Jorie Soltic

The Πολιτικὸς Στίχος poetry as reliable evidence of linguistic phenomena

Case-study: the distribution of object clitic pronouns in the Chronicle of Morea

Abstract:

Adresse: Dr. Jorie Soltic, Ghent University, Department of Linguistics (Greek), Blandijnberg 2, 9000 Ghent, Belgium, Jorie.Soltic@UGent.be

1. Introduction

Many linguists refuse to believe that data from verse texts can provide reliable evidence of linguistic phenomena. I believe that the Medieval Greek πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry represents an exceptional case, because of two particular reasons. Firstly, the rhythm, the idiom and the background of the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry are all related to the everyday language (section 2). Secondly, the πολιτικὸς στίχος contains a high degree of flexibility (section 3).

   In this article, I focus on the issue of flexibility. By means of a case-study on the position of the object clitic pronouns in two parallel manuscripts of the Chronicle of Morea, I will show that the πολιτικὸς στίχος poet has so many alternatives at his disposal, that he cannot have felt constrained by the verse structure. The alternatives are found on all levels of grammar: phonology, morphology, lexicon and syntax. Moreover, the metre itself provides a good deal of flexibility (section 4).

2. Everyday language

The πολιτικὸς στίχος is a metre which seems very well suited for the "ordinary" everyday language. Beck[1] even labels it "der geborene Vers für eine einfache, volkstümliche Aussage". Contrary to ancient metres, the πολιτικὸς στίχος is no longer based on the since long disappeared difference between long and short syllables, but actually takes the truly pronounced word accent into consideration. Each πολιτικὸς στίχος consists of two metrical cola of respectively eight and seven syllables, divided by a fixed caesura.[2] Only the even syllables are allowed to carry an accent.[3] This iambic rhythm is conceived very natural for Greek: "Es ist in 'politischen Versen' abgefasst, einem Versmaß, welches der natürlichen Aussprache und dem natürlichen Rhythmus der Volkssprache gut angepasst ist".[4] Because of its fixed number of fifteen syllables, it is sometimes called the "δεκαπεντασύλλαβος". However, another synonym is more relevant to my purpose: "πεζὸς στίχος". The term "πεζός" points to the fluent, even almost prosaic nature of the metre: "Der 15-Silber kommt der Prosa sehr nahe, wie auch seine Bezeichnung πεζὸς στίχος bezeugt".[5] This competition with prose can presumably be interpreted more literally: it is striking that literary works in prose are very rare in the Greek Middle Ages, whereas the πολιτικὸς στίχος enjoys an enormous popularity during ages.[6]

Moreover, the use of the πολιτικὸς στίχος is inextricably connected with the "Volkssprache" or vernacular.[7] Before the 13th century, examples of texts written in vernacular Greek are very rare.[8] The πολιτικὸς στίχος seems to have provided

---

1 H.-G. BECK, Geschichte der byzantinischen Volksliteratur. Munich 1988, 15.

2 M.D. LAUXTERMANN, The spring of rhythm: an essay on the political verse and other Byzantine metres. *Byzantina Vindobonensia*, 22. Vienna 1999.

3 Cf. 4.4.2.3.

4 J.O. ROSENQVIST, Die byzantinische Literatur vom 6. Jahrhundert bis zum Fall Konstantinopels 1453. Berlin 2007, 113. – Cf. P. MACKRIDGE, The metrical structure of the oral decapentasyllable. *BMGS* 14 (1990) 200–212: 204 note 9: "the natural two-beat rhythm of Modern Greek is clearly indicated by the enclisis-rule", e.g. ἄνθρωπός τις.

5 M. HINTERBERGER, Sprachliche Variationsformen in volkssprachlichen metrischen Werken der spätbyzantinischen und frühneugriechischen Zeit, in N. Panayotakis (ed.), Origini della Literatura Neogreca I. Venezia 1993, 158–168: 165.

6 R. BROWNING, Medieval and Modern Greek. Cambridge ²1999, 75; cf. 4.2.

7 The appropriateness of the term "vernacular" is discussed in C. CUPANE, Wie volkstümlich ist die Byzantinische Volksliteratur? *BZ* 96 (2003) 577–99, and M. HINTERBERGER, How should we define vernacular literature? Paper given at the conference "Unlocking the potential of texts: interdisciplinary perspectives on medieval Greek" at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences, and Humanities, University of Cambridge, 18–19 July 2006.

8 HINTERBERGER, How should we define vernacular literature? (as footnote 4 above) 1.

the .Medieval Greeks with a tool for writing in the colloquial language: "Im Gegensatz zur sonstigen byzantinischen Literatur, die sich antikisierend und am attischen Griechisch orientierte, sind sie [the poems] in einer Sprachform verfaßt, die viele Ähnlichkeiten mit dem modernen neugriechischen Idiom aufweist."[9]

In view of its closeness to the vernacular spoken language, it should not come as a surprise that the πολιτικὸς στίχος has been associated with an oral tradition. Far from being orally composed, though, the πολιτικὸς στίχος texts are nowadays assumed to deliberately adopt an oral style, as the extensive use of formulas testify.[10]

In sum, the rhythm (iambic), the idiom (vernacular) and the background (oral) of the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry are all related to the everyday language. This constitutes a first argument in my defense of the use of this kind of poetry for linguistic purposes. In the rest of this article, I will focus on the second and main reason why I am convinced that πολιτικὸς στίχος texts can be used for the study of linguistic phenomena: the flexibility which their language shows.

3. Flexible language

The πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry seems to blend diachronic/dialectal variants. Therefore, its language is often called a "non-standardized, so-called mixed or macaronic language incorporating vernacular and learned elements".[11] This mix is often "historically" explained: since the Medieval Greeks could not easily throw off "the classic yoke", they still include ancient elements, which are now considered learned, classicizing forms. However, Hinterberger warns that the dichotomy learned/ancient versus vernacular/modern is not always that clear-cut: "Many linguistic features of the medieval vernacular that today seem to be archaisms were probably features also of the *living* language, as they are in modern Greek dialects".[12]

Moreover, the variation is not limited to so-called vernacular literature: "the usage of a considerable number of alternative forms is a general characteristic of

---

9 CUPANE, Volksliteratur (as footnote 7 above) 577. – Cf. BROWNING, Medieval and Modern Greek (as above footnote 6) 72 sq.; ROSENQVIST, Literatur (as footnote 4 above) 170.

10 G. M. SIFAKIS, Looking for the tracks of oral tradition in medieval and early modern Greek poetic works. *Journal of the Hellenic Diaspora* 27 (2001) 61 – 86: 67.

11 N. TOUFEXIS, Diglossia and register variation in medieval Greek. *BMGS* 32 (2008) 203 – 217; CUPANE, Volksliteratur (as footnote 7 above).

12 HINTERBERGER, How should we define vernacular literature? (as footnote 4 above) 4; my italics

medieval Greek, not only of the vernacular, but also of the non-vernacular".[13] The variation is also not confined to πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry; even prose contains the same alternatives: "Weiters weisen auch zeitgenössische Prosatexte eine ähnliche morphologische Vielfalt und Variationsbreite wie metrische volksprachliche Werke auf".[14] Finally, even in (Standard) Modern Greek, much variation still exists: "Contemporary Modern Greek remains very much a mixed language".[15]

All these facts suggest that in this period of transition many alternatives really coexist in living speech and may thus be genuine, at least in different parts of the Greek-speaking world: "I am inclined – along with many others – to suppose that there was in late Byzantine times a common spoken language in the capital and in urban areas linked with it, a common tongue in which a great many alternative forms, belonging historically to different dialects, were acceptable".[16]

I am convinced that the availability of such a freedom of choice greatly facilitates the process of verse composition, as it provides the poet with considerable linguistic flexibility.[17] Consequently, πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry does not constitute a poetic "straitjacket" and can be used for linguistic purposes. In what follows, I will illustrate this by means of a case-study: by analyzing the distribution of the object clitic pronouns (OCPs) in the Chronicle of Morea, I will demon-

---

13 Ibid. 4.

14 HINTERBERGER, Sprachliche Variationsformen (as footnote 5 above) 165; cf. M. HINTERBERGER, Το φαινόμενο της πολυτυπίας σε δημώδη κείμενα. In H. Eideneier / U. Moennig / N. Toufexis (eds.), Θεωρία και πράξη των εκδόσεων της υστεροβυζαντινής, αναγεννησιακής και μεταβυζαντινής δημώδους γραμματείας. Πρακτικά του Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Neograeca Medii Aevi, IVa. Irakleio 2001, 215–244; G.C. HORROCKS, Greek: a history of the language and its speakers. London ²2010, 318.

15 Ibid. 283; P. MACKRIDGE, Modern Greek, in E. Bakker (ed.), A companion to the ancient Greek language. Oxford 2010, 564–587: 571 sq.

16 BROWNING, Medieval and Modern Greek (as above footnote 6) 82; cf. HORROCKS, Greek (as footnote 14 above) 322. – HINTERBERGER, Sprachliche Variationsformen (as footnote 5 above) 165; 158–168: 168 speaks of "einem gemeinsamen, noch nicht nach Dialekten differenzierten sprachlichen *Pool*". However, it would go too far to equate the language of the πολιτικὸς στίχος with the truly spoken language, for it is of course to a certain extent adapted in function of its metrical structure. As such, the variation found in πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry is much greater than that in prose because of "die besondere Funktionalität der Alternativformen im Rahmen der metrischen Erfordernisse" (HINTERBERGER, Sprachliche Variationsformen, as footnote 5 above, 166). Thus, the πολιτικὸς στίχος poet exploit features which prove "to be extremely functional in 15-syllable verse (e. g. alternative forms)": HINTERBERGER, How should we define vernacular literature? (as footnote 4 above) 12 sq.; cf. HINTERBERGER, Φαινόμενο (as footnote 14 above).

17 Cf. P. MACKRIDGE, The position of the weak object pronoun in medieval and modern Greek. *Jazyk i rečevaja dejatel'nost'* 3 (2000) 133–151.

strate that metrical considerations are not of key importance for the distribution of the OCPs, contrary to the claim of several researchers. A comparison of two parallel manuscripts of the Chronicle of Morea, both composed in the πολιτικὸς στίχος, not only confirms the established rules for OCP distribution, but also reveals many possibilities for (re)formulation.

