CHAPTER THIRTY-SIX

Medieval and Early Modern Greek

David Holton and Io Manolessou

Introduction

Preliminaries

When Henry George Liddell died, Thomas Hardy wrote a light-hearted poem as a tribute to the lexicographers Liddell and Scott. He imagines Liddell musing on the enormity of the task and wondering:

> What could have led me to have blundered
> So far away from sound theology
> To dialects and etymology;
> Words, accents not to be breathed by men
> Of any country ever again!

Not true, of course. In fact, the subsequent history of the Greek language already extends over a longer period than that covered by *A Greek–English Lexicon*. The aim of the present chapter is to plot the development of the language from late antiquity to the early modern era. Two clarifications are immediately called for: first, we are concerned here with the evolving, non-learned language – the language of everyday communication – insofar as it is accessible via the surviving written texts, as opposed to the learned, archaizing language of scholars and littérateurs, which is the subject of ch. 35. The second clarification relates to the geographical spread of the language in this period, which coincides with neither that of Classical and *Koine* Greek nor that of the modern period. Greek-speaking areas grow and contract, partly following the fortunes of the Byzantine Empire. Thus, around 560 CE Greek must have been spoken (as a first or second language) throughout the southern Balkans, most of Asia Minor, and parts of southern Italy, Egypt, Palestine, and Syria (see map in Horrocks 1997a: 147). Areas that later came under Western or Turkish rule continued to be

Greek-speaking in our period, whereas the southeastern regions (Egypt, Palestine, Syria) ceased to be Greek-speaking when they were conquered by the Arabs. On the other hand, in the early modern period there are sizeable Greek-speaking diaspora communities in European cities such as Venice, Vienna, and Budapest. During this long period, the main metropolitan center and constant point of reference for the Greek-speaking Orthodox world is the city of Constantinople.

Chronological issues

In this and the following section we intend to discuss what we mean by "Medieval and Early Modern" Greek, first in chronological and then in linguistic terms.

The delimitation between the end of the *Koine* and the beginning of the medieval period has variously been set at around 300, 500, 600, or even 700 CE. The earliest limit is due to mainly historical considerations: 330 is the conventional start of the "Byzantine" period, corresponding to the foundation of Constantinople; many histories proper, and histories of literature or art, start there. The later datings also involve historical landmarks, such as the closing of Plato's Academy in Athens by Justinian (529, supposedly marking the end of "true" classical literature), the publication of the Justinianic laws known as the *Novellae* (535–, marking the "hellenization" of the Eastern Roman Empire through the replacement of Latin by Greek as the language of law and administration), and the conquest of Egypt by the Arabs (fall of Alexandria in 641, marking the end of available papyrological evidence for spoken Greek in the area, and any other area for that matter). Others draw the dividing line based more on literary criteria, such as the appearance of the first "Byzantine" texts, i.e., Christian chronicles and lives of saints (e.g., the *Historia Lausiaca*, fourth cent.), or the appearance of poetic works in which the classical metres have been influenced by the "new" stress-based accentual system of the language (Nonnus, fifth cent.).

Coming now to the end of the story, here again opinions are divided, and alternative chronological boundaries are proposed on the basis of historical, literary, and linguistic criteria. A very obvious, and frequently employed, *terminus* is 1453, the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans, which conventionally corresponds to the end of Byzantine history and literature. However, by 1453 most areas of the Greek-speaking world had been under Western or Ottoman rule for up to two and a half centuries. In 1453 Byzantine rule was limited to a very small area around Constantinople itself, Trebizond and part of the Peloponnese. Thus this date is merely symbolic and does not relate to linguistic realities. Alternative proposals include 1509, the date of publication of the first printed book in vernacular Greek (the *Apokopos* of Bergadis); 1669, the completion of the conquest of Crete by the Ottomans (putting an end to the flourishing Cretan Renaissance literature); or even 1821, the start of the war of independence that led to the establishment of the modern Greek state.

The medieval era thus covers, according to preference, between ten and fifteen centuries, making it arguably the longest period in the history of Greek. Its internal periodization is yet a third matter of controversy: some scholars believe it displays a fundamental linguistic unity rendering subdivision unnecessary, while for others it is possible to distinguish both linguistic and cultural/ideological differentiation between

sub-periods. Important internal landmarks are the twelfth century, during which vernacular literature starts to reappear after a considerable period of "silence," and the fifteenth century, when the disintegration of the Byzantine Empire through the Turkish conquest leaves more room for the development of local vernacular varieties, and prose (as opposed to verse) vernacular texts appear in significant quantity. In the course of the eighteenth century, we see the beginning of the ideological and political developments that will bring about the birth of the modern Greek nation-state and the emergence of a national language (see ch. 37).

The periodization adopted here does not ignore external (historical, literary, etc.) criteria, but gives more weight to internal (linguistic) ones on the basis of clusters of significant linguistic changes, which will be discussed below and presented in a summary table at the end of the chapter.

On the basis of the above discussion, the division employed is the following (with all dates approximate):

1. Early Medieval Greek (EMed.Gk) 500–1100
2. Late Medieval Greek (LMed.Gk) 1100–1500
3. Early Modern Greek (EMod.Gk) 1500–1700

Terminological issues

As stated above, this chapter is concerned with the evolution of Greek in everyday use. Naturally we have no access to the spoken language as such: we are entirely dependent on written texts. These texts are composed in a wide spectrum of linguistic levels, or *registers* (see ch. 20) according to their function, genre, intended readership, and the education of the writer. We can make a rough and ready division between *learned* (high) and *non-learned* (low) registers. The former make extensive use of linguistic features from older forms of Greek (see ch. 35), require a considerable degree of education on the part of the writer and reader, and are employed for literary, scholarly, or formal purposes. In non-learned registers, while some archaizing elements *may* occur (especially in morphology and lexis), mainly under the influence of ecclesiastical language, they tend to be sporadic rather than systematic. From a linguistic point of view, the main difference between the low and high registers is that only the former may be acquired as a native tongue through the mechanism of first-language acquisition, while the second is only accessible through instruction (Toufexis 2008).

The range of "low-register" texts is great – from dialect to a semi-formal mixed language – but it is through such texts that we can trace developments in the *vernacular*, if not the actual spoken language, the closest we can get to it via its written representation (on issues of terminology, see also Hinterberger 2006). Our use of the terms "vernacular," "Medieval," and "Early Modern" thus implies comparability with other European vernaculars of these historical periods.

Scholars, editors, and publishers from the sixteenth century onward have used various terms to refer to these non-learned registers: "vulgar Greek/grec vulgaire/Vulgärgriechisch," *lingua barbaro-graeca*, and *Romaic* (which, before Independence,

was the usual term in Greek: ρωμαίικα from the fact that in Byzantine times its speakers were Ρωμαῖοι, subjects of the Roman Empire).

Lastly, we should elucidate our use of *Byzantine* and *postclassical* in relation to language. "Byzantine Greek" can refer to any form of Greek used in a text written during the Byzantine era (330–1453) and within the empire's borders (or at least its sphere of influence), although some scholars would use the term only for the more learned, non-vernacular registers. However, the language of a vernacular text written in Crete or Cyprus in the fourteenth century is clearly not Byzantine Greek. "Postclassical" is an extremely broad term, indicating that a particular feature or development is located some time after the end of the Classical period, with possibly negative implications.

Linguistic Sources

Early Medieval Greek

As discussed elsewhere (chs 31 and 35), the later history of Greek can only be described in diglossic terms (even though the applicability of the term "diglossia" as understood by modern sociolinguistics is questionable for earlier periods of Greek): ever since the Atticist movement and until modern times, there is an ever-increasing rift between texts written in imitation of past linguistic forms, enjoying high prestige as well as educational and state support (ranging from the purest Classical Attic to a "simplified" administrative *Koine*), and texts written in the everyday spoken language of the period (ranging again from brief illiterate scrawls to literary prose and poetic works). For the first part of the early medieval period, evidence for spoken Greek comes principally from one area, Egypt, in the form of non-literary papyri (phonology and morphology discussed in Gignac 1976–81, syntactic description lacking). After the Arab conquest of the seventh century, however, this source rapidly disappears; furthermore, unfavorable historical conditions (Slav invasions, defensive and civil wars) led to a lowering of the educational and cultural level, and a corresponding radical diminution of literary production, to the point that one frequently speaks of a second "dark age" in the history of Greek (the first being the period twelfth to eighth cent. BCE).

