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0. Introduction
The spatial expression in the Greek language has diachronically undergone conspicuous changes. Compared with the abundant morphological variants during the long periods, however, its syntactic structure is fairly stable. Most standard syntactic patterns of the spatial expression in Ancient / Koine Greek (henceforth: AG/KG) are PREP+N as in (1) or ADV+GEN as in (2).

(1) έπει 'ον 'ης γῆς
'on the earth'
(2) εμπροσθεν των θυσιαστήριων 'in front of the altar'

On the other hand, Standard Modern Greek (henceforth: SMG) normally expresses spatial concepts by the pattern PREP+N as (3) or, when necessity occurs to indicate an object's location more precisely, by ADV+PREP+N as (4). Clitic pronouns, however, can directly follow the adverb in the form of the genitive, as (5).

(3) στη γη
'on the earth'
(4) μπροστά στο θυσιαστήριο 'in front of the altar'
(5) μπροστά του 'in front of it'

Thus, the standard syntactic structure of the Greek spatial expressions amounts to the four types: PREP+N, ADV+GEN, ADV+PREP+N, ADV+CLIT. Nevertheless, some medieval texts provide instances which cannot be categorized into any of the above. For example, the Late-Byzantine prose Alexander Romance (henceforth: Late-Byz.3), which has been handed down through several manuscripts in the 16th and 17th centuries5, includes an idiosyncratic pattern of the spatial expression as follows.

(6) απανωθέαν την ψλώγαν επέτοντο Φ’46,4
'they were flying over the fire5'
(7) εμπροσθεν έναν λύκον πολλά πράβατα φεύγουν Κ352,17-8
'many sheep run away in front of a wolf'

—35—
The syntactic pattern exemplified in (6-7), ADV+ACC, cannot be accepted by AG/KG nor by SMG.

The present study intends to examine this pattern so as to demonstrate that the pattern in question is not necessarily scribal errors or abbreviated forms for graphic convenience in Late-Byz. but can belong to the substandard paradigm in the late- and post-Byzantine periods. In section 1., firstly, we scrutinize examples in the four MSS. of Late-Byz. (FEVK). In section 2, the results from 1 are compared with those of two other versions. One of them is dated in the earlier period and the other is an early Modern Greek version, i.e. Pseudo-Kallisthenes ε and Phyllada. In section 3, we conduct a preliminary and random examination of some other vernacular texts in the late- and post-Byzantine periods. In section 4, the data collected in the previous sections are analyzed in order to clarify how the pattern in question is connected to the diachronic development of Greek. Finally, section 5 attempts to interpret the results from the view of general linguistics.

Owing to convenience, I will introduce some terms for each spatial concept*: Superior ('on / over'), Inferior ('under'), Anterior ('in front of'), Posterior ('behind'), Interior ('inside'), Exterior ('outside'), Proximate ('near'), Medial ('between / among'), Circumferential ('around'), Ulterior ('beyond') and Ceterior-Anterior ('opposite'). The examples for the spatial concepts will be examined in the order that they are listed above. Since the main subject in this study is the syntactic structure, the examples which are better categorized as metaphorical rather than spatial will be analyzed as well, insofar as they are concerned with the syntactic pattern ADV+ACC.

1. Examples in Late-Byz

1.1. Superior

Late-Byz., as well as the other Byzantine vernacular texts, possesses various lexical forms to represent each spatial concept.

Firstly, the concept Superior is expressed by numerous lexical variations as shown in Table 1 which is added at the end of this study. However, it should be noted that the accusative does not co-occur with all these forms, but only some adverbs such as απάνωθεν, απανώθεν, επάνωθεν (only in K) and κατάπάνω. In other words, the occurrence of ADV+ACC is motivated not semantically but lexically. (8-10) are typical examples, which clearly indicates that the accusative nouns in ADV+ACC are not governed by the verbs but the adverbs (for whole examples, see Tables 2.1-2.2).

