

Byzantine Particles, a Case Study: Juxtaposed τε καί and δέ in Medieval Dodecasyllables

Julie Boeten

PARTICLES in Byzantine texts have hardly been investigated, even though they are important indicators of language evolution and change. To study them in a metrical context proves to be especially illuminating, since the metre provides a prosodic framework, and at the same time the particles can provide us with more information on the functioning of Byzantine metre, about which in-depth research is only just beginning to emerge. Investigation of the particles τε and δέ appears especially meaningful in this regard, since on even a brief glance their word order and function seem to have changed by Byzantine times. In this paper I examine this systematically in order to provide insight into not only the functioning of the Byzantine dodecasyllable metre but also the changed usage of particles such as τε and δέ.

1. *Introduction*

Byzantine metre has mostly been studied in comparison with its earlier counterparts (especially the classical iambic trimeter, from which the dodecasyllable evolved)¹ or its later successors (the metres of Modern Greek folk songs).² Only in the past few years has it started to be examined for its own value and in its

¹ P. Maas, “Der byzantinische Zwölfsilber,” *BZ* 12 (1903) 278–323; A. Rhoby, “Vom jambischen Trimeter zum byzantinischen Zwölfsilber. Beobachtung zur Metrik des spätantiken und byzantinischen Epigramms,” *WS* 124 (2011) 117–142.

² P. Mackridge, “The Metrical Structure of the Oral Decapentasyllable,” *BMGS* 14 (1990) 200–213.

own right, most notably by Lauxtermann.³ Byzantine particles, similarly, have been largely ignored by scholars, the main exceptions being Tonnet⁴ and Soltic.⁵ As Wahlgren has remarked, “there is still much work to be done on Greek particles. Most Greek later than the early imperial period remains practically uncharted.”⁶ Medieval Greek particles are usually passed over on the assumption that they are used exactly as in classical texts (and therefore do not deserve specific attention) or because they are supposed to have disappeared in all medieval texts.

The combination of metre and particles—that is, the prosodic features of particles—has never been studied for the Byzantine dodecasyllable, although Soltic has done some pioneering work for the political verse.⁷ Despite this underappreciation, Byzantine particles can give us a host of information about metre and prosody in general. They were kept (rather artificially) alive throughout the Byzantine period and their use clearly evolves over time. It is a common misconception that, simply because their use is linked to a more artificial (atticizing) language, they are not worth studying. This is a gap we hope to fill here.

³ M. D. Lauxtermann, “The Velocity of Pure Iambus. Byzantine Observations on the Metre and Rhythm of the Dodecasyllable,” *JÖB* 48 (1998) 9–33; *The Spring of Rhythm: An Essay on the Political Verse and Other Byzantine Metres* (Vienna 1999); “Medieval Latin and Byzantine Accentual Metrics,” in F. Stella et al. (eds.), *Poetry of Early Medieval Europe: Manuscripts, Language and Music of the Latin Rhythmical Texts* (Florence 2000) 107–117; *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres* (Vienna 2003–2019) II 265–384 (“Appendix Metrica”).

⁴ H. Tonnet, “Aperçu sur l’évolution historique des particules de liaison (joncteurs) en grec,” *Cahiers Balkaniques* 12 (1987) 135–150.

⁵ J. Soltic, “Late Medieval Greek πάλιν: A Discourse Marker Signalling Topic Switch,” *GRBS* 53 (2013) 390–419; “The Particle γάρ: From Ancient Greek Sentence Connector to Blatant Line Filler? A Case-study on the Late Medieval Greek *Chronicle of Morea*,” *SO* 88 (2014) 136–147; J. Soltic, M. Janse, and K. Bentein, “A Note on the Order of Clitic Pronouns and Particles in the Grottaferrata Digenis Akritis,” *BZ* 105 (2012) 803–812.

⁶ S. Wahlgren, “Particles in Byzantine Historical Texts,” in A. Piltz et al. (eds.), *For Particular Reasons. Studies in Honour of Jerker Blomqvist* (Lund 2003) 333.

⁷ Soltic et al., *BZ* 105 (2012) 803–812; Soltic, *SO* 88 (2014) 136–147.

The textual corpus that will be our focus consists of Byzantine book epigrams. These are metrical inscriptions in a manuscript, on a subject that is in some way related to the manuscript. Kominis has described them as “epigrams in and on books”⁸ and Lauxtermann characterized them as “poems that are intimately related to the production of literary texts and manuscripts.”⁹ They are an interesting set of texts, since they cover a wide range of subjects, registers, and metres, thus giving us a more or less overall view of Byzantine poetic language. It is for this reason that book epigrams are a valuable corpus for this paper: they can give indications of linguistic evolutions or preferences over the entire span of the Byzantine era, whilst still remaining a coherent set of texts. Any detected evolutions can then be verified by checking for them in other Byzantine poetic texts, which is what has been done for this paper.

More specifically, our corpus consists of the book epigrams collected in the *Database of Byzantine Book Epigrams* (available at <http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/>). The Database distinguishes between ‘occurrences’ and ‘types’, occurrences being individual epigrams exactly as they are found in the manuscript and types being a sort of normalised ‘super-texts’, an umbrella under which one or more variants of the same text are collected.¹⁰ Only the occurrences will be the focus of this paper, since the particular idiosyncrasies of each epigram can be of importance for the interpretation and analysis of the text.¹¹

2. *A separated pair*

The first particle to be examined is τε, most notably in combination with its loyal companion καί. Indeed, throughout the

⁸ “τὰ ἐν βίβλοις καὶ εἰς βίβλους ... ἐπιγράμματα”: A. Kominis, *Tò βυζαντινὸν ἱερὸν ἐπίγραμμα καὶ οἱ ἐπιγραματοποιοί* (Athens 1966) 38.

⁹ Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry* I 197.

¹⁰ F. Bernard and K. Demoen, “Book Epigrams,” in A. Rhoby et al. (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Byzantine Poetry* (Leiden forthcoming).

