

# Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek

## BOOK OF ABSTRACTS

---

**Conference date: December 1-2, 2016**

**Conference venue: Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde (Koningstraat 18, Gent)**

**Organizing committee: Klaas Bentein, Mark Janse, Willy Clarysse & Bruno Rochette**



DE GRUYTER  
MOUTON



BRILL

*[www.varieties.ugent.be](http://www.varieties.ugent.be)*



## Program

### December 1, 2016

- 09.00-18.00 Registration
- 09.30-09.45 Dean, head of department & Mark Janse (welcome)
- 09.45-10.15 Klaas Bentein (Ghent University)  
Introduction: Varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek
- 10.15-11.15 **Plenary lecture**  
**Chair: Klaas Bentein**  
Martti Leiwo (University of Helsinki)  
Tracking down (-)lects in Roman Egypt
- 11.15-11.45 Coffee & tea break
- 11.45-13.15 **Session 1: Linguistic variation in Post-classical and Byzantine Greek**  
**Chair: Emilio Crespo**
- 11.45-12.15 Carla Bruno (Università per Stranieri, Siena)  
Tense forms in Greek Ptolemaic papyri: epistolary uses and diachronic drifts
- 12.15-12.45 Patrick James (University of Cambridge)  
Greek in the Desert City: terms of address and directives in the Sayings of the Desert Fathers and the Spiritual Meadow of John Moschos
- 12.45-13.15 Julie Boeten (Ghent University)  
Metrical Varieties in the Ὠσπερ ξένοι Book Epigrams
- 13.15-14.30 Lunch Break
- 14.30-15.30 **Session 2: Greek in Egypt (part 1)**  
**Chair: Martti Leiwo**
- 14.30-15.00 Victoria Fendel (University of Oxford)  
Syntactic variation in Egypt: Bilingual interference or the emergence of a regional variety?
- 15.00-15.30 Sofia Torallas Tovar (University of Chicago)  
Lexicographers and grammarians as sources for the study of Egyptian Greek
- 15.30-16.00 Coffee & tea break
- 16.00-17.00 **Session 3: Greek in Egypt (part 2)**  
**Chair: James Aitken**
- 16.00-16.30 Emilio Crespo (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)  
The letter of Emperor Claudius to Alexandrians and the archive of Nemesion
- 16.30-17.00 Marja Vierros (University of Helsinki)  
Idiolect in focus: brothers in the Memphis Serapeion
- 17.00- Reception
- 19.30 Conference dinner at Het Pand (Onderbergen 1, 9000 Gent)

## December 2, 2016

09.00-10.00 **Plenary Lecture**

**Chair: Mark Janse**

Geoffrey Horrocks (University of Cambridge)

Byzantine literature in “classical” genres: the underlying grammatical realities

10.00-10.30 Coffee & tea break

10.30-12.30 **Session 4: Analysing variation in later Byzantine Greek**

**Chair: Brian Joseph**

10.30-11.00 Staffan Wahlgren (Norwegian University of Science and Technology)

Describing, Narrating, Arguing: Text Type and Linguistic Variation in 10th c. Greek

11.00-11.30 Theodoros Markopoulos (University of Patras)

Manuscripts, *genre*, dialect or something else? Variation in Late Medieval Greek

11.30-12.00 Martin Hinterberger (University of Cyprus)

From highly classicizing to ‘usual prose’: The Metaphrasis of Niketas Choniates’ History

12.00-12.30 Mark Janse (Ghent University)

Orally Transmitted Songs as Evidence of Dialectal Variation in Medieval Greek

12.30-13.30 Lunch break

13.30-15.30 **Session 5: Registers of Post-classical and Early Byzantine Greek**

**Chair: Geoffrey Horrocks**

13.30-14.00 Jerneja Kavčič (University of Ljubljana)

Variation and register in Early Byzantine Greek: expressions of anteriority in non-finite constructions

14.00-14.30 Klaas Bentein (Ghent University)

Extending the Functional Sociolinguistic paradigm? ‘Formal’ and ‘informal’ as varieties of Post-classical and Early Byzantine Greek

14.30-15.00 Joanne Stolk (Ghent University)

Variation at multiple linguistic levels: the co-occurrence of phonological and morphological variants in Greek documentary papyri

15.00-15.30 Aikaterini Koroli (Austrian Academy of Sciences)

Imposing psychological pressure in papyrus request letters

15.30-16.00 Coffee & tea break

16.00-17.00 **Session 6: The language of religion**

**Chair: Sofia Torallas Tovar**

16.00-16.30 Brian Joseph (The Ohio State University)

Jewish Greek of Constantinople as a regiolect

16.30-17.00 James Aitken (University of Cambridge)

Variation between Septuagint books in the context of post-classical Greek

17.00-17.30 Concluding remarks (Mark Janse)

## List of abstracts

James Aitken, 'Variation between Septuagint books in the context of post-classical Greek' .....	6
Klaas Bentein, 'Extending the Functional Sociolinguistic Paradigm? "Formal" and "informal" as varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek' .....	6
Julie Boeten, 'Metrical variation in the Ὀσπερ ξένοι book epigrams' .....	7
Carla Bruno, 'Tense forms in Greek Ptolemaic papyri: epistolary uses and diachronic drifts' .....	8
Emilio Crespo, 'The Letter of Emperor Claudius to Alexandrians and the archive of Nemesion' .....	8
Victoria Fendel, 'Syntactic variation in Egypt: Bilingual interference or the emergence of a regional variety?' .....	9
Martin Hinterberger, 'From highly classicizing to "usual prose": The Metaphrasis of Niketas Choniates' History' .....	11
Geoffrey Horrocks, 'Byzantine literature in "classical" genres: the underlying grammatical realities' .....	11
Patrick James, 'Greek in the Desert City: terms of address and directives in the Sayings of the Desert Fathers and the Spiritual Meadow of John Moschos' .....	12
Mark Janse, 'Orally Transmitted Songs as Evidence of Dialectal Variation in Medieval Greek' .....	14
Brian Joseph, 'Jewish Greek of Constantinople as a Religiolect' .....	14
Jerneja Kavčič, 'Variation and register in Early Byzantine Greek: expressions of anteriority in non-finite constructions' .....	15
Aikaterini Koroli, 'Imposing psychological pressure in papyrus request letters' .....	16
Martti Leiwo, 'Tracking down (-)lects in Roman Egypt' .....	17
Theodoros Markopoulos, 'Manuscripts, genre, dialect or something else? Variation in Late Medieval Greek' .....	17
Joanne Stolk, 'Variation at multiple linguistic levels: the co-occurrence of phonological and morphological variants in Greek documentary papyri' .....	18
Sofia Torallas Tovar, 'Lexicographers and grammarians as sources for the study of Egyptian Greek' .....	20
Marja Vierros, 'Idiolect in focus: brothers in the Memphis Serapeion' .....	20
Staffan Wahlgren, 'Describing, Narrating, Arguing: Text Type and Linguistic Variation in 10th c. Greek' .....	21

