LINGUISTIC IDIOSYNCRACIES IN THE VERSIFICATION
OF *THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE* AND OTHER POEMS
CONTAINED IN THE CODEX MARCIANUS Gr. 408

All newly-published Greek Medieval texts, however small, need to be accompanied by a linguistic analysis and, in the absence of a comprehensive Medieval Grammar, a compilation of such analyses would prove invaluable for scholarship. The *Codex Marcianus 408*[1] contains anonymous versified works which reflect a language of significant linguistic and philological value. In this paper I propose to examine linguistic phenomena present in the language of ff. 1-13ᵛ [2]. Henceforth, I shall refer to ff. 1-13ᵛ as *The Fall of Constantinople*[3] or alternatively, as *Verse-Chronicle.*

The analysis which follows is neither complete nor exhaustive: in the main it will demonstrate, by means of extracts drawn from poems and their respective sources, a versifier's choice of language and approach to his versification. It will also include morphological and syntactical features which are peculiar to the poem and will take note of poetic forms and literary aspects not only in relation to the language found in relevant sources, but also relative to selected versified works included in the codex.

Since the turn of the century, scholars have on occasion made general observations[4] on the language of the codex as a whole, but to date no linguistic analysis has been given of *The Fall of Constantinople.* Only the language of the

1. Codex Marcianus Graecus 408 (colloc. 672). For a description of the whole codex see A. Gonzato, Il codice Marciano greco 408 e la data del romanzo bizantino di Alessandro con una ipotesi sull' autore, *BZ* 56 (1963) 239-260.

2. For a general description of folios 1-13ᵛ see A. Markopoulos, La chronique anonyme de Marcianus Gr. 408, *Πρακτικὰ τοῦ ΙΕ´ Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, IV, ᾿Αθῆναι 1980, 240-244.

3. For an edition of folios 1-13ᵛ (a poem of 759 lines) on the 1204 fall of Constantinople to the Latins and the 1261 recovery of the city by Michael Palaiologos, see J. Müller, Byzantinische Analekten, *Sitz. Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.,* Abhandlung 9, Wien 1852, 336-420. See further, my article Observations on Controversial Aspects of the Codex Marcianus Gr. 408, *BZ* 80 (1987) 16-36.

4. P. Charanis, Les βραχέα χρονικά comme source historique: An important short chronicle of the Fourteenth Century , *Byzantion* 13 (1938) 335-362 (esp. 339), makes a general remark on

Alexander poem (ff. 16-142) was examined by H. Christensen[5] in 1898, who provided a collective survey of all parts of speech and anomalies.

At the outset we shall examine two linguistic aspects in the versified works of the codex[6], that of formulas[7] and, more significantly, of the manner in which these formulas were adapted from their source material into metrical patterns by the anonymous poets for conversion from prose into poetry, that is to say into fifteen syllabic lines (the political verse)[8] which comprise hemistichs of eight and seven syllables with an invariable accent on the penultimate syllable of the second hemistich.

Formulas[9] are defined as repeated phrases which fill either the first or the second hemistich of the political verse. These are stock phrases (possibly connected with oral poetry) which were adopted by poets to facilitate their metrical compositions. More often than not these hemistiches were modified by versifiers to suit the particular half section of the line without affecting the metrical form, for example: *τὰ βουλητέα πρᾶξαι* (f. 4, line 169), a seven-syllable hemistich in *The Fall of Constantinople* appears as *μὴ πρᾶξαι βουλητέα* (f. 137ᵛ, line 5897) in the

---

the language as a whole, that it is «more or less learned and without any foreign influences». Markopoulos, *op. cit.*, writes: «Une partie importante du vocabulaire vient de la langue populaire et le récit est simple, malgré une empreinte de conservatisme certaine».

5. H. Christensen, Die Sprache des Byzantinischen Alexandergedichtes, *BZ* 7 (1898) 366-397. For the *Alexander* poem contained in the Codex Marcianus 408 see S. Reichmann, *Das Byzantinische Alexandergedicht* [Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 13], Meisenheim am Glan 1963.

6. The following are short poems contained in the codex (the titles showing the contents of the poems are mine): (a) *The Chaste Susanna*, ff. 153ᵛ-154ᵛ (drawn from the Apocrypha) 82 lines. (b) Πάσχα - poem f. 14 (drawn from Gregory Nazianzus) 14 lines. (c) *Orestes and Pylades*, ff. 14-14ᵛ (drawn from Gregory Nazianzus) 16 lines. (d) *Orion, Actaion and Iphigeneia*, ff. 14ᵛ-15 (drawn from Gregory Nazianzus) 29 lines. (e) *The Donation of Constantine*, ff. 142ᵛ-144 (drawn from Matthaios Blastares) 75 lines. (f) *The Seven Wonders of the World*, f. 153 (drawn from Gregory Nazianzus) 29 lines. (g) *Snakes of Onesikritos*, f. 152ᵛ (drawn from Aelianus, *De Natura Animalium, XVI*.

7. My article (see note 3 above) provides on pages 20-21 a list of formulas drawn from the various poems contained in our Codex.

8. See M. J. Jeffreys, The Nature and Origins of the Political Verse, *Dumbartons Oaks Papers*, 28 (1974) 143-195; *id.*, Formulas in the Chronicle of Morea, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 28 (1973) 164-195; M. Alexiou - D. Holton, The Origins and Development of «politikos Stichos»: A Select Critical Bibliography, *Mandatoforos* 9 (1976) 22-34; E. M. Jeffreys, The Popular Byzantine Verse Romances of Chivalry, *Mandatoforos* 14 (1979) 20-34; L. Polites, Νεώτερες ἀπόψεις γιὰ τὴ γέννηση καὶ τὴ δομὴ τοῦ δεκαπεντασυλλάβου, *Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν* 56 (1981) 211-228.

9. See M. J. Jeffreys, Formulas in the Chronicle of Morea, 175 ff. See further, my article Observations, 21; cf. M. J. Jeffreys, Byzantine Metrics: Non Literary Strata, *XVI Internationaler Byzantinistenkongress*, Akten 1/1 [Jahrbuch der Österreichishen Byzantinistik, 1981], 314-333.