¹¹ Hence, in quoting I preserve the sigla (such as + and ·) and the orthographic errors as found in the manuscripts; letters in parentheses represent expansions of abbreviations, e.g. (δὲ).

history of the Greek language, $\tau\epsilon$ and $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ form a tightly knit pair. $\tau\epsilon$ is a very old word with Indo-European roots (related to Sanskrit *ca* and Latin *-que*) whose function is to connect two parallel nouns, pronouns, or verbs, but also with a universalizing sense (illustrated in Latin *quisque* but also in Greek $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \tau\epsilon$ or $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \tau\epsilon$). $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$, on the other hand, has the function of introducing an addition, both in a connective way (joining words, phrases, clauses, or sentences) and a responsive way, where it has the adverbial meaning of “also” or “even.”¹² Both can be used on their own, but together they reinforce and complement each other.¹³ They can occur juxtaposed or with several words separating them, with a noticeable difference between several genres as to the percentages of juxtaposed and separated $\tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$.¹⁴ This sort of diverse usage is no different in later Byzantine texts.

Our focus will be on the dodecasyllabic poems, which constitute by far the largest part of our corpus of book epigrams.¹⁵ The juxtaposed pair $\tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ occurs relatively frequently in the dodecasyllabic epigrams (312 times),¹⁶ which most likely has to do with the connection between accentual poetry and the commatic asianic style. Indeed, Valiavitcharska states that the rhythm of Byzantine accentual poetry and that of Byzantine rhetorical texts (which are the rhythmical heir to the asianic style of Hellenistic times) are very similar, since both make use of

¹² J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² (London 1954) 289–327, 496–536.

¹³ J. Blomqvist, “Juxtaposed $\tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ in Post-Classical Prose,” *Hermes* 102 (1974) 170–178; Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 511–513; F. Lambert, “Un cas de coordination corrélatif: $\tau\epsilon \dots \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ en grec ancien,” in P. De Carvalho et al. (eds.), *Structures parallèles et corrélatives en grec et en latin* (Saint-Etienne 2005) 99–116.

¹⁴ Blomqvist, *Hermes* 102 (1974) 170–178.

¹⁵ Of the 9952 occurrences that are currently in the DBBE, 6934 (70%) are in dodecasyllables (date checked: 4 December 2018).

¹⁶ *Relatively* frequently, because we must keep in mind that we are dealing with medieval texts, which make overall significantly less use of the classical particles. However, compared to the occurrence of separated $\tau\epsilon \dots \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ (192 times) or of $\tau\epsilon \dots \tau\epsilon$ (31 times), for example, we may state that juxtaposed $\tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ occurs relatively frequently.

short, prosodic units that are chained together in a larger text.¹⁷ As such, both poetry and oratory exhibit the commatic style, i.e. a fragmented style that puts emphasis on the concatenation of units and the rhythm that is the result thereof. Blomqvist¹⁸ has noted that there is a remarkable correlation between the commatic style and the use of juxtaposed $\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$. He concluded that “juxtaposition of $\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ might be a characteristic of asianism,” and since the asianic style strongly influenced the commatic style in Byzantine times,¹⁹ it is no surprise that this same characteristic appears frequently in accentual poems as well. We therefore have a rather large number of occurrences of juxtaposed $\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ in our corpus to work with.

It is striking how often juxtaposed $\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ is divided by the caesura (or *Binnenschluß*),²⁰ as for example:²¹

- (1) + Αἶνος θ(ε)ῶ χάρις $\tau\epsilon\ \parallel\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ δόξα πρέπει·
 τῶ δόντι τέρμα \parallel τῆς γραφῆς φθάσαι σθένος
 Kalabruta – Monè Megalon Spèlaion 12 f. 203^r
<http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/85>

Of all the occurrences of juxtaposed $\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ in the dodecasyllabic part of the corpus (312), no less than 74% (231) are separated by the caesura, a significant proportion.

Before investigating this further, however, we must make sure that this is not something characteristic of book epigrams alone, but also occurs in other Byzantine texts. We have therefore examined several texts from different genres throughout the

¹⁷ V. Valiavitcharska, *Rhetoric and Rhythm in Byzantium, the Sound of Persuasion* (Cambridge 2013) 23 ff.; cf. H. B. Dewing, “The Origin of the Accentual Prose Rhythm in Greek,” *AJP* 31 (1910) 312–328. A text can thus be both asianic and atticist at the same time, as many Byzantine texts in fact are. This is because the asianic style involves a rhythmical component, while the atticist style involves a lexicological and morphological component.

¹⁸ Blomqvist, *Hermes* 102 (1974) 174.

¹⁹ Valiavitcharska, *Rhetoric and Rhythm in Byzantium* 57 ff.

²⁰ Maas, *BZ* 12 (1903) 282.

²¹ Unless otherwise stated, DBBE ID-numbers refer to occurrences and the texts are cited from the DBBE website.

Byzantine period. They were written by different authors, on different subjects, at diverse dates. They have in common only their metre, the dodecasyllable:

Work	τε and κáí juxtaposed	τε and κáí separated	% τε and κáí separated
<i>Expediitio Persica</i> – Pisides ²²	12	9	75%
<i>Versus</i> – Constantine Rhodios ²³	31	17	55%
<i>Iambi de variis argumentis</i> – Stoudites ²⁴	6	4	66%
<i>Metaphrasis odorum</i> – Geometres ²⁵	6	3	50%
<i>In Mariam Sclerenam</i> – Psellos ²⁶	4	1	25%
<i>Versus varii</i> – Mytilenaios ²⁷	15	13	87%
<i>Epigrammata</i> – Mauropous ²⁸	55	45	82%
<i>Epitaphius</i> ²⁹ + <i>Catamyomachia</i> ³⁰ – Prodromos	3	2	67%
<i>Versus de poematum generibus</i> – Tzetzes ³¹	26	25	96%
<i>Carmina</i> – Manuel Philes ³²	51	24	47%
<i>Epigrammata</i> – Planoudes ³³	1	1	100%

TABLE 1: Occurrences of juxtaposed τε κáí for each author, with number and percent of those separated by caesura

²² A. Pertusi, *Giorgio di Pisidia. Poemi I* (Ettal 1959) 84–136.

