

DAVID HOLTON – GEOFFREY HORROCKS – MARJOLIJNE JANSSEN – TINA LENDARI – IO MANOLESSOU – NOTIS TOUFEXIS, *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek* in 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2019. – ISBN 978-0-521-19529-4. Vol. 1: General Introduction and Phonology (pp. i–clxx, 1–237) – ISBN 978-1-107-18174-8. Vol. 2: Nominal Morphology (pp. 239–1263) – ISBN 978-1-107-18181-6. Vol. 3: Verb Morphology (pp. 1265–1857) – ISBN 978-1-107-18182-3. Vol. 4: Syntax (pp. 1858–2040) – ISBN 978-1-107-18183-0.

• MAXIM KISILIER, St. Petersburg State University / Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (m.kisilier@spbu.ru)

While Medieval and Early Modern Greek are now unanimously regarded as integral to the history of the Greek language, this view is relatively recent. In the first decades of the 19th century, most intellectuals (including ADAMANTIOS KORAI)<sup>1</sup> considered Byzantine Greek a corrupt linguistic variety hardly worthy of serious attention. In their efforts to study contemporary Greek, the Hellenists of the time (e.g. CHARLES-LOUIS-JULES DAVID in his *Comparative Description of the Ancient Greek and Demotic Languages*)<sup>2</sup> just compared Modern Greek with Ancient Greek, as if Medieval Greek had never existed at all.

The Neogrammarian era with its comparative method became a turning point. Scholars did notice that Byzantine Greek was completely unknown to them<sup>3</sup> but were far from unanimous as to how this gap was to be filled.

1. PETER H. MACKRIDGE, Byzantium and the Greek language question in the Nineteenth Century. In: DAVID RICKS – PAUL MAGDALINO (eds), *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity* (Centre for Hellenic Studies, King's College London. Publications 4). Farnham – Burlington 1998, p. 50.

2. Συνοπτικὸς παραλληλισμὸς τῆς ἑλληνικῆς καὶ γραικικῆς, ἢ ἀπλοελληνικῆς γλώσσης. Συντεθεῖς ὑπὸ Ἰουλίου Δαβίδ, τοῦ πάλαι μὲν προξένου τῶν Γάλλων εἰς τὸν Ὑδροῦντα τῆς Ἰαπυγίας, ἔπειτα δὲ ἀκροατοῦ εἰς τὴν πολιτικὴν βουλήν, καὶ ὑπονομάρχου εἰς τὸν νομόν τῶν ἐκβολῶν τοῦ Ἄλβιος, τέλος δὲ δημοσίου διδασκάλου εἰς το σχολεῖον τῆς Χίου. Paris 1820. For more details about Jules David and his works see: JEAN ANTOINE CARAVOLAS, L'helléniste français Jules David (1783–1854). *The Historical Review / La Revue Historique* 2 (2005) pp. 129–151; FATIMA ELOEVA, The Antinomy of Philology (an Approach by Jules David). *Literatūra* 64.3 (2022) pp. 66–77.

3. Cf. KARL KRUMBACHER, *Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Weimar 1884, p. 13.

Most Neogrammarians believed that comparing Ancient Greek with Modern Greek would provide much more valuable information about Medieval and Early Modern Greek than the direct linguistic analysis of Byzantine texts.<sup>4</sup> Some linguists even claimed that Medieval Greek could not be of interest for a serious researcher.<sup>5</sup> Opinions of this kind resulted from the impression that while the linguistic form of Byzantine learned literature was almost changeless,<sup>6</sup> the language of medieval popular literature, at least prior to the 16th and 17th centuries (i.e., before the Cretan Renaissance),<sup>7</sup> was in reality a strange mixture of archaic forms and vernacular. The Neogrammarians were ready to treat this mixture as *Kunstgräzität* (the term employed by KARL KRUMBACHER),<sup>8</sup> i.e. as a totally artificial language full of Ancient Greek forms, most of them evidently learnt at school.<sup>9</sup> The famous Hellenist IOANNIS PSYCHARIS / JEAN PSICHARI (1854–1929) propounded a completely different view. He believed that Byzantine popular literature, unlike historiography and hagiography, reflected actual everyday speech which later was erroneously regarded as an artificial amalgam of various linguistic forms.<sup>10</sup> This claim was very important for his ideas about the contemporary language and Demotic Greek, and inspired him to write the first-ever substantial study of Medieval and Early Modern Greek.<sup>11</sup> Despite his interest in SAUSSURE,<sup>12</sup> PSYCHARIS did not try to approach the Greek language as a system (or a set of systems) where all constituents are interrelated. Multiple inconsistencies in his ideas ex-

