CLITIC DOUBLING IN VERNACULAR MEDIEVAL GREEK

By Jorje 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

---

1 My work was funded by the Research Foundation of Flanders (FWO) (grant no. B/13006/01).
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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 and a co-referential clitic pronoun attached to the verb’ (Janse 2008: 165). Especially in Balkan languages, clitic doubling is a common phenomenon (Krapova & Cinque 2008: 278), as in the example from Albanian in (1):

(1) Ana lexoi libr-in (Kalluli 2008: 230)^

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Ana} \\
\text{NOM}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\underbrace{3s} \\
\text{cl,ACC}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{read} \\
\text{book-the,ACC}
\end{array}
\]

‘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.

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), 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), for example:

(3) \(\text{tin a yapai ti Yarimia}\) \(\text{CL,ACC loves ART,ACC Yarimia,ACC 3s}\)

Topic: ‘He loves Yarimia’

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.).
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)
   \[\text{ti Yarimía \textit{ti aγαπάι} = O clitic pronoun V}\]

2. topic left-dislocation (OV; + boundary pause)
   \[\text{ti Yarimía \# ti aγαπάι = O clitic pronoun V}\]

3. backgrounding (VO; − boundary pause)
   \[\text{ti aγαπάι ti Yarimía = clitic pronoun V O}\]

4. topic right-dislocation (VO; + boundary pause)
   \[\text{ti aγαπάι \# ti Yarimía = clitic pronoun V O}\]

\(^7\) 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) \[\begin{align*}
\text{frouta, ti la trói kámía forá'}
\end{align*}\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{fruit, ACC ct., ACC eats from time to time}
\end{align*}\]

‘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 πεζός στίχος/pezós stíchos, i.e. the prosaic verse (Hinterberger 1993: 165).
My corpus consists of three substantial texts composed in the *politikos stichos*: Libistros & Rodame (LR), Belthandros & Chrysanda (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*, 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) Ὦς κρύσταλλον παράλληλα # ἐκείνην τὴν ὀρφίαν (LR 474)
Os kristallon parfikase # ekimin tin oréan
ToPREP crystalACC compared thatACC ARTACC womanACC
‘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 Pausenmarkierung’ ‘When we take 12 to 17 syllables to be the average human breathing capacity for the recitation of verses (…) then we could consider such a middle caesura a supplementary possibility for a division according to sense and for the marking of pauses’ (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. 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 & Spyropoulos 2006), for instance:

(6) Ἐβγαίνει ἡ παράξενος # ὡς μ’ ἔκουσεν, θωρεῖ με (LR 2861)

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) Καί εἴδα καί ἔξενισθην το # καί μέρημα με ἔσεβθην (LR 147)

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, με/me appears before the verb because of the ad hoc focalized subject μέρημα/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.
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) Ἰδοὺ, τὸ κάστρον ἡδὲς τὸ, τί ἀκατηρεῖς, εἰπὲ μοὶ (LR 762)

Idú, to kástron evres to, ti akaterereis, ipe moi (LR 762)

'Look, the castle, you found it, what are you waiting for, tell us'

(9) καὶ ἐσέν ὅδεν σὲ ἐντρέπεται # χωρὶς τῆς βασιλείας (AB 60)

ke esén udeén se entrepeta # xoris tis vasilias

'and you, nothing suits you without the queen'

**Topic left-dislocation**

(10) ἐκινή δὲ τὸν Βέλθονδρον # ἐκατέσκοπησέν τὸν (BC 818)

ekini de ton Velthondon # ekateskopisen ton

'she NOM PTCL ART ACC Belthandros ACC saw CL,ACC

'and Belthandros, she saw him'

(11) τὸν Βέλθονδρον μοῦ τὸν ὡρσῖν # νὰ μὴ τὸν

ton Velthondon mou ton orson # na mi ton

ARTACC BelthandrosACC CL,GEN ARTACC BEAUTIFUL ACC PTCLMOD NEG CL,ACC evlojisi

'my beautiful Belthandros, he may not join him in matrimony'

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Total doubled NPs: 241</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topicalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic left-dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backgrounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic right-dislocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