## **James Aitken, ‘Variation between Septuagint books in the context of post-classical Greek’**

*University of Cambridge*  
jka12@cam.ac.uk

Assessment of the Greek in various Septuagint translations is dependent on the evaluation of interference from the source text. Accordingly, scholars have tended to identify translation technique as the defining characteristic of individual translations without paying attention to the language itself. This paper will examine features in the Septuagint that reflect developments in post-classical Greek even if they can be explained as appropriate formal representation of their Hebrew source text. The Septuagint therefore can serve as a source for linguistic evidence from the period, but also importantly, in the preferences of each of the translators, can be an indicator of the varying sensitivity of translators to linguistic register. Examples will be given from the Septuagint and documentary evidence of the Hellenistic period.

## **Klaas Bentein, ‘Extending the Functional Sociolinguistic Paradigm? “Formal” and “informal” as varieties of Post-classical and Byzantine Greek’**

*Ghent University*  
Klaas.Bentein@UGent.be

In this paper, I will report some preliminary findings of my larger research project on the language of Greek documentary writing (I – VIII AD). To be more specific, I will investigate to what extent the Functional Sociolinguistic paradigm (e.g. Martin & Williams 2004) can be adopted for the analysis of the Greek language in its social context. This theory considers language as a social semiotic with three basic functions – called ‘ideational’ (expressing something about the world), ‘textual’ (creating text), and ‘interpersonal’ (enacting social relations) – which systematically correlate with three major social parameters – called ‘field’ (the nature of the social activity), ‘mode’ (the ways in which interactants come into contact), and ‘tenor’ (the interactants and their social relation).

I intend to explore the following three research questions: (i) to what extent can TENOR, or in other words, the social situation, correlate with morpho-syntactic structures that are not strictly interpersonal in nature?; (ii) to what extent is there harmony or dissonance between the different metafunctions? Are there competing motivations at work?; (iii) is there some other type of functional motivation for the correlation between TENOR and the linguistic features under analysis? I will be looking at these three research questions by investigating three linguistic areas which are related to the ideational metafunction in the Functional Sociolinguistic paradigm, that is, relativisation, complementation, and co-ordination, and investigate their use in formal vs. informal texts (for the importance of ‘formality’ in documentary writing, see e.g. Lee 1985).

I will show that there are, indeed, significant correlations between specific strategies of relativisation/complementation/co-ordination and formal vs. informal texts respectively: for example, the co-ordinating structure  $\tau\epsilon \dots \kappa\alpha\iota$  is found in 91% of the cases in

formal texts, whereas the complementation structure ὅτι with the indicative is found in 85% of the cases in informal texts. This points to a metafunctionally diverse motivation of linguistic features (a conclusion also reached elsewhere, see e.g. Bakker 2009 on word order, and Bentein 2016 on aspect), with – in some cases – conflicting motivations. I argue that the relevance of the interpersonal level can still be considered functionally motivated, based on a broad understanding of the concept ‘functional motivation’ (see e.g. Hodge & Kress’ 1988 concept of ‘transparent signifier’). To be more specific, I argue that at least two factors underly the correlation between linguistic features and the formality/informality distinction: (i) the desire to use syntactically complex vs. non-complex structures; (ii) the wish to use archaic vs. non-archaic structures.

## References

- Bakker, S.J. 2009. *The noun phrase in Ancient Greek*. Leiden/Boston : Brill.
- Bentein, K. 2016. Aspectual choice and the presentation of narrative. An application to Herodotus’ Histories. *Glotta* 92, 24-55.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & C. Matthiessen. 2014. *Halliday’s introduction to Functional Grammar*. London & New York.
- Hodge, R. & G. Kress. 1988. *Social Semiotics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Lee, J.A.L. 1985. Some features of the speech of Jesus in Mark’s Gospel. *Novum Testamentum* 27, 1-26.
- Martin, J. & G. Williams. (2004). Functional sociolinguistics. In: U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. Mattheier & P. Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society*, 120-129. Berlin.

## **Julie Boeten, ‘Metrical variation in the “Ὠσπερ ξένοι book epigrams’**

*Ghent University*  
Julie.Boeten@UGent.Be

Greek manuscripts are generally being studied as witnesses of Ancient, Early Christian or Byzantine texts. By contrast, the (snippets of) texts found in the margins of these manuscripts have received very little scholarly attention. Book epigrams are a good example of such little-explored marginalia. Recently, however, a wealth of material has become publicly – and freely – available through the Ghent University Database of Byzantine Book Epigrams ([www.dbbe.ugent.be](http://www.dbbe.ugent.be)), which has sparked off further research into this subject.

The “Ὠσπερ ξένοι χάρουσιν ἰδεῖν πατρίδα”-colophon was a very popular one in Byzantine times. In the Database of Byzantine Book Epigrams over 160 occurrences of this type have been collected today and that number is still growing. Of these numerous occurrences, many contain metrical irregularities that at first sight seem to be blatant mistakes by the scribe. At a closer look, however, these “mistakes” seem to be not so much errors as simply metrical variations, that were not felt to be irregular by the scribe.

In order to come to this conclusion, this paper will investigate the commatic style that was typical of Byzantine rhetoric (and more specifically of asiatic and liturgical rhetoric), the modern linguistic concept of Information Units, and the Byzantine idea of εὐρυθμία.