4. E.g. GEORGIOS N. HATZIDAKIS, *Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Έλληνικά*. Vol. 1 (Βιβλιοθήκη Μαρασλή). Athens 1905, p. 404.

5. MICHAEL DEFFNER, *Νέα Έλλάς* 20 (1874).

6. Cf. ROBERT BROWNING, *The Language of Byzantine Literature*. In: SPEROS VRYONIS JR. (ed.), *The 'Past' in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture*. Malibu 1978, p. 103.

7. More details in DAVID HOLTON (ed.), *Literature and Society in Renaissance Crete*. Cambridge 1991.

8. KARL KRUMBACHER, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches (527–1453)*. 2. Aufl. Munich 1897, p. 796.

9. E.g. KRUMBACHER, *Beiträge*, p. 14; GEORGIOS N. HATZIDAKIS, *Einleitung in die Neugriechische Grammatik* (Bibliothek Indogermanischer Grammatiker 5). Leipzig 1892, pp. 234–284.

10. JEAN PSICHARI, *Essais de grammaire historique néo-grecque*. Vol. 1. Paris 1886, p. 209–210; cf. MACKRIDGE, *Byzantium*, p. 55.

11. JEAN PSICHARI, *Essais de grammaire historique néo-grecque*. Vols. 1–2. Paris 1886–1888.

12. MILENA JOVANOVIĆ, *Jean Psichari et Ferdinand de Saussure*. In: KONSTANTINOS A. DEMADES (ed.), *Ταυτότητες στον ελληνικό κόσμο (από το 1204 έως σήμερα)*. Vol. 3. Athens 2011, pp. 179–193.

posed them to criticism by his eternal opponent GEORGIOS HATZIDAKIS (1843–1941), who was certain that the Greek literary language could not have been actually spoken in Byzantium – just like the *katharevousa* which HATZIDAKIS supported was not spoken in nineteenth-century Greece.<sup>13</sup>

The polemic demonstrated, among other things, that Medieval and Early Modern Greek could form the subject of linguistic research and that this research was to be based not only on Byzantine popular texts, which contained multiple vernacular features, but also on highbrow literature.<sup>14</sup> Until recently, there were generally two approaches to Medieval and Early Modern Greek:

(a) analysis of separate phenomena;<sup>15</sup>

(b) description of the most representative or notable Byzantine texts through the lens of the language's evolution.<sup>16</sup>

However, even the most detailed surveys, such as the one by GEOFFREY HORROCKS,<sup>17</sup> did not offer a detailed picture of Medieval and Early Modern Greek, since their aim was to trace the development of the Greek language as the whole – rather than provide a thorough description of its linguistic system in any single period. That is why *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek* was so eagerly expected. The project began in 2004, and one could follow its progress through reports and publications of its participants.<sup>18</sup> When the *Grammar* itself finally appeared in 2019, it exceeded all expectations in terms of its bulk (more than 2250 pp.) and the completeness of its bibliography (pp. xxxvii–clxvi). The latter neglects only papers in Slavic languages and forms in its own right a valuable contribution to Hellenic studies in general and to Medieval and Early Modern Greek studies in particular.