As a result, the available sources for tracing the history of the language are hard to come by: the non-literary sources are almost exclusively inscriptions, which are fairly short and formulaic in character, published disparately in hundreds of archeological publications, and for which there exists no comprehensive linguistic description. Literary texts approaching the vernacular, in varying degrees, come in the following types (see Browning 1983: 55–6; Horrocks 1997a: 161–5): (i) chronicles, such as the *Chronographia* of Ioannes Malalas (sixth cent.), the anonymous *Chronicon Paschale* (seventh cent.); (ii) hagiographical texts, such as the works of Bishop Leontios of Neapolis, the *Life* of Patriarch Euthymius, *The Spiritual Meadow* of John Moschos; (iii) short poems (known as *acclamations*) and satirical songs in praise or derision of the emperor, transmitted by Byzantine historians (see Maas 1912); (iv) works by learned authors, but in a consciously simplified register, with conservative phonology

and morphology but considerably innovative syntax and vocabulary, such as the works of Emperor Constantine Porphyrogennetos, *De Caerimoniis* and *De Administrando Imperio* (tenth cent.), or the *Strategikon* of Kekaumenos (eleventh cent.).

The form of language appearing in these texts is of course not uniform – it varies according to period and genre. None of them can claim to be direct representations of everyday language, and the linguistic changes that will be discussed below are attested sporadically in them, and sometimes only indirectly, through hypercorrection. Furthermore, it is difficult to distinguish genuine changes datable to the period of the work's composition from changes datable several centuries later, when the manuscripts were copied.

Late Medieval Greek 1100–1500

The twelfth century is a landmark for the study of the later history of Greek, as it is mainly from this century onward that textual sources close to the spoken language appear again in comparative abundance. However, this statement needs qualification. The vernacular sources are for the most part literary (documentary sources such as letters, legal documents, etc. written in the vernacular are still quite scarce) and in verse (prose works such as historical and fictional narratives only appear at the very end of the period). Furthermore, even the most vernacular of texts contain some admixture of learned archaizing elements, since literacy involves some training in Ancient Greek. Additionally, the process of copying vernacular literature differed greatly from that of Classical literature, as there was no model standard language which the copyist needed to emulate and as the texts themselves were not treated as "fixed" entities to be meticulously preserved. This resulted in many different "versions" of the (usually anonymous) vernacular literary works, frequently quite divergent from one another.

Linguistic research in the language of medieval vernacular texts therefore requires careful distinction between what constitutes authentic usage of the period under examination and what can be attributed to either the influence of earlier literary language or the linguistic habits of a copyist one or more centuries removed from the original (see Manolessou 2008).

The most important of the available vernacular texts from this period (see Beck 1971) fall in the following categories: satirical "begging" poems known as the *Ptochoprodromika*, moralizing and didactic poems (the anonymous *Spaneas* and two poems by Michael Glykas), a few examples of heroic poetry such as the *Song of Armouris* and the "epic" *Digenis Akritis* (eleventh–twelfth cent.), verse romances, some of them original Greek creations (*Kallimachos and Chrysorrhoe, Livistros and Rodamne*) and some adaptations of Western romances (*Imberios and Margarona, Theseid, Achilleid*, *War of Troy*). Of particular importance is the verse *Chronicle of the Morea*, describing the Frankish conquest and rule of the Peloponnese, because of its length and relative independence from learned language.

Cyprus is a case apart, since from this area only there appear, at the end of this period (fifteenth cent.), two extensive prose chronicles, by Leontios Machairas and Georgios Boustronios. Cypriot literature is the first truly dialectal literature.

Early Modern Greek 1500–1700

A major help in the investigation of EMod.Gk is the appearance, from around 1550, of grammatical descriptions of the contemporary language (about fifteen in number; see Legrand 1874: 175–98). Although the phonological sections are somewhat sketchy, nominal and verbal morphology is treated in detail. Geographical variation in this period is more easily studied than in the previous one, due to the abundance of non-literary sources. However, their provenance is mainly from Venetian-occupied areas (Crete, Cyclades, Heptanese), while for the areas under Ottoman rule (Thessaly, Macedonia, Thrace) evidence is hard to come by.

Literary texts become more abundant in this period, again particularly from areas under Western European rule, although verse texts continue to outnumber prose; romance and other narrative works, popular texts of a religious or moralizing texts (some translated from Italian, such as the *Fior di Virtù*), and intralingual translations from Ancient Greek (*Iliad*, *Batrachomyomachia*) are the main text types we encounter. With the advent of printing, many of these texts enjoy wide circulation, from the early sixteenth century onward. From a linguistic point of view, there may well have been a tendency for editors and printers to prioritize texts that were not markedly dialectal, and perhaps even to eliminate dialectal features.

Two main areas of literary production can be identified in the early modern period: (i) Crete, where Renaissance influences are fruitfully assimilated, and comedy, tragedy, pastoral, and other genres are successfully cultivated by writers of the stature of Georgios Chortatsis and Vitsentzos Kornaros (Holton 1991) until the completion of the Ottoman conquest in 1669; (ii) the Heptanese (especially Corfu and Zakynthos), which enjoyed close relations with Venice.

Language Change in the Medieval Period

Phonology

Most of the changes that radically transformed Ancient Greek into its medieval and modern successor(s) had already taken place during the *Koine* period (see ch. 16), especially in the phonological domain. The only major phonological changes in EMed. Gk are: (i) the merger of /y/ and /i/ (dated around the ninth–tenth cent.), which resulted in the modern five-vowel system /a e o i u/; (ii) the appearance of the affricate phonemes /ts/ and /dz/ around the sixth century. A number of conditioned sound changes make their (sporadic) first appearance in this period, but never achieve full regularity, i.e., never encompass the totality of the vocabulary, in any period of Greek, due to the strong conservative influence of learned language (see Newton 1972 and Moysiadis 2005). Some of these are shown in table 36.1.

These changes achieve a certain degree of regularity in LMed.Gk: they appear in all the texts included in the sources discussed above, and with a quite high rate of frequency. Therefore, although it is rare to find a text in which the innovative form appears to the exclusion of the older, "unchanged" variant, in most cases it can

Table 36.1 Phonetic changes first appearing in Late Koine–Early Medieval Greek

	Change	*Example*
vowels	Deletion of unstressed initial vowels	ἡμέρα > μέρα, ὀφρύδιον > φρύδιν [iméra] > [méra], [ofrýðion] > [frýðin]
	/o/ > /u/ unstressed, adjacent to labial/velar	κοκκίον > κουκκίν, πωλῶ > πουλῶ [kocíon] > [kucín], [poló] > [puló]
	/i/ > /e/ unstressed, adjacent to liquid/nasal	κηρίον > κερίν, ὑπηρεσία > ὑπερεσία [ciríon] > [cerín], [ypiresía] > [yperesía]
consonants	Manner dissimilation of stops	πτωχός > φτωχός, ἔκτος > ἔχτος [ptoxós] > [ftoxós], [éktos] > [éxtos]
	Manner dissimilation of fricatives	φθονερός > φτονερός, ἐχθές > χτές [fθonerós] > [ftonerós], [exθés] > [xtés]
	Deletion of final /n/	τὸν λόγον > τὸ λόγο [ton lóγon] > [to lóγo]
	/l/ > /r/ before consonant	ἀδελφός > ἀδερφός, τολμῶ > τορμῶ [aðelfós] > [aðerfós], [tolmó] > [tormó]

be assumed that in spoken language the change has been established, and the unchanged forms are a result of learned influence (see Manolessou and Toufexis, 2009).

In EMod.Gk, the most important phenomenon in the phonological domain are some changes which constitute major isoglosses within Greek, and serve to distinguish between the various dialects (see Trudgill 2003 and Newton 1972 for Modern Greek dialectal phonology). Unfortunately, there is insufficient information concerning their emergence, which must date at least to the previous period; however, evidence for them becomes sufficient only in this era.