4. Distribution of Medieval Greek OCPs

Being somewhat overworked, the field of the object clitic pronouns provides an ideal case to prove that it is methodologically justified to use a corpus solely consisting of πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry for studying certain linguistic phenomena in Medieval Greek. First, it is necessary to sketch the OCP distribution rules (4.1). Afterwards, I discuss the traditional view that the poetic genre distorts the language (4.2). I oppose this way of thinking with the implicit assumptions of OCP researchers who intuitively feel that the metre under scrutiny constitutes an exception (4.3). The last section contains the actual case-study on the OCPs in two parallel manuscripts of the Chronicle of Morea (4.4).

4.1. Brief outline of the distribution rules

In recent years, linguists have shown a remarkable interest in Medieval Greek OCPs.[18] The impetus for this increased interest is an article by Peter MACKRIDGE

---

18 Cf. A. ROLLO, L'uso dell'enclisi nel greco volgare dal XII al XVII secolo e la legge Tobler-Mussafia. *Italoellenika* 2 (1989) 135 – 146; P. MACKRIDGE, On the placement of the weak personal pronoun in medieval Greek vernacula. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 15 (1995) 906 – 929; MACKRIDGE, Position (as footnote 17 above); M.C. JANSSEN, Η πρόταξη και επίταξη του αδύνατου τύπου της προσωπικής αντωνυμίας την εποχή του Ερωτόκριτου και της Θυσίας του Αβραάμ. *Cretan Studies* 6 (1998) 129 – 144; P. PAPPAS, Weak object pronoun placement in later medieval Greek: intralinguistic parameters affecting variation. *The Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 56 (2001) 79 – 106; P. PAPPAS, The imperative and weak object pronoun placement in later medieval Greek. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 22 (2002) 234 – 248; P. PAPPAS, Variation and morphosyntactic change in Greek. From clitics to affixes. Basingstoke 2004; C. CONDORAVDI / P. KIPARSKY, Clitics and Clause Structure: The Late Medieval Greek System. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5 (2004) 159 – 183; M. JANSE, Convergence and divergence in the development of the Greek and Latin clitic pronouns, in R. Sornicola / E. Poppe / A. Shisha-Halevy (eds.) Stability variation and change of word-order patterns over time (Amsterdam 2000, 231 – 258; M. JANSE, Clitic doubling from ancient to Asia Minor Greek, in D. Kallulli / L. Tasmowski (eds.), Clitic doubling in the Balkan Languages. *Linguistik Aktuell*, 130. Amsterdam

(1993) entitled *An editorial problem in medieval Greek texts. The position of the object clitic pronoun in the Escorial Digenes Akrites*, in which he draws attention to the complexity of the distribution of these small – prosodically deficient – words.[19]

It has been acknowledged that Medieval Greek OCPs obligatorily appear next to the verb of which they constitute the direct or indirect object: "the clitic object pronoun ceased to be a freely moving part of the clause and instead became part of the verb phrase".[20] Whether the Medieval Greek OCPs appear before or after their verb depends on a number of rules identified by Mackridge.[21] Mackridge has discovered that the element immediately before the verb plays a major role. Briefly, if this preverbal element is a function word, a preferential word or an ad hoc emphasized constituent, the OCP is triggered towards this element and thus appears in preverbal position.

With function words I refer to words with a non-lexical meaning which are syntactically obliged to open a subordinate clause, viz. all sorts of subordinating conjunctions (complementation, condition, time, comparison, finality), particles such as νά and relative pronouns,[22] for instance:

1. Καὶ ὁ ἀμιρὰς <u><u>ὡς τὸ</u></u> **ἥκουσεν**, # μακρέα τὸν ἀποξέβην (E 52)[23]

2008, 165 – 202; P. Vejleskov, The Position of the Weak Object Pronoun in the Greek Portulans and in the Chronicle of the Turkish Sultans, in E. & M. Jeffreys (eds.), Approaches to texts in Early Modern Greek. *Neograeca Medii Aevi*, V. Oxford 2005, 197 – 209; A. Revithiadou / V. Spyropulos, A typology of Greek clitics with special reference to their diachronic environment. Rhodes 2006; A. Revithiadou / V. Spyropulos, Greek object clitic pronouns: a typological survey of their grammatical properties. *Language Typology and Universals* 61 (2008) 39 – 53; C. A. Thoma, Distribution and function of clitic object pronouns in popular 16th–18th century Greek narratives. A synchronic and diachronic perspective, in J. Rehbein / C. Hohenstein / L. Pietsch (eds.), Connectivity in grammar and discourse. Amsterdam 2007, 139 – 163; Soltic (2012). J. Soltic, Distribution of the object clitic pronouns in the Grottaferrata manuscript of the Digenis Akritis. *BMGS* 36 (2012) 178 – 197.

19 P. Mackridge, 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 Neo-greca I. Venezia 1993, 325 – 342.

20 Ibid. 339.

21 Ibid.; Mackridge, Position (as footnote 17 above) and Placement (as footnote 18 above).

22 Cf. Soltic, Distribution (as footnote 18 above).

23 Mackridge, Editorial problem (as footnote 19 above) 328. – From now on, I put the verb in bold and underline the OCP; the (potential) preverbal triggering element is underlined twice. The fixed caesura after the eighth syllable is marked by the symbol #.

Preferential words include words which are "disproportionally common" at the beginning of a clause,[24] since they are emphasized "by nature" and initial position is a typical place for items of emphasis.[25] Dover[26] has drawn a list of preferential words in Ancient Greek. It contains negations, interrogatives, demonstratives, emphatic personal pronouns, as well as distinctive (μόνος, ἄλλος, ἕτερος) and quantitative adjectives (ὅλος, πᾶς, πολύς), for example:

> 2. Κὺρ Ἥλιε, <u>τί μᾶς</u> **ἔποικες** # καὶ ἐκακοδίκησές μας; (E 94)[27]

Ad hoc emphasized constituents can belong to all word classes.[28] I give one example of an ad hoc emphasized subject which attracts the OCPs into preverbal position:

> 3. Τοῦτα <u>ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ τὰ</u> **ἔδωκεν**, # ἔχει μέγιστον κάλλος (E 1333)[29]

Needless to say that if none of the above mentioned words is present, the OCP appears immediately after the verb

> 4. καὶ **ἐθεώρει** <u>τον</u> λοιπὸν # καὶ ἀποκαμάρωνέ τον (E 595)[30]

Postverbal position is thus the unmarked position of OCPs. This observation also seems to apply to OCPs which are the object of a *non*-finite verb. After infinitives, participles/gerunds and imperatives, the placement of the pronouns is robustly postverbal.[31]

Even after preferential words and ad hoc emphasized elements, the OCPs sometimes may occur postverbally, for OCPs occurring in combination with a preferential word/ad hoc emphasized constituent do *not necessarily* appear immediately before the verb. On the other hand, the class of function words attracts

---

24 K.J. Dover, Greek Word Order. Cambridge 1960, 20.
25 G.C. Horrocks, Clitics in Greek: a diachronic review, in M. Roussou / S. Panteli (eds.), Greek outside Greece II. Athens 1990, 35–52: 41.
26 Dover, Greek Word Order (as footnote 24 above) 20 sqq.
27 Mackridge, Editorial problem (as footnote 19 above) 329.
28 I admit that we cannot draw a sharp line between the last two categories, since preferential words are actually emphasized "by nature". As a consequence, a continuum might constitute a more suitable way to represent these preverbal triggers, yet the threefold classification is maintained here for the sake of clarity (cf. Soltic, Distribution, as footnote 18 above).
29 Mackridge, Editorial problem (as footnote 19 above) 331.
30 Mackridge, Editorial problem (as footnote 19 above) 327.
31 Pappas, Variation (as footnote 18 above) 70.

the OCPs into preverbal position *almost without exception*. Thus, the distribution of Medieval Greek OCPs is determined by a quasi-obligatory syntactic rule (function words) and a rather optional pragmatic principle (preferential words/ad hoc emphasized constituents): "the rules are primarily a matter of syntactic context and secondarily a matter of pragmatics (in this case, emphasis)".[32]

4.2. Traditional view: only prose as reliable evidence

Having primarily deduced these rules from πολιτικὸς στίχος data, Mackridge[33] does not believe that the metrical nature of his corpus has exercised much influence on his results. This might seem a remarkable view, since it is a widespread belief that only prose can offer reliable linguistic evidence: "One strategy has been to accord greater weight to the evidence of prose texts over poetic ones for showing 'real' features of the spoken language, the assumption being that part of the poetic process involves stretching grammatical and lexical boundaries".[34] In modern linguistics, it is indeed felt contra-intuitive to rely on metrical, poetic texts for the description of a linguistic phenomenon. With regard to Medieval Greek OCPs, this point of view has been explicitly expressed by Thoma:[35]

> "He [Pappas, JS] focused on texts from the 12th–16th centuries, unfortunately poetic texts ... Unfortunately Pappas ... only uses mainly poetic works due to difficulties in finding prose texts of the period he examines (12th to 16th centuries), admittedly a problem if one wants to say something about the language of the period"

Therefore, Thoma's corpus[36] solely consists of prose texts. Criticism on the use of πολιτικὸς στίχος texts as evidence of the OCP distribution rules is also found in Chila-Markopoulou's review on Pappas:[37]

> "Another point (...) concerns the extent to which the corpus is as wide and as representative as possible, since it is restricted to vernacular texts of LMG written in verse. As a conse-

---

32 MACKRIDGE, Editorial problem (as footnote 19 above) 326.

33 Ibid.

34 B.D. JOSEPH, Textual authenticity: evidence from medieval Greek, in S. Herring / P. van Reenen / L. Schoesler (eds.), Textual parameters in ancient Languages. Amsterdam 2000, 309 – 329: 312.