I do not think that the *The Cambridge Grammar* is a book to be read consec-

13. GEORGIOS HATZIDAKIS, Μεσαιωνικά, p. 193; IDEM, Einleitung, pp. 234–284.

14. Cf. MARTIN HINTERBERGER (ed.), *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature* (Βυζαντινός: Studies in Byzantine History and Civilization 9). Turnhout 2014.

15. E.g. ANDRÉ MIRAMBEL, *Essai sur l'évolution du verbe en grec byzantine*. Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique 61 (1966), pp. 167–190.

16. E.g. ROBERT BROWNING, *Medieval and Modern Greek*. 2d edn. Cambridge 1983, pp. 53–87.

17. GEOFFREY C. HORROCKS, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*. London – New York 1997.

18. E.g. IO MANOLESSOU, *Modern Greek Dialectology and the Grammar of Medieval Greek*. In: ANGELA RALLI – BRIAN D. JOSEPH – MARK JANSE – ATHANASIOS KARASIMOS (eds), *Proceedings: 4th International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory (MGDLT 4)*, Chios, 11–14 June 2009. Patras 2010, pp. 24–30.

utively from beginning to end – though if one could do that, it would make for very useful and thought-provoking reading. Like many comprehensive grammars of modern languages,<sup>19</sup> it is a work of reference. The authors define it as ‘a text-based descriptive grammar’ (p. xxii) and distinguish three types of sources (p. xxv):<sup>20</sup>

(i) An electronic corpus comprising approximately 3 million words. It includes already available digitized Medieval and Early Modern Greek texts either donated by editors and publishers, or transcribed by the participants in the project. The online *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* was also used as a source, since it includes Byzantine literary and non-literary texts.

(ii) Printed editions of mostly non-literary texts (some of them scanned as non-machine-readable PDF files). These are the majority of the sources used in the project.

(iii) Digitized images of manuscripts of literary and non-literary texts, especially from the collection of microfilms created in the University of Sydney under the guidance of ELIZABETH JEFFREYS (1941–2023) and MICHAEL JEFFREYS.

Unlike most historical grammars of Modern Greek, *The Cambridge Grammar* makes wider use of non-literary texts because in general they are easier to date and localize than literary ones. Besides, such texts were seldom re-copied, and thus contain fewer scribal errors and/or interventions.

The *Grammar* is divided into four continuously paginated volumes. Vol. 1 starts with a lucid introduction about the project’s aim, sources, and methodology, then proceeds to phonology and phonetics. This was probably the most difficult part of the project, because the researchers were unable to analyze living speech and had to deal with written representations of sounds. The Greek alphabet does not usually reflect allophonic variation, so it was important to study scribal errors, especially in manuscripts, the apparatus in critical editions, and Greek texts written in non-Greek alphabets. For historical phonology and phonetics, general theoretical analysis of linguistic phenomena along with the evidence from earlier and later forms of the language were also helpful. The combination of these approaches

---

19. Cf. DAVID HOLTON – PETER H. MACKRIDGE – IRENE PHILIPPAKI-WARBUR-TON, *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. London – New York 2007.

20. Unfortunately, the corpus of sources, even its digital part, did not have full parsing and annotation, so it could not provide quantitative data on diachronic and diatopic variations (p. xxviii).

made it possible not only to provide a general picture of Medieval and Early Modern Greek sounds and their evolution, but also to shed light on specific details.

The part about phonetics/phonology has three chapters. The first one outlines the phonemic inventory of vowels and diphthongs, their major characteristics (e.g. quantity), general patterns of allophonic variation (e.g. synizesis and phenomenon of raising vowels),<sup>21</sup> and processes such as:

(a) vowel addition: prothesis (σύν > ἐσύν), insertion of a vowel into the consonant cluster (βιβλία > βιβιλία) and addition of final vowel in different parts of speech (ἔγραφαν > (ἐ)γράφανε);

(b) vowel deletion: aphaeresis (τὸν ἐπίσκοπον > τὸν πίσκοπον), syncope (σημερινῆς > σημερνῆς) and apocope (ἄφησε την > ἄφησ' την);