The foremost dialectal phonological phenomenon is the so-called "northern vocalism," which affects unstressed mid and high vowels, raising the first and deleting the second (on vowel phonology, see also tables 7.7–8 and fig. 7.1). Thus (i) /e/ > /i/ and /o/ > /u/ and (ii) /i/ and /u/ > ∅. The phenomenon affects northern Greek-speaking areas and forms the basic isogloss dividing Modern Greek in two groups, northern and southern. Some scholars claim that it can be traced as far back as the end of the *Koine* period (e.g., Panayotou 1992a, on the basis of inscriptions from Macedonia). The examples are few for the LMed.Gk period but become numerous in EMod.Gk. (Note that the abbreviations of medieval Greek texts cited below refer to the list at the end of this chapter.)

ὄριξιν (< ὄρεξιν) (*Chr.Tocc.* 2684)

ἀρσινικόν (< ἀρσενικόν) (document from Athos, thirteenth cent.)

δίδου (< δίδω) καὶ ἐγὼ (document from Skyros, sixteenth cent.)

A second dialectal feature is the strong palatalization of velar consonants, which affects southern dialects (Crete, Cyprus, Dodecanese, parts of the Peloponnese). The earliest (LMed.Gk) examples come from Cyprus, and other areas display the phenomenon only in EMod.Gk times:

ψυχικόν > ψυσικόν [psiçikón] > [psiʃikón] (Mach. 224.9)

κόκκινο > κότζινο [kókino] > [kótsino] (document from Peloponnese; 1688)

Morphology and Syntax

In the morphological and syntactic domain, it is difficult to follow evolutions, as they are often obscured by the consciously archaizing form of the texts. The nominal and verbal system, however, must have been radically restructured, and at least the following changes are evident.

Loss of grammatical categories

a) The *dative case* is replaced by the genitive or accusative (Humbert 1930, Lendari and Manolessou 2003; see also ch. 16) in the function of indirect object and various personal uses (ethical, personal gain, etc.). The change starts from clitic forms of personal pronouns already in Egyptian papyri, spreads later to full lexical phrases, and must have been completed around the tenth century, although dative forms still appear even in late medieval vernacular texts. In EMed.Gk texts, the accusative seems to be the preferred variant, but in LMed.Gk both alternatives are equally frequent. The choice between the two constitutes a major dialectal isogloss in Modern Greek, with accusative preferred in the northern and Asia Minor dialects, and genitive in southern and island dialects, as well as in Standard Modern Greek; however, the fixing of the choice between the two alternatives cannot be narrowed down, as some texts have fixed choice as early as the ninth century while others as late as the nineteenth century present variation:

εἴρηκά **σου** ὅτι δὸς ἐμοί κέρμα . . . καὶ εἶπες **με** ὅτι . . .
I told *you* that "give me coin . . ." and you told *me* that . . . (*P.Oxy.* 1683; fourth cent. CE)

δηλοῖ **αὐτὸν** ὁ γέρων · δεῦρο ἕως ὧδε
The old man declares *to him*: come here (Mosch. 2877A)

ὁ οὖν Δαυίδ, ὁ μέγας, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ χώραν οὐκ ἐδίδου **τὸν βασιλέα**
And David, the great, was not giving his land *to the king* (*DAI* 46.118)

ἐνταῦτα **τὸν ἐλάλησεν** κ' **εἶπεν του** τὰ μαντᾶτα
There *he spoke to him* and *told him* the news (*Chron.Mor.* H 2249)

As a direct object and a prepositional complement, the dative is everywhere replaced by the accusative, which gradually becomes the only possible case for this syntactic usage. The first instances of the change date from *Koine* times, and in EMed.Gk they

increase greatly. In LMed.Gk vernacular texts the dative is no longer a possible verbal and prepositional complement except as an archaism:

πῶς νῦν ὑμῶν πιστεύσομεν **τοὺς ὅρκους**;

How can we now believe *in your oaths*? (Theoph. 209.3)

καὶ οἱ φάρες ἂν **σὲ** ἀκολουθοῦν, ἐσὲν κανεὶς οὐ φθάνει.

Even if the steeds pursue *you*, no one will overtake you. (*DigE* 281)

καὶ πρὸς τὸ ἡλιοανάτελμα πλησιάζουσιν **τὸ κάστρον**

and towards sunrise they approach *the castle*. (*Achil.N* 477)

Exceptionally, especially in southern and island areas, there appear from LMed.Gk onwards, as a dialectal feature, verbs governing the genitive instead of the (otherwise universal) accusative:

βόηθα **τοῦ δουλευτῆ** σου

Help *your servant*. (*Thys.Avr.* 117)

ἤμνογε καὶ τοῦ φίλου του, ὀγιὰ νὰ **τοῦ πιστεύγη**

He swore to his friend, so that he would *believe him*. (*Erotokr.* 1.403)

εἰς τὴν στράταν ἐπάντησε **'νοῦ καραβίου** σαρακήνικου

On the way [the galley] met *a* Saracen *ship*. (Mach. 194.18)

Another alternative to the dative in most functions (verbal complement, personal, instrumental, adverbial, etc.) is replacement with prepositional phrases governing the accusative (see also ch. 16):

ἐγύμνωσεν δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν **πρὸς αὐτὸν**

he took off his clothes and said *to him* . . . (*V.Sym.Sal.* 90.19)

αὐτὸν τὸν βλέπεις ἔδωκεν **εἰς τὴν μονὴν** εἰκόναν

He that you see gave *to the monastery* an icon. (*Ptoch.* 4.90)

εὐχὴν καὶ παρακάλεσιν ἀπέστειλεν **εἰς ὅλους**

He sent a wish and a request *to all*. (*Chron.Mor.* H 487)

b) The *active participle* is lost, replaced by an uninflected gerund functioning as a manner/temporal adverbial (Mirambel 1961, Manolessou 2005). The change, caused perhaps more by the double (verbal and nominal) nature of the participle than

by its difficult (third declension) inflectional paradigm, started from singular neuter participles around the fourth century CE and was completed around the fifteenth, with the addition of an adverbial marker –[s] to the uninflected –[onta] form.

παιδαρίου τελευτήσαντος, **ζῶντα** ἀπέδωκεν τῇ μητρί

When a child died, he gave it back to its mother *alive*. (*Chron.Pasch.* 186.1)

θεοῦ σποράν **μέλλοντα** καλεῖσθαι τὸ τικτόμενον

Because the child *was going to be* called a god's seed. (*V. Alex. L* 1.10.32)

ἦλθες σὺ ὁ καθηγούμενος μονῆς [. . .] **κομίζοντα** γραφὴν

You, the abbot of the monastery [. . .], came *bringing* a letter. (Cusa 432.3; 1183)

ὁ πρίγκιπας [γὰρ] **ἐβλέποντας** τὴν τόση ἀλαζονείαν

ἀπὸ χολῆς του καὶ θυμοῦ ὤμοσε εἰς τὸ σπαθί του

The prince, *seeing* their great arrogance,

in anger and resentment swore upon his sword. (*Chron.Mor.* H 2917–18)

During the LMed.Gk period, an aspectual distinction between present (imperfective) and aorist (perfective) gerund was still possible, a difference which persisted in EMod.Gk but has disappeared from Modern Greek:

ἀκούσοντά το οἱ ἄρχοντες [. . .] μεγάλως τὸ ἀνεχάρησαν

Upon hearing it, the lords were greatly pleased. (*Chron.Mor.* H 351)

καὶ **περάσοντας** πέντε χρόνους ἐσυφωνήσαμεν

Five years *having passed*, we agreed. (document from Peloponnese; 1683)

c) The *infinitive* is reduced in use, replaced by finite complement clauses, in a long process that lasts until the end of the medieval period. The causes of the evolution are multiple, but probably include the achievement of greater semantic transparency (since the infinitive could not express person distinctions) and of simplified subject case assignment mechanisms. The process might have been strengthened by a phonetic factor, the homonymy of some infinitive forms with the third singular active indicative/subjunctive, which resulted from the falling together of /ei/, /ę̄/, and /ē/ as /i/ and the debility of final /n/, dated already to *Koine* times (Joseph 1990: 23–4):

γράφειν ≠ γράφει ≠ γράφῃ	>	γράφει(ν) = γράφει = γράφῃ
graphę̄n ≠ graphei ≠ graphēi	>	γrafi(n) = γrafi = γrafi

γράψειν ≠ γράψει ≠ γράψῃ	>	γράψει(ν) = γράψει = γράψῃ
grapsẹ̄n ≠ grapsei ≠ grapsēi	>	γrapsi(n) = γrapsi = γrapsi
γραφθῆναι ≠ γραφθῇ	>	γραφθεῖ(ν) = γραφθῇ
graphthēnai ≠ graphthēi	>	γrafθi(n) = γrafθi

The above schema also presents two morphological evolutions of LMed.Gk, which have enhanced the phonetic similarity between infinitive and finite third person forms: -σειν /si(n)/ replaces –σαι /se/ as the active aorist ending, and –ειν /i(n)/ replaces –ηναι /ine/ as the passive aorist ending, both in analogy to the active present.