35 THOMA, Distribution (as footnote 18 above) 140 sqq.

36 Ibid.

37 D. CHILA-MARKOPOULOU, Review of Pappas, Variation [as footnote 18 above]. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5 (2004) 199 – 212.

quence, the reliability of the statistical results is compromised (...) There exist texts – even though less numerous and less studied – written in prose, which could render the data more representative and the conclusions safer."[38]

Thus, Chila-Markopoulou[39] concludes by saying Pappas' corpus "should include more sources (mostly non-poetic)" in order to obtain representative results on the OCP distribution. However, she admits that Pappas has actually followed "the usual practice for compiling the corpus for this period, as the poetic vernacular texts are the most numerous and the most studied".[40] Indeed, Medieval Greek linguists are almost forced to include πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry in their corpus, since prose texts are very rare during this period. As mentioned above, I conceive this scarcity of prose texts not as a problem, but as an indication of the naturalness of the πολιτικὸς στίχος (cf. 2).

4.3. Πολιτικὸς στίχος as an exception

Mackridge[41] is not only the first to formulate the rules of Medieval Greek OCP distribution, he is also the first to counter criticism of the above kind. In very general terms, he states that grammar always takes precedence over metrical issues:

> "I believe that, each time grammar appears to be in conflict with versification, we must apply the principle that grammar takes precedence: most scribes knew their language far better than they knew the rules of versification (...) Language is a system, while meter is only a sub-system of it"

More concretely, Mackridge[42] emphasizes the flexibility of the πολιτικὸς στίχος: its so-called mixed language provides so many alternatives that the poet must have been able to put the OCP in the grammatically correct position:

> "In texts where older and newer constructions co-exist as alternatives (e.g. οὐ & δέν ...), the choice between them was clearly a matter of style for the writer, and often the reason for his choosing one alternative rather than the other was no doubt a metrical consideration. But I

---

38 Cf. CHILA-MARKOPOULOU, ibid.: "I believe, however, that an investigation based on a wider corpus, which would include prose texts, would have rendered the research more interesting and possibly would have given different results"; and ibid. 209: "He [Pappas, JS] therefore based his examination entirely on poetic texts, and that constitutes a drawback".

39 Ibid. 209

40 Ibid. 201.

41 MACKRIDGE, Editorial problem (as footnote 19 above) 339.

42 Ibid.

> must emphasize that once that stylistic choice was made, the writer had no alternative but to follow the grammatical rules that dictated the position of clitic pronouns"

Pappas[43] even consecrates a whole section to the possibility of metrical constraints on OCP distribution. He begins by acknowledging that "there has been no serious discussion of the possible effect that the metrical constraints of the 'politikos' verse have had on the placement of weak object pronouns specifically".[44] In general, Pappas seems to support Mackridge's view that grammar prevails over metre in the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry:[45]

> "One should allow for the possibility that infrequent occurrences of less-than-grammatical constructions would be accepted if they were experienced within a robustly grammatical context, while a succession of them would indeed prohibit comprehension"

Moreover, a very strong argument for the justification of a πολιτικὸς στίχος corpus is the fact that Mackridge's[46] results have largely been confirmed by various other researchers.[47] Even Thoma's[48] results, based solely on prose texts, parallel those of Mackridge. Eideneier[49] has a similar experience: "Mackridge konzentrierte sich in seinen Studien zunächst auf die byzantinische Dichtung in der Volkssprache. Eigene Studien zur zeitgleichen Prosa in der Volkssprache führen zum selben Ergebnis". Thus, a comparison with prose clearly proves the validity of the results deduced from πολιτικὸς στίχος data.

In the following section, however, I will show that the same conclusion can be drawn without appealing to prose texts. By means of a comparison of the OCP distribution in two parallel πολιτικὸς στίχος manuscripts of the 14th century Chronicle of Morea, I will substantiate the intuitions of Mackridge and Pappas.

---

43 Pappas, Variation (as footnote 18 above).

44 Ibid. 74.

45 H. Eideneier, Von Rhapsodie zu Rap: Aspekte der griechischen Sprachgeschichte von Homer bis heute. Tübingen 1999, 74.

46 Mackridge, Position (as footnote 17 above), Placement (as footnote 18 above), and Editorial problem (as footnote 19 above).

47 Cf. Janssen, Πρόταξη (as footnote 18 above); Pappas Weak object pronoun, and Variation (as footnote 18 above); Condoravdi/Kiparsky, Clitics (as footnote 18 above); Revithiadou/ Spyropulos, Typology 18 (as footnote above); Soltic, Distribution (as footnote 18 above). Moreover, the rules Mackridge has identified in 1993 constitute a logical continuation of post-classical tendencies, cf. Janse, Clitic doubling (as footnote 18 above).

48 Thoma, Distribution (as footnote 18 above).

49 Eideneier, Von Rhapsodie zu Rap (as footnote 45 above) 116.

4.4. Case-study: comparison of the OCPs in two parallel manuscripts of the Chronicle of Morea

4.4.1. Introduction Chronicle of Morea

The 14th century Chronicle of Morea covers the history of French feudalism on the Peloponnese ("Morea") after the 4th crusade in 1204[50]. The Chronicle survives in versions in four different languages: Italian, Aragonese, French and Greek.[51] The Greek version is preserved in five manuscripts, of which I only take the two most important into account: manuscript Havniensis Fabricius 57 (H) and Parisinus Graecus 2898 (P).[52] Both are composed in the πολιτικὸς στίχος. The latter contains 8191 verses, whereas the former counts as many as 9219 πολιτικοὶ στίχοι, even though its beginning is missing. In the edition I have used,[53] this gap and other lacunas in H are supplemented by manuscript Taurinensis B.II.I (T). Schmitt has undertaken the enormous task of making a parallel edition of H (& T) and P.[54]

It should be noted that the decision of making such a synoptic edition is not that self-evident. Editorial techniques have been problematised, as texts of this type and date often survive in several (anonymous) versions which differ to such an extent that a conventional collation of the readings into one primary version is impossible. Consequently, the notion of "mistake" is very diffcult to demonstrate: "Das Fehlen einer Norm für das vernakulare byzantinische Griechisch macht es schwierig zu bestimmen, was ein 'Fehler' im handschriftlichen Text ist".[55] Each version thus having its own validity and requiring "einer unter-

---

50 T. Shawcross, The Chronicle of Morea: historiography in Crusader Greece. Oxford 2009.
51 Ibid. 33. – The debate on which version is closest to the original has centred round the French and Greek versions: M. Jeffreys, The Chronicle of the Morea: priority of the Greek version. *BZ* 68 (1975) 304–350: 304; cf. J. Schmitt, The Chronicle of Morea. Groningen 1904; N. A. Bees, Zur Chronik von Morea. *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 13 (1917) 122–124; H. E. Lurier, Crusaders as conquerors: the Chronicle of Morea. New York 1964; P. Topping, Review of Lurier. *Speculum* 40 (1965) 737–742.
Note that the Greek version of the Chronicle of Morea is the only one not written in prose, which according to my mind again proves the naturalness of the πολιτικὸς στίχος (cf. 2).
52 Shawcross, Chronicle of Morea (as footnote 50 above) 35.
53 Schmitt, Chronicle (as footnote 51 above).
54 Ibid. – This edition is found integrally on the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*; cf. W. J. Aerts, The Lexikon to the Chronicle of Morea as a tool for linguistic Studies, in E. & M. Jeffreys (eds.), Approaches to texts in early modern Greek. *Neograeca Medii Aevi*, V. Oxford 2005, 141–151: 142: "the old but nevertheless reliable edition of these texts by John Schmitt".
55 U. Moennig, Die Erzählung von Alexander und Semiramis. *Supplementa Byzantina*, 7. Berlin 2004, 218.

schiedlichen editorischen Behandlung"[56], Agapitos speaks of "ἡ ἀνεπάρκεια τῆς στεμματικῆς μεθόδου".[57]

With regard to the exact relationship between H and P, Jeffreys[58] is convinced that "P is probably not directly or indirectly copied from H". Indeed, although telling of course more or less the same story, H and P present some important ideological and linguistic differences. H is the oldest of the two – written in the late 14th century – and seems to reflect a somewhat anti-Greek attitude.[59] P, copied much later, filters out the pro-Frankish passages "found distasteful" or rewrites them from a more Greek perspective.[60] As a result of its pro-Frankish feelings and its "badly written Greek", Schmitt[61] claims that H is written by a non-native speaker[62], while "it is evident that P was written by a Greek".[63] On the other hand, Jeffreys presumes that *both* H and P are written by native Greeks.[64]

It is this same scholar who has established a clear connection between the Chronicle of Morea and an oral tradition by making an elaborated study of the formulas (cf. 2). Jeffreys[65] has found that the level of formulas in H ranges from 21.2 percent to 53.5 percent, which surpasses all other Greek vernacular works. Shawcross[66] confirms these oral residues: "Everything about the Greek version suggests that it is a text which has been highly influenced by methods

---

56 Ibid. 217.

57 P. A. AGAPITOS, Ἀφήγησις Λιβίστρου καὶ Ῥοδάμνης Κριτικὴ ἔκδοση τῆς διασκευῆς α. *Byzantine kai neoellenike bibliotheke*, 9. Athens 2006, 105. – Cf. H. EIDENEIER, Leser- oder Hörerkreis? Zur byzantinischen Dichtung in der Volkssprache. *Hellenika* 34 (1983) 119 – 150: 140: "Jede Version muß als eigenständiges Dichtwerk betrachtet und gewürdigt werden"; cf. MOENNIG, Erzählung 209 sqq., who prints the two versions of *Alexander and Semiramis* successively; AGAPITOS, Ἀφήγησις, ibid. 94 sqq. who treats the manuscripts of *Livistros and Rodamni* quite eclectically; cf. the discussions in H. EIDENEIER / U. MOENNIG / N. TOUFEXIS (eds.) Θεωρία καὶ πρᾶξη τῶν ἐκδόσεων τῆς ὑστεροβυζαντινῆς, ἀναγεννησιακῆς καὶ μεταβυζαντινῆς δημώδους γραμματείας. *Πρακτικὰ τοῦ Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου Neograeca Medii Aevi*, 4a. Hamburg 28.–31.1. 1999. Irakleio 2001.