(c) vowel changes: change to /e/ in the adjacency of liquids (primarily /r/) and nasals (Σαρακηνός > Σαρεκηνός), labialization (γεφύρι > γιοφύρ'), raising of /o/ to /u/ (Λευκωσίας > Λευκουσίας, χῶμα > χοῦμα), backing of /i/ to /u/ (Γεράσιμος > Γεράσουμος, χρυσοῦ > χρουσοῦ), assimilation (μοναχός > μαναχός) and dissimilation (ἀπολογία > ἀπιλογία). Some of the aforementioned vowel changes may be interpreted differently. For example, raising of /ó/ to /ú/ (χοῦμα) is frequently regarded as a post-Doric feature,<sup>22</sup> while the 'backing of /i/ to /u/' in χρουσοῦ actually results from the shift of Ancient Greek /y/ to /u/, which can be found in many local Greek varieties.<sup>23</sup>

Some processes could be caused by direct contact of the vowels (i.e. hiatus or hiatus resolution). The authors of *The Cambridge Grammar* distinguish several such processes, including:

(1) deletion of one of the vowels (Ἰσάακου > Ἰσάκου);

(2) coarticulation of the vowels, e.g. diphthongization (ἐκάτην > καημένος), synizesis (ἐκκλησίαν > ἐκκλησίαν), and crasis (μου ἔδειξαν > μῦδειξαν);

(3) intervocalic glide /j/ (ἄερας > ἀγέρας).

Some of the vowel changes mentioned here are important features of con-

21. This phenomenon is frequently called 'northern' vocalism, because it is typical of many Northern Greek varieties: see for instance HATZIDAKIS, *Einleitung*, pp. 342–353; BRIAN NEWTON, *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect: A Study of Modern Greek Phonology*. Cambridge 1972, pp. 182ff.

22. GEORGIOS N. HATZIDAKIS, *Γλωσσολογικαὶ μελέται*. Athens 1901, pp. 558–561.

23. Cf. AGAPITOS G. TSOPANAKIS, *Eine Dorische Dialektzone im Neugriechischen*. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 48.1 (1955), pp. 57–58.

temporary Modern Greek dialects.<sup>24</sup> The history of most of these still remains unknown,<sup>25</sup> and *The Cambridge Grammar* may become a solid basis for research on them.<sup>26</sup> Some aspects are already discussed here, e.g. retention of ‘Doric’ /a/ and Ionic /e/, emergence of Pontic /æ/ and /œ/, and the so-called *raising vocalism*.<sup>27</sup> Even so, it must be acknowledged that Medieval and Early Modern Greek sources inform us that these dialectal phenomena existed but not supply proper isoglosses.

The chapter on consonants provides a general description of the consonant system, phonotactics,<sup>28</sup> and gemination, and pays much heed to phonetic/phonological processes which involve consonants:

- (a) consonant addition, i.e. prothesis (τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ μας > τοῦ νεαυτοῦ μας), aphaeresis (Νάουσα > Ἄγουσα), and appearance of epenthetic consonants in various phonetic environments (ιερέας > ιγερέας);
- (b) consonant deletion (θυγατέρα > θυατέρα) including final /-s/ (ὁ ἄνδρας της > ὁ ἄνδρα της);
- (c) retention or addition of final /-n/ (ἀγάπα ὁ ἕνας > ἀγάπαν ὁ ἕνας);
- (d) consonant changes: dissimilation (ὄφθαλμόν > οφταλμ[ον]), palatalization (και > τζαι), voicing (ἐν πρώτοις > ἐν μπρώτοις) / devoicing (Κουρτιστὰν), fricativization (τέτοιαν > τέδοιαν) and fricative and liquid interchange (ἐτόλμησες > ἐτόρμησες).