Alexander poem. The following underscored hemistichs represent examples of formulas appearing in various poems contained in the Codex:

The Donation of Constantine: τὰ βουλητέα πράξαντας, ἀπείργεσθαι μηδόλως (f. 143, line 33)
The Chaste Susanna (Apocrypha): καὶ παρετήρουν τὸν καιρὸν *πράξαντα βουλητέα* (f. 153ᵛ, line 21)
The Fall of Constantinople: ὁ πρὸς πολέμους ἰσχυρός, ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν μάχαις (f. 1, line 12), extract i (a)
Alexander poem: ὁ πρὸς πολέμους ἰσχυρός, ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν μάχαις (f. 16, line B), extract ii (a)
The Chaste Susanna (Apocrypha): Τί δαι ποιεῖ Θεὸς αὐτὸς *ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν πᾶσιν* (f. 154, line 51)

To illustrate the manner in which the anonymous poets of the present codex adapted their formulas to metre we need to establish parallels between the prose-extracts which were their source and the corresponding versified attempts of the poets.

Before we attempt the prose / verse comparisons, it must be noted at the outset that the poet of *The Fall of Constantinople* had written a chronicle in prose (folios 145-146ᵛ in the codex)[10] on the Fourth Crusade in 1391, and a year later (in 1392) decided to reproduce the same incidents in verse, *The Fall of Constantinople*, as a verse-chronicle modelled on the diction and style of the oldest major work in the codex, the *Alexander* poem written in 1388[11].

Below is an extract of the prose-chronicle written in 1391, which we shall refer to as *The Prose-Chronicle*.

Prose-Extract A: The Prose-Chronicle (ff. 145-145ᵛ)

᾽Εν ἔτει ͵ϛψιβ΄, ἥτις ἦν ιβ΄ ᾽Απριλλίου, δευτέρᾳ δὲ τῆς ϛ΄ ἑβδομάδος τῶν νηστειῶν· ἑάλω δὲ οὕτως μαχομένης πάσης τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν Λατίνων ἀπὸ τοῦ μέρους τοῦ πρὸς βορρᾶν τῆς θαλάσσης· ῎Ανδρες δύο Λατῖνοι, γενναῖόν τι διαπραξάμενοι, καταπηδῶσιν ἀπὸ τῆς κλίμακος τῆς νηὸς τῆς ἐν τῷ Πετρίῳ μαχομένης, ἐν ᾧ τόπῳ ἦν ὁ βασιλεὺς ᾽Αλέξιος ὁ Δούκας ἔνδοθεν μαχόμενος, καὶ κατῆλθον περὶ τὸν ἐκεῖσε πύργον ξιφηφόροι οὓς μὴ δυνηθέντες ἐξῶσαι ἢ φονεῦσαι οἱ ὄντες ἐκεῖσε ῾Ρωμαῖοι διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἰσχυροὺς καὶ γενναίους, συνέρρευσαν καὶ ἕτεροι ἀπὸ τῆς κλίμακος ἐν τῷ πύργῳ, ἐν οἷς καὶ Πέτρος τις τοὔνομα, ἱππηλάτης λατῖνος πρῶτος ὁρμήσας εἰσῆλθεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκεῖσε πύλης ἔνδον τῆς

---

10. See my article, Observations, 24, where one whole section is devoted to *Authorship* ascribing both *The Fall of Contantinople* and the *Prose-Chronicle* to the same authtor. See further the following authors who ascribe the two works to a single author: (a) A. Gonzato, *op. cit.*, 285; (b) J. Morelli, *Bibliotheca Manuscripta Graeca et Latina*, Bassano 1802, 278; (c) H. Christensen, Die Vorlagen des byzantinischen Alexandergedichtes, *BZ* 7 (1898) 43-76; (d) P. Charanis, *op. cit.*, 35.

11. See my article Observations, *passim*.

πόλεως· ὃς καὶ φοβήσας τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὄντας Ῥωμαίους, φυγαδίας ἐποίησεν· ὁ δὲ
βασιλεὺς καταληφθεὶς μονώτατος ἀπέδρασε καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ κατεκυριεύθη ἡ πόλις
παρὰ τῶν Λατίνων. Ἐξήρχοντο δὲ φεύγοντες οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι παρὰ τῆς πύλης τῆς
Χρυσείας βουλῇ τῶν Λατίνων. Ἔτυχε δὲ τότε τὸ χριστιανικὸν πάσχα Ἀπριλλίου
κε΄. Ὁποῖα γοῦν κατειργάσαντο οἱ Λατῖνοι δεινὰ τῇ πόλει, ἀνάγνωθι τὴν βίβλον
Νικήτα τοῦ Χωνιάτου καὶ μάθῃς αὐτά, θρήνων γὰρ εἰσὶν ἄξια πολλῶν τὰ τότε
γενόμενα. Ἐκρατήσθη δὲ παρὰ τῶν Ἰταλῶν ἐπὶ χρόνοις νη΄.

(Müller, *Byzantinische Analekten*, 390. See Note 3).

The contents of the extract of the above *Prose-Chronicle* are drawn from Niketas
Choniates, as attested by the author himself in the last three lines of the passage.
The following passage is drawn from Niketas Choniates[12]:

Prose-Extract B: Niketas Choniates

Ἀνοχευσάμενοι δ᾿ οὖν οἱ πολέμιοι τὴν μετ᾿ ἐκείνην ἡμέραν καὶ τὴν ἐφεξῆς
κυριώνυμον, τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ πάλιν τῇ πόλει προσπλέουσι καὶ ταῖς ἠόσι προσίσχου-
σιν, ἥτις ἦν δωδεκάτη μὲν τοῦ Ἀπριλλίου μηνός, δευτέρα δὲ τῆς ἕκτης ἑβδομάδος
τῶν νηστειῶν. μέση μὲν οὖν ἡμέρα, καὶ κατίσχυον τὰ ἡμέτερα, κἂν ἡ ἀκμὴ τοῦ
κακοῦ ἰσχυροτέρα τις ἦν καὶ δριμυτέρα τῆς πρότριτα [...] ἐκ τῶν κλιμάκων μιᾶς,
ἥτις ἄγχιστα ἦν τῶν Πετρίων καὶ βασιλέως ἔναντι διεπονεῖτο, ἄνδρες δύο
παραδόντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ τύχῃ πρῶτοι τοῦ ἑταιρικοῦ ἐς τὸν κατ᾿ ὄψιν πύργον
καταπηδῶσι καὶ διασοβοῦσι τὸ ἐκεῖσε Ῥωμαίοις φυλακικὸν συμμαχικόν, ἐκ δὲ
τούτου διασείσαντες τὴν χεῖρα ἄνωθεν οἷον σύμβολον χαρᾶς καὶ θάρσους τοὺς
φυλέτας ἐπέρρωσαν. ἐξίσου δὲ τοῖς εἰς τὸν πύργον ἁλαμένοις καί τις ἐκ τῆς
ἱππάδος Πέτρος τοὔνομα διὰ τῆς πύλης εἴσεισι τῆς ἐκεῖσε...

