the doubling pronoun has a singular form, although more than one object is added (cf. section 5.4.2).

Whatever the concrete function of the above dislocations is, it might be clear that they constitute even more obvious markers of an adopted oral discourse than the clitic doubling constructions. It is conspicuous that in almost all examples the NP is found to the right of the verb (VO). To be precise, I have found only one example of what can be called a left-dislocated subject:

(54) Ἀλλά γε πῶς ὀ̱   Βέλθανδρος, # πῶς   οὐδὲν **ἐσχετλία** (BC 1094)
     Allá je   pós o̱   Vélθanðros, #   pós   uðén   **esxetlía**
     But   PTCL how$_{INT}$ ART$_{NOM}$ Belthandros$_{NOM}$ how$_{INT}$ NEG   complained
     'But how <u>Belthandros</u>, how <u>he</u> **did** not **complain**'

All other examples concern *right*-dislocations. This observation can be related to the oral discourse of the corpus. Spoken language consists of a linear succession of informational 'chunks', called Idea or Intonation Units by Chafe (1994). Given the instantaneous character of spoken language, mistakes or ambiguities cannot be concealed by a rewrite. Applied to texts, the 'information flow' can be said to proceed from left to right. In view of the assumed oral character of the vernacular poetry, it should come as no surprise that nearly all the above dislocations are *right*-dislocations: a speaker makes a complete utterance which, however, suddenly seems not entirely straightforward to him (an unspecified subject or an ambiguous pronoun), so that afterwards (i.e. to the right) he/she gives a clarification: the subject is made explicit or the pronoun is repeated by an NP which contains the full load of information.

In this regard, it is interesting to note that in the modern folk-songs the second part of the *politikos stichos*, i.e. the seven-syllable part after the caesura, commonly clarifies the first eight-syllable part: 'τὸ δεύτερον ἡμιστίχιον φαίνεται συμπληροῦν ἤ ἐπεκτεῖνον ἤ προσδιορίζον καλύτερον τὴν ἔννοιαν τοῦ πρώτου'/'to ðéfteron imistíxion fénete simplirún i epektínon i prosðiorízon kalíteron tin énnian tu prótu' 'the second hemistich seems to complete or extend or specify in a finer way the idea of the first one' (Kyriakides 1990: 197). This pattern of elaboration actually parallels the above right-dislocations in which the caesura functions as boundary pause for the dislocation. Since the folk-songs contain structures characteristic of colloquial speech, this observation further strengthens the relation of the vernacular poetry to an oral discourse.

7. CONCLUSION

In this paper, clitic doubling in the Medieval Greek vernacular has for the first time been described in detail. On the basis of a representative corpus of fourteenth century romances, I have shown that the co-occurrence of an object NP with a co-referential clitic pronoun indicates topicalized objects in the Medieval Greek vernacular, as in Modern Greek. The main evidence for this assumption is provided by the distribution of clitic pronouns. In Medieval Greek, clitic pronouns can be attracted into preverbal position by *ad hoc* focalized constituents. The fact that 95.5 per cent of the clitic pronouns doubling a preposed object appears *post* verbally proves that these doubled NPs must be interpreted as topics. However, the notion 'topic' (as opposed to focus) is often conflated with (referential) 'givenness', since there seems to be a correlation between the two, albeit independent, concepts (Gundel & Fretheim 2004). Therefore, I have also analysed the doubled NPs according to Chafe's (1994) continuum of activation statuses: no less than 90.5 per cent could be classified as (semi-)active information.

It is not only the modern function of topic marker that can be adopted; the modern four-part typology developed by Janse (2008) can also be applied to vernacular Medieval Greek clitic doubling: topicalization, topic left-dislocation, backgrounding, topic right-dislocation, based on word order (OV or VO) and presence/absence of a boundary pause. Although I have been dealing with purely written texts, the latter – prosodic – criterion has caused no difficulties, since vernacular Medieval Greek is inextricably connected with the *politikos stichos* metre of which both the verse end and the standard caesura can be considered boundary pauses.