24. To avoid the well-known discussion about ‘dialect or language’ (see e.g. RAF VAN ROOY, *Language or Dialect? The History of a Conceptual Pair*. Oxford 2020), I use the term *dialect* for all local varieties of Greek, although this discussion is also relevant for Modern Greek dialectology. Cf. NIKOLAOS G. KONTOSOPOULOS, *Διάλεκτοι και ιδιώματα της νέας ελληνικής*. Athens 2001, pp. 2–3; BRIAN D. JOSEPH, What is Meant by ‘Modern Greek Dialect’? Some Thoughts on Terminology and Glossonymy, with a Glance at Tsakonian. In: MAXIM KISILIER (ed.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory (MGDLT 9)*. Leonidio, 4–6 June 2021. Leonidio 2022, pp. 55–71.

25. There are a few lucky exceptions such as CHARALAMPOS P. SYMEONIDES, *Ιστορία της Κυπριακής διαλέκτου από τον 7<sup>ο</sup> αιώνα προ Χριστού έως σήμερα*. Nicosia 2006.

26. We already have good examples such as IO MANOLESSOU, *The Historical Background of the Asia Minor Dialects*. In: ANGELA RALLI (ed.), *The Morphology of Asia Minor Greek: Selected Topics (Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory 13)*. Leiden – Boston 2019, pp. 20–65.

27. The term *raising vocalism* is generally used for the set of phonetic phenomena which includes raising of /e/ to /i/ and /o/ to /u/ and loss of /i/ and /u/. Regularly attested in Northern Greek, it occurs in other parts of Greek-speaking world as well, e.g. in Pontic. Raising phenomena from various dialects may be of different origin and nature.

28. Position of consonants within the word and possible consonant clusters.

The last chapters of the phonetic/phonological volume give general information on accentuation and stress. The authors emphasize that many phonetic changes they mentioned before are connected with accentuation. They also provide a list of proclitics and enclitics. It seems, however, that the long-standing issue when pronominal enclitics preceding a verb became proclitics is still in need of discussion.

Vol. 2 describes nominal morphology. Its introduction makes some general statements which may seem obvious, but further analysis is impossible without them. Medieval and Early Modern Greek have inherited from the Ancient Greek nominal system two principal categories: gender and case. Most cases exist to the present day,<sup>29</sup> but dative must have disappeared from the vernacular by the 10th century. Even so, it is frequently encountered later on in texts of the mixed or higher registers. The Introduction provides a list of the most typical contexts where dative can be expected<sup>30</sup> and focuses on three varieties of case merger:

- (1) the replacement of genitive plural by accusative plural of masculine nouns in Cyprus (τὸ δίκαιον **τους κριτάδες**);
- (2) the replacement of the accusative plural by the nominative plural of masculine nouns in the Cyclades (εἶδα **τις ἀνθρώποι**);
- (3) the replacement of the nominative singular by accusative singular of masculine nouns in Pontic (ὁ **Κυριακόν**).<sup>31</sup>

The last part of the volume's introduction focuses on stress shift as a result of synizesis (**βασιλέα** vs. **βασιλιά**).

The following chapters examine nominal morphology by part of speech (nouns, adjectives and participles, adverbs, articles and pronouns, and numerals) describing declension, possible deviations and allomorphic variation, and sometimes regional peculiarities. Thus, we learn that in certain regions (Crete, Heptanese, Aegean islands), flexion /-éos/ due to synizesis is transformed into [-jós] and the noun it belongs to may become oxytone (p. 259). Such attention to regional variants is extremely important, especially for those who are interested in historical dialectology.

29. The use of genitive in Standard Modern Greek and its dialects has become much more limited compared to Ancient Greek; more details in DIONYSIOS MERTYRIS, *The Loss of the Genitive in Greek: A Diachronic and Dialectological Analysis*. Ph.D. thesis. La Trobe University. Melbourne 2014.

30. These are dates or temporal expressions, indirect objects and complements of the verb, prepositional phrases and adverbial expressions.