²³ I. Vassis, “Στίχοι Κωνσταντίνου ἀσηκρίτη τοῦ Ῥοδίου,” in L. James, *Constantine of Rhodes, On Constantinople and the Church of the Holy Apostles* (Farnham 2012) 18–84.

²⁴ P. Speck, *Jamben auf verschiedene Gegenstände* (Berlin 1968) 109–308.

²⁵ M. De Groote, “Joannes Geometres’ *Metaphrasis of the Odes*: Critical Edition,” *GRBS* 44 (2004) 382–404.

²⁶ M. D. Spadaro, *Michaelis Pselli In Mariam Sclerenam* (Catania 1984) 71–88.

²⁷ M. De Groote, *Christophori Mitylenaii versuum variorum collectio cryptensis* (Turnhout 2012) 3–139.

²⁸ P. de Lagarde, *Joannis Euchaitorum Metropolitae quae in codice Vaticano Graeco 676 supersunt* (*AbhGött.* 28 [1881]) 1–51.

²⁹ P. Gautier, *Nicéphore Bryennios. Histoire* (Brussels 1975) 355–367.

³⁰ H. Hunger, *Der byzantinische Katz-Mäuse-Krieg* (Vienna 1968) 80–124.

³¹ W. J. W. Koster, *Scholia in Aristophanem I.1* (Groningen 1975) 84–109.

³² E. Miller, *Manuelis Phylae Carmina I–II* (Paris 1855–1857).

³³ S. P. Lampros, “Ἐπιγράμματα Μαξίμου Πλανούδη,” *Νέος Ἑλληνομνήμων* 13 (1916) 415–421.

We can see some differences from author to author (without any real chronological evolution, but perhaps with a certain relation to the linguistic register),³⁴ but with a clear tendency to prosodically break up the pair τε καί, since all the authors (except Psellos) separated them in at least half of the cases. We may therefore conclude that the prosodic separation of our duo is something characteristic for Byzantine dodecasyllabic texts in general. Our question of course is: why?

The caesura that breaks up these two particles also breaks up the entire verse into two cola (κῶλα) or metrical half-verses. It is important to understand that the metrical cola that make up the dodecasyllable function in the same way as so-called *intonation units* or *information units*.³⁵ The theory of information units is part of the theoretical framework of Cognitive Linguistics, most thoroughly investigated by Wallace Chafe.³⁶ He finds that speech is not uttered in long strings or whole sentences, but rather in short ‘chunks’. These chunks have not only a semantic,

³⁴ More research on the use of juxtaposed τε καί and its correlation with certain styles or registers would be valuable in this regard.

³⁵ J. Boeten and M. Janse, “A Cognitive Analysis of Metrical Irregularities in the “Ὠσπερ ξένοι” Book Epigrams,” *BMGs* 42 (2018) 79–91.

³⁶ W. L. Chafe, “Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View,” in C. N. Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic* (New York 1976) 27–55; *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production* (Norwood 1980); “Cognitive Constraints on Information Flow,” in R. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse* (Amsterdam 1987) 21–51; “Linking Intonation Units in Spoken English,” in J. Haiman et al. (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia 1988) 1–27; “Prosodic and Functional Units of Language,” in J. A. Edwards et al. (eds.), *Talking Data: Transcription and Coding in Discourse Research* (Hillsdale 1993) 33–43; *Discourse, Consciousness and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing* (Chicago 1994); “Inferring Identifiability and Accessibility,” in T. Fretheim et al. (eds.), *Reference and Referent Accessibility* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia 1996) 37–46; “Language and the Flow of Thought,” in M. Tomasello (ed.), *The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional Approaches to Language Structure* (Hillsdale 1998) 93–111; “The Analysis of Discourse Flow,” in D. Schiffrin et al. (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (Oxford 2001) 673–687.

syntactic, and prosodic unity, but also a cognitive foundation, because speaking in information units allows the speaker to cognitively structure what he is about to say whilst also allowing the listener to process what is being said. They are, in short, tightly connected to the pragmatics of language and how language functions in the linguistic mind. The metrical cola of the Byzantine dodecasyllable have a very similar function, in that they also have prosodic, semantic, syntactic, and therefore cognitive unity.³⁷ This means that verses in the Byzantine dodecasyllable are broken up into two (or more)³⁸ prosodic parts that have some level of cognitive autonomy.

The semantic and syntactic unity of the metrical colon means that *καί* very regularly occurs at the beginning of a new colon, for it introduces a new coordinated noun, word group, or clause (cf. the original meaning and use of *καί*). This would certainly account for *καί* systematically being on the right side of the caesura. Then why is *τε* not on the same side as *καί*, right next to its loyal companion? Since the pair *τε καί* was often thought to connect two linguistic items more *tightly* than simple *καί* or simple *τε*,³⁹ one might expect that they would form one tight union as well. Further consideration, however, shows that it makes perfect sense for *τε* to be on the other side of the caesura, at the end of the colon. First of all, *τε* is an enclitic particle, hence always attached to the preceding word. It would therefore be entirely impossible for *τε* to feature at the very beginning of a colon. Moreover, it seems that the particle has undergone a slight change in function by medieval times. Whatever the

³⁷ J. Soltic, *The Late Medieval Greek πολιτικός στίχος Poetry: Language, Metre and Discourse* (diss. Ghent 2015); Boeten and Janse, *BMGS* 42 (2018) 79–91.

³⁸ This can be illustrated by example (1) above. The first verse not only has the main caesura at B7, but we can also assume a smaller caesura at B4 (see below).