απάνωθεν

(8) ἡ ἁρπαγὴς μέγας απάνωθεν τὴν τέταρτν τοῦ βασιλέως. E12,3

'A big eagle came flying over the emperor's tent.'

απανώθεν

(9) απανωκλίθανοι, ὅποι βάνοι απανωθεκόν τα ἁρμάτα. F49,13

'surcoat, which they wear over the armor'
"Spáνωθεν"  
(10) ἔποσεν ἐπάνωθεν τῷ κάστρῳ. K354,30-1
  "He rushed on the castle."

καταπάνω  
(11) ἔρχοντας καταπάνω τοῖς βασιλέα τῶν Λιγύπτων. E3,1
  "They charged at the king of the Egyptians."

Tables 2.1-2.2 indicates that the pattern ADV+ACC is systematically observed in αποκάτως and καταπάνω, though, in some cases, it exchanges with ADV+GEN or ADV+PREP. The stability of the governed cases varies with the version. For example, αποκάτως in F consistently takes the accusative, while E and V sometimes attempt to replace the accusative with the standard pattern.

More noteworthy is that the adverbs which can be followed by the accusative are more complicated from the morphological viewpoint than those which never co-occur with the accusative. Namely, the adverbs followed by the accusative are derived with a prefix or suffix (e.g. απάνωθεν < από+άνωθεν, αποκάτως < από+άνωτος, επάνωθεν < επι+άνωθεν, καταπάνω < κατά+από+άνω), while those which do not accept the accusative are equipped at most with one affix (e.g. ανωθεν < ανω+θεν, απάνω < από+ανω).

When a pronoun follows the adverbs, it always appears in the form of the clitic genitive. Therefore, the pattern ADV+ACC is involved only with the noun.

1.2. Inferior  
Among the lexical variations of Inferior, examples of ADV+ACC are provided by αποκάτως I -σου and ὑποκάτω (only in K) (11). (See Tables 1&2.3.)

(12) αποκάτως τὰ ἔξω ἐκείνων ἀνθρώπων, αποκάτως τὰ φύλλα...ἐξέβαιναν βρίσκεσ
  F80,3 'There were men lying under the trees and fountains were gushing out under the leaves.'

It should be noted that, in this spatial concept too, the accusative exchanges with the genitive, εἰς and clitics. The version which shows the most conspicuous inclination towards the standard pattern is E, in which ADV+ACC is observed only in three cases (E49,27;125,11;128,2).

The data of Inferior reinforces the observation of Superior in that the accusative tends to be governed by the adverb with a suffix such as αποκάτως (< από+κάτω) or ὑποκάτω (< ὑπό+κάτω), while such an adverb without a suffix as κάτω is always followed by the preposition (see Table 1).

1.3. Anterior  
The adverbs of Anterior which co-occur with the accusative are as follows (See Tables 1&2.4): ἐν μπρος (13)
(13) επήρε το κοντάριν του καὶ εξεβί σ’ εμπός τον Πόρον Ε101,1 (ομπός F)
    'he took his spear and came out in the presence of Poros'

(14) έκοψαν το κεφάλι του δραγομιάνου εμπός τον αποκρισάρην V46,7-8
    'they cut the interpreter’s head in front of the delegate'

(15) ἐστελείν εμπός τούς λέοντας τέσσαρες χιλιάδες αμάθητα βουβάλια καὶ αγελάδια.
    'they sent four thousand untamed oxen and cows in front of the lions.'

MS. F has here too the larger tendency towards ADV+ACC than E. However, more noteworthy is the preference for the accusative pattern in MSS. V and K. In some cases (V46,8; K352,17; V80,28; K374,22), they select ADV+ACC, though the standard patterns are used in MSS. F and E.