31. This phenomenon still exists in modern Pontic: /ura'non/ vs. the Standard Modern Greek οὐρανός.

It is a pity that this volume lacks a chapter (or a section) on compounds. Recent research by GEORGE CHAIRETAKIS and ANGELA RALLI has demonstrated that the dialect with long-lasting Romance influence (e.g., South-Italian Greek, Heptanesian, Cretan, and Cypriot) frequently have left-headed compounds which generally are not typical of Modern Greek.<sup>32</sup> It would be interesting to trace this phenomenon in Medieval and Early Modern Greek – but such work remains to be done.

Vol. 3, dedicated to verb morphology, begins with an overview of developments in the verbal system. The authors trace the general evolution of verb stems, mention that only two participles remain in use (the present passive and the perfect passive), and provide general information on the use of the augment, conjugation, and periphrastic constructions. The next four chapters discuss these matters in details.

The chapter on stem formation shows the variety of patterns used in formation of imperfective and perfective stems of different classes of verbs and mention possible transfers between verb classes.<sup>33</sup> We also learn about adaptation of loanwords: for examples, the Romance verbs in -ar[e], when borrowed, frequently add -ιζ- to the imperfective stem (especially if the borrowing occurred from the early 16th century onward): Venetian *sonàr* > ἑσονάριζες.

The chapter about augment analyzes both simple and compound and prefixed verbs. The syllabic augment is generally /e-/, but regionally it may be /i-/. Due to the loss of vowel length distinction, the verbs with initial /i-/, /o-/ or /u-/ have no temporal augment, although the augment may be sometimes reflected in graphics, e.g. <ω> instead of <o> (which were both pronounced the same way in Medieval Greek).

The chapter on conjugation is not limited to the flexions in different tenses, voices and moods, but also pays attention to the present and aorist infinitives and the gerund. It is well known that while the present infinitive has completely disappeared from Standard Modern Greek, the aorist infinitive may be found in some varieties of Pontic<sup>34</sup> and in Modern Greek forms

---

32. GEORGE CHAIRETAKIS – ANGELA RALLI, An Electronically-Based Investigation of Left-Head-ed Dialectal Compounds. In: MAXIM KISILIER (ed.), Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory (MGDLT9). Leonidio, 4–6 June 2021. Leonidio 2022, pp. 33–53.

33. These are ‘transformations’ of barytone verbs into oxytone verbs (συνηθοῦνε < συνεθίζω), and vice versa, i.e. conflation of the oxytone verbs with the verbs in -ιζω / -άζω (σταματίζει < σταματῶ).

34. E.g. PETER H. MACKRIDGE, The Medieval Greek Infinitive in the Light of



of perfect and pluperfect. In Byzantine texts, both infinitives are often written without the final /-n/ and coincide with 3 sg. of aorist subjunctive. However, the authors of *The Cambridge Grammar* do not believe that homonymy could be the cause of the disappearance of the present infinitive in a fully inflected language such as Greek (p. 1682).

The last chapter of Vol. 2 describes the periphrastic forms of future, perfect, pluperfect, aorist, imperfect, conditional, and subjunctive. It is often hard to understand the actual semantics of each periphrastic form in a Medieval or Early Modern Greek text: for example, it is very tempting to treat all combinations of ἔχω with other verb forms, primarily infinitive, as perfects,<sup>35</sup> but they are sometimes not. Fortunately, *The Cambridge Grammar* provides textual data so rich that a reader has full opportunities to make her or his own research and to check some of the authors' conclusions.

The last volume analyzes syntax, which is – except for research on clitic pronouns and their position – the least studied linguistic level of Medieval and Early Modern Greek.<sup>36</sup> The chapters of this volume mainly use material from the grammar database created by NOTIS TOUFEXIS. They do not aim to compare Medieval and Early Modern Greek syntax either with Ancient or Modern Greek (which does not exclude certain diachronic observations). Step by step, the syntactic chapters describe different types of clauses (main, complement, and adverbial), noun and prepositional phrases, coordination and apposition, and constituent order. The number of issues raised in this volume is so large that their discussion would have required a series of publications, and it is impossible to give even a brief overview here. I limit myself to just two remarks that may seem critical but are in fact suggestions for future study.