## **Carla Bruno, ‘Tense forms in Greek Ptolemaic papyri: epistolary uses and diachronic drifts’**

*Università per Stranieri, Siena*  
bruno@unistrasi.it

On the background of the diachronic evolution of the Classical Greek verb system, this paper takes into account the distribution of tense stems in the Greek of a representative corpus of Ptolemaic papyri letters.

What emerges is a composite picture in which inconsistencies with the classical standards can be referable to both evolutive trends (as the gradual reassessment of the functional domain of historical tenses) and discursive reasons (with possible shifts not only from the sender to the receiver perspective in the time reference, but also between the different levels of enunciation).

### Selected bibliography

Evans T. (2001). *Another Ghost: The Greek Epistolary Perfect*, «Glotta», 75, pp. 194-221.

Evans T. & Obbink D. (2010) (eds.), *The language of the papyri*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horrocks G. (2010<sup>2</sup>), *Greek: A History of the language and its speakers*, London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Klauck H.-J. (2006). *Ancient Letters and the New Testament. A Guide to the Context and Exegesis*. Waco Texas: Baylor University Press.

Mandilaras B. G. (1973), *The verb in the Greek non-literary papyri*, Athens: Ministry of Culture and Sciences.

Mayser E. (1926). *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, II, 1. Berlin & Leipzig: W. de Gruyter & Co.

White J. L. (1986). *Light from ancient letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

## **Emilio Crespo, ‘The Letter of Emperor Claudius to Alexandrians and the archive of Nemesion’**

*Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. Fundación Pastor de Estudios Clásicos (Madrid)*  
emilio.crespo@uam.es

The Letter of Emperor Claudius to Alexandrians (P. Lond. 6, 1912), dated to 41 AD, is one of the most famous documentary texts from ancient Egypt. The papyrus copy that has come down to us was written on the back of a tax-register of which the recto was written by the same hand at Philadelphia. The letter deals with various subjects, of which the one that has attracted most attention concerns the feud and riots between the Jews in Alexandria and other inhabitants of that town and the efforts of the Emperor to maintain peace. An edition is readily accessible at <http://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.lond;6;1912>



The document attests to a high number of orthographical errors. Many of them may be interpreted as reflecting a pronunciation of most vowels similar to that of standard present-day Greek. Just to cite a single case, the confusions between ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς might be accounted for as concealing an identical pronunciation [i'mis] for both pronouns. The abundance of misspellings in the text contrasts with its official style and clearly shows that the author had a low command of traditional Greek spelling.

The copy of this letter is just one of the 64 certain and 2 uncertain documents that make up the archive of Nemesion, son of Zoilos, a tax collector at Philadelphia in the mid third of the first century AD. "Half of the texts in the archive are lists of taxpayers, year lists of payments due, day books and lists of arrears, in different classifications (by area and village, alphabetically by name of the tax payers, by type of taxes)" (Clarisse, "Nemesion son of Zoilos", Leuven Database of Papyrus Collections). Most texts were written by and for Nemesion, a man of substance in the village, married to Thermouthis and probably with three children. About ten documents in the archive are Nemesion's private business letters. The general picture from the spellings of these documents goes in the same direction as the copy of the letter of Emperor Claudius.

The conclusion is that this tax collector regularly wrote Greek with phonetic spelling, a habit probably common with other members of similar socio-economic layers.

R. S. Bagnall, *Reading Papyry, Writing Ancient History*, New York, 1995, 33-34

A. E. Hanson, "Documents from Philadelphia Drawn from the Census Register," *Actes du XV Congrès International de Papyrologie Deuxieme Partie*, Bruxelles, 1979, 60-74

- , "Topographical Arrangement of Tax Documents in the Philadelphia Tax Archive", *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists*, Copenhagen, 1992, 210-218

- , "Egyptians, Romans, Arabes and Ioudaioi in the First Century A.D. Tax Archive from Philadelphia: P. Mich. inv. 880 recto and P. Princ. III. 152 revised", *Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization: Life in a Multicultural Society: Egypt from Cambyses to Constantine and Beyond*, vol. 51, Chicago, 1992, 133-48

-, "Papyri and Efforts by Adults in Egyptian Villages to Write Greek", in E. P. Archibald, W. Brockliss and J. Gnoza (eds.), *Learning Latin and Greek from Antiquity to the Present*, Cambridge, 2015, 10-29

## **Victoria Fendel, 'Syntactic variation in Egypt: Bilingual interference or the emergence of a regional variety?'**

*University of Oxford*  
victoria.fendel@classics.ox.ac.uk

In a situation of bilingualism, the relevant languages may interact in several ways so that new language varieties may result. This paper will explore certain aspect of the linguistic interaction between Greek and Egyptian (Coptic), taking documentary papyri as its source of evidence. It will ask whether our evidence allows to distinguish between bilingual interference and the emergence of a regional variety of Greek in Egypt. A regional variety may have developed because a considerable number of people were

bilingual and decided to allow frequently occurring contact-induced structures to conventionalize. The resulting variety may be subsumed under what Adams has called an 'indigenised' link language (Adams 2003; cf. Bubenik 1993). This was based on the Greek Koine, but had absorbed features that Greek could only develop in contact with Egyptian. As Greek disappeared from Egypt in the aftermath of the Arab conquest, structures that passed into the modern language are unlikely to have formed part of this regional variety. Conversely, features which did not survive and additionally call for an explanation other than inner-Greek development may have resulted from the specifically Egyptian constellation of language contact.

In the past, both phonological (recently Horrocks 2014) and lexical-semantic (i.a. Torallas Tovar 2004, 2010) phenomena have been studied, areas in which regionalisms most often deviate from the perceived standard language (cf. Adams 2007). By contrast, this paper will focus on the area of syntax, which will be divided into verbal syntax, nominal syntax and discourse syntax. (Morphologically, the typological distance between Greek and Coptic and speakers' language loyalty may be held responsible for the virtual inexistence of evidence proving language contact.)