1.4. Other Spatial Concepts

Examples of the accusative pattern are provided by only a few of the other spatial concepts in Late-Byz. To put it concretely, the adverbs of Posterior ("behind")⁴⁴, Interior ("inside"), Exterior ("outside") and Proximate ("near")⁴⁵ are followed by the genitive, preposition ες or clitic pronouns but not by the accusative. However, some adverbs which substantiate such concepts as Medial ("between / among"), Circumferential ("around"), Ulterior ("beyond") and Citerior-Anterior ("opposite") are found to co-occur with the accusative.

Medial

(16) ἵτον Βουκέφαλον καὶ με {αὐτὰ τὰ} κέρατα ανάμεσὰ τα αὐτία μια πήχα. F18,1
    'Bukefalos with the horns, one cubit between the ears.'

Circumferential

(17) τὸν Οκεανὸν ποταμόν, ὥσπερ τρέχει ολόγυρα τῷ κόσμῳ ὅλον. E121,2
    'the Okeanos river, which runs around the whole world.'

(18) ἐβάλεν βίγλες ολόγυρα τῷ φουσάτῳ. F39,3
    'He positioned guards around the army.'

Ulterior

(19) ἐπρεῖν τὸν Αντίοχον...ἀντίπερα τὸ ποτάμι. K362,13-14
    'They found Antiochos...beyond the river.'

Citerior-Anterior

(20) οὐδὲν πρέπει εσῶ να στέκεσαι αὐτίκρυς τον βασιλέα. E94,2
    'you should not stand opposite the king.'

Let us summarize the findings in this section:

(A) MSS. F, E, V and K all include the pattern ADV+ACC. However, not all of the spatial concepts
are realized by this pattern but only some of them: Superior, Inferior, Anterior, Medial, Circumferential, Ulterior and Citerior-Anterior. Besides, the occurrence of ADV+ACC is not motivated semantically but lexically in that only certain adverbs for each spatial concept accept the accusative pattern.

(B) The adverbs with affixes (e.g. απο-, υπο-, -θεν, -θεον) tend to be followed by the accusative. In contrast, the adverbs without suffixes do not govern the accusative. An exception is Anterior, in which the accusative co-occurs with the simple adverbs from the morphological viewpoint like ἐμπρός, ομπρός as well as ἐμπροσθεν.

(C) Pronouns can follow the adverbs only in the form of the clitic genitive.

(D) The preference for ADV+ACC varies with the MSS. Among the four, MS. E has the greatest tendency to replace the accusative pattern with the standard ones.

2. Earlier and Later Versions of Alexander Romance

This section investigates whether the pattern ADV+ACC is so widely used that it is found also in the earlier and later versions of the prose Alexander romance. If so, the pattern is to a high degree connected with the diachronic development of Greek.

Pseudo-Kallisthenes ε, an earlier version dated from the 7th-8th centuries, is basically written in AG/KG. Therefore, the syntactic structure in this text are AG/KG types, i.e. ADV+GEN and PREP+N.

(21) ὑποκάτωθεν σὺν τῶν δένθρων ὀπὸ τὰ φύλλα ὁ ἀνθρωποί ἄνεκεντο. ε 31,1 (cf. (12))

On the other hand, Phyllada, a descendent of Late-Byz. in the 18th century, has substituted ADV+PREP (22) or ADV+GEN (23) for ADV+ACC. (See the extreme right column in Table 2).

(22) ἔβαλεν ομπρός εἰς τοὺς λέοντας τέσσαρας χιλιάδες βουφάλια καὶ βοίδια αμάθητα.

Φ201, cf. (15)

(23) επτείσασαν ἁνωθεν τῆς φωτίας, Φ77, cf. (6)

As concerns its lexical characteristics, Phyllada prefers more archaic words. Therefore, it has replaced vernacular forms in Late-Byz. such as απανόθεον, απάνου, αποκάτω-τοι with AG/KG types such as ἁνωθεν, ἐπάνω, ὑποκάτω.