The first remark is about particles. Ancient Greek had a very rich inventory of particles which played significant syntactic roles<sup>37</sup> and have disappeared in Modern Greek and its dialects. *The Cambridge Grammar* gives only

---

Modern Dialectal Evidence. In: COSTAS N. COSTANTINIDES – NIKOLAOS PANAGIOTAKIS – ELIZABETH M. JEFFREYS – ATHANASIOS D. ANGELOU (eds), Φιλέλλην: Studies in Honour of Robert Browning (Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia. Bibliothek 17). Venice 1996, pp. 191–204; IOANNA SITARIDOU, The Romeyka Infinitive: Continuity, Contact and Change in the Hellenic Varieties of Pontus. *Diachronica* 31.1 (2014) pp. 23–73.

35. More details in MAXIM KISILIER, Из истории новогреческого перфекта. *Индоевропейское языкознание и классическая филология* 20.1 (2016) pp. 426–439.

36. Cf. PANAYIOTIS A. PAPPAS, *Variation and Morphosyntactic Change in Greek: From Clitics to Affixes*. Hampshire – New York 2004 (with bibliography).

37. Cf. JOHN D. DENNISTON, *The Greek Particles*. 2d edn. Oxford 1954.

examples of the contrastive use of δέ (pp. 2009–2010). However, other particles, e.g. γάρ, were also used at least in Byzantine learned texts (cf. p. 1105) and their analysis could be also interesting. Besides, some Modern Greek dialects have developed ‘new’ particles, e.g. Pontic /pa/<sup>38</sup> or /pal/ from πάλιν. These particles definitely appeared in Medieval or Early Modern period, so it would be interesting to investigate their various uses in texts.

My second remark concerns the topic of *left dislocation* (pp. 2023–2025), which the ‘Index of Linguistic Terms and Concepts’ (p. 2043) names *clitic doubling*<sup>39</sup> – although many linguists prefer to distinguish clitic doubling from left dislocation.<sup>40</sup> I am not sure if differentiation between these phenomena is all that relevant in the context of Medieval and Early Modern Greek Grammar, but even so, one must define terms with precision.

In sum, I will repeat that *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek* is a tremendous and very successful project and that we should be extremely grateful to its authors for the great work they have done. Still, it is important to keep in mind that this Grammar is not the end of the road but a very promising start for new research. Its possible transformation into a digital database with a powerful search engine could create new opportunities for Byzantine and Early Modern Greek studies.

### Keywords

Byzantine Greek; Medieval Greek; Early Modern Greek; phonetics; phonology; morphology; syntax

---

38. MICHAEL SETATOS, Το ποντιακό πα. Νεοελληνική διαλεκτολογία 4 (1994–1995) pp. 39–60; IOANNA SITARIDOU – MARIA KALITSA, Contrastivity in Pontic Greek. *Lingua* 146 (2014) pp. 1–27. The same particle exists in Azov Greek, see MAXIM KISILIER, Contact Phenomena in Azov Greek. *Languages* 7.3 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7030174>, pp. 9–10.

39. Interestingly, the same term for this same phenomenon is used in GUNNAR DE BOEL, The Genesis of Clitic Doubling from Ancient to Medieval Greek. In: DALIANA KALLULLI – LILIANE TASMOWSKI (eds), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages* (*Linguistik aktuell / Linguistics Today* 130). Amsterdam – Philadelphia 2008, pp. 89–103. This contribution, however, is not mentioned in *The Cambridge Grammar*, so we should rather speak about a strange tendency than about any direct influence.

40. E.g. ELENA ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, Clitic Doubling. In: MARTIN EVERAERT – HENK VAN RIEMSDIJK (eds), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. 2d edn. Oxford 2017, pp. 4–6.