Unlike clitic doubling in Modern Greek, the construction is still fairly optional in Medieval Greek and has a rather colloquial character (De Boel 2008). As such, I have considered the frequent occurrence of the doubling construction a piece of further evidence of the oral discourse which the vernacular *politikos stichos* poetry is acknowledged to adopt. In this regard, I have discussed two structures which are especially related to the special category of corrective topic right-dislocations: dislocated genitives and dislocated subjects, which might lack agreement with the verb. Both constructions definitely constitute further indication of the assumed oral style of the vernacular texts.

As the 'oral discourse' thesis has primarily been defended from a more literary perspective (cf. formulas), it will be revealing to investigate linguistic phenomena typical of spoken language in the texts under consideration. Therefore, I hope that this paper will lead to more studies adopting a linguistic point of departure to substantiate the view that 'the medieval poet, at least the poet of the popular romances, wrote as he spoke' (Crosby 1936: 104).

University of Ghent
Department of Linguistics
Blandijnberg 2
9000 Gent, Belgium
Email: jorie.soltic@ugent.be

References

AGAPITOS, PANAGIOTIS, HULT, KARIN & SMITH, OLE, 1999. *The Byzantine Achilleid. The Naples Version*, Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

ALEXOPOULOU, THEODORA & FOLLI, RAFFAELLA, 2011. 'Indefinite topics and the syntax of nominals in Italian and Greek', *WCCFL 28 Proceedings* 1, 1–12.

ALEXOPOULOU, THEODORA & KOLLIAKOU, DIMITRA, 2002. 'On linkhood, topicalization and clitic left dislocation', *Journal of Linguistics* 38, 193–245.

ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, ELENA, 1994. *Clitic Dependencies in Modern Greek*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Salzburg.

ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, ELENA, 1999. 'Conditions on clitic doubling in Greek', in Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 761–98.

APOSTOLOPOULOS, PHOTIS, 1984. *La Langue du Roman Byzantin Callimaque et Chrysorrhoé*, Athens: Akadèmia Athènôn.

BEATON, RODERICK, 1986. 'The oral traditions of Modern Greece: a survey', *Oral Traditions* 1, 110–33.

BEATON, RODERICK, 1996. *The Medieval Greek Romance*, 2nd edn, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BROWN, GILLIAN & YULE, GEORGE, 1983. *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHAFE, WALLACE, 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

CHILA-MARKOPOULOU, DESPINA, 2004. 'Review of Pappas's "Variation and morphosyntactic change in Greek: from clitics to affixes"', *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5, 199–212.

CONDORAVDI, CLEO & KIPARSKY, PAUL, 2004. 'Clitics and clause structure: the late medieval system', *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5, 159–83.

CROSBY, RUTH, 1936. 'Oral delivery in the Middle Ages', *Speculum* 11, 88–110.

CINQUE, GUGLIELMO, 1990. *Types of Ā-Dependencies*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

DE BOEL, GUNNAR, 2008. 'The genesis of clitic doubling from Ancient to Medieval Greek', in Dalina Kallulli & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*, Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 89–103.

DIK, HELMA, 1995. *Word Order in Ancient Greek. A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus*, Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

DIK, HELMA, 2007. *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

DIK, SIMON, 1997. *The Theory of Functional Grammar*, 2nd edn, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

DIMITRIADIS, ALEXIS, 1994. 'Clitics and island-insensitive object-drop', *Proceedings of FLSM-5, Urbana-Champaign, IL, Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 1–54.

DOVER, KENNETH, 1960. *Greek Word Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

EGEA, JOSÉ MARIA, 1998. *Historia extraordinaria de Beltandro y Crisanza*, Granada: Athos-Pérgamos.

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

ESTIGARRIBIA, BRUNO, 2006. 'Why clitic doubling? A functional analysis for Rioplatense Spanish', in Timothy Face & Carole Klee (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 8th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 123–36.

FERRARESI, GISELLA & LÜHR, ROSEMARIE, 2010. 'The role of information structure in language change: introductory remarks', in Gisella Ferraresi & Rosemarie Lühr (eds.), *Diachronic Studies on Information Structure: Language Acquisition and Change*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1–14.