³⁹ K. Fuhr, “Excursus zu den attischen Rednern,” *RhM* 33 (1878) 583; R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* II. 2 (Hahn 1872) 248; J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard, and N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* III (Edinburgh 1963) 339; F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen 1976) §444.2.

function of τε in antiquity,⁴⁰ it becomes more of a rhythmically structuring particle in Byzantine times, with the function of corroborating the rhythmical pauses in a text. Whether it occurs in the second position of a clause as in example (2.a), as a forerunner for καί as in (b), or as part of an enumeration as in (c), τε seems to have a clear tendency to occur in the neighbourhood of the caesura:

(2)

- (a) ἀνδρονίκου τε || τοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν τονάλων:~
DBBE 4843, Milan – Bibl. Ambrosiana P 38 sup. f. 97^v
<http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/4843>
- (b) τὸν Ἀμαλήκ τε || τὸν νοητὸν συντριβῶν
καὶ τὰς ἐκείνου || παγίδας καὶ τοὺς λόχους
Athos – Monê Megistês Lauras B 86 (Eustratiades 206), end of MS.
<http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/9433>
- (c) Μακρούς τε λήρους || ἀστικῶν ἀθυρμάτων ∴
Δόξαν κενὴν τε || πάμπαν ἐκφύγοις φόβῳ ∴
Milan – Bibl. Ambrosiana A 152 sup. f. 213^r
<http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/571>

In addition to being positioned in the second place in an information unit (P2), as it was in ancient times,⁴¹ it now also becomes quite common to put τε anywhere before a caesura. Of course, in some cases, e.g. (2.a), P2 occurs exactly before the caesura, so these two possibilities are not mutually exclusive. Thus, we can assume that τε receives an extra function which it did not have in ancient times and which has more to do with the structuring of the rhythm than with semantics (see below).

3. *Diairesis*

The fact that, in 74% of the cases, τε καὶ brackets the caesura raises the question whether τε καὶ *always* entails some sort of

⁴⁰ Blomqvist, *Hermes* 102 (1974) 170–178; Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 495–563; C. J. Ruijgh, “Esquisse d’une nouvelle théorie sur ‘TE épique’,” *Mnemosyne* 22 (1969) 1–66; Lambert, in *Structures parallèles et corrélatives* 99–116.

⁴¹ M. Janse, “Clitic Doubling from Ancient to Asia Minor Greek,” in D. Kallulli et al. (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages* (Philadelphia 2008) 165–202; D. M. Goldstein, *Wackernagel’s Law in Fifth-Century Greek* (diss. U. California Berkeley 2010); F. Scheppers, *The Colon Hypothesis. Word Order, Discourse Segmentation and Discourse Coherence in Ancient Greek* (Brussels 2011).

pause, even when it does not surround the caesura. In other words, can we assume some sort of metrical pause in the cases where *τε καί* occurs far from the main caesura, as in the following two examples:

(3)

- (a) Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον καὶ πόνος Ἰωάννου
 τοῦ πίκλην Πλουσιαδηνοῦ τάχα καὶ θύτου
 ψάλτου τε καὶ ἄρχοντος ||^{B7} τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν
 πρωτόπαπα δὲ Βιτζα Χάνδακος Κρήτης.

Athos – Monè Megistès Lauras E 83 (Eustratiades 545), end of MS.
<http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/4132>

- (b) θάψων τῷ σώμα τοῦ φονευτοῦ σωματί(ων)
 καὶ μη καταλ(υ)σ(ί)ν μόνον σὺ δειξάσεις
 οὕτως γὰρ ἐιργάσατο τάυτα τὰ τρία
 ἐξαγόρευσῖν ||^{B5} ἐντῶλήν τέ, καὶ κόπ(ον) +

Meteora – Monè Metamorphoseos 553 f. 338^v
<http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/140>

This would certainly make sense, given the postpositive character of *τε* and the rhythmically structuring function of *τε* just described.

And it indeed seems to be so, for the remaining 26% of cases of juxtaposed *τε καί* in dodecasyllables are not random, but suggest an entirely new pattern of fixed places in the verse where a second metrical pause can, but does not always, occur. We are dealing here with secondary caesurae, which were most likely often audible but not as prominent as the main caesura, and which effectively divided the verse into three segments rather than two. This kind of threefold division has been discussed by Fränkel and Janse for the classical hexameter.⁴²

Marc Lauxtermann discusses secondary caesurae in Byzantine poetry and calls these secondary pauses “diariseses.”⁴³ This is not to be confused with the diariesis in ancient metres, since it is simply a slightly less strong pause in comparison with the main

⁴² H. Fränkel, “Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter,” in *Wegen und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* (Munich 1960) 100–156; M. Janse, “The Metrical Schemes of the Hexameter,” *Mnemosyne* 56 (2003) 343–348.

⁴³ Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry* II 265–384.

caesura. He assumes that there can be a diairesis at B4 when the main caesura is at B7, or a diairesis at B8 when the main caesura is at B5. However, our corpus suggests further possibilities as well. Table 2 shows that no less than 21.5% of juxtaposed *τε καί* in dodecasyllabic book epigrams have a diairesis at B3 when the caesura is at B7 or a diairesis at B9 when the caesura is at B5:

Diairesis		Other	
Total: 13 (4.5%)		Total: 67 (21.5%)	
B4	B8	B3	B9
4 (1.5%)	9 (3%)	20 (6.5%)	47 (15%)

TABLE 2: *τε καί* with diairesis B4 or B8 vs. B3 or B9.