The first to be lost was the infinitive dependent on verbs of saying, thinking, etc. It is replaced by clauses introduced by ὅτι, ὡς, and in LMed.Gk also πῶς and ὅπου, in a process which began in the *Koine* period:

λέγουσιν ὅτι Πλούτων ἥρπασε τὴν κόρην

They say that Pluto ravished the girl. (Mal. 63.2)

φανερὸν ἦν ὅτι αὐτὸς ἦν ἡ νίκη

It was obvious that he was (the cause of the) victory. (*V.Alex. L* 13.22)

The infinitive dependent on verbs denoting ordering, wanting, and in general future-referring actions involving will is ultimately replaced by complement clauses introduced by ἵνα > νά /hína/ > /na/:

καὶ **εἶπεν** αὐτῇ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ζήνων **ἵνα** αἰτήσῃ τὸν πατρίκιον Ἰλλοῦν

and King Zeno *told* her *to* ask the patrician Illous. (Mal. 387.3)

This change begins in *Koine* times, but the infinitive in such uses is maintained throughout the medieval period, albeit in alternation with finite clauses. The faster rate of loss of the first type of infinitive clause is probably due to the fact that the subject of the infinitive clause is usually non-co-referential with that of the matrix clause, thus requiring a different and more complex case assignment mechanism (nominative for finite verbs, accusative for infinitives), while in the second case the subject of the matrix and the infinitive clause are most frequently identical. Thus, it is structures where the accusative and infinitive (AcI) syntax predominates which are lost first, whereas control structures are retained longer (Horrocks 1997a: 45–6; Kavčič 2005: 190).

Obligatory control verbs ("want," "can/be able," "begin/end") are precisely the ones which retain infinitival structures in LMed.Gk; research (Joseph 2000, Mackridge 1996) shows that in this period the infinitive can be still be claimed as a "living," "authentic" category, regularly appearing even in the lowest registers, and being retained up to modern times in peripheral Modern Greek dialects (Pontic and southern Italian).

οὐκ ἠμποροῦν τὴν **εὕρειν**

they can't *find* her (*DigE* 124)

ἀλλὰ καβαλλικεύοντα ἄρχασαν **συντυχαίνει**

but, having mounted their horses, they began *to converse* (*Chron.Mor.* H 5261)

οὐκ ἐπόρεσα **σταθῆναι** [utʃ epóresa staθíne]

I wasn't able *to stay* (Modern Pontic; Mackridge 1996: 197)

τί ἤρτετε **κάμει** ὦδε; [ti írtete kámi óðe]

what did you come here *to do*? (Modern Calabrian; Karanastasis 1997: 143)

A characteristically LMed.Gk use is the development of a new type of infinitival construction, the so-called circumstantial infinitive. Its origins lie in the articular infinitive governed by prepositions which was a widespread *Koine* phenomenon:

διὰ **τὸ** ἀνθρωποφάγον αὐτὸν **εἶναι**

because he [Bucephalus] *is* a man-eating beast (*V. Alex. L* 1.17)

μετὰ **τὸ διελθεῖν** ἐκεῖνον, εἴσελθε ὡς εἷς πάντων ἡμῶν

after *he passes*, enter like one of us (*V. Euth.* 12.79.1)

In LMed.Gk and EMod.Gk, the infinitive appears without a preposition, with a subject co-referential to that of the matrix verb, and having a temporal/causal meaning. The construction is very widespread in texts of the period, but has disappeared from Modern Greek and its dialects:

τὸ ἀκούσει το ὁ μισὶρ Ντζεφρὲς σπουδαίως ἐκεῖσε ἀπῆλθε

Upon hearing it, messire Geoffroi hurriedly went there (*Chron.Mor.* H 2491)

τὸ ἰδεῖ τὴν κόρην ὁ ἀμιρᾶς μετὰ τοῦ νεωτέρου . . . πονεῖ, στενάζει, θλίβεται

When the emir *sees* the girl with the young man, he aches, he sighs, he's sad (*Flor.* 1710)

Creation of periphrastic forms

a) The *future* is replaced by the indicative and various periphrastic constructions (Markopoulos 2009). The causes of the change are multiple, including the inability of the future to express aspectual distinctions and the formal identification of the ancient future indicative with the aorist subjunctive after the loss of phonological vowel quantity. The change starts from the *Koine* period, when the first alternatives to the ancient future appear. In EMed.Gk the usual variants are: present indicative, aorist subjunctive, ἔχω + infinitive (the dominant periphrasis around the eighth–tenth cent.), and, less frequently, μέλλω + infinitive (often used interchangeably).

ὄμοσόν μοι, ὅτι οὐδενὶ **λέγεις ἃ μέλλω σοι λέγειν**

Swear to me that *you will tell* no one what *I am about to tell you*. (Mosch. 2900.22)

καὶ ἐὰν λαλήσῃς τὸν στρατόν, ἵνα δέξωνταί με, καὶ τὰς ῥόγας αὐτῶν **ἐπαυξῆσαι ἔχω** καὶ εἰρήνην **ποιῶ** μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων

If you tell the army to accept me, *I shall increase* their pay and *I shall make* peace with the king of the Romans. (Theoph. 326.1)

In LMed.Gk, by far the most frequent future periphrasis is formed by the verb θέλω [θélo] "want" + present/aorist infinitive:

θέλω γενεῖν καλὰ καὶ **θέλομεν φαγεῖν** καὶ **πιεῖν** ὁμοῦ

I shall get well, and *we shall eat* and *drink* together. (Sphrantz. 16.26)

ὡς πότε **θέλω κυνηγᾶν** λαγούδια καὶ περδίκια;

Until when *shall I be hunting* hares and partridges? (*DigE* 744)

This construction, following a well-studied but still controversial path (Joseph and Pappas 2002, Markopoulos 2007) ends up, in EMod.Gk, as a periphrasis involving an uninflected and reduced form of the verb, θὲ or θά, plus a finite replacement of the infinitive with (νὰ +) subjunctive present or aorist. The θά + subjunctive form, which constitutes the single Modern Greek future expression, is first attested in the late sixteenth century, but the older forms persist and co-occur with newer ones:

τὰ θαλάσσια ἐγνωρίζουσιν ὅταν **θέλῃ νὰ ἀλλάξῃ** ὁ καιρός

the fish know when the weather *is going to change* (Landos 131.8)

γιατί **θέλω θανατωθῶ** τὴν ὥρα ποὺ **θὲ φάγω**/ τὸ ξύλον τὸ τῆς γνώσεως

because *I shall die* the moment *I shall eat* the tree of knowledge (Vestarchis 33)

ἕνας μας **θὲ νὰ σκοτωθῇ** κι ὁ ρήγας του **θὰ χάσῃ**

One of us *will die* and his king *will lose* (*Erotokr.* 4.1778)

b) The *perfect and pluperfect* are lost, and in their place several periphrases arise, with the new auxiliary verbs "to be" and "to have" plus various forms of the infinitive or participle (see Aerts 1965, Moser 1988). The loss is motivated by the identification in meaning of the ancient perfect and aorist (already completed during the *Koine* period), evident from the fact that in EMed.Gk texts the (ancient) perfect forms are used interchangeably with the aorist:

[ὁ βασιλεὺς] τὰ ἐξ ἔθους γινόμενα ἄριστα εἰς τὰ ιθ΄ ἀκούβιτα **ἔπαυσε** καὶ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον τοῖς πτωχοῖς **δέδωκεν**.