Below is the metrical version (extract from *The Fall of Constantinople* by the same
author as *The Prose-Chronicle* in the codex.

Verse-Extract C: The Fall of Constantinople (f. 5, lines 237-271)

<div style="text-align:center">

τῆς μάχης γενομένης δὲ τούτων στερρεωτέρας,
ἑάλω πόλις παρ᾿ αὐτῶν ὧν τῶν Θεοῦ κριμάτων·
ὅπως δ᾿ ἐδόθη τοῖς ἐχθροῖς τοῖς ὧδε καταγράψω.
240   Πάσης αὐτῶν δυνάμεως Λατίνων μαχομένης
ἔκ τε θαλάσσης τοῦ βορρᾶ καὶ ταῖς ναυσὶ ταῖς τούτων
κλίμακας ἀναρτήσαντες ὑψηλοτάτας πάνυ

</div>

---

12. *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, ed. I. A. van Dieten [Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzanti-
nae], 2 vols, Berlin 1975, p. 569.

προσήγγισαν τοῖς τείχεσι τῆς πόλεως καὶ πύργοις
πηδήσαντες δ' ἀπὸ μιᾶς κλίμακος ἄνδρες δύο
245 Λατῖνοι σθεναρέστεροι κατῆλθον πρὸς τὸν πύργον,
πρᾶγμα διαπραξάμενοι μέγιστον καὶ γενναῖον,
ξίφη γυμνὰ κατέχοντες καὶ φόβον ἐμποιοῦντες,
ἐν ᾧ καὶ τόπῳ βασιλεὺς τὴν μάχην συνεκρότει
μετὰ παντὸς στρατεύματος, δυνάμεώς τε πάσης.
250 Οἱ δύο γοῦν, ὡς εἴρηται, Λατῖνοι κατελθόντες
πρὸς πύργον τὸν πρὸς θάλασσαν, ᾧ κλῆσις ἦν Πετρίον
πολλοὺς προσαποκτένουσι τῶν δυστυχῶν Ῥωμαίων,
μὴ δυνηθέντες οἱ πολλοὶ τοὺς δύο καταστρέψαι.
Εἶτα κατῆλθον ἕτεροι Λατῖνοι πρὸς τὸν πύργον,
255 πάντας κατακρημνίσαντες ἔξωθεν τοὺς Ῥωμαίους,
καὶ τὴν σημαίαν τὴν αὐτῶν στήσαντες ἐν τῷ πύργῳ·
ἐν οἷς καὶ Πέτρος τοὔνομα γενναῖος ἱππηλάτης
πρῶτος ὁρμήσας ἔφιππος εἰσῆλθεν ἐν τῇ πόλει
ἀπό τε πύλεως αὐτῆς τῆς οὔσης ἐν Πετρίῳ,
260 ὃς καὶ φοβήσας ἅπαντας ὄντας ἐκεῖ Ῥωμαίους
φεύγειν αὐτοὺς ἐποίησεν· ἥλιε, βλέπεις ταῦτα;
Ἔνθεν λοιπὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς σὺν μετρητοῖς ἱππίοις
καταληφθεὶς μονώτατος φεύγει καταισχυμένος,
κραυγάζων ἐν ταῖς ἀγυιαῖς· στῆτε, Ῥωμαῖοι, στῆτε,
265 πρὸς πόλεμον ὠτρύνθητε, κατὰ Λατίνων πάντες,
στραφέντες μαχησώμεθα, μὴ λάφυρα φανῶμεν
αὐτοῖς Λατίνοις τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σὺν γυναξὶ καὶ τέκνοις.
οὐκ ἦν ὁ τούτῳ συμμαχῶν, οὐ πάρεστιν ἀκούων·
ἀλλ' εἰσφυγεῖν ἐτράπησαν ἅπαντες οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι.
270 ἑάλω πόλις οὖν κακῶς τότε παρὰ Λατίνων,
ἡ βασιλὶς τῶν πόλεων, ἡ τρισευτυχεστάτη.

(Müller, *Byzantinische Analekten*, 374)

In Extracts A, B, and C we have three different levels of puristic Greek (Extract B reflecting the highest). We should therefore investigate the existence of formulas and poetic forms in *The Fall of Constantinople* to gain some insight into the conversion of prose into poetry by the versifier. The following are formulas drawn from Extract C (*The Fall of Constantinople*) and the *Alexander* poem respectively:

The Fall of Constantinople: τῆς μάχης γενομένης δὲ τούτων στερεωτέρας (line 237)
Alexander poem: τῆς μάχης γενομένης δὲ τούτων στερεωτέρας (f. 48, line 1542)
The Fall of Constantinople: ἔνθεν λοιπὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς σὺν μετρητοῖς ἱππέοις (line 262)
Alexander poem: πρῶτος, Κανδαύλης, ἐξελθὼν σὺν μετρητοῖς ἱππέοις (f. 122, line 5076)

Alexander poem: ἔφη: Σὺν τῇ συζύγῳ μου *καὶ μετρητοῖς ἱππέοις* (φ. 122ᵛ, line 5091).
The Fall of Constantinople: στραφέντες μαχησόμεθα, μὴ λάφυρα φανῶμεν (line 266)
       αὐτοῖς λατίνοις τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις (line 267)
Alexander poem: *καὶ λάφυρα γενώμεθα σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις* (f. 114, line 4689)

Bearing in mind that the versifiers of *The Fall of Constantinople* and the *Alexander* poem are not the same person[13], one is able to discern the usage of formulas which were adopted by various authors in the fourteenth century. In the above instance the author of *The Fall of Constantinople* must have modelled his verse-chronicle on the style of the *Alexander* poem and had adopted the formulas accordingly. «Similarity in diction and style between the two poems is not sufficient evidence to prove that the same author wrote both poems. [...] We have the presence of formulaic patterns which were borrowed and used for metrical purposes»[14]. These formulas, either inherited or construed to suit the poetry, allowed for easier reading and comprehension of didactic works drawn from the difficult writings of historians, *e.g.*, Niketas Choniates as illustrated in Prose-Extract B.