(i) Ὅ Λίβιστρος πρὸς Κλῖτοβον # ἱρκεψεν νὰ τὸν λέγη (LR 3293)

O Livistros pros Klitovon # irokepsen na ton leji

'To Klitobos, Libistros began to say to him'

In this example, the preposition πρὸς/πρὸς + 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) ἐδέσποζοξες το το βεργίν # καὶ μονή σου να το
enedespózó to to verjín # ke móni su na to
own cl,acc ART,acc stick,acc and alone_fem cl,gen PTCL,mod cl,acc

’χις (BC 585)

’xis

have

‘you own it, the stick, and you alone have it’

(13) Καὶ τι τά θέλω τά πολλά, # φίλε μου, τά
Ke ti ta thelo ta pollá, # file mu, ta
And why_int cl,acc want ART,acc great,acc friend,voc cl,gen ART,acc

ἐν μέσο; (LR 2036)

in_prep middle,dat

‘And why would I want (to tell) them, the great things, my friend, the things

(that happened) in the meantime?’

**Topic right-dislocation**

(14) Ἀφήνω, παρατέχω ta # τά τότε λαληθέντα (LR 3564)
Afino, paratécho ta # ta tote laliθénda
pass on leave cl,acc ART,acc then_adv said,part

‘I pass on, I leave them, the things said at that moment’

(15) Καὶ ο Ἀχιλλε δήν την ἐλεγεν # την Ἥλιογενημένην (AB 1356)
Ke o Achillefs tin elegen # tin iliojenniménin
And ART,nom Achilles,nom cl,acc spoke ART,acc sun born,acc

‘And Achilles spoke to her, the sun born girl’

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) Ως βασιλέας με εφίμισαν # εμέν καὶ την Ροδάμμην (LR 2247)
Os vasilian me efimisan # emén ke tin Rodámnin
As,prep king,acc cl,acc honoured me,acc and ART,acc Rodamne,acc

‘As a king they honoured me, me and Rodame’

(17) καὶ άτοι τους τὸν ἐνδόςσασιν # ἐκείνον καὶ τήν κόρην (AB 1502)
ke ati tus ton enóbassin # ekéinon ke tîn kórin
and they,nom cl,gen cl,acc dressed him,acc and ART,acc girl,acc

‘his men dressed him, him and the girl’

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 \textit{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 $\rightarrow$ a bed).\footnote{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 Vallduvi (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.}

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’
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) ἀπήρεν καὶ εἰς τὰ χέρια του σκοτάριν καὶ κοντάριν. 
took and inPREP ARTACC armsACC CL GEN shieldACC and swordACC 
‘he took in his arms a shield and a sword.’

(19) οἱ Ἐρωτεῖς μὲ ἔφονεσαν καὶ κατετρώσασιν με. 
i ART NOM Cupids NOM CL,ACC killed and hurt CL,ACC 
‘The Cupids killed me and hurt me.’

(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.

Table 2. Total doubled NPs: 241

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Active/ (%)</th>
<th>Semi-active/ (%)</th>
<th>Inactive/ (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>69 (28.6%)</td>
<td>29 (12%)</td>
<td>40 (16.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-active</td>
<td>151 (62.7%)</td>
<td>39 (16.2%)</td>
<td>112 (46.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>21 (8.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Total doubled NPs: 241

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active: 69</td>
<td>13 (24.5%)</td>
<td>13 (33.3%)</td>
<td>10 (25.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-active: 150</td>
<td>37 (69.8%)</td>
<td>65 (59.1%)</td>
<td>29 (74.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive: 22</td>
<td>3 (5.7%)</td>
<td>12 (10.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Total doubled NPs: 241

Table 3. Total doubled NPs: 241

(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) Ἐγράψεν τῷ πιττάκιν της, πέμπει το πρός ἐμένα Ἐγραψεν to pittakin tis, pembei to pros emena
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 ἀντί δέματος εἶχε τὸ δακτυλίδιον.
ke apano andi dematos ixe to daktilidion.
and above_adv instead_prep string_gen had ART_ACC ring_ACC
‘and on top of the string it had the ring.’
Ἐπέτασά τιν την γραφήν, # ἐπήραξ, ἐφίλησά την (LR 1745)
Epetasas tin tin grafin, # epira, efilisa tin
T ook cl_acc ART_ACC letter_ACC held kissed cl_acc
‘I took it, the letter, I held (it), I kissed it’