58 JEFFREYS, Chronicle (as footnote 51 above) 350.

59 Ibid. 305 sq.; SHAWCROSS, Chronicle of Morea (as footnote 50 above) 263.

60 Ibid. 264.

61 SCHMITT, Chronicle (as footnote 51 above) xxxviii.

62 More specifically: by a Graecised Frank or a so-called "Gasmule", the offspring of a Greco-Frankish marriage SCHMITT, Chronicle (as footnote 51 above) xxxviii.

63 SCHMITT, Chronicle (as footnote 51 above) xxix sq.

64 JEFFREYS, Chronicle (as footnote 51 above).

65 M. J. JEFFREYS, Formulas in the Chronicle of the Morea. *DOP* 27 (1973) 163 – 195: 188.

66 SHAWCROSS, Chronicle of Morea (as footnote 50 above) 181.

of composition derived from the pragmatic concerns of oral performance and reception".

4.4.2. Method of working

4.4.2.1. Colon as norm

I have compared the position of OCPs in H with their position in P. In the majority of the parallel verses containing an OCP, no difference is seen. In a number of cases, the position of the OCP does differ in a meaningful way. However, not all these verses in which the OCPs significantly differ in H and P are taken into account. As is the case with many works written in metre, some verses are metrically incorrect.

With regard to πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry, metrical incorrectness can lie either in the number of syllables (cf. 4.4.2.2) or in the accentual pattern (cf. 4.4.2.3). Since it is my aim to prove that the position of OCPs is *not* influenced by the metrical structure, I have only included those parallel pairs in which the environment of the OCP is metrically correct in both H and P.

With "environment" I do not mean the verse in its totality but the metrical colon in which the OCP in question occurs. As mentioned, each πολιτικὸς στίχος is divided into two metrical cola by a fixed caesura after the eighth syllable.[67] This caesura is of such a strong nature, that most scholars believe that the origin of the metre must be sought in the combination of an octosyllable and a heptasyllable: "Koder's study (…) has irrefutably proved the composite origins of the political verse, deriving from two separate colons, the one octosyllabic; the other heptasyllabic".[68] Indeed, enjambment between the first and the second colon hardly occurs, which points to the autonomy of two metrical cola. As such, I take the relatively independent colon rather than the verse as norm for metrical (in)correctness.

Table 1

Metrically correct or metrically incorrect colon?	Total number of cola in which OCP significantly differs in H and P: 323

---

67 Lauxtermann, The spring of rhythm (as footnote 2 above); cf. 2.
68 Ibid. 18.

Metrically incorrect colon: hypo- or hypermetrical	27
Metrically incorrect colon: deviate accentuation pattern	33
Metrically correct colon	263

4.4.2.2. Exclusion of hyper- and hypometrical cola

The most straightforward cases of metrical errors are cola in which the required number of syllables is not respected. The colon can either contain too many (hypermetrical) or too few (hypometrical) syllables. In the following example, the second colon of H contains eight syllables instead of seven:

> 5. H 249 νὰ ἔχω βουλὴν κι ἀπολογίαν # τὸ <u>τί</u> <u>μὲ</u> **θέλουν** ὁρίσει

The following example is also excluded from my analysis, since the first colon of P is hypometrical: seven syllables instead of the required eight:

> 6. P 8211 τὸ <u>πῶς</u> <u>τὸν</u> **παρακαλῶ** # νὰ ὁρίση, νὰ μὲ δώσουν

4.4.2.3. Exclusion of cola with a deviant accentuation pattern

It has been mentioned that the πολιτικὸς στίχος has an iambic pattern, which means that only the even syllables can be accented (cf. 2). However, the first and the ninth syllable, i.e. the first syllable of each colon, are also allowed to carry an accent.[69] This fact further confirms the above mentioned autonomy of the two cola. Consequently, I have only excluded those cola in which the accent of a lexical word occurs at an uneven syllable, except the first and the ninth. The addition "of a lexical word" is a necessary one, since "mots accessoires" should not be taken into account when considering the accentuation pattern: "l'accent des mots 'synnomes' n'ayant aucune valeur métrique".[70] This category of "mots synnomes" includes conjunctions, prepositions, definite articles, particles, OCPs and some demonstratives.[71][72] Thus, the accent on the fifth syllable in the follow-

---

69 P. APOSTOLOPOULOS, La Langue du Roman Byzantin Callimaque et Chrysorrhoé. Athens 1984, 214.
70 Ibid.
71 Ibid. 37.

ing example does not play a role, since the accent on the OCP τούς is irrelevant with regard to the accentuation pattern:

7. P 2955 καὶ <u>προνοῖες</u> <u>τοὺς</u> **ἔδωκε** # στὸ μέρος τῶν Βατίκων

It is because of the accent on its third syllable (προ<u>νο</u>ῖες) that this example is excluded from my analysis. However, I must admit that an accented third, fifth or eleventh syllable are not that unusual in the πολιτικὸς στίχος, as is implied by the following citation of Jeffreys:[73] "a political verse must have 15 pronounced syllables with a break after 8. The only invariable rules are the stress-accents on 14 and *either* on 6 *or* 8. There are no stresses on 7, 13 and 15, except occasionally on unimportant words (articles, pronouns, prepositions, etc.) at 7 and 13".

In general, the mistakes concerning accentuation pattern are less heavy mistakes than those concerning the number of the syllables; they may even sometimes be no true "errors". As tape recordings are not preserved, we are left with the manuscripts and thus depend on the orthography to judge the metrical correctness of the verse. It is very plausible that the verses in this section sounded metrically perfectly in an oral performance (cf. 2), but that the scribe put the accent in a wrong place. This might well be the case in the above example: προνοῖες (3rd syllable accented) instead of πρόνοιες (2nd syllable accented), as the noun is accentuated in Modern Greek. As such, some examples presumably illustrate the discrepancy between the spelling convention and the real pronunciation: "Perhaps the most striking feature here is the mismatch between the colloquial pronunciation required to meet the demands of the metre … and the conservative orthography which, if taken seriously, would produce many inmetrical lines".[74] Although we can thus expect that "eine Anzahl metrischer Unregelmäßigkeiten sich als Divergenzen zwischen dem geschriebenen und dem gespro-

---

72 It has been noted that accents on particles are of an artificial nature, cf. J. WACKERNAGEL, Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1 (1892) 333–446: 377; B. LAUM, Das alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem unter Zugrundelegung der theoretischen Lehren der Grammatiker und mit Heranziehung der praktischen Verwendung in den Papyri. Paderborn 1928; and J. NORET / C. DE VOCHT, Une orthographe insolite et nuancé, celle de Nicéphore Blemmyde, ou à propos du δέ enclitique. *Byzantion* 55 (1985/86) 493–505. If OCPs appear postverbal, they do not receive an accent. This fact confirms that the accent on OCPs is of a conventional nature.
73 M. JEFFREYS, The nature and origins of the political verse. *DOP* 28 (1974) 141–195: 148 note 11.
74 HORROCKS, Greek (as footnote 14 above) 353.

chenen Wort erklären",[75] I have decided not to include in my analysis those examples metrically deviating from (what is considered) the standard pattern for the sake of convenience.[76]

4.4.2.4. Metrical flexibility

As a matter of fact, the πολιτικὸς στίχος does not impose many metrical constraints and thus does not constitute a rigid metrical system. On the contrary, the πολιτικὸς στίχος allows a lot of what can be called "metrical flexibility": "Es läßt sich nur ein Minimum an Regeln für diesen Vers aufstellen"[77]. To begin with, not *every* even syllable must of course carry an accent, as we have already seen in the examples: "La possibilité de l'accent métrique de ne pas frapper les mêmes syllabes accentuables offre sans aucun doute au décapentasyllabe byzantin une certain marge de souplesse rythmique".[78]

Moreover, as in ancient metres, elision and hiatus are very frequently used strategies to fit the metrical requirements. Not all cola containing more verses than the required number of eight or seven syllables are thus automatically excluded. The following contrastive pair is very suitable for illustrating elision and its "counterpart" hiatus:

> 8. H 318 τὸ ὅσον ποιήσῃ νὰ στερχτοῦν, # <u>νὰ</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἔχουσιν πληρώνει.**
> P τὸ ὅτι ποιήσῃ νὰ στρεχτοῦν # καὶ <u>νὰ</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἐκπληρώσουν.**

At first sight –or better: count–, the second colon of H contains eight syllables. However, if we assume an elision takes place between τό and ἔχουσιν, this colon satisfies the required number of seven syllables. In P, on the other hand, a hiatus must occur between τό and ἐκπληρώσουν in order to "save" the number of seven syllables.

---

75 Moennig, Die Erzählung (as footnote 55 above) 157.

76 Cf. "Zudem kann man davon ausgehen, daß metrische Unregelmäßigkeiten im mündlichen Vortrag, für den die Texte geschrieben waren, in einem gewissen Maße ausgeglichen werden konnten" (Moennig, Die Erzählung, as footnote 54 above, 212; cf. A. Kambylis, Textkritik und Metrik, *BZ* 88 (1995) 38–67: pages 52–55 specifically deal with the Chronicle.

77 Beck, Volksliteratur (as above footnote 1) 15.

78 Apostolopoulos, La Langue (as footnote 69 above) 222. – Cf. T. Lendari, Livistros and Rodamne. The Vatican Version. *Βυζαντινὴ καὶ Νεοελληνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, 10. Athens 2007, 128: there exists "a wide variety of rhythmical variation of stress on the even syllables of a metrical line".