Our anonymous authors, with not necessarily a profound knowledge of Ancient Greek, used formulaic patterns of a puristic nature (as illustrated in these examples) to retain a reasonable degree of purism in their simplified poetry which was, in turn, to be read (or heard) by the less educated. These formulas must inevitably have bee connected with oral tradition[15] and employed for easier adaptation to poetry. To be noted with interest is the author's use of the genitive absolute, both in his *Prose-Chronicle*, Prose-Extract A, lines 2 and 3: μαχομένης πάσης τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν Λατίνων, and in his Verse-Chronicle, Verse-Extract C, line 240: πάσης αὐτῶν δυνάμεως Λατίνων μαχομένης. This rearrangement of the genitive absolute illustrates the author's adaptation of his own puristic phrases transferred from prose to verse. Clearly the *Prose-Chronicle* reflects a degree of puristic Greek somewhat elevated from the language of everyday speech, though not as elevated and incomprehensible in Archaism as that of Niketas Choniates (lines 6-7 κἂν ἡ ἀκμὴ τοῦ κακοῦ ἰσχυροτέρα τις ἦν καὶ δριμυτέρα τῆς πρότριτα). Mingled with puristic forms are poetic forms: πύλεως (for πύλης) line 259, ἱππέοις (for ἱππεύσι) line 262, attested in the language of *The Fall of Constantinople*. To demonstrate more clearly the conversion of language from prose to poetry, we need to juxtapose source-extracts with their corresponding poetic versions as illustrated

---

13. See my article Observations, 24, in which I have provided a structural analysis of both *The Fall of Constantinople* and the *Alexander* poem, from which my conclusions have indicated different authors at work.

14. *Ibid.*, especially 25.

15. See M. J. Jeffreys, Byzantine Metrics: Non Literary Strata, 331.

below. Compare, for instance, the language forms of the author's *Prose-Chronicle* side by side with those of his verse-chronicle, *The Fall of Constantinople*.

Prose Chronicle	Verse-Chronicle: *The Fall of Constantinople*
πρῶτος ὁρμήσας εἰσῆλθεν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκεῖσε πύλης (f. 145ᵛ) ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς καταληφθεὶς μονώτατος ἀπέ- δρασε καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ κατεκυριεύθη ἡ πόλις παρὰ τῶν Λατίνων (f. 145)	πρῶτος ὁρμήσας ἔφιππος, εἰσῆλθεν ἐν τῇ πόλει, ἀπό τῆς πύλεως αὐτῆς τῆς οὔσης ἐν Πετρίῳ (lines 258-259) Ἔνθεν λοιπὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς σὺν μετρητοῖς ἱππέοις καταληφθεὶς μονώτατος φεύγει καταισχυ- μένος (lines 262-263)
(Müller, *Byzantinische Analekten*, 390)	(Müller, *Byzantinische Analekten*, 374)

To be noted firstly is the poetic form πύλεως used in verse to replace πύλης (the correct orthographic form). Furthermore, the verse-form, ἱππέοις constitutes part of a formula (see formulas drawn from the *Alexander* poem cited earlier on in the paper). When it came to reproducing in verse, the author filled in his hemistichs with formulas for metrical convenience. The above poetic forms are such as fitted well into the metre and which, as M. J. Jeffreys states, had belonged to an oral poetic language «with useful functions within the system of Composition»[16].

To further our discussion on the manner of conversion from prose to poetry, I shall introduce practical illustration from one other poem of major importance contained in our codex, on ff. 142ᵛ-144, a work which has hitherto not been brought to the attention of scholars.

For the convenience of the reader, I have entitled the poem *The Donation of Constantine*[17]. The contents of this poem are based on Matthaios Blastares's version

---

16. These forms must have belonged to a language of an orally poetic nature which had formed a system comparable to the language mixture of the Homeric oral tradition. Compare the following parallel provided by Jeffreys (Byzantine Metrics, 331) explaining the eclecticism of the vernacular poetic language of the fourteenth century: «The Homeric language was never anybody's speech, nor yet a learned language of the schoolroom. [...] It was a language developed over the centuries of oral singing for the performance of the hexameter. [...] A helpful technique of composition [...] the matching of a useful grammatical form with a point in the hexameter where it filled well [...] generations added linguistic forms to the epic language whilst accepting increasing numbers of archaisms with useful functions within the system of composition [...]. There is plainly no direct connection between the Homeric oral tradition and its Byzantine equivalent. It is mentioned here as a parallel to illustrate how an oral tradition of some centuries could explain the eclecticism and uniformity of the vernacular poetic language of the fourteenth century and after».

17. Folios 142ᵛ-144 provide work (75 lines + 4 title lines) on the 'donation' by Constantine

of Constantine's 'donation' of ecclesiastical powers to Pope Silvester I, as supreme arbiter of the universal church. By decreee of this 'donation', the powers of the Church were to be submitted to Pope Silvester and all ecclesiastics were to be subject to the bishop of Rome, to whom the Emperor had transferred the city of Rome and all the western regions.

Below are selected Extracts D, E and F of my own transcription from the codex.