(21) μέρος ἐπαπειλήσατο ἐμὲν ὡς συγγενήν του.
meros epapilisato emen os singenin 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.’
Ἐξῆλθεν τοις ἵπποις καὶ ἰσημερίσθη μου, # φιλὲ, τας ἀπελάσας του (LR 2428)
Epexithen tois hipoiis kai isimeristhe mou, # filê, tas apilasa tu
Had cl_acc ART_NOM heart_NOM cl_gen friend_voc ART_ACC threats_ACC cl_gen
‘My heart retained them, friend, his threats?’

Semi-active information – literal repetition in context:

(22) ἔψη ἐις τὸν ὅπνον μου εἶδο τον ἐντάμα
epsê eis ton hopnon mou eido ton entama
yesterday_adv in_prep ART_ACC sleep ACC cl_gen saw cl_acc together_adv
μὲ τὴν κόρην
me tin korin
with_prep ART_ACC girl_acc
‘yesterday in my sleep I saw him together with the girl’
καὶ ὡς ἔξυπνη σα, φιλέ μου, τοῦς ἔδικούς μου τὸ εἴπα
ke os ekspinisa, file mu, tus edikus mu to eipa
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 ἀπολογήθησαν πάντες οἱ ἐδικοί μου”
ke touto me apolojithsan pantes i edikoi mou”
and that_acc cl_acc answered all nom ART_NOM own_nom cl_gen
‘and all my men answered me that’”
Τὸν Λίβιστρον ἐδόκασαν βουλήν οἱ ἐδικοί του
Ton Lifivtron edokasan vulin i edikî tu
ART_ACC Libistros_ACC gave advice_ACC ART_NOM own_nom cl_gen
‘His men gave Libistros advice’
ἐπει τὸ κάστρον ἐφήτασεν, # τὴν κόρην ηὔρηκεν τὴν (LR 752)
epi to kastron efhtasen, # tin korin euriken tin
after_sub ART_ACC castle_ACC reached ART_ACC girl_ACC found cl_acc
‘after he had reached the castle, the girl, he found her’
Concept derivable from context:

(23) βοτάνια νά ἐχω ἀντὶ τροφής, # νερὸν νά τὸ

plants_{ACC} PTCL_{MOD} have instead_{PREP} food_{GEN} water_{ACC} PTCL_{MOD} _CL_{,ACC}

ιστερομαχί (LR 2671)¹⁷

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) μαριχίνει τὸ τὸ κάλλος σου, # νεκρὼνει τὴν μορφήν

maréni _CL_{,ACC} ART_{ACC} beauty_{ACC} CL_{,GEN} kills _ART_{ACC} form_{ACC}

su

σου (LR 3068)

‘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 τὸ/to). Rodamne is constantly described in terms of beauty in LR (cf. adjectives ἡθικήν/θικίν, ἐρωτικόν/ερωτικόν, λαμβράν, ἐμορφήν/ἐμορφίν, ὀμίλον/ορέαν, ἐξαιρετόπλαστον/ekseretóplaston and her quasi-epithet τὴν παραξενον) 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) ἀπελατκίκην ἔσωρεν, # τοῦτο οὐ ψεῦδομαι τὸ (BC 231)

apelaťkin éswren, # touto ou psévdomai touto (BC 231)

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 τοῦτο τὸ καμώματα # μάθη τα ὁ πατήρ σου (BC 1071)
ke tāta ta kamomata # maathi ta o patir su
and those ARTACC deedsACC learns clACC ARTNOM fatherNOM clGEN
and those deeds, your father will learn them'

(27) καὶ λέγει τας ὁ Βέλθανδρος # συντας τας τρεῖς φρόνιμος (BC 602)
ke leji tas oVelthandros # astas tas trim orneas
and speaks clACC ARTNOM BelthandrosNOM thoseACC ARTACC three beautifulACC
and Belthandros spoke to them, those three beautiful girls'