Our starting point will be two letters belonging to two fourth century bilingual (Greek-Coptic) archives, P. Kell. Gr. 1 72, P. Herm. 7. When analysing them several factors must be taken into account, i.e. epistolary conventions, the state of the Greek language in the fourth century, the impact of colloquial speech, the writers' linguistic ambitions and finally their bilinguality. Both letters also contain contact phenomena other than bilingual interference, i.e. borrowing (Torallas Tovar 2004) and code-switching (Luiselli 2008). It will be argued that one of them may reflect an emerging regional variety of Greek, whereas the other merely seems to display bilingual interference. Finally, it will be asked how representative our evidence is for the whole population of fourth century Egypt and what kind of evidence we would need to corroborate further the claim that there actually was a regional variety of Greek in Egypt.

## References

Adams, J. (2003). *Bilingualism and the Latin language*. Cambridge.

Adams, J. (2007). *The regional diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge.

Bubenik, V. (1993). 'Dialect contact and koineization: The case of Hellenistic Greek', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 99: 9–23.

Horrocks, G. (2014). *Greek. A history of the language and its speakers*. 2nd edition. Chicester.

Luiselli, R. (2008). 'Greek letters on papyrus. First to eighth centuries: A survey', *Asian Studies* 62/3:677–737.

Torallas Tovar (2004). 'Egyptian lexical interference in the Greek of Byzantine and early Islamic Egypt', in Sijpesteijn, P., and Sundelin, L. (eds.) (2004). *Papyrology and the history of early Islamic Egypt*. Islamic history and civilization 55. Leiden, 163–198.

Torallas Tovar, S. (2010). 'Greek in Egypt', in Bakker, J. (ed.) (2010). *A companion to the ancient Greek language*. Malden and Oxford, 253–266.

## **Martin Hinterberger, 'From highly classicizing to "usual prose": The Metaphrasis of Niketas Choniates' History'**

*University of Cyprus*  
siebens@ucy.ac.cy

During the first decade of the 13th century Niketas Choniates wrote a highly classicizing history covering the last 50 years before the Capture of Constantinople by the participants of the 4th Crusade. Around 1340-50 this relatively popular text which linguistically however was accessible only with major difficulties, was 'transposed' to a much simpler variety of Greek which has been dubbed 'the language of usual prose' or 'Byzantine written koine' (not to be confused with the so-called vernacular used at the same time for literary texts in verse).

It is the aim of my paper to explore the major differences between these two texts, Choniates' History and its Metaphrasis. These differences cover all linguistic areas, phonetics, morphology and syntax as well as vocabulary. Concerning vocabulary, I shall present the provisional results of a research project currently carried out at the University of Cyprus. Furthermore I am especially interested in the question how exactly Choniates uses his high-style markers, i.e. all those linguistic elements which are regularly replaced in the Metaphrasis by other elements. In previous studies I have investigated the use of pluperfect and perfect forms in Byzantine texts, and the respective results are confirmed by the Metaphrasis. With the opportunity of the Gent Conference of Varieties, I shall turn my attention to other classicizing markers such as Attic declension, Attic personal pronouns etc. Choniates' use of these features, though seemingly arbitrary, to a high degree is consistent within the History and also in comparison with other contemporary texts.

The juxtaposition of original and Metaphrasis (not only in this case) leads us to the question how to define classicized Byzantine Greek, but also how to define the language 'of usual prose', both varieties displaying to various degrees characteristics both of the living contemporary as well as of the archaizing language of the written tradition.

## **Geoffrey Horrocks, 'Byzantine literature in "classical" genres: the underlying grammatical realities'**

*University of Cambridge*  
gch1000@cam.ac.uk

A great deal of recent research has focused on the literary registers of Byzantine Greek, and our understanding of writers' linguistic behaviour has been significantly advanced as a result. This lecture will focus on a limited range of issues with a view to clarifying Byzantine writers' use of 'classical Greek', i.e. on the highest levels of the spectrum of linguistic registers.

It is now widely accepted that few if any Byzantine writers sought to replicate the language of classical models in any precise way, and that varieties of high-register Greek had evolved with the passage of time, steadily allowing non-classical elements into the

contemporary literary 'standard'. It is striking, however, that very few of these innovations involve morphology and that the majority involve syntax and semantics. The question is why this should be so. An examination of the surviving grammars inherited from antiquity, and of their later medieval adaptations, provides an immediate answer. There is a meticulous listing of forms and paradigms, but typically little or no attention is given to syntax, and where there is such attention, the focus is theoretical rather than practical, and largely centred on the syntax of word forms rather than of clauses. Some possible reasons for this are briefly explored.

For the few in a position to learn the literary language, therefore, it was a matter of mastering morphological paradigms by rote and then learning to use the various forms, many of which were long obsolete in contemporary Greek, in some other way. In the absence of formalised syntactic rules abstracted from past usage, the only realistic options were the close examination of precedents under the guidance of a teacher, and also – something that has been underestimated – reliance on the linguistic intuitions of writers as native speakers of more 'natural' forms of contemporary Greek. The two, of course, overlap, to the extent that the teachers were also native speakers, themselves taught by earlier generations of native speakers.

My own (limited) work in this field has focused on expressions of futurity and modality, and it has been argued that to a large extent the writers of high-register works regarded the obsolete morphological resources of classical Greek as stylistically marked realisations of the regular categories of the contemporary/colloquial language, and used them accordingly – subject in part to the application of constraints inherited from the grammatical tradition. This implies that, at an appropriate level of abstraction, medieval Greek in any given period had a largely common grammar in terms of the syntax and semantics of its underlying 'constructions', and that writers saw their principal task as one of 'transposing' between different potential 'realisations' according to register and genre, each characterised by particular lexical, phraseological and (especially) morphological resources.

Examples are provided from both early and late(r) Byzantine literature to support this contention, and it is argued that, with specific reference to expressions of futurity and modality, conditional sentences were a powerful instigator of the innovations that shaped the functional redeployment of the classical categories (future, subjunctive, optative) in this domain.