Verse-Extract D: The Donation of Constantine (ff. 142ᵛ-143, lines 1-18)

θέσπισμα χρυσοβούλλειον καὶ νόμος Κωνσταντίνου
τοῦ πρώτου τῶν Χριστιανῶν μεγίστου βασιλέως
πρὸς πάσαν τὸν θειότατον Σίλβεστρον τὸν τῆς Ρώμης
σὺν διαδόχοις τοῖς αὐτοῦ, πῶς δεῖ τιμᾶσθαι τούτους.

f. 142ᵛ   θεσπίζομεν σὺν ἄπασι σατράπαις ἡγεμόσι
            καὶ τῇ συγκλήτῳ τῆς ἡμῶν μεγίστης βασιλείας,
            τὸν Ρώμης τὸν ἐπίσκοπον πάπαν καὶ πατριάρχην,
            διάδοχον θεότατον τοῦ κορυφαίου Πέτρου,
   5   τὴν ἐξουσίαν μείζονα κεκτῆσθαι βασιλέων
            εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ὑπόνομον καὶ πᾶσαν οἰκουμένην
            τιμᾶσθαι τε καὶ σέβεσθαι καὶ καταπροσκυνεῖσθαι
            μεγίστην δὲ καὶ τὴν τιμὴν κατέχειν ὑπερπάντα,
            τοὺς βασιλέας τοὺς ἐν γῇ καὶ τοὺς ἐν ἐξουσίαις
   10   εἶναι δ' αὐτὸν καὶ κορυφὴν τεττάρων τῶν μεγάλων
            θρόνων τῶν πατριαρχικῶν καὶ πρόκειτον καὶ πρῶτον
            ψηφίζειν δὲ καὶ συνιστᾶν καὶ κρίνειν ὀρθοδόξως.
f. 143   Ὅσα πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν δόγματα συντελοῦσι
            σὺν τούτοις δὲ δωρούμεθα Σιλβέστρῳ τῷ πατρί μου
   15   σὺν διαδόχοις τοῖς αὐτοῦ πάποις τοῖς θειοτάτοις
            οἰκεῖν εἰς τὰ βασίλεια τούτους ἀνεμποδίστως,
            τιάραν τὴν βασιλικὴν τῇ κεφαλῇ κοσμεῖσθαι
            πολυτελῶν καὶ θαυμαστῶν λίθων καὶ τῶν μαργάρων,

Verse-Extract E: The Donation of Constantine (ff. 143-143ᵛ, lines 25-49)

   25   σκήπτροις καὶ ταῖς κοσμήμασι πᾶσι τῶν ἀνακτόρων

---

the Great to the Pope, drawn from Matthaios Blastares, *Syntagma Alphabeticum-b* (Migne, *PG* 144, col. 1285-1288). The author's introductory lines explain how the new law of Constantine had offered the highest powers of the Church to Pope Silvester I. The Syntagma (a collection of secular and ecclesiastical canons in alphahetical order), was written in 1335.

τοὺς δὲ τῷ κλήρῳ τῆς αὐτῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας 'Ρώμης
κατειλεγμένους ἅπαντας ὁρίζομεν κοσμεῖσθαι,
ἐνδύματα συγκλητικὰ παραπλησίως τούτους
ἔχειν δ' αὐτοὺς ἐν ἵππεσι λευκὰς ὀθώνας πάντας
30   τοιαύταις ὑποδύσεσι λευκαῖς κεκοσμημένους,
Τοὺς δ' ἐκ συγκλήτου τῆς ἡμῶν εἰς κλῆρον αἱρουμένους
γενέσθαι πατριαρχικὸν τούτους παραχωροῦμεν
τὰ βουλητέα πράξαντας, ἀπείργεσθαι μηδόλως.
"Οτι δὲ τὸν ἐκ τοῦ χρυσοῦ στέφανον παραιτεῖται
35   δεσπότης ὁ σεβάσμιος ἐμὸς πατὴρ καὶ πάπας,
ὁ δείξας ἐμοὶ Σίλβεστρος, ὁ δ' ἐν τῆς ἀληθείας
ἐκ ταπεινοῦ φρονήματος πράου τε καὶ μηρίου
ἡμεῖς οἰκείαις ταῖς χερσὶ τῇ θείου τούτου κάρᾳ,
λῶρον τὸν πανυπέρλαμπρον τιθέαμεν, ἐκ πόθου
40   φέροντα τὴν ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ζωοδότου
λίθοις τιμίοις λάμποντα, χρυσῷ καὶ τοῖς μαργάροις·
f. 143ᵛ   ὀφφίκιον δὲ στράτορος ἡμεῖς ὑποδεικνύντες
ἵππους τε τούτου χαλινοὺς κρατήσαντες ἐκ πόθου
τῶν ἀνακτόρων ἔξιμεν, τούτου καὶ τῶν αὐλέων
45   πίστει καὶ πόθῳ καὶ τιμῇ Κυρίου μου τοῦ Πέτρου
μεγίστῃ συνεχόμενοι καὶ τούτῳ προσκυνοῦντες,
τοῖς διαδόχοις τοῖς αὐτοῦ πᾶσι παραχωροῦντες,
αὐθεντικῶς ἐπιτηρεῖν κατέχειν καὶ δεσπόζειν
πόλιν τὴν 'Ρώμην ἅπασαν καὶ δύσεως τὰ μέρη.

Verse-Extract F: The Donation of Constantine (ff. 143ᵛ-144, lines 60-75)

60   μητέρα τὴν τῶν πόλεων πασῶν ὑποδεικνύντων
ἄδικον δόξαντας ἡμᾶς κατέχειν δεσποτείαν
τὸν βασιλέα τὸν τῆς γῆς, 'Ρώμης τῆς περιφήμης,
εἰς ἣν κατείδομεν αὐγὴν πίστην ἀληθεστάτην
θεοῦ τὴν ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν καλῶς, ἀναμαθόντες
65   οἰκείαις ταῦτα δὲ χερσὶ γράμμασιν ἐρυθραίοις
γράψαντες καὶ σφραγίσαντες καὶ τάφῳ προστιθέντες
Πέτρου τοῦ πρωτοκήρυκος καὶ πρωτοθρόνου 'Ρώμης,
ὅρκους ἐκεῖ τιθέαμεν μὴ σαλευθῆναι ταῦτα,
μὴ παραβῆναι πώποτε καλῶς τὰ προκριθέντα,
70   ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς μετέπειτα τὸ κράτος δεξαμένοις
f. 144   τοὐμὸν τὸ θεῖον καὶ σεπτὸν ἐμοῖς τε διαδόχοις
ἔχουσι τὴν εὐσέβειαν τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ πίστιν,
φυλάττειν ἀπαράθραυστα τούτοις παρεγγυῶμεν

τὰ κυρωθέντα παρ' ἐμοῦ καὶ τῷ σεπτῷ Σιλβέστρῳ
75   σὺν διαδόχοις τοῖς αὐτοῦ, γραφέντα καὶ δοθέντα.