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) πάντες τα πάσχει ήγείται τα # ωσάν να μη τα
panda ta pasxi iji̇ta ta # osan na mi ta
allACC RELACC suffers considers clACC as ifSUB PTCLMOD NEG clACC
pasxi suffers
all that he has suffered, he considers it as if he has not suffered it’

(29) τοῦτον τὸν κόσμον τὸν βραστάς, # ληστεύεις καὶ κρατεῖς
tuton ton kosmon ton brastas, # listevis ke kratis
thatACC ARTACC landACC RELACC possess plunder and dominate

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topicalization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic left-dislocation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic right-dislocation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 οἶς νικησέτης ἀπέ τούς δίδω # ἄνδρα να τὸν ἐπάρο (LR 2055)
ke ions niksi apet tus dido # andra na ton epairo
and RELNOM wins fromPREP ARTACC two husbandACC PTCLMOD clACC take
‘and the one of the two who will win, him 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.

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 οἶς νικησέτης ἀπέ τούς δίδω # ἄνδρα να τὸν ἐπάρο (LR 2055)
ke ions niksi apet tus dido # andra na ton epairo
and RELNOM wins fromPREP ARTACC two husbandACC PTCLMOD clACC take
‘and the one of the two who will win, him I will take as my husband’

19 Cf. section 5.5.1.2: demonstrative pronoun.
(30) ἀρνεῖσθι τον τόν Ἐρωτάν # τόν ἐκατεδουλώθης (LR 3711) deny cl,ACC ART_ACC Cupid_ACC REL_ACC enslaved 'you deny him, the Cupid, who enslaved you'

(31) Ἐδέστης δὲ τὸ θέσμων, τὴν ἀπειλὴν ἔκεινην, Having seen PART PTCL ART_ACC spectacle_ACC ART_ACC threat_ACC that_ACC 'After they had seen the spectacle, that threat,'

ἦθος ἀποσχιστώνοιτε, πιπτοῦσιν, προσκυνοῦν τον. immediately ADV disarmed REFL fall worship CL,ACC

Orders emprison cl,ACC and chain cl,ACC 'He ordered to make them prisoners of war and to chain them'

κχιμαλωσίαν ἐπήρασεν ἀμέτρητην, μεγάλην. captivity_ACC took immeasurable_ACC enormous_ACC 'they took an immeasurable, enormous captivity.'

Ὡς τὸ ἐδεύει καὶ <τὸ> ἡκουσεν # ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκείνος20 Os to iđen ke <to> ikusen # o vasiléfis ekinos

WhenSUB cl,ACC saw and cl,ACC heard ART Nom king Nom that Nom 'When he saw it and heard it, that king'

τὸ θαύμαν τὸ ἐγένετον εἰς ὅλον τὸν θαύμον τὸν (AB 630) to thávman to èxenetoñ eis òlon ton thamoun ton (AB 630) ART ACC wonder ACC REL ACC happened to PREP whole ACC ART ACC race ACC cl,GEN 'the wonder which happened to his whole race'

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 θαύμαν/το θάβμαν (the wonder) is already implied by κχιμαλωσίαν ἀμέτρητην, μεγάλην/exmalosján amétirtn, meýalín (immeasurable, enormous captivity). A comparable example is the next one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Total doubled NPs modified by relative clause: 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Cf. section 6.3.2: dislocated subject.
But around night in order that you cancel the fear which we had because of those voices, 

φόνας γλῶσσαν ἄγνώστων, πολλά νά συντυχίνουν-

foin tongues GEN uncountable GEN constantly ADV PTCL MOD speak 

voices ACC tongues GEN uncountable GEN constantly ADV PTCL MOD speak

of the co-referential clitic pronouns. We have seen that constituents occurring immediately

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
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)

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:

\[35\] Τὸ κάστρο ὡς τὸ ἔφτασαν, # στέκουν καὶ θεωροῦσι (LR 783)

To kástrō os to éftasan, # stékoun ke theorúsi

`the castle, when they reached it, they stood and watched`

Table 6. Total OV doubling without intervening constituent: 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preverbal pronoun (OclV): 3</th>
<th>Postverbal pronoun (OVcl): 65</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topicalization</td>
<td>32(^1)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic left-dislocation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: cl = clitic pronoun.