[The emperor] stopped the traditional dinners at (the hall of) the nineteen couches, and gave their cost to the poor. (Theoph. 232.5)

The change starts in *Koine* times and takes many centuries to reach completion. In the EMed.Gk period, the variant perfect/pluperfect periphrastic constructions in the lowest registers are εἰμί + active aorist participle, εἰμί + passive aorist participle, and εἰμί + passive perfect participle. Many of them, however, can arguably be viewed as a combination of copula + adjectival participle rather than as true periphrases:

κτίσας τὸ βουλευτήριον· **πεσόντα** γὰρ **ἦν**

building the assembly hall, because *it had fallen into disrepair* (Mal. 211.18)

καὶ λαβὼν αὐτὸν ἀπήνεγκεν ὅπου **ἦσαν θάψαντες** αὐτὸν

And taking him he led him where *they had buried* him (Mosch. 107.82)

τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ δημόσιον **ἦν κεκτισμένον** παρὰ τὸ ὄρος

and this public bath *was built* by the mountain (Mal. 263.14)

In LMed.Gk a peculiar change occurs: what was previously the dominant future-referring periphrasis, the auxiliary ἔχω "have" + infinitive, becomes a past-referring perfect/pluperfect expression. The change starts from the contexts in which the past form of ἔχω + infinitive was used as a future-in-the-past, i.e., expressing unrealized possibility in the past, in conditional and counterfactual clauses (see Moser 1988, Horrocks 1995):

εἶχον δὲ καὶ τὰς ἡμῶν ναῦς **καῦσαι** οἱ βάρβαροι, εἰ μὴ νὺξ ἐπῆλθε

the barbarians *would have been able to burn/would have burnt* our boats, if night had not fallen (Mal. 128.5)

The formation "had" + infinitive was initially used only in the apodosis of conditional clauses, but later in the protasis also:

ἂν τό **'χεν μάθει** πρότερον, ἂν τό **'χεν ἐγροικήσει**, τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν Ρωμαίων **κληρονομήσειν εἶχεν**

If *he had learned it* earlier, if *he had heard it*, *he would have inherited* the kingdom of the Romans. (*Velisar.*χ.371–2)

In this position, expressing a presupposition for the realization of the apodosis, it could easily be re-analyzed as expressing an action/event anterior to the apodosis:

ἐκεῖνοι ἂν σὲ **εἶχαν εὑρεῖ**, Συρίαν οὐκ ἐθεώρεις

If *they had found you*, you would not have seen Syria (*DigE* 141)

From this interpretation, anteriority in the unreal past, there derives the use of the periphrasis as a true pluperfect, expressing an action/event anterior to another action/event in the "real" past. This "true" pluperfect use appears around the thirteenth century, and is quite frequent in LMed.Gk texts and present in most Modern Greek dialects.

καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν μετ' αὐτοὺς καθὼς τοὺς **εἶχε ὁμόσει**

and he did not leave with them, as *he had sworn* to them (*Chron.Mor.* P 81)

However, the corresponding perfect use, employing the present form of the auxiliary "have" appears much later, is extremely rare in the texts, and most Modern Greek dialects lack this formation, despite the fact that it is the only means of expressing the perfect in Standard Modern Greek:

εὐχαριστίες σᾶς δίδομε πολλές . . . /γιὰ τὴν καλὴν ἀκρόασιν ὁπού **'χετε** μας **δώσει**

We give you many thanks for the attentive listening *you have given* us. (*Fort.* V.411)

Instead, both LMed.Gk texts and dialects present alternative formations, the most frequent being those employing the verbs "to be" and "to have" with the perfect participle passive:

ἐκεῖνος ὁποὺ **ἔχει** τὸ πρᾶγμαν **χαμένον** ἐντέχεται νὰ τὸ λάβῃ ὅλον

He who *has lost* the thing must take it all. (*Assiz. B* 426.22)

ἔχει κλειδωμένα | τὴν πόρτα ἡ κεράτσα μου

My lady *has locked* the door. (*Katz.* 2.105)

στὸ Νίκλι γὰρ τοῦ εἴπασιν ὅτι **ἔνι διαβασμένος**

They told him that he *is gone* to Nikli. (*Chron.Mor.* H 2298')

c) The *imperative mood* must have lost the third person already during *Koine* times, but the second person remains unchanged (apart from analogical re-formations of the endings). It is complemented by a periphrastic formation made up of the subjunctive (present or aorist) introduced by the uninflected particle ἂς [as], a grammaticalized form of the imperative ἄφες of the verb ἀφίημι "let" (Nikiforidou 1996):

καὶ εἴτι θέλεις **ὅρισε**, αὐθέντη, καὶ **ἂς μὲ ποιήσουν**.

And whatever you want, lord, *command*, and *let them do to me*. (*Achil.N* 920)

εὐθὺς "**ἂς βράσῃ** τὸ θερμόν" λέγει πρὸς τὸ παιδίν του

Straightway he says to his son, "*Let* the water *boil*." (*Ptoch.*2.116)

The grammaticalization process begins in the *Koine* period, when the verb appears still in unreduced form, accompanying non-co-referential hortative subjunctives:

ἢ πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· ἀδελφέ, **ἄφες ἐκβάλω** τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου . . . ;

Either how canst thou say to thy brother, Brother, *let me pull out* the mote that is in thine eye . . .? (Luke 6:42)

Early attestations of reduced [as] are from Egyptian papyri dated to the sixth to seventh centuries, and several examples can be found in texts from that period onwards:

καὶ **ἂς λάβ[ω]σ**ι[ν] οἱ ὀνηλάται μίαν ἀρτ(άβην) κριθῆς ὑπὲρ ἑκάστου γαϊδαρίου

And *let* the donkey-drivers *receive* one artaba of barley for each donkey. (*P.Amh.* 2.153; sixth–seventh cent.)

ὅμως ἄνω τὰ ἱμάτιά σου · **ἂς ἴδω**, τί ἔχεις

But up with your clothes, *let me see* what's wrong with you. (*Miracula* 66.13)

Leveling of nominal paradigms

The nominal paradigms undergo radical analogical leveling, originally due to phonological changes of the *Koine* period, namely the deletion of final /n/, the loss of quantity distinctions, and the monophthongization of diphthongs. These resulted in the homophony of previously distinct case-endings (see also table 16.2).

First declension singular accusative /ān/ First declension singular dative /āi/ Third declension singular accusative /a/	}	all just /a/
First declension plural accusative /ās/ Third declension plural accusative /as/	}	both /as/
First declension plural nominative /ai/	>	/e/
First declension plural dative /ais/	>	/es/
Third declension plural nominative /es/	>	/es/

Thus the ancient first declension (masc./fem. a-stems) and a large part of the ancient third declension (masc./fem. consonant stems) gradually merged into a single paradigm, in which the /a/ vocalism of the first declension prevails in the singular, and the /e/ vocalism of the third declension in the plural.

The schema shown in table 36.2 (details in Seiler 1958 and Ruge 1969) shows that: (i) the inflection of the nouns belonging to the first and third declensions becomes identical, except for the accentuation of the genitive plural (paroxytone for the "old third " nouns, oxytone for the "old first"), causing considerable variation in the accentuation of this case form in later Greek; and (ii) morphologically, the ancient five cases are reduced to two, although functionally they remain apart. Of course this is an oversimplifiying schema, which omits some residual third declension paradigms not amenable to this

Table 36.2 Evolution of nominal inflection

	First declension			*Third declension*	
	Singular	*Plural*		*Singular*	*Plural*
Feminine					
Nom.	/hɛ̄mérā/	/hɛ̄mérai/	≠	/elpís/	/elpídes/
Gen.	/hɛ̄mérās/	/hɛ̄merɔ̄n/		/elpídos/	/elpídɔ̄n/
Dat.	/hɛ̄mérāi/	/hɛ̄mérais/		/elpídi/	/elpísi/
Acc.	/hɛ̄mérān/	/hɛ̄mérās/		/elpída/	/elpídas/
	⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓		=	⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓	
Nom./Acc./Dat.	/iméra/	/iméres/		/elpíða/	/elpíðes/
Gen.	/iméras/	/imerón/		/elpíðas/	/elpíðon/
Masculine					
Nom.	/tamíās/	/tamíai/	≠	/kanɔ̄n/	/kanónes/
Gen.	/tamíū/	/tamiɔ̄n/		/kanónos/	/kanónon/
Dat.	/tamíāi/	/tamíais/		/kanóni/	/kanósi/
Acc.	/tamíān/	/tamíās/		/kanóna/	/kanónas/
	⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓			⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓	
Nom.	/tamías/	NAD		/kanónas/	NAD
Gen./Acc./Dat.	/tamía/	/tamíes/		/kanóna/	/kanónes/
		G /tamión/			G /kanónon/

evolution. These are the neuter paradigms (s-stems, t-stems, etc.) and the masc./fem. -i- and -u-stems, which retain (some of) their original inflectional forms.