For the benefit of the reader, lengthy extracts have been selected from *The Donation of Constantine, Verse-Extracts D, E, F,* and *Prose-Extract G* (below). Underscorings have been made of verbal echoes, and poetic forms reflected in the respective extracts.

Compare below the verse forms in *The Donation of Constantine* (folios 142^v-144 of our codex) side by side with the prose forms of Matthaios Blastares, *Syntagma Alphabeticum E* (Migne, *PG* 144, cols. 1285-1288) from whom the author of *The Donation of Constantine* has drawn his material.

Prose: Historical Source	Verse
Matthaios Blastares,	*The Donation of Constantine*
Syntagma Alphabeticum	ff. 142^v-144
καὶ τὰ χαλινὰ τοῦ ἵππου αὐτοῦ κατέχοντες, τῆς αὐλῆς τῶν ἱερῶν αὐτοῦ ἔξιμεν ἀνακτό-ρων	ἵππου τε τούτου χαλινοὺς κρατήσαντες ἐκ πόθου τῶν ἀνακτόρων ἔξιμεν, τούτου καὶ τῶν αὐ-λέων
(Migne, *PG* 144, col. 1286)	(f. 143^v-lines 43-44)
ἵπποις ἐποχουμένους, ὀθόνας περικειμένους λευκάς.	ἔχειν δ' αὐτοὺς ἐν ἵππεσι, λευκὰς ὀθόνας πάντας
(*Ibid., col.* 1286)	(f. 143-line 29)

Once again, we see the forms αὐλέων, ἵππεσι[18], substituting the conventional forms. An aspect of significance to be noted in the above extracts is that of the author's close adherence to the wording of his original historical source, whereas the author of *The Fall of Constantinople* (Verse-Extract C) adhered as closely as possible to his own wording (Prose-Extract A) of the history (drawn from Choniates) and not to the language of Choniates, which was inaccessible to readership.

To gain a clearer insight into the author's adaptation to verse, from a source directly in from of him, we need to make a few observations by comparing his poetic language with the prose language of his source before him.

Below is an extract from Matthaios Blastares's *Syntagma*:

Prose-Extract G: Syntagma Alphabeticum E (PG 144, cols. 1285-1288)

Θεσπίζομεν σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς σατράπαις, καὶ τῇ συγκλήτῳ τῆς ἡμῶν βασιλείας,

---

18. Compare similar examples in the Alexander poem: πήχεων (f. 113^v, line 4669), τειχέων (f. 62^v, line 2189), *inter alia.*

τὸν ῾Ρώμης ἐπίσκοπον καὶ διάδοχον τοῦ κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ κυρίου μου Πέτρου, πλείονα τῆς βασιλείας ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ παρὰ πάντων πολλῷ πλέον ἢ τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶσθαι καὶ σέβεσθαι κεφαλήν τε εἶναι τῶν τεσσάρων πατριαρχικῶν θρόνων, κρίνεσθαί τε πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ψηφίζεσθαι τὰ τῇ ὀρθοδόξῳ συμβαίνοντα πίστει· δωρούμεθα δὲ τῷ πατρί μου τῷ μακαρίῳ Σιλβέστρῳ καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ διαδόχοις τὸ ἡμέτερον παλάτιον, τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διάδημα, ἐκ λίθων τιμίων καὶ μαργάρων συγκείμενον, τὸ κυκλοῦν τὸν τράχηλον ὠμοφόριον, τὴν πορφυρᾶν χλαμύδα, τὸν κόκκινον χιτῶνα, καὶ πάντα τὰ βασιλικὰ ἐνδύματα, τὰ τῶν βασιλικῶν *ἵππων* ἀξιώματα, τὰ σκῆπτρα, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς βασιλείας κοσμήματα, καὶ τὴν δόξαν ἅπασαν τῆς ἡμῶν ἐξουσίας· τοὺς δὲ τῷ κλήρῳ τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ῾Ρώμης *κατειλεγμένους* κοσμεῖσθαι κελεύομεν παραπλησίοις τῇ συγκλήτῳ ἡμῶν ἐνδύμασιν, *ἵπποις ἐποχουμένους, ὀθόνας* περικειμένους *λευκάς,* ὡς δὲ καὶ τὰ ὑποδήματα τούτων ὀθονίων εἶναι πεποιημένα λευκῶν· καὶ ὃς ἂν αἱροῖτο κληρικὸς ἐκ τῆς ἡμῶν συγκλήτου γενέσθαι, τοῦτον πρός τινος μηδαμῶς εἴργεσθαι· ὅτι γε μὴν τὴν ἐκ χρυσίου στεφάνην φρονήματος μετριότητι ὁ Πατήρ μου ὁ ἁγιώτατος Σίλβεστρος παραιτεῖται, ταύτῃ τοι τὸν ὑπέρλαμπρον *λῶρον,* σημαίνοντα τὴν ἁγίαν ᾿Ανάστασιν, τῇ ἁγίᾳ κεφαλῇ αὐτοῦ *ἰδίαις χερσὶν* ἐπεθήκαμεν· ἡμεῖς δὲ *στράτωρος ὀφφίκιον* ὑπελθόντες, καὶ τὰ χαλινὰ τοῦ *ἵππου* αὐτοῦ κατέχοντες, τῆς *αὐλῆς* τῶν ἱερῶν αὐτοῦ *ἔξιμεν ἀνακτόρων,* αἰδοῖ καὶ φόβῳ τοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ ἁγίου συνεχόμενος Πέτρου· τῶν χρησίμων δὲ κομιδῇ καὶ θεοφιλῶν νενομίκαμεν, ἐκστῆναι μὲν τῆς πόλεως ῾Ρώμης καὶ τῶν δυτικῶν χωρῶν ἁπασῶν τε καὶ πόλεων, τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ Πάπᾳ· τὸ δὲ τῆς βασιλείας κράτος πρὸς τὰ τῆς *Ἑῴας* μέρη *μετενεγκεῖν,* καὶ τὴν ἐν καλλίστῳ κειμένην τῆς ὑφ᾽ ἡλίῳ τοῦ Βύζαντος πόλιν καταλαβεῖν, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ἱδρύσασθαι τὰ βασίλεια, *ἄδικον οἰηθέντες* ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς βασιλέα, ἔνθα ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν θρησκείας ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὑπῆρξεν ἡμῖν. Ταῦτα ταῖς *ἰδίαις χερσὶ* γράψαντες, καὶ τῷ νεκρῷ τοῦ κυρίου μου ἐπιθέμενοι Πέτρου, πίστεις ἐνόρκους ποιούμεθα, ἦ μὴν ὅλως πάντα ταῦτα μὴ παραβῆναι· ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τὸ ἡμέτερον διαδεξαμένοις κράτος φυλάττειν ἀπαράθραυστα παρεγγυώμεθα πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα *ἡμῶν Πάπαν* καὶ τοὺς αὐτοῦ διαδόχους.