Table 7. Total OV doubling with intervening constituent: 95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preverbal pronoun ([X]OXclV): 87</th>
<th>Postverbal pronoun ([X]OXVcl): 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topicalization</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic left-dislocation</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{21}\) The three exceptions (LR 3147, LR 3241, LR 3343) all concern ὅλος/ολός ‘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/ολός 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’ ἵσως τὴν καρδίαν σου # φοβος την παρατρέχει (LR 2789)
If_{SUB} maybe_{ADV} ART_{ACC} heart_{ACC} CL,GEN fear_{NOM} CL,ACC passes through
‘If maybe your heart, (if) fear passes through it’

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 τὸτο βεργίν, # Βέλθανδρε, ἐσὲ τὸ
And PTCL.MOD and that_{ACC} ART_{ACC} stick_{ACC} Belthandros_{VOC} you_{ACC} CL,ACC
dῖδο
give
‘And that stick, Belthandros, to you I give it’

(38) καὶ ἐμὲ δεσπότειν μ’ ἔταξες # καὶ ἀρκεῖ με ἐπιτυχ, κῦθέντη (AB 177)
ke eme despotin m’ etakses # ke arki me epito, kuthenti
and me_{ACC} master_{ACC} CL,ACC appointed and suffices CL,ACC that_{NOM} lord_{VOC}
‘and me, as a master you appointed me and that is sufficient to me, lord’

(39) τὸ πῶς τὸν ἐνυγχοποιοῦν # ὠς φίλον τὸν ἐποίκειν (LR 1038)
to pös ton evuxoypolon # os filon ton epiken
ART how_{INT} ART_{ACC} eunuch_{ACC} asPREP friend_{ACC} CL,ACC made
‘and how the eunuch, (how) he made him a friend’

(40) Στρατιώτη, τὸ γατάνι μου, # τὸ τριχοχατανῶ μου
Stratioti, to gataní mou, # to trichochatanô mou
Soldier_{VOC} ART_{ACC} hairlock_{ACC} CL,GEN ART_{ACC} hairlock_{ACC} CL,GEN
‘Soldier, my lock of hair, my lock of hair’
σφραζον τὸ ἐνέςπασαν # οἱ χειρὶς μου ἀπ’ ἐμένα (LR 3751)
sirrizon to enespasan # i xires mu ap’ emena
utterly_{ADV} CL,ACC tore ART_{NOM} hands_{NOM} CL,GEN from_{PREP} me_{ACC}
‘utterly my hands tore it 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). 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).

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, # μικρὸ τε καὶ μεγάλοι (LR 635)  
оли на тон аку́гусин, # микр и тё ке мега́л и
all NOM PTCLMOD CL,ACC listen small NOM PTCL and big NOM
‘all listen to him, small and big’

γέροντες, νεόι, ἀπαντεῖς, # μικρὸ τε καὶ μεγάλοι (LR 2111)  
ёрондес, нёй, апандес, # микр и тё ке мега́л и
elderly NOM youngsters NOM all NOM small NOM PTCL and big NOM
‘old men, young men, all, small and big’

---


25 See Jeffreys (personal communication 26 June 2011): ‘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, # μικρός τε καὶ μεγάλοι (AB 1877)
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) ἐμ怀抱 μέν, εἰ κατί μὴ καθ’ Ελλήνων χθόνα
emí mén, i ke mít kaθ’ Ellínon xthóna

me_DAT PTCL as if_SUB NEG on_PREP GreeksGEN ground_ACC
‘To me, although I was not on Greek ground’

τεθράμμεθ’, ἀλλ’ οὖν ξονετά μοι δοκεῖς
teétrammeth’, all’ un ksinetá mi dokís

was fed but PTCL meaningful_ACC CL,DAT seem


lénin

say_INF

‘born and bred, you seem to me saying words full of sense’