The evolutions described above are only sporadically evident in texts of the early medieval period, in inscriptions, papyri, chronicles, and lexica (data in Hatzidakis 1892: 77–80; Dieterich 1898: 156–67; Jannaris 1897: 106–9, 120–3), although some of them make their first appearance in *Koine* times.

Frequently cited EMed.Gk attestations of the changes described above include those shown in table 36.3.

The ancient second declension (masc./fem./neut. o-stems) shows less change, as the masculine o-stems are the most conservative nominal inflectional paradigm, retaining the ancient inflection intact (apart from the loss of the dative and the final -n). However, the feminine and neuter paradigms undergo important modifications. A new and well-populated subset of neuter nouns evolves, through a change first appearing in *Koine* times: the deletion of /o/ following /i/ in inflectional endings (i.e., -ιος, -ιον > -ις, -ι(ν)). Scholars disagree whether this is a phonetic or morphological evolution. Due to the extreme frequency of *-ion* as a diminutive (often in order to replace "difficult" third declension inflectional patterns which involved stem allomorphy, e.g., ὀφρύς > ὀφρύδιον, παῖς > παιδίον), the –ιον > -ιν suffix lost all semantic force as a diminutive and was seen as simply the inflectional ending. Thus the neuter

Table 36.3 Early evidence for changes in nominal inflection

Phenomenon	*Example*
First decl. pl. –ες for –αι	οἱ δὲ ῥινοτομηθέντες **Πέρσες** (Mal. 331.7)
Third decl. nom. sg. –α	σεισμοῦ λαβροτάτου γενομένου ἐν Κύπρῳ, **Σαλαμίνα** πόλις κατέπεσε (Theoph. 29.25)
Third decl. gen. sg. –ας for –ος	φορῆσαι τὸ **τῆς Δημήτρας** σχῆμα (Mal.173.22); ἐκ τῆς **προίκας** (Pieria, Kitros; third cent.; Panayotou 1992b: 20)

o-stem class now contains two subtypes of nouns, those ending in -o(ν) and those ending in –ι(ν), but inflection otherwise remains unchanged.

The restructuring of feminine o-stems is more substantial: the feminine second declension inflection, being identical to the masculine o-stems, was felt to be "untypically" feminine, having as it does {presence of -s} in nom. sg. and {absence of -s} in gen. sg., in contrast to the reformed first and third declension paradigm, which had the reverse. As a result, feminine o-stems (a not so numerous class anyway) were reformed in the following ways:

a) they became masculine (ἡ ἄμμος > ὁ ἄμμος). This tendency had already begun in the Classical period (cf. the examples from Aristophanes and Aristotle in Hatzidakis 1892: 24) and became stronger in *Koine* times. Gignac (1976–81: 2: 39–40) mentions forms like τὸν γύψον (second cent.), τοῦ βώλου, τοὺς πλίνθους (third cent.).

b) they acquired first declension endings (ἡ παρθένος > ἡ παρθένα). Again, this is a change first appearing in late *Koine*, e.g., καμίνῃ, ἀντιδίκαις (Gignac 1976–81: 2: 39-40), ἵνα πολλὰς παρθένας διαφθείρῃ (*De fallacia* 7.7; fourth cent.).

c) they were replaced by diminutives. Thus ἀμπέλιον (< ἄμπελος) appears already in Hippocrates, νησίον (< νῆσος) in Strabo and ῥαβδίον (< ῥάβδος) in Theophrastus (LSJ s.vv.) and these become more frequent in later periods, to the point that in Modern Greek they have replaced the original feminine form (except in very formal or scientific registers).

d) they adopted an inflectional pattern similar to that of first declension feminines (ἡ ἄμμος τῆς ἄμμου > ἡ ἄμμο τῆς ἄμμος, ἡ μέθοδο sg., but οἱ μέθοδες pl.). This change is never attested in EMed.Gk texts, first appearing around the fourteenth century, e.g., τῆς Κόρινθος (*Chron. Mor.* H 1476), but becomes frequent only in EMod.Gk, e.g., ἡ Ρόδο ἐθλίβηκε, τῆς Χίος ἐκακοφάνη (*Symfor.* 189).

Turning to verbal morphology, in the inflectional domain there develops a tendency for analogical unification of past tense endings (Babiniotis 1972). The -a- vowel characteristic of the aorist and perfect spread to the imperfect (with the exception of the second singular where the -e- vowel of the imperfect prevailed in the aorist and perfect), while the –ασι ending of the perfect spread to the imperfect and aorist. The change encompassed the "strong aorist" inflectional paradigm, which disappeared, replaced by its weak aorist counterpart. The result is a merged past personal ending system (see table 36.4), which in LMed.Gk also spreads to the passive voice.

Table 36.4 Merger of past active endings

	Imperfect		*Aorist*		*Perfect*
1 sg.	e-graph-on	≠	e-graps-a	=	ge-graph-a
2 sg.	e-graph-es	≠	e-graps-as	=	ge-graph-as
3 sg.	e-graph-e	=	e-graps-e	=	ge-graph-e
1 pl.	e-graph-omen	≠	e-graps-amen	=	ge-graph-amen
2 pl.	e-graph-ete	≠	e-graps-ate	=	ge-graph-ate
3 pl.	e-graph-on	≠	e-graps-an	≠	ge-graph-asi
	⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓		⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓		⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓⇓
1 sg.	e-γraf-a	=	e-γraps-a		
2 sg.	e-γraf-es	=	e-γraps-es		
3 sg.	e-γraf-e	=	e-γraps-e		
1 pl.	e-γraf-ame(n)	=	e-γraps-ame(n)		
2 pl.	e-γraf-ete/-ate	=	e-γraps-ate		
3 pl.	e-γraf-an/ -asi	=	e-γraps-an/ -asi		

The change probably originated from the 3 sg., which was identical in the three paradigms, and is also the most frequent, and therefore basic, form in many languages, and was strengthened by the semantic merger of aorist and perfect which produced a large majority of forms with the characteristic -a- vowel. The identity of 1 sg. and 3 pl. in the imperfect might also have been an original motivation for change in both persons. The change begins in *Koine* times, where several cases of fluctuation between allomorphs of the personal endings are attested (Mandilaras 1972: 127–8, 148–56; Gignac 1976–1981: 2: 331–50).

The best-studied syntactic change in the medieval period involves word order, and in particular the placement of weak personal pronouns (clitics) with respect to the verb (Horrocks 1990, Mackridge 2000, Pappas 2004). In Ancient Greek, personal pronouns are enclitic, and governed by Wackernagel's law, according to which they appear in second position in the clause. Already in this period there emerges a tendency for them to appear immediately after the verb, in order to ensure semantic transparency, which becomes even stronger in the *Koine* period (Janse 2000). Thus in EMed.Gk, most clitic pronouns are immediately postverbal (see, e.g., statistics for Moschos in Kissilier 2003), although pre-verbal position adjacent to a focused element is possible:

Ἐὰν καύσῃ **με** τὸ πῦρ, ἐκ τῶν καιομένων μου ὀστέων λάβετε

If the fire burns *me*, take from my burning bones. (Mal.18.16)

γύμνωσον σεαυτόν, ὅπως ἴδω **σε**, ἀδελφέ

Take off your clothes so I can see *you*, brother. (*Miracula* 3.12)

ἐὰν τελευτήσῃς, ἐν μέσῳτῆς πόλεώς **σε** θάψομεν καὶ οὐκ ἐξάξομέν **σε** ἔξω τῶν τειχῶν.

If you die, in the middle of the city we'll bury *you*, and we won't take *you* outside the walls. (*DAI* 53. 378).