### **Patrick James, 'Greek in the Desert City: terms of address and directives in the Sayings of the Desert Fathers and the Spiritual Meadow of John Moschos'**

*Tyndale House, Cambridge*  
pj221@cam.ac.uk

The Sayings of the Desert Fathers (fifth/sixth c. ce) and the Spiritual Meadow of John Moschos (sixth/seventh c. ce), whose style is 'free from tortured rhetoric' (Baynes 1955: 261), report the spoken interactions of monks, nuns, and others throughout the Levant and Egypt in hierarchical societies of hermits and monasteries. Apophthegm 7 of Joseph

of Panephrisis, for example, contains one monk's request for information and the instruction given by another, both apparently of the same status (ἀββᾶς):

Παρέβαλεν ὁ ἀββᾶς Λῶτ τῷ ἀββᾷ Ἰωσήφ, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Ἀββᾶ κατὰ δύναμίν μου ποιῶ τὴν μικρὰν μου σύναξιν,... Τί οὖν ἔχω ποιῆσαι λοιπόν; Ἀναστάς οὖν ὁ γέρον, ἤπλωσε τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν· καὶ γεγόνασιν οἱ δάκτυλοι αὐτοῦ, ὡς δέκα λαμπάδες πυρός· καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· Εἰ θέλεις, γενοῦ ὄλος ὡς πῦρ.

As collections of representations of such interactions, these two texts are likely to be invaluable for the study of register and diastratic variation, of variation by gender and age, and of idiolects in 'Late Koiné Greek' (300–600 ce) and beyond.

That said, the Sayings of the Desert Fathers and the Spiritual Meadow have received much more attention as evidence for the historical development of Greek than for variation in relation to social status, social distance, age, or gender. These collections (chiefly, though, the Spiritual Meadow) feature, although, perhaps, only in passing, in the grammars, handbooks, and introductions that treat Post-Classical Greek (Browning 1983, Horrocks 2010, and Jannaris 1897), in lexica (Lampe 1961–1968 and Sophocles 1900), in chrestomathies (Sophocles 1900, Wilson 1971, and Whitacre 2007), and in studies of specific developments (e.g. Bentein 2016, Markopoulos 2009, and Mihevc-Gabrovec 1960). For John Lee (Phronemata 30.1 (2015), 23–42), the Sayings of the Desert Fathers provide specimens of the morphology, lexicon, and syntax of 'Late Koiné Greek'.

It is clear, then, that, although the nature, form, and unpretentious language of these collections make them likely to be invaluable evidence for linguistic variation, they remain underexploited from a sociolinguistic perspective. Moreover, such sociolinguistic inquiries can be built upon research about the place of these particular texts in the historical development of Greek. Also, their Egyptian setting makes letters and petitions on papyri and ostraca particularly relevant as a corpus for comparison. In turn, sociolinguistic research on these collections will aid our analysis of contemporary documentary texts and will further our understanding of the development of Greek in this period.

This paper is a pilot project for a much larger study of variation in 'Late Koiné Greek' and beyond. It will consider the presence and position of terms of address (e.g. ἀββᾶ in the extract above, but also ἀγαπητέ, ἀδελφέ, γέρον, πάτερ, τέκνον, τεκνίον, etc.) and directives (i.e. various imperative forms and constructions as well as declaratives, precatives, polite conditionals, questions, and hints: note, in the extract above, the conditional εἰ θέλεις before the imperative γενοῦ in answer to the question τί οὖν ἔχω ποιῆσαι λοιπόν; that implies 'Tell me what I must do!'). Both of these two central areas of sociolinguistic research have been fruitfully studied in ancient texts (e.g. Leiwo 2010 and Dickey 1996). My investigation will demonstrate the value of the Sayings of the Desert Fathers and the Spiritual Meadow for sociolinguistic inquiry and my results will be used to delineate further the varieties that are present in these written representations of spoken 'Late Koiné Greek'.

## Mark Janse, 'Orally Transmitted Songs as Evidence of Dialectal Variation in Medieval Greek'

Ghent University  
mark.janse@ugent.be

The evidence for dialectal variation in Medieval Greek is relatively scarce, with some notable exceptions such as Cypriot and Pontic Greek. In the case of Cappadocian Greek, there are no medieval sources except three verses written in Ottoman script (Theodoridis 2004). Indirect evidence comes from correspondences between variation attested in inscription written in the Asia Minor Greek Koine and Cappadocian Greek dialects (Manolessou 2015) or in Medieval Greek loanwords in Romani dialects now spoken in Western Europe (Tzitzilis 1998). Other indirect evidence, ignored until now as far as I know, comes from orally transmitted songs. As is well known, such orally transmitted songs contain many archaisms not related to the spoken varieties of their time. A very important collected of such songs is Levidis (1892), an unpublished manuscript from the Dawkins Archives in Oxford, which I hope to publish in due time with the permission of its owner, Exeter College. Dawkins (1934) published three of the Cappadocian songs, one of which recorded by Levidis in Fertek, a Southwestern Cappadocian dialect, containing a great number of features which are very different from the dialect as recorded by Dawkins (1916). In this paper I will discuss these features as archaisms going back to the Late Medieval Period or even before.

Dawkins, Richard. M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.

Dawkins, Richard M. 1934. Some Modern Greek Songs from Cappadocia. *American Journal of Archaeology* 38, 112–22.

Levidis, Anastasios M. 1892. Πραγματεία περὶ τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ λαλουμένης γλώσσης, μετὰ τῶν δημωδῶν ᾠμάτων, αἰνιγμάτων, παροιμιῶν, εὐχῶν, καταρῶν, ὄρκων, κυρίων ὀνομάτων, μύθων, ᾠμάτων μεσαιωνικῶν, γραμματικῆς, καὶ γλωσσαρίων ὀκτώ, καὶ σημειώσεων. Manuscript.

Manolessou, Io. 2015. Sources for the Early History of Variation in the Asia Minor Dialects. Paper presented at the International Conference on Morphological Variation and Contact, University of Patras, 19-20 June 2015.

Theodoridis, Dimitris. 2004. Versuch einer Neuausgabe von drei griechischen Doppelversen aus dem *Dīwān* von Sultan Walad. *Byzantion* 74, 433–451.