Thus, the comparative examination of ε and Phyllada with Late-Byz. illustrates that the pattern ADV+ACC cannot date back to the earlier version from the 7th-8th centuries and that it has not been transmitted to the later version of the 18th century neither, except a few cases of Circumferential (see Table 2.5).

3. Other Byzantine Vernacular Texts

In this section, we will enlarge the examination to some other texts in Byzantine vernacular Greek in
order to demonstrate whether the pattern ADV+ACC prevails in more than one prose work and whether it can be connected to the main diachronic drift of the Greek language.

Many texts of Byzantine vernacular literature do not know this pattern. For example, *Ptochopromika*, Byzantine Cavalier romances (*Kallimachos* and *Chrysorroi* and the other four pieces), satirical poems (*Poulologos*, *Porikologos*) do not provide a clear example of ADV+ACC. Therefore, the pattern never can be regarded as standard in the late-Byzantine periods.

However, my random examination has found a small number of instances. Firstly, we shall cite examples from prose texts.

(24) ας μαζωχτοιν τα νερα απο κατωθι του ουρανο.  
'Let the water gather under the heavens.'

(25) διωτι εποιησεν τον εαυτον του αποκατω σκεπασαιν ετερον.  
'because he put himself under another person's protection.'

(26) απεταγει απανωθι την φωλαιαν του  
'(The pelican) flies over its nest'

(27) εποιησαν γεφυραν επανω αυτον  
'they built a bridge over it (= the Danube)'

(28) όταν ειναι απανωθην τους τοιχους ζενος  
'when someone is over [beyond?] the walls'

(29) ουδεν εποιησαν εκεινην την δωραν επιροστεν ετεσαιτως μαρτυρασ.  
'(the deceased) did not make the donation in the presence of those witnesses.'

In addition, ADV+ACC is found in several verse texts as well.

(30) αμελλων τον επεταχεν ομπρος [sic] τον πεθερων του.  
'He threw him down with the saddle in front of his father-in-law.'

(31) φερνουν τον ρηγαν τον φρικτων ομπρος του βασιλεα  
'They brought the dreadful king in front of the emperor'

(32) Και μετα τατα ωρισεν εμπρος τους κεφαλαδες  
'And then he gave orders in front of the commanders'

(33) ροιχον εφορει κωκαιον, μνον ομπρος το ατηβος  
'he wore red clothes, only in front of his chest it covering his body until his knees.'

(34) αω ρεχη γη εσανηαν ομπρος Ισιμανιατας.  
'they appeared in front of Ismailis like a spider.'

(35) Εις το παλαιτ εμπικανε, ζ του γενεραλε φτανουν,  
'to the captain, and they appeared in front of the captain.'
'They entered the palace, arrived at the general, expressed their wish in front of him.'

(36) Ἠκέ ... 

(antípera τον Αφράτην Cod. P) 

'Then he went up and down the length of the Euphrates;'

(37) κατάβημαν χαρζανστοι ανάμεσα τον κάμπου 

'we came down, whipping our horses, into the plain'

(38) Βουνόπουλον τοὺς ἐδείξεν ανάμεσα τον κάποιον, 

'He showed them a small mountain in the plain,'

As shown from these examples, ADV+ACC is observed both in verse and prose texts in the late- and post-Byzantine periods ranging from the 15th century to the 17th century	extsuperscript{15}. Nevertheless, the status of the pattern can never be regarded as stable, since it exchanges with the standard patterns in each text and besides tends to be replaced by them in the other MSS.

The fact that almost all the examples in the verse texts involve o-ἐπιπός makes the legitimacy of the examples ADV+ACC doubtful, so that many editors, regarding them as 'haplological writings' of I-5 +σ-ι, insert the preposition σ- or ἧ behind the adverbs	extsuperscript{15}. However, the examples of ADV+ACC are in some degree supported as authentic by the systematic investigation in this study. It has been demonstrated that accusative nouns can also follow some adverbs which do not end in -5 both in the prose texts (απανώθεν, καταπάνο, ἐπιπόσιν) and the verse texts (antípera, ανάμεσα). The examples with these adverbs distinctly exclude the possibility of the 'haplological writings' and lead to assumption that the pattern in question was prevailing as substandard.