In LMed.Gk however, a more complex system of object clitic pronoun placement evolves, which depends on the type of constituents preceding the verb (if any): (i) a clitic is postverbal if the verb is first in the clause or preceded by a co-ordinating conjunction or the subordinating conjunction ὅτι, e.g:

καὶ πίνει **τα** καὶ ἐρεύγεται, κιρνοῦν **τον** ἄλλον ἕνα

And he drinks *them* and belches, they treat him to *another* drink. (*Ptoch.* 3.122)

διατὶ μὲ τὸ ὥρισε ὁ ἰατρὸς κ' εἶπεν ὅτι ὠφελεῖ **με**

because the doctor prescribed it for me and said it does *me* good (*Chron. Mor.* H 8209–13)

and (ii) it is pre-verbal when the verb is preceded by a subordinating conjunction or a fronted constituent, e.g.,

μὲ δύναμης **τὰ** ἅρπαζαν κ' ἐρρίχτασίν **τα** κάτω,

κι ἂν ἦτον τόσα ἀπότολμος νὰ **τοὺς** ἀντιμιλήσῃ,

εὐτὺς χάμω **τὸν** ἔρριπταν, πολλὰ **τὸν** τιμωροῦσαν.

With force they seized *them* and cast them down,

and if anyone was so bold as to speak against *them*,

they would throw *him* to the ground and punish *him* severely. (*Chron.Mor.* P 15–17)

After the medieval period this pattern changes, and object clitics become increasingly pre-verbal, to the point that in Modern Greek the pre-verbal position is the only available option with finite verbs, and the postverbal one with gerunds and imperatives. Cretan Renaissance literature still largely adheres to these rules, but prose texts begin to show the modern pattern:

ὅμως, **σὲ** παρακαλῶ, ἀνασηκώσου

But please, get up. (*Don Quixote* 524.39)

καὶ ἐζεμάτισε ξίδι καὶ **τοῦ** ἔρριξε ᾽ς τὰ μάτια καὶ **τὸν** ἐτύφλωσε·

and he boiled vinegar and poured it in *his* eyes, and blinded *him* (*Chron.Tourk.Soult.* 25.14–15)

However, some Modern Greek dialects (such as Cretan and Cypriot) preserve the older pattern, while others (Pontic) have developed in the opposite way, generalizing the postverbal position.

Lexicon

The vocabulary is the domain in which the greatest amount of change is evident. Change in EMed.Gk consists mainly of borrowing from Latin: initially military, legal, and administrative terminology (e.g., κάστρον < *castrum* "castle," ἀππλικεύω < *applicare* "camp," μανδᾶτον < *mandatum* "message"), but also everyday words, such as ὀσπίτιον < *hospitium* "house," φοῦρνος < *furnus* "oven" (Kahane and Kahane 1982). Latin influence decreases when Greek becomes the official language.

Loans from Slavic languages also began to enter Greek in this period, but very few of them (mostly military and administrative terms) are attested in early sources, e.g., ζάκανον "law" (*DAI* 38.52), τζελνίκος "general" (Kekaum. 172.30) (see Schreiner 1986), and possibly though controversially, the diminutive suffixes –ίτσα, -ίτσι. In LMed.Gk and EMod.Gk, Slavic loan words are slightly more frequent (there are 28 recorded in Kriaras 1976–), and also include everyday terms (βάλτα "swamp" (*DigE* 1138), καράνος "penitent" (*Ptoch.* 1.257), καρβέλι "loaf" (*Spanos* 5.392). Slavic influence is more easily detected through toponyms and ethnic and personal names (Miklosich 1870).

The third source of foreign influence in the EMed.Gk period is Persian and Arabic (sometimes difficult to distinguish, because loan words from the first enter Greek via the second), giving terms such as ἀγγούριον "cucumber" < *ʿagur*, ἀμιρᾶς "emir" < *amir*, χάνδαξ "trench" < *khandaq*. Kriaras (1967–) gives 80 words of Arabic origin for the LMed.Gk period.

In LMed.Gk, the influence of Latin and Arabic naturally decreases, and the main source of loan words and constructions are the Romance languages, coming into contact with Greek through the Frankish conquest of Greece (Kahane and Kahane 1982). Areas under French occupation, such as the Peloponnese and Cyprus, present many loan words from Old French, especially terms of feudal administration, e.g., φίε < *fief*, σεργέντης < *serjent*, μπαρούνης < *baron*, κλέρης < *clerc* (all from the *Chron.Mor.*), ἀπλαζίριν < *plaisir*, κουβερνούρης < *gouvernour*, τζάμπρα < *chambre* (all from Mach.), which however slowly drop out of the language in the EMod.Gk period, as contact with French decreases. Areas under Venetian occupation (Crete, Cyclades, Heptanese) are the centers of Italian influence. The supremacy of the medieval Italian cities in sea trade was also a major source of Italian influence on Greek (Hesseling 1903). Italian influence proved more lasting than French, due to the much longer and stronger period of contact (the Heptanese remained under Venetian rule until the Napoleonic wars), and is still apparent in Modern Greek dialects.

Towards the end of the LMed.Gk period, Turkish becomes the main source of influence on vocabulary, since most Greek-speaking areas fall under Turkish rule: Kriaras (1967–) reports 273 words of Turkish origin in medieval vernacular texts, including administrative and military terms (πασάς "pasha," βεζίρης "vizier," ἀσκέρι "army") but also everyday words (ἄτι "horse," καζάνι "pot," κονάκι "house," κουβάς "bucket") (see Moravcsik 1943).

Table 36.5 Major linguistic changes by period

Period	*Phonology*	*Morphology–Syntax*	*Lexicon*
Early Medieval	Change of /y/ > /i/ Appearance of /ts/, /dz/	Loss of dative Loss of declarative infinitive -οντα active gerunds ἔχω + inf. = future εἰμί + pass. part. = perfect	Latin borrowings
Late Medieval	Deletion of unstressed initial vowels Manner dissimilation of stops and fricatives	-οντας active gerunds Inf. only in control structures θέλω + inf. = future ἔχω + pass. part. = perfect Merger of first and third declension masc./fem.	Italian and French borrowings
Early Modern	Dialectal phonology: Northern vowel raising Palatalizations	Loss of aorist gerund Total loss of infinitive θὲ νά, θὰ + subj. = future ἔχω + inf. = perfect Change in clitic word order	Italian and Turkish borrowings

In table 36.5, the changes discussed above are classified by period.

Conclusions

The author of one of the few contemporary grammars of Medieval (or rather, Early Modern) Greek, Mitrofanis Kritopoulos (Dyovouniotis 1924), explained in 1627 that in writing his linguistic description he was motivated by the hope that αἰσχυνθήσονται οἱ νῦν Ἕλληνες ὁρῶντες ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ, καθάπερ ἐν κατόπτρῳ, τὴν σφῶν ἀμορφίαν καὶ εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς πάλαι ὡραιότητος ἐπανήξουσιν "the present-day Greeks will be so ashamed to see their own ugliness reflected in this book, as if in a mirror, that they will return to the recollection of their erstwhile beauty." The aspiration of the present chapter, although its subject is similar to that of Kritopoulos' book, is quite the reverse: we hope that readers will realize that knowledge of and research into Medieval Greek need not be inextricably linked to Ancient Greek; we regard Medieval Greek as an autonomous language, and a fascinating subject in its own right. Phonologically speaking, the all-pervasive changes which took place in the *Koine* period have ensured that the Medieval (and Modern) Greek system is entirely different in sound and structure from that of Ancient Greek; grammatically, Medieval Greek displays constant variation and change over a period of more than a millennium, very far from any notion of a rigid, codified "Classical" language. It can perhaps be more fruitfully compared to the medieval phase of other modern European languages (coexistence of

a vernacular and an alternative – high – linguistic code, complex textual tradition of literary works, chaotic spelling, issues of orality/literacy, thematic similarities, insufficient modern linguistic research).

Then why, one might ask, is this chapter included in a book dedicated to Ancient Greek? First, it is a natural inclination to want to know what happens next, how the story ends – although in this case it is still going on. Secondly, a purely linguistic motive: Greek offers a rare opportunity, among the world's languages, to study language change over more than 3,000 years of continuous recorded tradition (well, with a small gap for the Dark Ages, 1200–800 BCE); strangely, this opportunity has often been ignored. Finally, the fact that ancient, medieval, and modern forms of the language share the same name should remind us that the disciplines of Classical, Byzantine, and Modern Greek Studies are not separate, watertight categories of scholarship, but can frequently inspire mutually beneficial collaboration.