Tzitzilis, Christos. 1998. Mittelgriechischen Lehnwörter im Romanes. In: Birgit Iгла & Thomas Stolz (eds.), *Was ich noch sagen wollte: A Multilingual Festschrift for Norbert Boretzky on Occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, 327-340. Berlin.

## Brian Joseph, 'Jewish Greek of Constantinople as a Religiolect'

The Ohio State University  
joseph.1@osu.edu

The conference announcement quite rightly mentions a number of “lects” that play a role in shaping the range of variation that is found in Post-Classical and Byzantine Greek: “chronolects, dialects, idiolects, ethnolects, genderlects, regiolects, sociolects, [and] technolects”. I propose in this paper to add a key “-lect” to this list by addressing aspects

of a *religio-lect* that is highly relevant for the study of Greek, namely Jewish Greek.

I bring Jewish Greek into the mix, through a consideration of the Jewish Greek of 16<sup>th</sup> century Constantinople as revealed in the 1547 translation of the Old Testament. This remarkable work has not gotten the full attention that it deserves, being barely mentioned, if at all, in English-language works on the latter history of Greek while receiving more play in Tonnet 1993.

While there are some doubts expressed about the value of this work, e.g. by Tonnet, who notes a slavishness to its word order, vis-à-vis the Hebrew original, I will argue that this is in fact a legitimate variety of Greek, as a religiously defined lect; a comparison between its use of the infinitive and that found in New Testament Greek, arguably a representative of Jewish Greek from an earlier era, suggests a legitimacy to the language through the distribution of infinitival usage. Further, through its use of other Hellenistic Koine (New Testament) Greek features, Constantinople Judeo-Greek offers material that provides a view into an important social dimension that is characteristic of Jewish languages; that is, these features show the conservatism often found in Jewish languages and thus point to some degree of social isolation for its speakers.

### **Jerneja Kavčič, ‘Variation and register in Early Byzantine Greek: expressions of anteriority in non-finite constructions’**

*University of Ljubljana*  
jerneja.kavcic@guest.arnes.si

Variation in the use of finite and non-finite dependent constructions in Post-Classical/Early Byzantine Greek has received considerable attention (a recent example: Bentein 2015). This paper discusses a less-known phenomenon which concerns variation within non-finite dependent clauses. As argued in Kavčič forth., some Post-Classical/Early Byzantine texts regularly employ the perfect infinitive in the so-called declarative infinitive clauses, which convey anteriority. An example is PSI 4.281 (100–199 AD): λεγόντων το λεγόμενον γεγονέναι πρᾶγμα η (ἔτει) Δομιτιανοῦ “saying that the thing they were talking about happened in the eighth year of Domitian”. These texts thus avoid the Classical Greek construction, in which the aorist infinitive conveyed anteriority, e.g.: ἃ φησι δρᾶσαι αὐτὸν Ἡσίοδος “what Hesiod says that he had done” (Plato, Resp. 277e8). In diachronic terms, the process that affected this construction seems to be related to the aspectual nature of the aorist and to the emergence of the so-called anterior perfect (Kavčič forth.).

Nevertheless, other Post-Classical/Early Byzantine texts still contain instances of the Classical Greek construction. My aim is to show that in these periods, the register plays a decisive role in the variation between the aorist and the perfect infinitives in the construction investigated. I thus present the results of an analysis of this construction in a number of Post-Classical/Early Byzantine texts (official and private papyri documents, from the 1st–6th centuries AD; the New Testament; literary texts written in different registers). The analysis shows that the Classical construction is avoided in lower registers, e.g. in private letters, which tend to use the “innovative” construction with the perfect infinitive. (There are, however, exceptions: individual authors may use the Classical construction when writing in formal contexts; the latter may also be used when

referring to an event that took place before another past event.) The same phenomena are observed in official papyri documents and in Early Byzantine literary texts, written in what can be considered “middle” registers (Horrocks 2010; an example is *Pratum Spirituale*). On the other hand, the Classical construction occurs in higher registers (e.g. in Procopius of Caesarea) about as frequently as in Classical Greek.

I thus conclude that, although not mentioned in the major works on syntactic variation in the Post-Classical/Early Byzantine periods (Horrocks 2010; Hult 1990), the use of the aorist infinitive in the construction investigated is another property of higher registers in these periods. In addition, I discuss a (minor) issue concerning the construction investigated and the style of official papyri documents: the latter seems to be a compromise between the natural development of the language and conservative stylistic tendencies (Horrocks 2010: 90) rather than to follow the Attic norm strictly (Mandilaras 1973: 329). Official documents thus regularly display in the construction investigated the perfect infinitive (in the function of conveying anteriority) and the future infinitive. While the former appears to be an innovative construction, the latter is a much more conservative feature, given that the future infinitive retreated early from the spoken language (Markopoulos 2009: 28).

#### References

Kavčič forth., The Decline of the Aorist Infinitive in Ancient Greek Declarative Infinitive Clauses, *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 16/2 (2016).

Bentein, K., 2015, Minor Complementation Patterns in Post-Classical Greek (I–VI AD): A Sociohistorical Analysis of a Corpus of Documentary Papyri, *Symbolae Osloenses* 89/1, 104–147.

Horrocks, G., *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, 2nd edn., Chichester.

Hult, K., 1990, *Syntactic variation in Greek of the 5th century AD*, Göteborg.

Mandilaras, B., 1973, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri*, Athens.

Markopoulos, Th., 2009, *The Future in Greek: From Ancient to Medieval*, Oxford.

### **Aikaterini Koroli, ‘Imposing psychological pressure in papyrus request letters’**

*Austrian Academy of Sciences (Institut für Kulturgeschichte der Antike)*  
Aikaterini.Koroli@oeaw.ac.at

The vast majority of the private papyrus letters dated to the Roman (31 B.C. – 330 A.D.), Byzantine (330 A.D. – 641 A.D.) and Early Arab period (641 A.D. – 799 A.D.) of Egypt fall into the category of request letters. As such, we can consider the letters in which requesting constitutes the primary communicative goal — or, at least, one of the main communicative goals — of their senders. The latter may resort to various linguistic strategies in their effort to convince the recipients to satisfy their requests. Very often, they use a wide variety of politeness strategies or they submit their request(s) in an imperative tone. These linguistic strategies are found either in the parts of letter including the directive speech acts themselves or in their context.