Line 1 of Verse-Extract D and Prose-Extract G (*Donation of Constantine*) show clearly direct copying, but with a pleonastic approach (for example σατράπαις ἡγεμόσι), *i.e.* a redundant use of words for the sake of extra syllables. This was a common characteristic of poets of the political verse. A similar approach by the author of *The Fall of Constantinople* is noteworthy in Extract C on line 246 μέγιστον καὶ γενναῖον (*inter alia*) to suit the metre. Lines 38 and 65 in Verse-Extracts E and F respectively, give rise to an interesting question as to why the author should have made use of οἰκείας rather than ἰδίαις (with an equal number of syllables) in two successive instances in the same poem, whereas the source

(Prose-Extract G) reflects to corresponding use of ἰδίαις χερσί in both cases. See the prose / verse sections juxtaposed below:

Prose: Historical Source Matthaios Blastares, *Syntagma Alphabeticum*	Verse *The Donation of Constantine*

Πατήρ μου ὁ ἁγιώτατος Σίλβεστρος παραι-
τεῖται... τὸν ὑπέρλαμπρον λῶρον, ... τῇ ἁγίᾳ
κεφαλῇ αὐτοῦ *ἰδίαις χερσὶν* ἐπεθήκαμεν.
                    (Migne, *PG* 144, col. 1288)

ἡμεῖς *οἰκείαις ταῖς χερσὶ* τῇ θείου τούτου
                                          κάρᾳ
λῶρον τὸν πανυπέρλαμπρον τιθέαμεν ἐκ πό-
                                          θου
                    (f. 143, lines 38-39)

ταῦτα ταῖς *ἰδίαις χερσί* γράψαντες, καὶ τῷ
νεκρῷ τοῦ κυρίου μου ἐπιθέμενοι Πέτρου
                    (*Ibid.*, col. 1288)

οἰκείαις ταῦτα δὲ *χερσὶ* γράμμασιν ἐρυ-
                                          θραίοις
γράψαντες καὶ σφραγίσαντες καὶ τάφῳ προ-
                                          στιθέντες
Πέτρου τοῦ πρωτοκήρυκος καὶ πρωτοθρό-
                              νου 'Ρώμης.
                    (f. 143, lines 64-66)

The answer would be that οἰκείαις... χερσὶ was a phrase used in the traditional language (connected with oral transmission)[19] and belonged to the poetic idiom of this period.

The Fall of Constantinople reflects the same phrase on line 436 (see below) which describes an episode of Andronikos II wiping the bleeding face of St George, the martyr. The source of the incident is Pachymeres[20] who does not employ this idiom in his description of the St George episode, as seen below:

Prose: Historical Source Georgios Pachymeres, *Andronikos Palaiologos*	Verse *The Fall of Constantinople*

'Ως δὲ κατέσχεν ὕστερον 'Ανδρόνικος
                              τὸ κράτος,
. . . .

Θεοτόκου εἰκών... ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἡμέραις ἐδα-
κρυρρόει, ...ὀφθαλμῶν χέουσα, ὥστε καὶ
σπόγγοις τὸ ἐκρέον συνάγεσθαι. καὶ αὖθις ἐν
τοῖς Χαρσίου αἷμα τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ λαμπρὸν
μάρτυσι λάμποντος Γεωργίου δαψιλῶς ἀνέ-
βλυζε.
                    (Pachymeres, II, 82. See note 19)

ὃς προσελθὼν καὶ κατιδὼν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸ
πρᾶγμα *οἰκείαις* τούτου *ταῖς χερσὶ* κατα-
σφογγίζει τοῦτο. ὁρῶντος οὖν τὸν μάρτυρα
πάλιν ἐκ τοῦ προσώπου αἷμα πολὺ κατέρ-
ρευσε καὶ μεῖζον τοῦ προτέρου.
                    (f. 8ᵛ, lines 430, 435-438)

                    (Müller, *Byzantinische Analekten*, 379)

---

19. See note 7.

20. Georgii Pachymeris *De Michaele et Andronico Palaeologis*, ed. I. Bekker [CSHB], 2 vols., Bonn 1835. See esp. vol. II, p. 82. The story presented in *The Fall of Constantinople* is a version of that given by Pachymeres who reports that, in the church of Charsia, Andronikos saw a

Clearly, the traditional phrase οἰκείαις χερσὶ echoed in the mind of the poet as he reproduced the St. George episode in verse.

In addition to the poetic features discussed above, one which presents a particular interest (attested in *The Fall of Constantinople*) is reflected on line 573, in the form ὀμωκότας (fellow-plotters). See lines 573-575 below, which describe the (1261) entry of the Greeks (with the Caesar Strategopoulos as leader) into Constantinople during the reign of Michael VIII Palaiologos, for the reconquest of the city from the Latins.