This means that we have more occurrences of a diairesis at B3 or B9 than at B4 or B8 (the diaireses that Lauxtermann suggested). Moreover, *all* instances of juxtaposed *τε καί* occur either around the main caesura, around the diairesis as Lauxtermann defined it, or around the diairesis at B3 or B9. As such, the diairesis at B3 or B9 is the missing piece of the puzzle. We repeat example (3), showing a diairesis at B3 with a caesura at B7 (3.a) and a diairesis at B9 with a caesura at B5 (3.b):

- (a) Θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον καὶ πόνος Ἰωάννου
 τοῦ πίκλην Πλουσιαδηνοῦ τάχα καὶ θύτου
 ψάλτου τε καί ἄρχοντος ^{||B7} τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν
 πρωτόπαπα δὲ Βιτζα Χάνδακος Κρήτης.
- (b) θάψων τῷ σώμα τοῦ φονευτοῦ σωματ(ων)[·]
 καὶ μη καταλ(υ)σ(ῖν) μόνον σὺ δειξάσεις[·]
 οὕτως γὰρ ἐργάσατο τάυτα τὰ τρία
 ἐξαγόρευσῖν ^{||B5} ἐντῶλήν τὲ, καὶ κόπ(ον) +

As mentioned, if we add the number of occurrences where *τε καί* brackets the caesura to the number where *τε καί* suggests a diairesis at B4 or B8 and the number where B3 or B9 is suggested, then we have a full 100% of all occurrences of juxtaposed *τε καί*. This means we are not dealing with mere tendencies, but what seems to be a rule: juxtaposed *τε καί* *always* surrounds a caesura or diairesis and this diairesis can be positioned at B3 or B9 as well as B4 and B8.

This is not confined to book epigrams. The other corpus of randomised Byzantine texts exhibits the same pattern:

Work	B3	B9	B3+B9/all juxtaposed τε καί
<i>Expeditio Persica</i> – Pisides	1	2	22%
<i>Versus</i> – Rhodios	7	7	46%
<i>Iambi de variis argumentis</i> – Stoudites	0	2	33%
<i>Metaphrasis odarum</i> – Geometres	1	2	50%
<i>In Mariam Sclerenam</i> – Psellos	0	3	75%
<i>Versus varii</i> – Mytilenaios	0	2	13%
<i>Epigrammata</i> – Mauropous	3	7	18%
<i>Epitaphius</i> + <i>Catamyomachia</i> – Prodromos	0	0	0%
<i>Versus de poematum generibus</i> – Tzetzes	0	1	4%
<i>Carmina</i> – Philes	22	5	53%
<i>Epigrammata</i> – Planoudes	0	0	0%

TABLE 3: Juxtaposed τε καί suggesting a diaresis at B3 or B9

Throughout all Byzantine history, it seems to be relatively common to place juxtaposed τε καί around a diaresis at B3 or B9. This means that a dodecasyllabic verse cannot be divided only into two cola of five and seven syllables, but that these cola can be split up yet again into segments of three and four syllables. An example of this is in Psellos' *In Mariam Sclerenam*, line 361:

(4) τὸ λαμπρὸν ὄμμα ἰΒ⁵ γῆς ὁμοῦ τε | καί πόλου.

Let us now consider Lauxtermann's *principle of pairing*,⁴⁴ which holds that the Byzantine metres came into being through the pairing of two shorter cola. As such, the dodecasyllable emerged from the pairing of a five-syllable colon (pentasyllable) and a seven-syllable colon (heptasyllable). However, it now seems that these paired cola can themselves be split up into even smaller parts. This may actually be some relic from a caesura in the older, shorter verse types, out of which the dodecasyllable originated (i.e. pentasyllable plus heptasyllable). This can be illustrated by a book epigram that is composed entirely in heptasyllables:⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Lauxtermann, *The Spring of Rhythm* 51.

⁴⁵ This epigram is presented by the scribe in a peculiar way, with the first and last letters of each verse aligned and forming the vertical sentence σός εἰμι τίμιε σός. Not all verses are marked here with a metrical break, because,

- (5) Σὸς εἰμὶ ἢ τίμιε σὸς ς
 ὁ βιβλίον σοι τοῦτ ο
 συνθεῖς ἅμα ἢ καὶ γράψας
 εἰκὼν Θεοῦ ἢ πάντιμ ε
 ἴλαρὲ ἢ τῷ βλέμματ ι
 μιμητὰ ἢ τοῦ Ἀβραά μ
 Ἰωσήφ ἢ τῷ σῶφρον ι
 τῷ φυγοσοδόμω Λά τ
 ἰδοῦ προσάγω δὴ σο ι
 μῦρον καθὼς Μαριά μ
 Ἰησοῦ ἢ τῷ Σωτῆρ ι
 ἐμοῖς λόγοις ἢ τιμῶν σ ε
 σύ δ' ἀντίδος ἢ σὰς εὐχὰς ς
 οὐ κρεῖττον ἢ οὐδὲν ἄλλ ο
 σὸς εἰμὶ ἢ τίμιε σὸς ς.

Athos – Skētē Kausokalubiōn 10 f. 55^v
<http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/6671>

As we can see, for the majority of the verses (11 out of 15) we can assume a rather weak metrical pause at B3 and B4, corroborating that the caesurae in the earliest, shorter verse types live on in the diaireses of Byzantine metre. The metrical break in these heptasyllables is quite weak and not mandatory (it does not occur in every verse), which is reflected in the diaireses of Byzantine metre, which are likewise not mandatory in every verse. Thus, it might be feasible to say that the newly-found diaireses at B3 and B9, as well as the diaireses at B4 and B8 which were postulated by Lauxtermann, are in fact relics of a caesura in the older and shorter verse types. However, more research is needed before anything conclusive can be said about this.

4. *The hexameter: an isosyllabic metre?*

There is an interesting parallel in the treatment of juxtaposed τε καί in dodecasyllables on the one hand and in hexameters and elegiacs on the other. Although the latter are quantitative metres, based on the alternation between long and short syllables

with regard to the matter at hand, we are focusing on those that have a noticeable pause or break at B3 or B4.

and so having little in common with the isosyllabic medieval metres (such as dodecasyllables and political verses), there are similarities to be discerned.