In the present paper, I will present systematically these two ways of imposing psychological pressure to the recipient(s), by focusing on

- a. how they are linguistically codified at many different levels;
- b. how and to what extent they serve the communicative goal of the sender, and
- c. how these linguistic strategies interact with each other.

Moreover, I will present the sociolinguistic dimension of all these linguistic data by focusing on characteristic examples of letters written by and sent to clergies.

## **Martti Leiwo, 'Tracking down (-)lects in Roman Egypt'**

*University of Helsinki*  
martti.leiwo@helsinki.fi

Out of total of 54,312 published Greek and Latin documentary texts (April 2004, HGV, see Bülow-Jacobsen 2009, 3) 50786 are written on papyri or ostraca. The period of Roman rule greatly outnumbers those of the Hellenistic period (Bagnall 2009, xviii). According to papyri.info there are 63 747 Greek loosely dated documents (2015). This is a huge number, but, unfortunately, some of the texts are edited before customary very high standards of editing, and are without autopsy less useful for accurate linguistic research than the best editions. In total, the registers of documentary texts as well as scribal professionalism vary a lot, and the time span covers at least 800 years (e.g. 300 BCE – 500 CE). This signifies considerable linguistic variation. My talk will focus on Roman Egypt and will 1) offer some socio-historical context for understanding different documentary texts, 2) look for differences in hands and documents for identifying professional and casual writers, 3) suggest that speech communities in the desert differ significantly from those in the Nile valley and Delta as regards language use, 4) provide some examples of formal documentary varieties that could be called doculects, and recognizable individual varieties that seem to be idiolectic, and, finally, connected with the previous, 5) discuss possible contexts where contact-induced variation is more probable than internal variation.

I will also give a bibliography of linguistic research concerning documentary papyri and ostraca.

The research is carried out in the project Act of the Scribe. Transmitting linguistic knowledge and scribal practices, funded by the Academy of Finland.

## **Theodoros Markopoulos, 'Manuscripts, genre, dialect or something else? Variation in Late Medieval Greek'**

*University of Patras*  
theomark@upatras.gr

The corpus of Late Medieval Greek (LMG) texts in the vernacular is very well-known, as

it has been the subject of study of a long philological tradition which endeavored to connect it with the Modern Greek language and culture. One linguistic feature of those texts has been immediately recognized and held prominent ever since in all relevant studies: the great amount of linguistic variation they exhibit at all levels of linguistic structure (similarly to the situation involving other contemporary Western European ‘vernaculars’), and especially with regard to the mixing of vernacular and non-vernacular (or ‘learned’) forms (cf. e.g. Horrocks, 2010).

This mixing, traditionally downplayed in order to argue for an alleged sharp divide between ‘learned’ and vernacular literary production, has recently led scholars (cf. e.g. Toufexis, 2008) to employ the notion of a sociolinguistic ‘continuum’ for Late Medieval Greek texts, where no clear boundaries between potential different registers exist. Although this notion can link the discussion of LMG with the current sociolinguistic thinking and as such will be utilized in the present article, it cannot provide answers for various outstanding issues, such as: a) Which factors determine the amount of ‘learned’ material found in vernacular texts? b) What is the relationship between areal and social variation in the vernacular corpus? and c) What is the relationship between the amount of linguistic variation, the date of the production of the manuscripts and the assumed date of the production of the text?

This paper aims to provide some preliminary answers to those questions on the basis of the examination of morphosyntactic patterns in literary LMG texts in the vernacular (e.g. periphrastic constructions involving ‘ekho’=have and the use of the gerundive –onta). It argues that the variation and, in particular, the interplay between ‘learned’ and vernacular features is mostly determined by three factors: author’s erudition, genre and author’s intentions. Moreover, the date of the original production of the text, even if known to a close approximation, can hardly be the decisive factor for the linguistic features found. Finally, it stresses the importance of – and the need for – a multifactorial analysis of those texts which will combine linguistic insights with sociolinguistic facts and notions.

#### References

- Horrocks, G. 2010. *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Toufexis, N. 2008. “Diglossia and register variation in Medieval Greek”. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 32: 203-217.

## **Joanne Stolk, ‘Variation at multiple linguistic levels: the co-occurrence of phonological and morphological variants in Greek documentary papyri’**

*Ghent University*  
joanne.stolk@ugent.be

The growing linguistic interest in Greek documentary papyri relies largely on the widespread variation attested in these texts. Part of the variation is diachronic and could correspond to historical changes in the language. Synchronic variation can be found between language ‘varieties’, i.e. socially or contextually defined forms of a language

(Leiwo 2012: 1-2). User-related varieties, such as idiolects and sociolects, are confined to particular people and their communities, while use-related varieties, such as text type and register, are dependent on the situation, e.g. purpose of communication, relationship between speakers and the genre of text (Halliday, McIntosh & Stevens 1964: 75-110).

A language variety can also be defined as “a set of co-occurring variants” (Berruto 2010: 229). Sociolinguistic variables can be found at multiple levels of the language. For example, the place of a text on a register-continuum can be described as “the sum of a number of linguistic dimensions (phonology, semantics, morphology, syntax)” (Bentein 2015: 479). However, as Bentein (2015: 479) also acknowledges, one document may not show the expected distribution of features and frequencies may differ with respect to the different dimensions (cf. Bubeník 1993: 22; James 2007: 35-38). Hilla Halla-aho (2010: 172) has shown for the Latin used in non-literary letters that “in a given letter, different levels of language organization (phonological / orthographic, morphological, and syntactic) need not, and often do not, consistently relate to one linguistic variety (register or sociolect)”.

In this paper I will examine to what extent phonological or orthographic variation co-occurs with morphological and/or morpho-syntactic variation in Greek papyri. I will use the database Trismegistos Text Irregularities which contains all editorial regularizations of non-standard use of orthography and morphology (Depauw & Stolk 2015). For this purpose, I will annotate the regularizations according to the linguistic units they apply to, such as phonemes and morphemes. Do particular features co-occur frequently and, if so, what could have caused this distribution? Is the use of a particular combination of variants use-related or user-related?