As the indirect object is separated from its verb δοκεῖς/δοκίς by a long subordinated clause, it is repeated in the form of its clitic counterpart μοι/μι 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 postverbal 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.
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). 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) Ηὔζήνθη δὲ τὸ κράτος του # τοῦ βασιλέως ἔκεινου (AB 83)
Efksinhı δε to kratos tu # tu vasilios ekinu

‘His power increased, (the power) of that king’
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 θελημαν τω νά ἐξθη, λέγω, τοῦ Βερδερίχου (LR 2750)

\(\text{to}_{\text{PREP}} \text{will}_{\text{ACC}} \text{cl}_{\text{GEN}} \text{PTCL}_{\text{MOD}} \text{comes}_{\text{say}} \text{ART}_{\text{GEN}} \text{Berderichos}_{\text{GEN}}\)

‘she would bend herself to his will, I mean, (the will) of Berderichos’

(46) ὁλες οἱ συγγενεῖς του, ξένη, τοῦ Βερδερίχου (LR 3087)

\(\text{all}_{\text{NOM}} \text{ART}_{\text{NOM}} \text{relatives}_{\text{NOM}} \text{cl}_{\text{GEN}} \text{stranger}_{\text{VOC}} \text{ART}_{\text{GEN}} \text{Berderichos}_{\text{GEN}}\)

‘all his relatives, stranger, (the relatives) of Berderichos’

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

(47) Λατινικά τὰ ρώχα τῆς ὑπηρχαν τῆς ὀρχίσ (LR 1983)

\(\text{Latin}_{\text{NOM}} \text{ART}_{\text{NOM}} \text{clothes}_{\text{NOM}} \text{cl}_{\text{GEN}} \text{were}_{\text{ART}} \text{beautiful}_{\text{GEN}}\)

‘Her clothes were Latin, (the clothes) of the beautiful one’

(48) κοι παρευθύς τὰ δάκρυα τῆς ἐκατέβαιναν τῆς κόρης (AB 1350)

\(\text{and immediately}_{\text{ADV}} \text{ART}_{\text{NOM}} \text{tears}_{\text{NOM}} \text{cl}_{\text{GEN}} \text{came down}_{\text{ART}} \text{GEN}\)

‘and immediately her tears streamed down, (the tears) of the girl’

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) κοι λέγει πρὸς τὸν πενθερόν τοῦ ὁ Αχιλλέας

\(\text{ke}_{\text{PREP}} \text{says}_{\text{to}} \text{ART}_{\text{ACC}} \text{father-in-law}_{\text{ACC}} \text{cl}_{\text{GEN}} \text{ART}_{\text{NOM}} \text{Achilles}_{\text{NOM}}\)

‘and he said to his father-in-law, the great Achilles’

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/να τος (‘there he is!’). As English is non-pro-drop language, I have underlined the coreferential subject pronoun in my translation.
‘four years, as they told me, the leading demons’

Belthandros sat down on his own in the palace,‘

Belthandros sat down on his own in the palace,’

‘he peeped a while from one window’

‘he saw that she came outside and went to the garden’

‘Chrysandza, girl of the king, his much desired girl’

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/ελεπί still has ὁ Βέλθανδρος/ο Βέλθανδρος as its subject, while the subject of ἐξέβηκεν/ἐξέβηκε and πάγει/πάγι has changed to Χρυσάντα/Χρυσάντα. 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:

‘he cried, lamented, he and Chrysandza’

‘I and the marvelous, erotic girl Rodamne’
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 πώς ὁ Βέλθανδρος, πώς οὐδὲν ἐσχετλία (BC 1094)
But PTCL how INT ART NOM Belthandros, how he 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 δὲύτερον ἡμιμέτριον φαίνεται συμπληροῦν ἢ ἐπεκτείνειν ἢ προσδιορίζων καλύτερον τὴν ἔννοιαν τοῦ πρώτου’/‘to δέφτερον imistixion fénète simpliründ i epektúnon i prosidiorízón kalíteron tin ἐννίαν 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).
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