FÉRY, CAROLINE, 2006. 'The fallacy of invariant phonological correlates of information structural notions', in Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow & Manfred Krifka (eds.), *The Notions of Information Structure*, Potzdam & Berlin: University of Potzdam & Humboldt University of Berlin, 1–21.

FÉRY, CAROLINE, FANSELOW, GISBERT & KRIFKA, MANFRED (eds.), 2006. *The Notions of Information Structure*, Potzdam & Berlin: University of Potzdam & Humboldt University of Berlin.

GELUYKENS, RONALD, 1992. *From Discourse Process to Grammatical Construction: On Left-Dislocation in English*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GIVON, TALMY, 2001. *Syntax: An Introduction*, vol. 1, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GUENTCHÉVA, ZLATKA, 2008. 'Object clitic doubling constructions and topicality in Bulgarian', in Dalina Kallulli & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*, Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 203–23.

GUNDEL, JEANETTE & FRETHEIM, THORSTEIN, 2004. 'Topic and focus', in Laurence Horn & Gregory Ward (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, Oxford: Blackwell, 175–96.

GUNDEL, JEANETTE, HEDBERG, NANCY & ZACHARSKI, RON, 1993. 'Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse', *Language* 69, 274–307.

HABERLAND, HARTMUT & VAN DER AUWERA, JOHAN, 1987. 'Doubling and resumption in Modern Greek', *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 8th annual meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki, 27–29 April 1987 (A Festschrift for John Chadwick)*, 323–34.

HEIM, IRENE, 1982. *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

HENDRIKS, HERMAN & DEKKER, PAUL, 1995. 'Links without locations' in Paul Dekker & Martin Stokhof (eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth Amsterdam Colloquium*, ILLC: University of Amsterdam, 339–58

HINTERBERGER, MARTIN, 1993. 'Sprachliche Variationsformen in volkssprachlichen metrischen Werken der spätbyzantinischen und frühneugriechischen Zeit', in Nikolaos Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della Literatura Neogreca*, vol. 1, Venice: Instituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, 158–68.

HOLTON, DAVID, MACKRIDGE, PETER & PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON, IRENE, 2004. *Greek. An Essential Grammar of the Modern Language*, London: Routledge.

HORROCKS, GEOFFREY, 2010. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, 2nd edn, London: Longman.

IATRIDOU, SABINE, 1995. 'Clitics and island effects', *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 11–31.

JANSE, MARK, 2008. 'Clitic doubling from Ancient to Asia Minor Greek', in Dalina Kallulli & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*, Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 165–202.

JEFFREYS, MICHAEL, 1973. 'Formulas in the Chronicle of the Morea', *Dumbarton Oak Papers* 27, 163–95.

KALLULLI, DALINA, 2008. 'Clitic doubling, agreement and information structure', in Dalina Kallulli & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*, Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 227–56.

KRAPOVA, ILIYANA & CINQUE, GUGLIELMO, 2008. 'Clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian' in Dalina Kallulli & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*, Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 257–86.

KYRIAKIDES, STILPON, 1990. *Το δημοτικό τραγούδι: Συναγωγή μελετών/Το dimotikó traγúdi: Sinaγojí*, Athens: ΕΡΜΗΣ/ ERMIS.

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

LENDARI, TINA, 2007. *Livistros and Rodamne. The Vatican Version. Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary and Index-Glossary*, Athens: MIET.

MACKRIDGE, PETER, 1990. 'Orality in Medieval and Modern Greek poetry: introduction', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 14, 123–28.

MACKRIDGE, PETER, 1993. 'An editorial problem in Medieval Greek texts. The position of the object clitic pronoun in the Escorial Digenes Akrites', in N. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della Literatura Neogreca*, vol. 1, Venice: Instituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia, 325–42.

MACKRIDGE, PETER, 1995. 'On the placement of the weak personal pronoun in Medieval Greek vernacular', *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 15, 906–29.

MACKRIDGE, PETER, 2000. 'The position of the weak object pronoun in Medieval and Modern Greek', *Jazyk i rečevaja dejatel'nost'* 3, 133–51.