Synizesis of *i* and *e* with a following vowel is another common strategy to maintain the required number of syllables:[79]

9. H 6550 ἃς ἔχω εἴδησιν μικρὴν # κ' εὐθέως <u>νὰ</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **ἀποστείλω.**
   P ἃς ἔχω εἴδησιν μικρὴν # εὐθέως <u>νὰ</u> <u>τὰ</u> **στείλω.**

In P the adverb εὐθέως contains three separate syllables, while in H the ε and ω must be pronounced as one sole vowel (= synizesis).[80]

Moreover, these metrical phenomena are not only important to achieve the correct number of syllables, but also to get the *right* (i. e. even) syllable accented, for instance:

10. H 6495 κ' ἐζήτησέ του ἀπολογίαν # ν' ἀπέλθη στὸν Μορέαν

Synizesis takes place in ἀπολογίαν to get the eighth syllable accentuated. In Μορέαν, on the other hand, synizesis does not occur, as the fourteenth syllable needs to carry the accent. Normally, synizesis is indicated by a shift of the accent, so we would have expected ἀπολογιάν instead of ἀπολογίαν.[81] This deviant accentuation pattern is actually due to the ancient spelling conventions to which the scribe is striving at (cf. 4.4.2.3). However, this phenomenon is so frequent and so well-documented that I do not consider it a metrical mistake with regard to the accentuation pattern: "metrical synizesis, unlike grammatical synizesis, does not necessarily involve accent shift".[82]

This quotation of Lendari points to the fact that synizesis – and by extension also elision – cannot be considered a purely metrical phenomenon, as it is typical of Modern Greek phonology: "in many, even rather late manuscripts of vernacular texts the accent is placed on the first of two consecutive vowels, while we know that in the spoken language they had been synizesised long before (e. g. Συρία–Συριά, καρδία–καρδιά)".[83] Keeping this at the back of our mind, we can conclude that the metrical structure itself, which is of course inextricably connected with phonology, provides a first crucial source of flexibility in the form of elision/hiatus and synizesis.

---

79 Cf. Browning, Medieval and Modern Greek (as above footnote 6) 77; cf. Apostolopoulos, La Langue (as footnote 69 above) 14; Lendari, ibid. 130; Hinterberger, How should we define vernacular literature? (as footnote 4 above) 8.
80 Note that elision takes place between τοῦ and ἀποστείλω in H.
81 Browning, Medieval and Modern Greek (as above footnote 6) 77.
82 Lendari, Livistros (as footnote 78 above) 130 note 5.
83 Hinterberger, How should we define vernacular literature? (as footnote 4 above) 8.

4.4.2.5. Four-part classification

After leaving out the metrically "deviant" examples, I have attempted to stream-line the relevant parallel pairs by tentatively dividing them into four main cate-gories. First, in a number of cases, a preverbal OCP in H becomes postverbal in P (or vice versa) because the element before the verb, which triggers the OCP into preverbal position, has been moved (4.4.3.1.1), replaced by another structure (4.4.3.1.2), or simply deleted (4.4.3.1.3). I have gathered these examples under the section "structural difference" (4.4.3.1).

In my second category, the poet of P has replaced H's preverbal trigger by a different element, which, however, also belongs to one of the three triggering cat-egories (function word, preferential word or ad hoc emphasized element, cf. 4.1). As expected, the OCP then remains preverbal (4.4.3.2). In the third section, the preverbal trigger is the same in H and P, but its position has slightly changed and – with it – the position of the OCP: the OCP now occurs at a different sylla-ble. I have also included pairs in which *post*verbal OCPs occupy a different syl-lable (4.4.3.3).

Finally, in the fourth section, the triggering element also stays the same, but the OCP alternates between pre- and postverbal position (4.4.3.4).

The first and second category primarily confirm that the distribution of OCPs is not subject to (metrical) arbitrariness, but generally obeys the outlined rules. The third and the fourth category especially prove that the πολιτικὸς στίχος poet has the freedom to make certain alternations without disrupting the metrical structure.

The phrase "make certain alternations" mistakenly may imply the idea that the poet of P consciously rewrites H. As mentioned, however, no evidence exists that the poet of P has the version of H at his disposal (cf. 4.4.1). Therefore, the term "difference"" is a more appropriate term than "change" to describe the dis-similarities between the parallel pairs. However, it is almost impossible to com-pare two things without using words which imply an active author, such as "re-place", "move", "omit", etc.

As all these parallel pairs involve a certain rearrangement, they provide us with an ideal circumstance to observe the various means to fit the verse structure and will thus reveal recurring sources of flexibility. We will find variation on all levels of grammar: phonology (cf. metrical variation), lexicon, morphology and syntax.

Table 3

Type of difference	Total metrically correct cola with a significant difference between H and P: 263
1. Structural difference; different position	42
2. Similar preverbal trigger; same position	110
3. Same (lack) of preverbal trigger; different syllable	102
4. Same preverbal trigger; different position	9

4.4.3. Analysis parallel pairs

4.4.3.1. Structural difference; different position

4.4.3.1.1. Movement of the preverbal trigger

I start my analysis with parallel pairs in which the difference is primarily of a syntactic nature: a change in word order. To begin with, the preverbal trigger can be moved to a position after the verb and consequently the OCP exchanges its preverbal position for a postverbal one, in accordance with the outlined rules (cf. 4.1), for instance:

> 11. H 7804 τὸ πνεῦμα του ἐπαρέδωκεν # κι **ἀπῆραν** <u>το</u> <u>οἱ ἄγγέλοι</u>
>   P τὸ πνεῦμα του ἐπαρέδωκεν,# <u>οἱ ἄγγελοι</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἐπῆραν**
> 12. H 4222 "Πρίγκιπα, ἐσὺ θεωρεῖς # κ' **ἐβλέπεις** <u>το</u> <u>ἀτός σου</u>
>   P "Πρίγκιπα, ἐσὺ θεωρεῖς, # <u>ἀτός σου</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἐβλέπεις**

We find metrical/phonological, lexical and morphological differences which allow to maintain the correctness of the verse structure. The following contrastive pairs provide good examples:

> 13. H 2647 ἐπεὶν τὰ εἶχαν καὶ κρατοῦν # <u>ἀπὸ τὸν Πάπαν</u> <u>τὰ</u> **εἶχαν.**
>   P ὅτι τὰ εἶχαν καὶ κρατοῦν, # **εἶχαν** <u>τα</u> <u>ἐκ τὸν Πάπαν</u>.

In P, a hiatus occurs between τα and ἐκ instead of the elision between τὰ and εἶχαν in H. Moreover, the preposition ἀπό has undergone a lexical change: it has been replaced by its synonym ἐκ.

14. H 6566 <u>πολλὰ</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **ἐφάνη** ὀνόστιμον, # ἐχάρην το μεγάλως
     P **ἐφάνη** <u>του</u> <u>πολλὰ</u> καλόν, # ἐχάρηκε μεγάλως

In P, the adjective καλόν is used instead of ὀνόστιμον, which has a similar meaning ("good"). The change in word order results in the omission of the elision between τοῦ and ἐφάνη.

15. H 4462 τὴν Μάϊνην καὶ τὸν Μυζηθρᾶ, # <u>ἐκεῖνος</u> γὰρ <u>τὰ</u> **ἐποιῆσεν**
     P τῆς Μάνης μὲ τὸν Μηζηθρᾶ # **ἔχτισέν** <u>τα</u> <u>ἐκεῖνος</u>

In P, the particle γάρ is deleted. Therefore, a hiatus occurs between τα and ἐκεῖνος, while in H elision takes place between τά and ἐποιῆσεν. The verb ποιέω ("to do") is replaced by the more concrete χτίζω, meaning "to build".

16. H 5320 Γίνωσκε, ἀφέντη βασιλέα, # **κράτει** <u>το</u> <u>ἀπ' ἐμέναν</u>
     P Γίνωσκε, ἀφέντη πρίγκιπα, # <u>ἀπὸ ἐμᾶς</u> <u>τὸ</u> **κράτειε**

In P, ἐμέναν is shortened into ἐμᾶς. This is a morphological difference, since ἐμέναν refers to the first person singular, while ἐμᾶς is a plural pronoun. A hiatus now occurs between ἀπό and ἐμᾶς, instead of the (written) elision between ἀπ' and ἐμέναν.

4.4.3.1.2. Replacement of the structure

The following pairs do not involve a movement, but a replacement of the syntactic structure:

17. H 715 Καὶ ἄλλο πάλε σᾶς λαλῶ, # **πληροφορέθητέ** <u>το</u>
     P Κι ἄλλο πάλιν ἠξεύρετε, # <u>πληροφορίαν</u> <u>σᾶς</u> **λέγω**

In P, the verb πληροφορέω is subdivided into the rather weakly used verb λέγω and the object πληροφορίαν. Since this object constitutes the most important information, it is emphasized and as such attracts the OCP into preverbal position.[84]

However, the most common type of this "replacement structure" is when the articular infinitive is substituted by a temporal clause introduced by the function word ὡς. As mentioned above (cf. 4.1), postverbal OCPs are the norm after the

---

84 Note that the OCP refers to something totally different in P (σᾶς instead of το).

infinitive, whereas the second construction –with the function word– requires preverbal OCPs, for instance:[85]

> 18. H 6335 **Τὸ ἀκούσει** <u>το</u> ὁ πρίγκιπας # κ' ἐκεῖνοι τῆς βουλῆς του
> P <u>Ὡς</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἤκουσεν** ὁ πρίγκιπας # κ' ἐκεῖνοι τῆς βουλῆς του

Once, such a temporal clause replaces the gerund, which is also associated with postverbal OCPs, as in Standard Modern Greek:

> 19. H 351 **Ἀκούσοντά** <u>το</u> οἱ ἄρχοντες, οἱ πρῶτοι τῆς Βενετίας
> P 351 <u>Ὡς</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἤκουσαν** οἱ ἄρχοντες τῆς Βενετίας οἱ πρῶτοι

4.4.3.1.3. Deletion of the preverbal trigger

If the preverbal trigger is deleted, we expect the OCP to become postverbal. In the next examples, the function word is omitted:

> 20. H 1618 ὡς φρόνιμους <u>ποῦ</u> <u>σᾶς</u> **θεωρῶ** # πληροφορίαν σᾶς λέγω
> P **ὁρῶ** <u>σας</u> γὰρ ὡς φρόνιμους # καὶ καθαρὰ σᾶς λέγω

In this example, a synonym is used: θεωρῶ has exactly the same meaning as ὁρῶ.