Bentein, Klaas. 2015. “The Greek Documentary Papyri as a Linguistically Heterogeneous Corpus: The Case of the “Katochoi of the Sarapeion” Archive”, *Classical World* 108: 461-484.

Berruto, Gaetano. 2010. “Identifying dimensions of linguistic variation in a language space.” In Peter Auer and Jürgen Erich Schmidt, *Language and Space: An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation, Volume 1: Theories and Methods*, 226-240. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bubeník, Vít. 1993 “Dialect Contact and Koineization: The Case of Hellenistic Greek.” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 99: 9-23.

Depauw, Mark and Joanne Stolk. 2015. “Linguistic Variation in Greek Papyri. Towards a New Tool for Quantitative Study.” *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 55: 196-220.

Halla-aho, Hilla. 2010. “Linguistic varieties and language level in Latin non-literary letters.” In Trevor V. Evans and Dirk Obbink (eds.), *The Language of the Papyri*, 171-183. Oxford: University Press.

Halliday, Michael A. K., Angus McIntosh and Peter Stevens. 1964. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching*. London: Longman.

James, Patrick. 2007. *Retention and retreat: complementary participles and infinitives with verbs of perception and declaration in the Roman and Byzantine documentary papyri*. PhD diss., Cambridge University.

Leiwo, Martti. 2012. "Introduction: Variation with Multiple Faces." In Martti Leiwo, Hilla Hallaaho and Marja Vierros, *Variation and Change in Greek and Latin*, 1-11. Helsinki [Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 17].

## **Sofia Torallas Tovar, 'Lexicographers and grammarians as sources for the study of Egyptian Greek'**

*University of Chicago*  
sofiat@uchicago.edu

The papyri from Egypt provide an invaluable source for the study of Egyptian Greek, including both administrative Greek and more popular varieties. However, due to the climate and humidity of the Delta, relatively few papyri are preserved from the city that probably had the largest production of bureaucratic documents and literary texts: Alexandria. The information we do have about the Greek of that important city comes from a few surviving fragments of grammarians and lexicographers. In this paper I will analyze some of the problems posed by these sources, and some of the methods that can be used to extract useful information from them.

## **Marja Vierros, 'Idiolect in focus: brothers in the Memphis Serapeion'**

*University of Helsinki*  
marja.vierros@helsinki.fi

An archive of over a hundred Greek texts (petitions, letters, accounts, and dreams) from the Serapeion in Memphis provide us with an exceptional possibility to examine the language variety of two brothers, Ptolemaios and Apollonios, the eldest and the youngest son of the soldier-settler Glaukias. The handwritings of both brothers were identified by U. Wilcken (1927) when he published these texts from the mid-2nd century BCE as one entity. The questions I am addressing in this paper, are the following: 1) Can we say that these autograph texts represent the idiolects of Apollonios and Ptolemaios? 2) How does that reflect in our interpretation of the interesting linguistic variation found in the whole archive (described in Bentein 2015)? If a text has been written by the hand of certain individual, does it necessarily follow that the language variation pattern belongs to this individual? The text types coming from the pens of Apollonios and Ptolemaios vary, but Apollonios produced more texts. For example, Ptolemaios did not write any petitions. The petitions written by Apollonios, on the other hand, are especially interesting since they are usually drafts or copies. In some cases it is very difficult to distinguish between a copy and a draft. The archive includes also several petitions written by chancery hands, showing that scribes were used in the process of producing the petitions sent to the King or a lower official. Therefore, it is worth studying in detail what kind of patterns we can discern in Apollonios' draft petitions vs. the final petitions and compare them with his letters and accounts. I will pay attention to the patterns of legal / official language and examine if they are transferred into Apollonios' "idiolect". The texts written by Ptolemaios form another point of comparison. The papyrus archive of Ptolemaios and Apollonios partakes in the discussion concerning the level of the individual vs. the speech community in studying language variation grammar (cf. Labov 2001, 33–34).

## References

Bentein, K. The Greek Documentary Papyri as a Linguistically Heterogenous Corpus: The Case of the "Katochoi of the Sarapeion" Archive. *Classical World* 108.4 (2015) 461–484.

Labov, W. *Principles of Linguistic Change, Volume 2. Social Factors*. Language in Society 29. Blackwell: Malden, MA and Oxford 2001.

Wilcken, U. (Hg.), *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (Ältere Funde). Erster Band, Papyri aus Unterägypten mit 2 Tafeln*. Walter de Gruyter: Berlin und Leipzig 1927.

## **Staffan Wahlgren, 'Describing, Narrating, Arguing: Text Type and Linguistic Variation in 10th c. Greek'**

*Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim*  
staffan.wahlgren@ntnu.no

It seems that much of current research on variation in Greek is motivated by an interest in the natural language: investigations of papyri as well as of the New Testament, in which cases the variation between a formal and a less formal (often conceived as natural) alternative is the object of attention, testify to this. In contrast, varieties of Greek further removed from the natural language, such as Byzantine Literary Greek, especially of the middle and late periods, are neglected.

As has been argued (see e.g. Martin Hinterberger (Ed.), *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature*, Turnhout 2014: Brepols), there is a great need for research on Byzantine Greek, not the least of literary forms of the middle and late periods, and a need to investigate variation in these.

The present paper is an attempt at a small contribution in this field. It is a study of variation in the 10th c. AD, and the discussion focuses on the oeuvre of Symeon the Logothete, an author mainly known for his *World Chronicle* but also as a writer of letters. The question to be pursued is how variation within Symeon's corpus can be described in the framework of text linguistics, and for this purpose, descriptive, narrative and argumentative sections are subjected to scrutiny and compared to each other.

The paper is a spin-off of a larger research project which involves the building of a tagged database of Byzantine literary Greek (called ByzTec), which, in its present form, contains texts from the 10th and 14th centuries, with markup for morphology, morpho-syntax, and (this is work in progress) with dependency treebanking.