MANOLESSOU, IO & STAMATIS, BEIS, 2006. 'Syntactic isoglosses in Modern Greek dialects: the case of the indirect object' in Mark Janse, Brian Joseph & Angela Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, Patras: University of Patras, 220–35.

PAPPAS, PANAYIOTIS, 2004. *Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek. From Clitics to Affixes*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON, IRENE, 1975. 'The passive in English and Greek', *Foundations of Language* 13, 563–78.

PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON, IRENE, 1977. 'Modern Greek clitic pronouns and the "surface syntax constraints" hypothesis', *Journal of Linguistics* 13, 259–81.

PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON, IRENE, 1985. 'Word order in Modern Greek', *Transactions of the Philological Society* 83, 113–43.

PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON, IRENE, 1994. 'Verb movement and clitics in Modern Greek', in Irene Philippaki-Warburton, Katerina Nicolaidis & Maria Sifianou (eds.), *Themes in Greek Linguistics*, vol. 1, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 53–60.

RAMOUTSAKI, IONNA, 1996. 'Ἡ πρόταξη καὶ ἐπίταξη τῶν προσωπικῶν ἐγκλιτικῶν ἀντωνυμιῶν σὲ κείμενα τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς δημώδους λογοτεχνίας'/'I prótaksi ke epítaksi ton prosopikón eŋklitikón andonimión se kímena tis meseonikís ðimódus loɣotexnías', in José Egea & Javier Alonso (eds.), *Prosa y Verso en Griego Medieval. Rapports of the International Congress 'Neograeca Medii Aevi III' Vitoria 1994*, Amsterdam: Hakkert, 317–20.

REVITHIADOU, ANTHI & SPYROPULOS, VASSILIOS, 2006. *A Typology of Greek Clitics with Special Reference to their Diachronic Environment*, Rhodes: University of the Aegean.

REVITHIADOU, ANTHI & SPYROPULOS, VASSILIOS, 2008. 'Greek object clitic pronouns: a typological survey of their grammatical properties', *Language Typology and Universals* 61, 39–53.

ROSENQVIST, JAN OLOF, 2007. *Die byzantinische Literatur. Vom 6. Jahrhundert bis zum Fall Konstantinopels 1453*, Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter.

SEIDL, AMANDA & DIMITRIADIS, ALEXIS, 1997. 'The discourse function of object marking in Swahili', *CLS (Chicago Linguistic Society)* 33: The Main Session, 373–89.

SHAWCROSS, TERESA, 2005. 'Oral residue and narrative structure in the Chronicle of Morea', *Byzantion* 75, 310–33.

SIFAKIS, GREGORY, 2001. 'Looking for the tracks of oral tradition in Medieval and Early Modern Greek poetic works', *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 27, 61–86.

SOLTIC, JORIE, 2012. 'Distribution of the object clitic pronouns in the Grottaferrata manuscript of the Digenis Akritis', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 36, 178–97.

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 & Lukas Pietsch (eds.), *Connectivity in Grammar and Discourse*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 139–63.

TOMIC, OLGA, 2006. 'Clitic clusters and clitic doubling, Balkan Sprachbund and morpho-syntactic features', *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 67, 239–331.

TRYPANIS, CONSTANTINE, 1963. 'Byzantine oral poetry', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 56, 1–3.

VALLDUVÍ, ENRIC, 1992. *The Informational Component*, Ph.D. thesis, New York: Garland.

VEJLESKOV, PETER, 2005. 'The position of the weak object pronoun in the Greek Portulans and in the Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans', in Elizabeth & Michael Jeffreys (eds.), *Approaches to Texts in Early Modern Greek (Neograeca Medii Aevi V)*, Oxford: University of Oxford, 197–209.

WICHMANN, ANNE, 2001. 'Spoken parentheticals', in Karin Aijmer (ed.), *A Wealth of English (Studies in Honour of Göran Kjellmer)*, Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 177–93.

ZIV, YAEL, 1994. 'Left and right dislocations: discourse functions and anaphora', *Journal of Pragmatics* 22, 629–45.