Lauxtermann says of the hexameters of Georgios Pisides: “the Pisidian hexameter was well on the way to becoming a truly accentual metre: a 17-syllable verse (spondaics are avoided); divided into two hemistichs, 8 + 9, by a caesura after the eighth syllable (the ‘feminine’ caesura); with an obligatory stress accent on the penultimate at line end.”⁴⁶ Whilst the prosodic features of the hexameter are of course maintained (though not always rigorously), it seems that it is becoming more of an isosyllabic metre in the minds of some writers, in the same way as the dodecasyllable and the political verse. This includes subdividing the verse into smaller cognitive chunks (information units), with a distinct caesura to separate them. The differentiation between long and short syllables had of course long been lost to the Byzantine ear, and consequently the hexameter had become nothing more than a way for authors to show off their high education (or lack thereof). It thus no longer sounded particularly pleasing to the ear; so it seems logical that it would be slightly adapted in order to assume at least some audible rhythmicity. That explains why the hexameter becomes a semi-isosyllabic metre with two or more metrical cola. In this respect, it is interesting to see what happens to juxtaposed $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ in the hexametrical book epigrams.

First of all, it is important to note that juxtaposed $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ does not occur nearly as often in hexameters or elegiacs as it does in dodecasyllables or political verse. Single $\tau\epsilon$ or doubled $\tau\epsilon$, on the other hand, occurs much more frequently in hexameters than in dodecasyllables. This of course has to do with the difference in style that accompanies these metres.⁴⁷ As was mentioned above,

⁴⁶ Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry* II 301.

⁴⁷ Each metre seems to have been more or less connected with a certain register, and texts written in a particular metre elicit the expectation that the text will exhibit this or that style. While hexameters and elegiacs were more connected to an epic language, dodecasyllables exhibited a continuum of

juxtaposed τε καί is linked to a more commatic style,⁴⁸ which hexametrical epigrams do not exhibit—at least not to the same extent. It follows that single or doubled τε was felt to be a more epic and ‘Homeric’ option than the combination τε καί, and it lent itself perfectly to the hexameter.

In the entire corpus of book epigrams, we find 19 occurrences of juxtaposed τε καί in hexameters or elegiacs. In the elegiacs, τε καί features only in the hexametrical lines, which may or may not be a coincidence. Of these 19 occurrences, more than 52% (10 occurrences) surround a caesura after the eighth syllable, for example:

- (6) ζῆτα δ’ ἄρ’ ἀνδρομάχης τε || καὶ ἕκτορος ἔστ’ ὀαριστής
Cologne (Geneva) – Bibl. Bodmeriana 85 f. 56^v
<http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/7603>

Two other occurrences have a caesura after seven syllables, three a caesura after nine syllables, and one after three. It thus seems that the same locations are preferred for caesurae in the hexameter as in the accentual metres, and the caesura after eight syllables (which does seem to be favoured) reminds one very much of the political verse. Of course, the hexameter has not become an entirely accentual metre and is still predominantly an archaic, prosodic metre, but it is interesting to see a second dimension added to the poem, almost as though a see-through sheet of paper with new additions is placed over a drawing. The original is still there, but it receives an extra layer.

5. τε and δέ

The second particle on which we will focus is δέ. Its original use is as a connective particle, with a semantic meaning ranging from “and” to “but” and everything in between.⁴⁹ However, it

more or less classicizing language, and political verse was often used for the vernacular (in later Byzantine times). For more on register in Byzantine learned texts see M. Hinterberger, *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature* (Turnhout 2014).

⁴⁸ Blomqvist, *Hermes* 102 (1974) 174.

⁴⁹ Denniston, *Greek Particles*² 162–189.

emerges that its function has changed in the Byzantine texts and it has become almost interchangeable with $\tau\epsilon$. Whereas $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in ancient texts was always found in the second position of an information unit and sometimes in correlation with a preceding $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$,⁵⁰ it is now often postponed until later in the verse, sometimes in the very last place of a colon instead of the second place. Moreover, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is found very often to adhere to the left side of the caesurae, in the same way as $\tau\epsilon$ does.

Surveying the occurrences of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in our corpus of dodecasyllabic book epigrams, we have noted where each deviating $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ was positioned in the verse. By “deviating” is meant any $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ that does not occur in the second position of the clause, except cases where $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is pushed to the third position by prepositives and proclitics, such as articles or $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$,⁵¹ as for example:

- (7) $\acute{\omicron}$ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\delta$ $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ χ (ριστο) υ || λουκᾶς ἀνλακεργάτης
 Paris, BnF – gr. 71 f. 186^r
<http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/9991>

The article $\acute{\omicron}$ is not felt to be P1 by the Byzantine writer, but is felt to be one word with $\beta\omicron\upsilon\delta$. Therefore, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is not located at P3 but at P2. At the same time, the positioning of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in this verse may also suggest a caesura at B3—so immediately following $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$.

Two interesting tendencies can be discerned in deviating positions of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$: $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ postponed until it immediately precedes the caesura (137 times), and a use of $\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ which strikingly resembles the use of $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ (27 times). Compare this with 689 occurrences of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in P2, which is the classical usage:

$\tau\epsilon$ in P2	$\tau\epsilon$ preceding caesura	$\delta\grave{\epsilon}$ $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$
689 (80.8%)	137 (16%)	27 (3.2%)

TABLE 4: $\tau\epsilon$ in regular P2 vs. deviating positions

In general, there are not many instances of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in our corpus when compared to classical texts, corroborating the generally accepted thesis that particles had disappeared in the spoken

⁵⁰ J. Wackernagel, “Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1 (1892) 333–446.

⁵¹ M. H. B. Marshall, *Verbs, Nouns and Postpositives in Attic Prose* (Edinburgh 1987).

language by this time. However, they do still occur and the majority still adhere to Wackernagel's law; but the remaining 19.2% of deviating positions cannot be ignored.