FURTHER READING

There is no comprehensive grammatical description for any sub-period of Medieval Greek. However, there are five scholarly works which constitute indispensable contributions, though now considerably out of date: Hatzidakis 1892 and 1905–7, Jannaris 1897, Dieterich 1898, and Psaltes 1913. Recent accounts of the history of later Greek are Browning 1983 and Tonnet 2003; the most linguistically informed description is Horrocks 1997a. The University of Cambridge hosts a major research project which will shortly produce a grammar of LMed.Gk and EMod.Gk (details at www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/grammarofmedievalgreek; see also Holton, forthcoming). Many examples in this chapter come from the electronic corpus and database of the project. The vocabulary of LMed.Gk and EMod.Gk is well served by the dictionaries of Kriaras (1967–), (available online in a concise version, at http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/medieval_greek/kriaras/index.html) and Trapp et al. (1994–); both, however, have yet to reach completion. EMed.Gk is only partially covered by Lampe 1969, Sophocles 1887, and Konstantinidis and Moschos 1907–95 (the Greek translation of the eighth edition of Liddell and Scott, with additional material on *Koine* and EMed.Gk). Loan words in Medieval Greek, their sources and phonetic adaptation, are discussed in Triantaphyllidis 1909. Bibliographic surveys of linguistic research on the period are Kapsomenos 1985, Apostolopoulos 1994, Janse 1996–7, and Jeffreys and Doulavera 1998.

MEDIEVAL AND EARLY MODERN GREEK SOURCES

Achil.N Smith, O. L. 1991. *The Byzantine Achilleid. The Naples Version* (Wiener Byzantinische Studien 21). Vienna.

Assiz. Σάθας, K. N., 1877. *Ἀσσίζαι τοῦ Βασιλείου τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ τῆς Κύπρου,* in *Μεσαιωνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη ἢ συλλογὴ ἀνεκδότων μνημείων τῆς ἑλληνικῆς ἱστορίας*, vol. 6. Venice and Paris.

Chr.Tocc.	Schirò, G. 1975. *Cronaca dei Tocco di Cefalonia; prolegomeni, testo critico e traduzione* (*CFHB* 10). Rome.
Chr.Pasch.	*Chronicon Paschale*. *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 92.
Chron.Mor.	Schmitt, J. 1904. *The Chronicle of Morea, Τὸ Χρονικὸν τοῦ Μορέως*. London.
Chron.Tourk.Soult.	Zoras, G. Th. 1958. *Χρονικὸν περὶ τῶν Τούρκων σουλτάνων (κατὰ τὸν Βαρβερινὸν ἑλληνικὸν κώδικα 111)*. Athens.
Cusa	Cusa, S. 1868–82. *Diplomi greci ed arabi di Sicilia, pubblicati nel testo originale, tradotti ed illustrati*. Palermo.
DAI	Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando imperio*. Greek text ed. Gy. Moravcsik, English trans. R. J. H. Jenkins, 1967. Washington DC.
De Caer.	Reiske, J. J. 1829. *Constantini Porphyrogeniti imperatoris de cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae libri duo*, vol. 1 (Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae). Bonn.
De fallacia	Casey, R. P. 1935. "An early homily on the devil ascribed to Athanasius of Alexandria." [St Athanasius, *De fallacia diaboli*] *Journal of Theological Studies* 36: 4–10.
DigE	Jeffreys, E. M. 1998. *Digenis Akritis. The Grottaferrata and Escorial Versions* (Cambridge Medieval Classics 7). Cambridge.
Don Quixote	*Δον Κισότης της Μαντσίας*. In Kechagioglou, G. 2001. *Πεζογραφική Ανθολογία. Αφηγηματικός γραπτός νεοελληνικός λόγος. Βιβλίο πρώτο: Από το τέλος του Βυζαντίου ως τη Γαλλική Επανάσταση*. Thessaloniki.
Erotokr.	Alexiou, S. 1980. *Βιτσέντζος Κορνάρος, Ἐρωτόκριτος*. Athens.
Flor.	*Florios kai Platzia-Flora*. In Kriaras, E. 1959. *Βυζαντινὰ ἱπποτικὰ μυθιστορήματα*, 141–214. Athens.
Fort.	Vincent, A., 1980. *Μάρκου Ἀντώνιου Φόσκολου Φορτουνάτος*. (Ἑταιρία Κρητικῶν Ἱστορικῶν Μελετῶν, Κρητικὸν Θέατρον 2). Herakleion.
Katz.	Politis, L. 1964. *Γεωργίου Χορτάτση Κατζοῦρμπος*. (Ἑταιρία Κρητικῶν Ἱστορικῶν Μελετῶν, Κρητικὸν Θέατρον 1). Herakleion.
Kekaum.	Ioannes Cecaumenus, *Strategicon*. In Wassiliewsky B. and V. Jernstedt. 1896. *Cecaumeni Stategicon et incerti scriptoris De officiis regiis libellus*. St Petersburg.
Landos	Kostoula, D. D. 1991. *Αγάπιος Λάνδος. Γεωπονικόν*. Επιμέλεια κειμένου–Εισαγωγή –Σχόλια – Γλωσσάριο. Volos.
Liv. V	Lendari, T. 2006. *Ἀφήγησις Λιβίστρου καὶ Ροδάμνης (Livistros and Rodamne). The Vatican Version. Editio princeps* (Βυζαντινὴ καὶ Νεοελληνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη 9). Athens.
Mach.	Dawkins, R. M. 1932. *Recital concerning the sweet land of Cyprus entitled "Chronicle". By Leontios Makhairas*. Oxford.
Mal.	Dindorf, L. 1831. *Ioannis Malalae chronographia* (Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae). Bonn.
Miracula	*Miracula Sancti Artemii*. In Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A. 1909. *Varia graeca sacra* (Subsidia Byzantina lucis ope iterata 6). St Petersburg.
Mosch.	Ioannes Moschos. *Pratum Spirituale*. *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. 87.3.
Ptoch.	Eideneier, H. 1991. *Ptochoprodromos. Einführung, kritische Ausgabe, deutsche Übersetzung, Glossar* (Neograeca Medii Aevi 5). Cologne.
Sphrantz.	Maisano, R. 1990. *Giorgio Sfranze, Cronaca* (*CFHB* 29). Rome.

Spanos Eideneier, H. 1977. *Spanos. Eine byzantinische Satire in der Form einer Parodie*. Berlin and New York.

Symfor. Bouboulidis, Ph. K. 1955. *Ἡ συμφορὰ τῆς Κρήτης τοῦ Μανόλη Σκλάβου.* Κρητικὸ στιχούργημα τοῦ ΙΣΤ΄ αἰῶνος. Athens.

Thys.Avr. Bakker, W., and A. F. van Gemert. 1996. *Η Θυσία του Αβραάμ. Κριτική έκδοση.* Herakleion.

Theoph. de Boor, C. 1883–5. *Theophanis Chronographia*. Leipzig.

V. Alex. L van Thiel, H. 1983. *Vita Alexandri Magni. Recensionem Graecam codicis L edidit Helmut van Thiel.* Darmstadt.

V. Euth. Karlin-Hayter, P. 1970. *Vita Euthymii patriarchae Constantinopolitani* (Bibliothèque de Byzantion 3). Brussels.

V. Sym.Sal. Festugière, J. A., ed. and trans. 1974. *Vie de Syméon le Fou et Vie de Jean de Chypre* (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 95). Paris.

Velisar. χ Bakker W., and A. F. van Gemert 1988. *Ἱστορία τοῦ Βελισαρίου.* (Βυζαντινὴ καὶ Νεοελληνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη 6). Athens.

Vestarchis Μιχαὴλ Βεστάρχης, *Ὁ Πρόλογος τῆς Ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου.* In M. Manoussakas and W. Puchner. 2000. *Ἀνέκδοτα στιχουργήματα τοῦ θρησκευτικοῦ θεάτρου τοῦ ΙΖ΄ αἰώνα. Ἔργα τῶν ὀρθόδοξων Χίων κληρικῶν Μιχ. Βεστάρχη, Γρηλ. Κονταράτου, Γαβρ. Προσοψᾶ.* Ἔκδοση κριτικὴ μὲ εἰσαγωγή, σχόλια καὶ εὑρετήρια. Athens.