A preferential word/ad hoc emphasized constituent can also be omitted:

> 21. H 7075 καὶ ἄλλοι φίλους εἴχασιν # καὶ **ὡδηγέψανέ** <u>τους.</u>
> P καὶ ἄλλοι εἶχαν φίλους τους # κι <u>αὐτοὶ</u> <u>τοὺς</u> **ὡδηγέψαν.**

Note the slight difference between ὡδηγέψανέ-ὡδηγέψαν. Rather than a morphological difference, this is a phonological difference, which continues to exist in Standard Modern Greek.[86] Because end -ν has become labile, a final ε is added in order to keep the personal ending distinctive.[87] Together with the hiatus between καί and ὡδηγέψανέ, this addition helps to obtain the fixed number of seven syllables.

> 22. H 1700 τὰ τριπουτσέτα ἐστήσασιν # κ' <u>ἐκεῖ</u> <u>τοὺς</u> **ἐσυχνάσαν**
> P τὰ τριμπουτζέτα ἔστησαν # καὶ **ἐσυχνάσασίν** <u>τους</u>

---

85 Cf. 1196, 5785, 6069, 6096, 6506, 7135, 7166, 7194, 8406, 8707, 8687.

86 Cf. Mackridge, Modern Greek (as footnote 15 above) 582: "The third person plural displays an alternation, typical of SMGk [Standard Modern Greek; JS], between a more formal (without -ε) and a more colloquial (with -ε) form".

87 Browning, Medieval and Modern Greek (as above footnote 6) 81.

Here, a morphological difference is found. The verb ἐσυχνάσαν is lengthened to ἐσυχνάσασιν. The ending -σιν doublemarks the third person plural. Note that in the first colon, the reverse happens: ἐστήσασιν is shortened to ἔστησαν.

> 23. H 619 εἰς τὸ σπαθὶ τοὺς ἔβαλαν, # <u>ὅλους</u> <u>τοὺς</u> **ἀπεκτεῖναν.**
>   P εἰς τὸ σπαθὶ τοὺς ἔβαλαν # καὶ **ἐκατέκοψάν** <u>τους.</u>

In these verses, the verb is subject to lexical variation: ἀποκτείνω is replaced by its synonym κατακόπτω.

In sum, this first main category not only provides strong evidence of the validity of the outlined rules, but also demonstrates the flexibility of the πολιτικὸς στίχος from a metrical/phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactic perspective. We will see that these sources of variation recur in all the other categories.

4.4.3.2. Similar preverbal trigger; same position

My second main category especially confirms the observation that the nature of the word immediately preceding the verb is crucial with regard to the position of the OCP (cf. 4.1). In the following examples, the OCP remains in preverbal position, while its preverbal trigger is replaced by an element with the same force of attraction.

> 24. H 426 τὴν Τσάραν, ποῦ εἰς τὴν Σκλαβουνίαν # <u>ἐνῶ</u> <u>μᾶς</u> **ροβολεύει**
>   P τὴν Τσάρα, ὅπου εἰς τὴν Σκλαβουνίαν # <u>ὅπου</u> <u>μᾶς</u> **ροβελέψη**

Both the temporal conjunction ἐνῷ and the relative pronoun ὅπου belong to the class of function words.

> 25. H 8395 εἰπέτε του εἰς πληροφορίαν # <u>ἂς</u> <u>τὸ</u> **κρατῇ** εἰς ἀλήθειον
>   P εἰπέ τον εἰς πληροφορία # <u>νὰ</u> <u>τὸ</u> **κρατῇ** στερέα

Note the use of the (quasi-)synonyms εἰς ἀλήθειον-στερέα. In H, elision takes place between κρατῇ and εἰς, so that the second colon does not contain more than seven syllables.

> 26. H 5793 Κι ὁ ρῆγας τοῦ ἀποκρίθηκεν, # <u>τὰ ἐτέτοια</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **ἐλάλει**
>   P Κι ὁ ρῆγας ἀπεκρίθηκεν, # <u>οὕτως</u> <u>τὸν</u> **συντυχαίνει**

The verbs in H and P are synonyms: both λαλέω and συντυχαίνω mean "to speak".

27. H 459 Ὁ ῥήγας γάρ, ὡς τὸ ἤκουσεν, # <u>μεγάλως</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἐλυπήθην**
    P Κι ὁ ῥήγας, ὡς τὸ ἤκουσεν, # <u>πολλὰ</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἐλυπήθην**

Note that elision (H) alternates with hiatus (P).

28. H 6305 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν πρίγκιπα,# <u>τέτοιαν βουλὴν</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **δίδει**
    P καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν πρίγκιπαν, # <u>οὕτως</u> <u>τὸν</u> **συμβουλεύει**

This example reminds us of the pairs with a syntactic difference, namely a verb (συμβουλεύει) which is split up into an emphasized object (βουλήν) and a weakly used verb (δίδει) (cf. 4.4.3.1.2).

29. H 3114 μεγάλως τὸ ἐλυπήθηκεν # κ' <u>εἰς σφόδρα</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἐδειλιάσεν.**
    P μεγάλως ἐλυπήθηκεν, # <u>δειλία</u> <u>τὸν</u> **ἐπῆρεν.**

The same applies to this pair: δειλιάζω ("to quail") is divided into the emphasized object δειλία ("fear") and the weakly used verb ἐπαίρνω ("to take"). In H, ἐδειλιάσεν is reinforced by εἰς σφόδρα, which is – just like δειλία in P – emphasized and is thus responsible for the preverbal position of the OCP.

30. H 6336 ὅλοι τὸ ἀγαπήσασιν # κ' <u>εἰς σφόδρα</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἐπαινέσαν.**
    P ὅλοι τὸ ἠγαπήσασιν, # <u>πολλὰ</u> <u>τὸν</u> **ἐπαινέσαν.**

Here the ad hoc emphasized prepositional phrase εἰς σφόδρα is replaced by the preferential adverb πολλά. By using the OCP τόν instead of τό, elision with ἐπαινέσαν is prevented in P.

4.4.3.3. Same (lack of) preverbal trigger; different syllable

In the third main category, the potential preverbal trigger is the same in H and P, but its position differs and – with it – the position of the OCP, which now occupies a different syllable (4.4.3.3.1). I have also included pairs in which postverbal OCPs occupy a different syllable (4.4.3.3.2).[88]

4.4.3.3.1. Preverbal OCPs

In many examples, the slightly different position of the OCP is caused by the loss/supplement of a small word such as the definite article, a particle or καί.

---

88 Remember that the accent of OCPs, being "mots synnomes", is not relevant with regard to the accentuation pattern (cf. 4.4.2.3).

Usually, this loss/addition of one sole syllable is compensated by metrical/phonological means:[89]

> 31. H 2850 Τὸ ἀκούσει το ὁ πρίγκιπας, # <u>μεγάλως</u> γὰρ <u>τὸ</u> **ἐχάρη** (13)[90]
>   P Τὸ ἀκούσει το ὁ πρίγκιπας, # <u>μεγάλως</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ἐχάρη** (12)[91]

Because of the deletion of the particle γάρ in P, elision no longer occurs between τό and ἐχάρη. Naturally, there is now a hiatus.

> 32. H 5426 λέγει του· "Ἔλθε μετὰ μὲ # καὶ <u>νὰ</u> <u>σὲ</u> **δείξω** ποῦ εἶναι." (11)
>   P λέγει τον· "Ἔλα μετ' ἐμὲν # ποῦ ἔναι <u>νὰ</u> <u>σὲ</u> **δείξω**." (13)

In H, elision affects ποῦ and ἔναι; in P, a hiatus occurs between the same words because of the "lack" of the one-syllable word καί. Note that this is also a true example of a syntactic difference, since the order of the constituents (the clauses νὰ σὲ δείξω and ποῦ εἶναι) has been changed.

The annulment of synizesis is another way to cope with one extra syllable:

> 33. H 2512 Τόσα τὸν ἀναγκάσασιν # καὶ <u>τόσα</u> <u>τὸν</u> **ἐβίασαν** (12)
>   P Τόσο τὸν ἀναγκάσασι, # <u>τόσο</u> <u>τὸν</u> **ἐβιάζαν** (11)

As the change of accent signals, the synizesis in ἐβιάζαν is made undone in P.

The deletion/addition of a small word is also often compensated by morphological means, as in the next example in which the ending of the verb has changed: -σιν has lengthened into -σασι (cf. 4.4.3.1.3):

> 34. H 3220 <u>ὅπου</u> γὰρ <u>τὸν</u> **ἐτρέμασιν** # 'ς ὅλην τὴν Ρωμανίαν (4)
>   P <u>ὅπου</u> <u>τὸν</u> **ἐτρεμάσασι** # 'ς ὅλην τὴν Ρωμανίαν (3)

More well-known and more widespread pairs of endings in Medieval Greek are the variants -ουν and -ουσι (present) and -αν and -ασι (imperfect and aorist),[92] for instance:[93]

> 35. H 2665 <u>νὰ</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **βοηθήσουν** κἂν ποσῶς # στὴν μάχην ὅπου εἶχεν. (2)

---

89 Cf. 3389, 4539.

90 Between brackets, I have added the syllable at which the OCP occurs.

91 Cf. 3242.

92 Browning, Medieval and Modern Greek (as above footnote 6) 81.

93 As mentioned, an -ε could be added to -ουν and -αν in order to keep the personal ending distinctive, since the final -ν is sometimes omitted (Browning, Medieval and Modern Greek, as above footnote 6, 81).