Therefore, it is not impossible to assume that, even if examples (30-35) in the verse texts can be interpreted as abbreviated forms for graphic convenience, the substandard status of the pattern ADV+ACC stimulated the usage of 'haplological writings'.

4. Analysis from the Diachronic Viewpoint

The pattern ADV+ACC is not accepted in AG/KG nor SMG. Neither is it regarded as standard in Byzantine Greek. Nevertheless, the fact that the pattern is observed in more than one manuscript of Late-Byz. and certain texts in Byzantine Vernacular Greek and the fact that some kinds of adverbs systematically accept the pattern hinder it from being ascribed to scribal errors. The pattern rather seems to reveal a sustandard rule of the grammar of the spoken language during the periods. Naturally, it is impossible to identify chronological and geographical extension of it before completing an exhaustive research on other late- and post-Byzantine vernacular texts. Here we shall define ourselves to sum up the results obtained from this small research: ADV+ACC is observed mainly in the 16th century prose texts and more sporadically in the 15th and 17th century texts. Among these
are texts which originate in Constantinople (Modern Greek translation of Pentateuch), Cyprus (Assizes) and Kerkyra (Kartanos).

The pattern ADV+ACC is consistent with the diachronic tendency of Greek which has enlarged the semantic domain of the accusative since AG/KG. Discussing striking changes in the process of the formation of SMG, Hatzidakis (1892:220-226) deals with the enlargement of the semantic domain of the accusative. The change, he points, is related to the fact that many verbs and prepositions in AG/KG governing the genitive or dative came to co-occur only with the accusative. Although he refers to only simple prepositions like ἀπό, ἐκ, μετά, σύν, ἕπε and ἀντί, our examination has shown that such adverbs as ἀπανώθειον, ἀνώθειον, ἀποκάτω, ὁμορρόζ tended to partake in this diachronic drift.

What is characteristic of Greek is that the pattern ADV+ACC has not been transmitted to SMG. First of all, such an adverb as ἀπανώθειον itself does not belong to the vocabulary of SMG. More interestingly, there are some dialects which use the adverbs examined in this study, but the pattern ADV+ACC is not known to the dialects. Μ does not provide an example of the accusative co-occurring with "ἀπάνωθειον" and "ἀποκάτω". Neither does it provide any example of the accusative pattern of "ἀποκάτωθειον", "ἀποκατωθείον", "ἀποπάνωθειον" and "ἀποπανωθείον" in spite of the suffixes with which they are equipped.

5. Analysis from the General Linguistic Viewpoint

So far, such forms as ἀπανώθειον, ἀποκάτω or ὁλόγυρα have been termed as adverbs. One may consider, however, that they can be better categorized as prepositions, since they govern accusative nouns. In this section, we shall discuss the grammatical category of these forms.

It is generally accepted that the syntactic difference between adverbs and prepositions is in the transitivity, namely whether they govern a (pro)noun or not. The division in SMG can be schematized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1a) can appear without governing (pro)nouns</td>
<td>(1b) never appears without governing (pro)nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2a) governs genitive nouns</td>
<td>(2b) governs accusative nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3a) governs clitic pronouns</td>
<td>(3b) never governs clitic pronouns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such forms as ἀπανώθειον or ἀποκάτω in Late-Byz. belong to the prepositional category in that they often govern accusative nouns (2b) and that they never appear without governing nouns (1b). Nevertheless, they also possess adverbial features, since in some cases they govern genitive nouns (2a) and clitic pronouns (3a) as well. This ambiguous status of the forms can be well explained if we consider that spatial prepositions tend to be diachronically derived from spatial adverbs and that the
one category cannot be discretely distinguished from the other.