> τοὺς ὀμωκότας σὺν αὐτοῖς ἐλθεῖν ἔσω προστάξας,
> οἵτινες ἐκπηδήσαντες ὡς λέοντες αὐτίκα,
> εἰσῆλθον ἔνδον πόλεως, ἀκώλυτον εὑρόντες
>
> (f. 10ᵛ, lines 573-575)

(Müller, *Byzantinische Analekten*, 384-385)

My translation of these lines (in fifteen syllables) reads as follows:

> *Telling his fellow-plotters there to make the entry with him.*
> *Like lions bouncing from their lair, without delay and quickly*
> *they found no hindrance on the way, and passed into the city.*

The form ὀμωκότας shows loss of reduplication[21], indicating that the versifier had used the unreduplicated form ὀμωκότας in place of the conventional reduplicated Attic form ὀμωμοκότας (accusative plural of the perfect participle of ὄμνυμι), in order to meet the demands of the metre. It must be noted that the form ὀμωκότας is not found in any of the relevant sources, or in the codex.

Pachymeres, Akropolites, and Gregoras use the nouns στρατιώτας, ἄνδρες and ὁπλίτας respectively. For example, Pachymeres[22] writes τῷ δὲ Καίσαρι τοὺς στρατιώτας ... πύλη εἰσέρχεσθαι, Akropolites[23] says that πεντεκαίδεκα ... ἄνδρες ... εἰσῆλθον, and Gregoras[24] refers to πεντήκοντα εἰσιόντας ὁπλίτας. All instances

---

radiant vision of St. George from whose countenance blood flowed freely. The Emperor, seeing this, took it as a grave omen. The story of the weeping Theotokos as reflected in Pachymeres (prose-section) does not appear in *The Fall of Constantinople*. In addition to Niketas Choniates and Georgios Pachymeres, other sources related to *The Fall of Constantinople* are Nikephoros Gregoras and Georgios Akropolites. See my article Observations, note 35.

21. On unreduplicated forms in Byzantine Greek see S. B. Psaltes, *Grammatik der Byzantinischen Chroniken* [Forschungen zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik, 2], Göttingen 1913, esp. 206-207. Compare further R. Browning, *Studies on Byzantine History, Literature and Education*, Variorum Reprints, VIII, 312.

22. Pachymeres, I, 140.

23. *Georgii Akropolitae Opera*, ed. A. Heisenberg, 2 vols. (1903), vol. I, containing the *Historia* revised by P. Wirth, Stuttgart 1978, ch. II, p. 182.

24. Nikephoros Gregoras (Migne, *PG* 148, col. 216).

of reduplication in *The Fall of Constantinople* are borrowings from the purist language, employed because they sounded more literary and conformed[25] with the metre.

Another means which the versifier resorted to in order to conform with the demands of the metre concerns morphological variation of proper names, *i.e.,* the versifier makes use of a variety of forms of proper names: *e.g.* Χαρσίαν, 373; Χαρισίου 378, 394, 414, 418; βυζαντίδι 140, 209; βυζαντία (sub title) 195; Λασκάρων 357 and Λασκαρίων 359.

I do not propose to comment on the more commonly attested Medieval Greek characteristics contained in *The Fall of Constantinople*. One anomaly, however, which deserves mention here (both for its syntactical and its metrical interest) is that of an absurd use of the accusative absolute. Cf. line 131 below[26]:

> ὁ δηλωθεὶς δ' 'Ανδρόνικος τοῖς παλαιτέροις χρόνοις
> ἔτι τὰ σκῆπτρα Κομνηνοῦ τοῦ Μανουὴλ κρατοῦντος,
> μιᾷ πρὸς τὸν ἱππόδρομον *τούτους ἀπερχομένους*
> ἔδειξεν οὗτος βασιλεῖ τοὺς κίονας τοὺς δύο
> τοὺς ὄντας εἰς ἱππόδρομον, ἐν οἷς κατεχρεμάσθη,
> εἰπὼν αὐτόν, ὡς βασιλεὺς μέσον αὐτῶν κιόνων
> ἐκκρεμασθεὶς ἀνηλεῶς μέλλει κακῶς τεθνάναι.

<div align="right">(Müller, Byzantinische Analekten, 370)</div>

The versifier, lacking in a sound knowledge of the Ancient Greek uses (erroneously) an accusative absolute of his own adaptation (a phrase of seven syllables) to conveniently accommodate the metre. There is no example of such an accusative absolute used of persons elsewhere in the text. Despite the ability of the writer to versify prose texts fluently, clarity of meaning and syntax were frequently sacrificed to metrical demands.

To conclude briefly: by means of a practical approach, we have endeavoured to illustrate oral techniques in the use of formulas which are common to other Medieval Greek texts[27], and have shown how some techniques of the oral poet have

---

25. *E.G.*, εὑρηκὼς 39; γέγονε 10, 42, 141, 214, 307, 334, 315, 401, 442, 443, 589, 595, 629, 639, 693, 717; ἔσχηκε 156; ἀκήκοεν 76, ἐδεδοίκει 53; συμβεβηκώς 593, *inter alia.*

26. Writers of the present period commonly used the form ἀπέρχομαι (with the prefix ἀπ- instead of the Classical ἐπ-) meaning to 'approach', 'enter'. Compare a similar usage in the *πάσχα-* poem of the codex, lines 4-5: πρὸς τὴν Παλεστίνην ἀπῆλθον, in my article, Pascha. An Unpublished Fourteenth Century Poem, *Apollonia* 2 (1982) 70-76, esp. 70.

27. See M. and E. Jeffreys, Imberios and Margarona: the Manuscripts, Sources and Edition of a Byzantine Verse Romance, *Byzantion* 41 (1971) 122-160, esp. 141 ff.; E. M. and M. J. Jeffreys, The Traditional Style of Early Demotic Greek Verse, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 5 (1979) 115-139, where a thorough examination is provided of formulas in the *War of*

survived in the diction and style of the popular versifier. Deductions made from prose / verse analogies have indicated how versifiers had deliberately employed a language elevated from everyday speech, one which was based on consciously selected formulaic expressions mingled with traditional forms to conform with the rhythm of their writing.

Rand Afrikaans University   C. MATZUKIS

Troy ('Ο πόλεμος τῆς Τρωάδος); see esp. 119. Some other significant works pertaining to formulas are cited by Jeffreys, Traditional Style, 130-131.