P πῶς <u>νὰ</u> <u>τὸν</u> **βοηθήσουσιν** # στὴν μάχην ὅπου ἔχει. (3)

With regard to the issue whether both forms actually belong to the spoken language, Browning writes:[94] "The language of the vernacular texts shows some uncertainty in regard to personal endings, forms which today either belong to different dialects or are found co-existing only in certain aberrant dialects used side by side". Hinterberger shares the opinion that both forms are genuine and must have been in parallel use:[95] "Also the apparently archaizing verb endings -ουσιν and -ασιν were also used in medieval spoken language as they are today e. g. in Cypriot Greek, besides the 'normal' endings -ουν and -αν". This opinion is corroborated by the observation that the same alternation occurs in prose texts: "In fast allen Prosatexten finden wir dasselbe Schwanken der Verbalendung der 3. Ps. Pl. Präsens Indikativ und Konjunktiv, sowie Konjunktiv Aorist auf -ουσιν/-ωσιν und -ουν".[96]

However, the difference in verb endings is not the only morphological variation in the above example. The alternation between genitive (H) and accusative OCP (P) must also be noted. Both cases can be used to replace the extinct dative and thus to express the indirect object.[97]

The flexibility with regard to endings and cases can be considered aspects of inflectional morphology. However, derivational morphology also offers many possibilities. In the next example, for instance, a prefix is added to the verb in H, as H does not contain the particle γάρ:

36. H 1441 <u>ὅλοι</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **ὑπωμόσασιν** # δοῦλοι του ν᾿ ἀποθάνουν. (3)
    P <u>ὅλοι</u> γὰρ <u>τοῦ</u> **ὠμόσασιν** # δοῦλοι του ν᾿ ἀποθάνουν. (4)

---

94 Browning, Medieval and Modern Greek (as above footnote 6) 81.

95 Hinterberger, How should we define vernacular literature? (as footnote 4 above) 4.

96 Hinterberger, Sprachliche Variationsformen (as footnote 5 above) 168; cf. Horrocks, Greek (as footnote 14 above) 318.

97 Cf. Browning, Medieval and Modern Greek (as above footnote 6) 58. – Cf. also E. Trapp, Der Dativ und der Ersatz seiner Funktionen in der byzantinischen Vulgärdichtung bis zur Mitte des 15. Jh. *JÖB* 14 (1965) 21 – 34; T. Lendari / I. Manolessou, Η εκφορά του έμμεσου αντικειμένου στα μεσαιωνικά ελληνικά. Γλωσσολογικά και εκδοτικά προβλήματα. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 23 (2003) 394 – 405; I. Manolessou / B. Stamatis, Syntactic Isoglosses in Modern Greek Dialects: The Case of the Indirect Object, in M. Janse / B. Joseph / A. Ralli (eds.), Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory. Patras 2006, 220 – 235. Note, however, that this distinction becomes geographically determined: the genitive is typical of Standard Modern Greek and the southern dialects, while the northern dialects prefer the accusative (Browning, Medieval and Modern Greek, as above footnote 6, 38).

Although I have excluded them from my statistics because of their supposed deviant accentuation pattern (cf. 4.4.2.3), the parallel pairs with the auxiliary ἔχω are quite interesting with regard to the future formation in Medieval Greek, for instance:

> 37. H 5991 νὰ πολεμήσῃ μετ' αὐτόν, # <u>νὰ</u> <u>τὸν</u> **ἔχῃ** **ἐξαλείψει** (10)
> P νὰ πολεμήσῃ μετ' αὐτὸν # καὶ <u>νὰ</u> <u>τὸν</u> **ἐξαλείψῃ** (11)

The periphrastic νά + ἔχω + infinitive (H) alternates with νά+subjunctive (P). The latter is generally said to constitute the more modern future construction, since the infinitive disappears during the Middle Ages.[98] The principal replacement of ἔχω + infinitive, though, is a periphrase with θέλω (+infinitive or +νά), which eventually results in the Modern Greek future particle θα.[99] It is thus obvious that "the formation of the future was in a state of flux" in Medieval Greek.[100]

As noted, the use of synonyms is also a very popular way to adjust to the metrical structure. Especially common verbs are easily replaced. In the first example, κράζω has become λαλέω:[101]

> 38. H 2182 <u>Ὁ δοῦκας</u> γὰρ <u>τὸν</u> **ἔκραξε** # ἐκεῖνον τὸν Ρουμπέρτον (5)
> P <u>Ὁ δοῦκας</u> <u>τὸν</u> **ἐλάλησεν** # ἐκεῖνον τὸν Ρουμπέρτον (4)

In the next example, the verb ἀφηγέομαι is changed into δείκνυμι:

> 39. H 6363 <u>λεπτῶς</u> <u>τοὺς</u> **ἀφηγήσετον** # τοῦ πρίγκιπος Μορέως (3)
> P <u>λεπτομερῶς</u> <u>τοὺς</u> **ἔδειξεν** # τοῦ πρίγκιπος τοὺς λόγους (5)

In many examples, the different syllable-position can be ascribed to a simple reordering of constituents:[102]

> 40. H 6686 οὐδὲν τὸ ἐστεργήθησαν # <u>νὰ</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ποιήσουν** οὕτως (10)
> P οὐδὲ ποσῶς τὸ ἔστρεξαν # οὕτως <u>νὰ</u> <u>τὸ</u> **ποιήσουν** (12)
> 41. H 2266 σκοπῶντα καὶ λογίζοντα, # τοῦ <u>νὰ</u> <u>τοὺς</u> **ἔχῃ** δούλους (11)
> P σκοπῶντας καὶ λογίζοντας # δούλους του <u>νὰ</u> <u>τοὺς</u> **ἔχῃ** (13)

---

98 B. D. Joseph, The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive: a study in areal, general, and historical linguistics. Cambridge 1983; Browning, Medieval and Modern Greek (as above footnote 6) 79.

99 Ibid. 79; cf. Th. Markopoulos, The future in Greek: from ancient to medieval. Oxford 2009.

100 Browning, Medieval and Modern Greek (as above footnote 6) 79.

101 Cf. 4986.

102 Cf. 7572.

Another recurring phenomenon is the subdivision of the verb into a weakly used verb and an object which represents the actual content (cf. 4.4.3.1.2):[103]

> 42. H 2627 κράζει τοὺς κεφαλᾶδες του # βουλὴν <u>νὰ</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **ἔχουν δώσει** (12)
> P λαλεῖ τοὺς κεφαλᾶδες του # ὡς <u>νὰ</u> <u>τὸν</u> **συμβουλέψουν** (11)

Note that this example also contains morphological differences, namely with regard to the case of the OCP and with regard to the future formation.

In the following example, we find both metrical/phonological and morphological differences:

> 43. H 3185 Κ' <u>ἐκεῖνος</u> γὰρ <u>τοῦ</u> **ἐχάρισεν** # τὸ ὀμάτζιο καὶ λιζίαν (5)
> P κ' <u>ἐκεῖνος</u> <u>τὸν</u> **ἐχάρισεν** # ὀμάτζιο καὶ λιζίαν (4)

The fact that another case – accusative instead of genitive – is used in P prevents elision between τόν and ἐχάρισεν. As such, the loss of one syllable, caused by the omission of γάρ, is compensated.

> 44. H 1646 τὴν ἀνθρωπέαν καὶ τὴν στρατείαν,# τόσον <u>νὰ</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **ἐνεμείνη** (12)
> P τὴν ἀνθρωπίαν καὶ τὴν στρατείαν # τόσην τὸ <u>νὰ</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **μένη** (13)

In P, elision between the OCP and the verb is prevented because the prefix ἐν is deleted.

In the following pair, a metrical/phonological difference is combined with a lexical one:

> 45. H 3809 <u>Λεπτῶς</u> <u>τὰ</u> **ἀφηγήσετον** # τοῦ Σεβαστοκρατόρου (3)
> P <u>Λεπτομερῶς</u> <u>τὰ</u> **ἐδήλωσεν** # τοῦ Σεβαστοκρατόρου (5)

In contrast to the hiatus in H, in P elision takes place between the OCP and the verb, which is a synonym of ἀφηγέομαι, namely δηλόω.[104]

In our last example, metrical/phonological, morphological and lexical differences co-exist:

> 46. H 8337 <u>Τὸ πρᾶγμα</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **ἀφηγήθησαν** # καὶ τὴν δημηγερσίαν (4)
> P <u>Τὸ πρᾶγμα</u> δὲ <u>τὸν</u> **εἴπασιν** # καὶ τὴν δημηγερσίαν (5)

In P we find another synonym of ἀφηγέομαι, namely λέγω (εἴπασιν). While in H elision takes place between the genitive OCP τοῦ and ἀφηγήθησαν, in P elision is

---

103 Cf. 3115, 9114.
104 Cf. 6363.

prevented by the accusative OCP τόν. P satisfies the required number of eight syllables thanks to the addition of the particle δέ.

4.4.3.3.2. Postverbal OCPs

Instead of on preverbal ones, this section concentrates on postverbal OCPs which occur at a different syllable in the two manuscripts.

> 47. H 8209 καὶ **λέγει** <u>του</u>· "Ἔπαρε φλασκί, # καὶ ἄμε εἰς τὸ κάστρον (4)
>   P **Λέγει** <u>του</u>· "Ἔπαρε φλασκί, # ἄγωμε εἰς τὸ κάστρον (3)

The loss of καί in P is compensated by a hiatus between του and ἔπαρε (instead of elision).

> 48. H 3879 καὶ **λέγει** <u>τον</u> χολιαστικά· # "Ἦτον καλὸν τὸ ἐποῖκες; (4)
>   P **λέγει** <u>του</u> χολιαστικά·# "Ἦτον καλὸ τὸ ἐποῖκες; (3)

In P, which does not contain the conjunction καί, no synizesis occurs in χολιαστικά.

> 49. H 3040 <ἐ>δούλωσε τὰ Σκλάβικα # κ' **εἶχεν** <u>τα</u> εἰς θέλημάν του (11)
>   P ἐδούλωσεν τὰ Σκλαβικὰ # κ' **ἐκατεδούλωσέ** <u>τα</u> (15)

The verb καταδουλόω has a stronger meaning, but in general the paraphrase ἔχω εἰς θέλημάν and καταδουλόω share the same semantics.

> 50. H 3423 τὸν ῥῆγαν τοῦ Σαλονικίου, # <u>νὰ</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **ποιήση** ὀμάντζιο (10)
>   P τὸν ῥῆγα Σαλονίκης δέ, # ὀμάντζιο <u>νὰ</u> <u>τοῦ</u> **ποίση** (13)

This pair involves a change in word order.