Several examples of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ postponed so that it immediately precedes the caesura and also of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ καί instead of $\tau\epsilon$ καί are found in the following epigram:

- (8) Ἄκουε τοίνυν τῶν ἐπιστολῶν βᾶθη.
 ὕψη $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ μᾶλλον συντομωτάτω λόγῳ·
 Ἐπιστολὴν πρώτην $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ || πρὸς ῥώμην γράφει,
 ὡς οἶα πρώτην χ(ριστὸ)ν εἰσδεδεγμένην·
 Δευτέρα πλήττει $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ || τοὺς κορινθίους, 5
 ὡς πίστιν οὐ τηροῦντας ἠκριβωμένως·
 Πάλιν $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ τούτοις τοὺς ὀνειδισμοὺς γράφει,
 καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ προστιθεὶς παρουσίαν·
 Τὴν δ ' αὐτάρτην πρὸς γαλάτας μὴ κόπους
 αὐτῷ παρασχεῖν. ἐγχαράττει, πρὸς πλάνη(v) 10
 ἰουδαϊστῶν, ἐκκυλισθέντας πάλιν·
 Πρὸς τοὺς ἐφεσίους $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ || καὶ ῥώμης, ἕνα
 σκοπὸν τέθεικεν οἶα πιστοῖς ἐκ λόγων.
 τοῦτον γὰρ ἦσαν οὐδαμῶς δεδορκότες.
 Ἐκ τὴν φιλίππων τοὺς κατοίκους ἐγγράφει· 15
 πλείους ἐπαίνους τῶν Κορινθίων πλέκω(v),
 καύχημα τ<ούτο>υ καὶ στέφανον δεικνύω(v).
 Εἰς ἐβδόμην $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ || τοῖς κολασσαῖς μνηνεῖ·
 ὡς εὐσεβοῦσι πᾶσαν ἐκφεύγειν πλάνη(v),
 κ(αὶ) νουθετεῖν ἔγραψεν ἀρχίπρω πλέον· 20
 Πρὸς θετταλοῦς ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}$) || δις γράφων, εὐφημί(ας)
 λόγους ἔγραψεν ὡς τι καὶ πεπονθότας
 ἐκ συγγενῶν, καθὼς περ ἐν σιῶν τινές·
 Πάλιν ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}$) τούτοις ἦν γράφων εὐθυμίας·
 καὶ καρτερεῖν τὲ συμφορῶν ἀθυμίας. 25
 οἷς καὶ σοφῶς ἔλεξεν αἰῶνος τέλος·
 Ἐξῆς ἔγραψε τὴν πρὸς ἐβραίους μίαν·
 φαίνων ἀμειψιν πίστεως ἐκ τῶν λόγων.
 φωνᾶς προφητῶν, πρόσθεσίν τε τ(ῶν) ὄχλω(v)·
 Ἡ πρὸς τιμόθεον ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}$) || πρώτη· τὸν τρόπον 30
 ἀρχῆς διδάσκει (καὶ) τύπους ἐκκλησίας.
 τὴν τάξιν αὐτὴν. καὶ διδάσκεσθαι πόθω·
 Αἰνεῖ ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}$) τοῦτον ἢ δις ἕξ. (καὶ) δεικνύει
 τὴν πίστιν ἐκ μάμμης τὲ (καὶ) μ(ητρὸ)ς φέρει(v)·

ψέγει <u>δέ</u> λοιπούς, οὐ τὸν ὀνησιφόρον·	35
Τιμοθέω δηλοῖ (<u>δέ</u>) ἢ φεύγειν πᾶν ῥέον	
καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ νῦν τελευτὴν μηνύει·	
τὰς αἰρέσεις φύναι <u>δέ</u> ἢ (καὶ) μὴ θαυμάσει(ν)	
γράψας πρὸς αὐτὸν τοῦ πορευθῆν(αι) τάχος·	
τὸ σπένδομαι γὰρ δεῖγμα τρανὸν τοῦ τέλους·	40
Ἐξῆς <u>δέ</u> τίτω κληρικῶν καταστάσεις,	
(καὶ) θεσμὸν ἐκτίθησι τῆς ἐκκλησίας·	
Δέδεκτο (καὶ) φιλήμων τὴν δις ἐπτάδα·	
τὸν δοῦλον ὀνήσιμον εἰς ἔλευθέρω(ν)	
ἐλθόντα τάξι (καὶ) μεμαρτυρηκότα,	45
σκελῶν τὲ θλάσιν ὡς κεκαρτερηκότα	
ῥώμης ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐν χρόνοις τοῦ τερτύλου :-	
Paris, BnF – gr. 224 f. 1 ^r	
http://www.dbbe.ugent.be/occ/2410	

We find four instances of *δέ* postponed so as to immediately precede the caesura (3, 5, 30, 36), two instances where *δέ* occurs in P3 so as not to separate two syntactically corresponding words (18, 21), and two instances of *δέ* καί (12, 38). All the while, however, we still see *δέ* in its ‘regular’ P2 position as well, indicating that displacement was a change in progress and had certainly not become the norm.

6. *The function of τε and δέ*

Both *τε* and *δέ* received a different and new function in Byzantine times, compared to ancient usage. What exactly is this function and was it the same for both?

First, all these deviating particles might seem merely a further argument to belittle the function of particles in Byzantine texts, as they definitely were in decline. As Soltic has said, this decline is not merely a reduction in frequency (they are not used as often), but also a reduction in variety (only a limited number of particles are still regularly used) and in function (their discourse role has become bleached).⁵² Obviously, they were no longer used in spoken language, so what is to be gained in studying them? This must be put in perspective, however, for the ‘abnormal’ use of particles had begun well before the Byzantine

⁵² Soltic, *SO* 88 (2014) 140.

period. Horrocks mentions the “frequently odd placement of the ‘second position’ connective and discourse particles” even in texts as early as dialogues by Plato, Menander, or Aristophanes.⁵³ Evans cites misplaced particles in non-literary papyri from the third century B.C.⁵⁴ However, the study of particles from the Byzantine period is still valuable, since much information can be gained about shifting preferences and evolution in usage. We must discard the rigid idea of what particles should look like according to the classical scheme and accept a change in function as the centuries go by. So what can we gather from the information about $\tau\epsilon$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in Byzantine book epigrams?