The diachronical derivation of spatial prepositions from corresponding adverbs is interlinguistically observed. Svorou (1986, 1994) argues that unidirectionality controls the development of spatial expressions which shifts from more lexical status (i.e. noun) and, passing through more grammatical ones (i.e. adverb, adposition, affix), reaches the most highly grammatical status in which the spatial morpheme is completely fused with the host noun31. This development is schematized as follows (Svorou, 1994:101):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{LEXICAL} \quad \text{GRAMMATICAL} \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\text{GENITIVE CONSTRUCTION} \quad \text{ADPOSITION} \rightarrow \text{AFFIX} \rightarrow \text{O} \\
\text{NOUN} \quad \text{ADVERB}
\end{array}
\]

The Greek morphs analyzed as adverbs in this study are positioned somewhere between ADVERB and ADPOSITION in this scheme. Therefore, strictly speaking, they cannot be regarded as typical prepositions nor adverbs.

**ABBREVIATIONS**


**NOTES**

*) This paper is a revision and expansion of an earlier study which has appeared in *Collected Papers dedicated to Professor Mamoru Yoshikawa* (1995).
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1) For the abbreviated grammatical categories, see ABBREVIATIONS in front of NOTES.

2) The term, Late-Byzantine prose Alexander Romance (Late-Byz.), has been borrowed from Holton (1974:10). It designates a group of prose texts transmitted by 13 MSS. (Moennig, 1992:41ff.).

3) For the date of the original Late-Byz., see Holton (1974:10). Moennig (1992:29&152) argues that Late-Byz. was translated from the medieval Serbian version in the 15th c.

4) The following are the editions used in this study and their abbreviations.

   E: Trumpf (1974) [quoted by chapters and paragraphs]
   E: Lolos (1983) & Konstantinopulos (1983) [quoted by chapters and paragraphs]
   F: Lolos (1983) & Konstantinopulos (1983) [quoted by chapters and paragraphs]
   K: Mητροπίς (1983) [quoted by pages and lines. Note: not from (1968)!
   Δ: Βελουδισ (1977) [quoted by Editio Princeps' pages, given on the margin of Βελουδισ' edition]
   V: Mitsakis (1967) [quoted by pages and lines]

5) The English translations have been translated as closely as possible to the original Greek.
6) This pattern is not referred to in authoritative AG/KG grammars such as Schwzyer (1950) or Janaris (1897). Among the SMG grammars, Χατζήδης (1907:458-9) and Thumb (1910:101-2) remark that some modern Greek dialects know the pattern ADV+ACC. (e.g. Icarian dialect, "έγκαταν ὁ ποιός 
tοι λοίφον 'he bent behind the rock', which corresponds to SMG έκαταν ὁ ποιός τοι βράχον, ἐπίσω ἀπό τοι βράχον). Τζάρτζις (1946: 90-92) describes the adverbs which accept the accusative, though no spatial adverb is listed except for κοντά in temporal use (cf. note 15).

7) F: Laurentianus Ashburnham 1444, a. 1521
   E: Eton College 163, mid-16th c.
   V: Vindobonensis Theol. gr. 244, 26r-43v, 16th c.
   K: Athous 3309, Kutlumus<iu 236, 159v-191v, 16th c.
   These four MSS. are regarded as "erste Gruppe" in that they belong to the older period (16th c.) (Moennig, 1987:46ff.). Among them, representatives of Late-Byz. are F and E, which keep the whole story of the romance. In contrast, V and K are epitomized versions (Moennig:ib.).

8) These terms have been borrowed from Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton (1987: 141-4).

9) απάνωθεν appears with the various accent-positions in the MSS. (απανώθεν, απανωθεν, απανωθενιον). Lolos consistently edits απανωθεν, though the other two forms are prevailing in the MSS. (Lolos, 1983:38), (cf. Moennig, 1987:42). The present study, following the MSS., selects απανωθεν as a representative form, except in the quotations from the editions.