> 51. H 6939 Λοιπόν, **λέγω** <u>σε</u>, ἀφέντη μου,# ἂν θέλη ἡ βασιλεία σου (5)
>   P Λοιπόν, ἀφέντη, **λέγω** <u>σε</u>, # ἂν θέλη ἡ βασιλεία σου (8)

At first sight, this example also seems a case of mere reordering. However, when we invest it in detail, we find more than a sole syntactic difference. By altering the order of the constituents λέγω σε and ἀφέντη, elision is excluded in P. In order to fit the standard number of eight syllables, the (semantically unnecessary) personal pronoun μου is deleted.

In the following example, we find both metrical/phonological and morphological differences:

52. H 8395 **εἰπέτε** <u>του</u> εἰς πληροφορίαν # ἃς τὸ κρατῇ εἰς ἀλήθειον
    P **εἰπέ** <u>τον</u> εἰς πληροφορία # νὰ τὸ κρατῇ στερέα

As a result of the use of the accusative case (instead of the genitive), elision is excluded in P. Moreover, εἰπέτε has become singular: εἰπέ.

The next pair shows morphological and lexical differences:

53. H 4631 **κράζει καὶ λέγει** <u>του</u>· "Ἀδελφέ, # θέλω νὰ ὑπάῃς ἐνταῦτα (6)
    P **ἐλάλησέ** <u>τον</u>· "Ἀδελφέ, # θέλεις νὰ ὑπαγαίνῃς (5)

We observe the common replacement of the genitive (H) by the accusative (P) and the consequential exclusion of elision (P). More strikingly, the paratactic verbs in H, κράζει καὶ λέγει, are substituted by one synonym in P: ἐλάλησε.

Although less eye-catching, some differences between the two versions must be considered from a phonological perspective:

54. H 3799 "Ἀμέτε εἰς τὸν πρίγκιπα # κ' **εἰπέτε** <u>του</u> ἀπὸ ἐμέναν (12)
    P "Σύρετε εἰς τὸν πρίγκιπαν # **πέτε** <u>τον</u> ἀπὸ μένα (11)

In H, elision takes place twice. This metrical/phonological "intervention" is not necessary in P since it has two syllables less: the imperative εἰπέτε is replaced by its phonological variant πέτε, which has lost its initial syllable. Furthermore, the emphatic personal pronoun ἐμέναν is changed into its shorter morphological variant μένα.[105]

In the following instance, a phonological difference is found in combination with a lexical one:

55. H 8849 κι **ἀπόστειλάν** <u>τον</u> στὸν Μορέαν # ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν Ἀνδραβίδα (5)
    P κ' **ὑπῆγαν** <u>τον</u> εἰς τὸν Μορέαν # ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν Ἀνδραβίδαν (4)

The poet of P uses the verb ὑπῆγαν instead of its synonym ἀπόστειλαν. The modern contraction στόν is split up into its former parts: εἰς and τόν.

---

105 It must be noted that I do not deny that the choice for a certain *form* of an *emphatic* personal pronoun is influenced by the metre, cf. LENDARI, Livistros (as footnote 77 above) 107: "We have variant forms for the full set of occurrences, e. g. ἐμέ, ἐμέναν, ἐμένα(ν), ἐσέναν, ἐσέν, ἐσέ, σένα, σέναν, σέν. The choice of the particular form depends, in all probability, on the metrical position of the word"; cf. D.C. HESSELING, Das Personalpronomen der ersten und zweiten Person im Mittelgriechischen. *BZ* 1 (1892) 379–339: 379. In this article, however, it is my aim to prove that this is not the case with regard to the choice for the *distribution* of the object *clitic* pronouns.

We will see that in our last main category phonological variation plays an even more important role.

4.4.3.4. Same preverbal trigger; different position

In this category, I have collected the examples which constitute the most decisive proof that the position of OCPs is not influenced by metrical constraints. As mentioned, the force of attraction of preferential words and especially of ad hoc emphasized constituents is less strong than that of function words (cf. 4.1). That is why I have called it an *optional* pragmatic principle. In some parallel pairs in the Chronicle, we find a preverbal OCP in one manuscript, while in the other the OCP appears after the verb despite the presence of the *same* preverbal preferential word/ad hoc emphasized constituent. The following examples provide such contrastive pairs:

56. H 1300 <u>ἐκεῖ</u> **ἐπολεμοῦσαν** <u>τὸν</u> # οἱ Τοῦρκοι κ' οἱ Ρωμαῖοι.
    P <u>ἐκεῖ</u> <u>τὸν</u> **ἐπολέμησαν** # οἱ Τοῦρκοι κ' οἱ Ρωμαῖοι.
57. H 1713 τὸ σώσει <u>τὸ</u> **ἐπολέμησαν**, # ἀπὸ σπαθίου τὸ ἀπῆραν
    P τὸ σώσει **ἐπολεμῆσαν** <u>το</u>, ἀπὸ σπαθὶ τὸ ἐπῆραν

Apparently, the πολιτικὸς στίχος poets alternate without problem between preverbal and postverbal OCPs. With the phrase "without problem" I point to the fact that the metrical structure stays correct, whether the OCP appears postverbal or preverbal. An important means to fit the metrical structure recurring in the above examples is the possibility of changing the accent of the verb: ἐπολεμ<u>οῦ</u>σαν-ἐπολέμησαν and ἐπολέμησαν-ἐπολεμῆσαν.

As mentioned, postverbal position is still the norm in Medieval Greek if no preverbal trigger is present (cf. 4.1). In Standard Modern Greek, on the other hand, finite verbs always require preverbal OCPs.[106] It now seems that the Chronicle of Morea sometimes foreshadows this development. Whereas in other πολιτικὸς στίχος texts of this period OCPs almost never appear clause-initially (which often comes down to the beginning of the verse or the position immediately after the caesura[107]), the Chronicle contains a few preverbal OCPs despite the *lack* of a preverbal trigger: "Some exceptions to the rule that V[erb] + P [ostverbal OCP] is obligatory at the beginning of independent clauses are found

---

106 Cf. I. Philippaki-Warburton, Verb movement and clitics in modern Greek, in I. Philippaki-Warburton / K. Nicolaidis / M. Sifianou (eds.), Themes in Greek linguistics. Papers from the First International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Reading, September 1993. *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 117. Amsterdam 1994, 53–60.
107 Cf. the relative autonomy of the two metrical cola (cf. 4.4.2.1).

in the Chronicle of Morea".[108] I have found some pairs in which an (exceptional) preverbal OCP alternates with a postverbal one:

> 58. H 83 τοῦ κόσμου ὅλου οἱ ἅπαντες # **ἐκατηγόρησάν** <u>τον</u>.
>   P ὅλοι τοῦ κόσμου οἱ ἄνθρωποι # <u>τὸν</u> **ἐκατηγορῆσαν**.
> 59. H 7179 Κ' ἐκεῖνοι ὅπου τὸ ἐξεύρασιν # <u>τὸν</u> **ἐπληροφορέσαν**
>   P Κ' ἐκεῖνοι ὅπου ἤξευραν # **ἐπληροφόρησάν** <u>τον</u>

Again, the accent of the verb slightly differs: ἐκατηγόρησάν-ἐκατηγορῆσαν; ἐπληροφορέσαν-ἐπληροφόρησαν. Pappas also stresses this accentual "optionality":[109] "These verb-forms were interchangeable ... the poet was able to manipulate the accenting of the verb in order to keep the pronoun preverbal".

5. Conclusion

In this article, I hope to have shown that, despite its metrical nature, πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry can provide reliable evidence of linguistic phenomena. Its language strikes us as everyday: its iambic rhythm suits spoken Greek well and its idiom is vernacular. Furthermore, there is no doubt that the πολιτικὸς στίχος poetry must be considered against an oral background.

However, the most convincing evidence lies in its enormous flexibility. The available sources of flexibility are numerous and various, which I have illustrated by means of a case-study on the distribution of OCPs in two parallel manuscripts of the 14th century Chronicle of Morea. After filtering out those cola which deviate from (what is considered) the standard metrical pattern, I have subdivided the parallel pairs containing a significant difference into four categories: H differs from P with respect to (i) the structure in which the OCP appears; (ii) its preverbal trigger; (iii) the syllable at which the OCP occurs or (iv) its precise position with regard to the verb.

A comparison of the two manuscripts reveals so much variation in all grammatical domains that the poet can hardly have felt constrained by the verse structure. To begin with, the verse structure itself is far from rigid: not every even syllable has to be accented; even some uneven syllables can carry an accent and some words (so-called "mots synnomes") can be neglected with regard to the accentuation pattern. Moreover, elision, hiatus and synizesis are metrical/

---

108 MACKRIDGE, Editorial problem (as footnote 19 above) 333; note 2. – Cf. PAPPAS, Variation (as footnote 18 above) 87; CHILA-MARKOPOULOU, Review (as above footnote 37) 210; note 6.
109 PAPPAS, Variation (as footnote 18 above) 78 sq.

phonological phenomena which allow to "play" with the fixed number of eight and seven syllables per colon. The subtle change of the accent, in particular of common verbs, also constitutes an important phonological device to fit the metrical structure. Other recurring phenomena are the deletion/addition of final -ν and final -ε.

Morphology as well provides a good deal of "optionality": we encounter derivational differences such as the addition/deletion of a prefix, yet especially inflectional alternatives are popular. These include variation with regard to the endings, the formation of the future and the replacement of the old dative case. Lexical variation primarily amounts to the use of synonyms, whereas syntactic variation chiefly consists of changes in word order and modifications of constructions, such the replacement of a finite verb by a non-finite one and the subdivision of a verb into a strong object and a weakly used verb.

It might have become clear that "*metri causa*" is not a valuable argument to explain the position of an OCP: if the poet had wanted the reverse order, the many available alternatives would have enabled him to place the OCP in preverbal instead of postverbal position and vice versa. Or more generally: the πολιτικὸς στίχος provides such a high degree of flexibility that the poet can almost freely choose the formulation he wants, or better: a formulation that is correct according to the Medieval Greek grammar. As a consequence, it is justified to use πολιτικὸς στίχος data for the study of linguistic phenomena, which is a welcome methodological achievement given the scarcity of prose texts in this period.