The function of $\tau\epsilon$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ has become quadruple, in the way that Soltic has described.⁵⁵ First, there is a stylistic function of these particles. This is illustrated by $\tau\epsilon$ in its single or double use in the hexameter, giving the language a more ancient look, but also by the abundance of juxtaposed $\tau\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ in dodecasyllabic epigrams, thus giving these texts a very commatic style.

Second, there is the metrical function: it serves as a metrical filler, in order to achieve the required number of syllables.

Third is the rhythmical or prosodic function, in which the particles are indicative of the *information unit* boundary. This is the function that has become very predominant in Byzantine dodecasyllables. It structures the metre and guides the pronunciation of the verse by making the metrical pause more audible. In this way, we can see the particle as a ‘filled pause’, since it lengthens and corroborates the metrical/discourse break.⁵⁶ We can define a filled pause as a discourse marker that implies a pause in the discourse, in the same way as a breathing pause

⁵³ G. C. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*² (Oxford 2010) 104.

⁵⁴ T. V. Evans, “Standard Koine Greek in Third Century BC Papyri,” in T. Gagos et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th International Congress of Papyrology* (Ann Arbor 2010) 197–206.

⁵⁵ Soltic, *Late Medieval Greek πολιτικός στίχος Poetry* 195–200.

⁵⁶ M. Swerts, “Filled Pauses as Markers of Discourse Structure,” *Journal of Pragmatics* 30 (1998) 485–496.

does, but, in contrast to a breathing pause, it is filled with a linguistic expression. Heeman and Allen describe it as follows: “Discourse markers tend to be used at utterance boundaries, and hence have strong interactions with intonational phrasing.”⁵⁷ As such, $\tau\epsilon$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ occurring immediately before the caesura and/or diaeresis can be considered to function as filled pauses.

Fourth, these particles have a pragmatic function, since both $\tau\epsilon$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ serve as discourse markers. Schourup has called these words “evincive”: “a linguistic item that indicates that at the moment at which it is said the speaker is engaged in, or has just then been engaging in, thinking; the evincive item indicates that this thinking is now occurring or has just now occurred but does not completely specify its content.”⁵⁸ This can be linked yet again to the way in which metrical cola of Byzantine metres function as information units.⁵⁹ Whereas the discourse function was most prominent in ancient texts, the stylistic and the rhythmical/prosodic functions have become prevalent in Byzantine times.

7. Conclusion

In the corpus of Byzantine book epigrams, the word order of the particles $\tau\epsilon$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ easily catches the eye, and deeper investigation suggests that this peculiar location is not confined to book epigrams but is a recurrent phenomenon in Byzantine poetry. The positioning of both $\tau\epsilon$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, which favours the neighbourhood of the caesura much more in Byzantine than in ancient texts, suggests that their original, classical semantic meaning has become bleached to the point of being nothing but empty phonological signifiers (‘filled pauses’). As such, they signal the approach of a break in pronunciation, thus highlighting

⁵⁷ P. Heeman and J. F. Allen, “Speech Repairs, Intonational Phrases, and Discourse Markers: Modeling Speakers’ Utterances in Spoken Dialogue,” *Computational Linguistics* 25 (1999) 527–571, at 531.

⁵⁸ L. Schourup, *Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation* (New York 1985) 14.

⁵⁹ Boeten and Janse, *BMGS* 42 (2018) 79–91.

the very prominent caesura. This ‘functionalisation’ (transformation into a purely functional word) seems to be a general tendency for particles in the Byzantine period, since their original use gradually fades because of their extinction in the spoken language. This also explains why τε and δέ seem to have become almost interchangeable in our corpus, as their semantic meaning has come to be forgotten.⁶⁰ However, it is also important to note that this is not a watertight rule and both τε and δέ are still used in their original context, that is, in the second position of a colon (P2).

Despite and perhaps even because of this, they can still give us important information about the pragmatics of Byzantine metre. For instance, we can safely assume that there was the possibility to add diataxai or secondary pauses to the verse, apart from the main caesura, simply by considering the positions of these particles. We can conclude that not only B4 and B8 are possible (as suggested by Lauxtermann), but also B3 and B9. These diataxai are possibly a remnant of a verse break in the earliest short verse types, out of which the dodecasyllable and political verse later emerged. With the pairing of these shorter verse types into the whole verses that we have, the smaller, original caesurae were retained, thus creating a secondary pause in the larger end product. However, more research about this is needed.

Despite the semantic bleaching and general decline of particles in Byzantine texts, the fact that they yet remain in use is significant and makes them worthy of scholarly interest. We must not invoke the classical particles and call every divergent

⁶⁰ The idea of ‘semantic bleaching’ is employed in works about grammaticalisation: L. J. Brinton, *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions* (Berlin/New York 1996) 65. Soltic, *Late Medieval Greek πολιτικός στίχος Poetry* 55, defines grammaticalisation as “the gradual evolution of conceptual expressions into DMs [discourse markers].” However, we cannot speak of true grammaticalisation in the case of τε and δέ, as they do not show increased frequency and their main function has become a rhythmical one rather than a discourse one. This is why I have chosen the slightly unusual word ‘functionalisation’ to indicate their evolution into a semantically empty functional word.

use wrong, since they have simply changed and evolved, which does not justify disapprobation. Much work remains to be done on Byzantine particles, but I hope to have shown that, contrary to common believe, they do deserve our attention.⁶¹

April, 2019

Department of Linguistics, Greek
Ghent University
9000 Ghent, Belgium
julie.boeten@ugent.be

⁶¹ This research was funded by FWO (Research Foundation Flanders) and established through collaboration with the project of the Database of Byzantine Book Epigrams (Ghent University). A first version of this paper was presented at the *Rencontres internationales des doctorants en études byzantines* in Paris (12–13 October 2018). Special thanks go out to Mark Janse, Klaas Bentein, and the anonymous reviewers for their useful comments and suggestions.