   Du Cange gives only examples of "απανωθεν"+GEN (απανωθεν του άρος...απανωθεν των νεφών).
   Kriaras notes that "ἐπάνωθεν" is followed also by the accusative, though no example of the pattern is given. Under the entry "ἐπανωθεν" in Kriaras, however, an example is found of the accusative pattern from George Boustronios' Chronicle of Cyprus (απανωθεν τους ανάφωσιν).

10) The observation that the four MSS. vary in the syntactic structure of the adverbial (or prepositional) phrase of the spatial expression supports the general remark on the language of each text:
   'V führt einige "gelehrte" morphologische Elemente und Wörter ein.' (Moennig, 1987:55).

11) Kriaras quotes some examples of "αποκατάρχειο +ACC from Late-Byz. (MS. V) and "αποκατάρχειο +ACC from the Modern Greek Pentateuch. (see note 22).

12) E125,11 includes an interesting example, where both ACC and GEN co-occur within the same adverbial phrase:
   τῆς ἱνδικῆς τα φωσάτα καὶ ὅλος ὁ κόσμος αποκατάρχειο την 'Ινδικῶν καὶ τοι τῆς ἑτέρας ετρόμαξεν E125,11
   (αποκατάρχειο τοι τῆς ἑτέρας ετρόμαξεν E.125,11)
   'The Indian army and all the people under [over?] India and under the sun were struck with terror.'

13) Kriaras gives only examples of "εἰμπρός"+GEN/PREP and "εἴμπροστά +PREP.

14) F121,3 has an example of ADV+ACC (κατοπθεν οι θάνατοι), though in temporal use.

15) F55,17 has an example of κοντά+ACC (κοντά το ποτήρι). However, this is a very unusual case, because no other example of κοντά+ACC has been found in my corpus and this example in F corresponds to κοντά εις in E55,17 and K354,31.

16) This has only two exceptions in F93,3 (απάνω του) and E80,6 (εἰμπρός τοι), see Table 1 & 2, 4.

17) See note 10.
20) Although it has been suggested by some scholars that the editio princeps was published in 1680 or 1699, the oldest edition accessible to us is 1750 (Moennig, 1992:34-5).
22) Modern Greek translation of the Pentateuch (a. 1547, Constantinople) written in Hebrew letters [ed. Hesseling, 1897].
23) Assizes, (c. 14th c.) [ed. Solitho, 1877].
26) Εκκτηρία αρχιερέων (17th c.) [ed. Μομφεράτος, 1889].
27) Achilleid, MS. O (16th c.) [ed. Smith, 1990]. The other two MSS. (L & N., ed. Hesseling, 1919), which date from approximately the same period as O., have ADV+PREP and ADV+GEN:

σιάσαλλον τον επέτασεν, εμπρός στον πεθέρου του. Αχιλ. L. 1179

σιάσαλλον τον επέτασεν έμπροσθεν του πεθερου του. Αχιλ. N. 1499

The editor emends the line of N το εμπρός του πεθερου του. Another example of Anterior in Achilleid is ομπρός του μασιλέα (MS. O. 682).
28) Tale of Belisarius, Cod. N. [ed. Follieri, 1970]. σε has been inserted between ομπρός and του in each case (ll. 129, 241, 297) by the editor. The same emendation is found in the critical edition by Bakker & van Gemert (1985), which reconstructs the version χ from the Cod. N. and Cod.V. It should be noted that there is one case (l. 32) where ομπρός στον in the edition corresponds to ομπρός εις του in MS.
33) The Lay of Armourer [ed. Αλέξιου (1985)]. The English translations of (36) and (37) have been taken from Ricks (1990).
34) Digenes Akrites, MS. E. [ed. Αλέξιου (1985)].
35) Since it is not certain that the examples from Digenes E. and Armourer derive from their originals, I assign the syntactic pattern observed in (36-37) to the period of the MSS., i.e. the 15th c. (Αλέξιου, 1985: τον ’ & 159).
36) E.g. Bakker-van Gemert (1988:48) : ‘(the copyist of MS. N) γράφει μονό -σε- αντί για δυνάλ’. Anyway, the problem does not seem to be solved by the metrical constraint, because MS. N systematically writes εις του instead of στον, breaking often the meter (Bakker-van Gemert, ib.). Therefore, it is not impossible to consider that the copyist could have inserted εις after ομπρός regardless of the meter, if he had hoped to do so. Also in Late-Byz., σε is used
instead of εις in only a few exceptional cases, which include one example of Anterior (F55.2, see Table 2.4).

37) This categorization is partially based on Emonds (1985:254, quoted in Foskett, 1991:32).

38) More macroscopically, this problem can be interpreted as an example of Grammaticalization. (See, Hopper & Traugott, 1993:104).
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**LEXICA**

**Du Cange:** Du Cange, Ch. (1688: rpt. 1958) *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis.* Lyon.

**ΙΔ:** Ιστορικοί λεξικοί της νέας ελληνικής, της τε κοινῆς ομιλουμένης καί των ιδιωμάτων. (1933-) Ακαδημία Αθηνών.

**Κριαράς:** Kriaras, E. (ed.) (1968-) *Ελεξίδο τῆς μεσοελληνικῆς ελληνικῆς καὶ τῶν θεαματικῶν.* Athenaeum, Θεσσαλονίκη.
Table 1. Syntactic Patterns of Superior, Inferior and Anterior in Late-Byz.

[F,E,V,K: four versions of Late-Byz. (see note 4). +∅: not followed by (pro)noun, i.e. intransitive use. For the other grammatical categories, see ABBREVIATIONS. The accusative patterns are underlined.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Anterior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+N +CLIT</td>
<td>+N +CLIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áνω</td>
<td>απόπροσθεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+∅ E</td>
<td>+GEN F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+τις K</td>
<td>ε/-ομπρός +∅ FEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ανωθεν</td>
<td>+GEN V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+GEN V</td>
<td>+τις FEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>απάνω/-ου +∅ FE FEVK</td>
<td>+GEN FEVK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+τις FEVK</td>
<td>+ ACC FEVK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+GEN FEVK</td>
<td>ε/-ομπροσθεν +τις EV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+τις FEV</td>
<td>+τις E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>απάνωθεν +ACC...K FEVK</td>
<td>+GEN EV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+τις EV</td>
<td>+ ACC...VK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>απανώθεν +τις EV F</td>
<td>κατέμπροσθεν +GEN FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+τις EV</td>
<td>+ ACC...FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>απανώθεν +τις EV F</td>
<td>ομπροστα +τις K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αποπάνω/-ου +GEN FE FEVK</td>
<td>+GEN F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+GEN FEVK</td>
<td>+GEN F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>επάνωθεν +ACC...K FEVK</td>
<td>+GEN FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+GEN FWK FEVK</td>
<td>+GEN FE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταπάνω/-ου +τις FEV</td>
<td>+GEN FEVK FEVK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+τις FEVK</td>
<td>+GEN...FE(V).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+N +CLIT</td>
<td>+N +CLIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αποκάτω/-ου +∅ FE FEV</td>
<td>+GEN FEV FEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+τις FEV</td>
<td>+τις FEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+τις FEV</td>
<td>+τις FEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κάτω/-ου +∅ FEVK</td>
<td>+τις FEVK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+τις FEV</td>
<td>+τις FEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατωθιόν +GEN V</td>
<td>+GEN...K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρακάτου/παρεκάτω +∅ FEV</td>
<td>+GEN...FEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+GEN K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+τις FEV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| * The pattern of ADV+clitic accusative is found only in F93,3(απάνω τον) and E80,6(εμπρός τον).
Table 2. Examples of ADV+ACC and their Parallels in Late-Byz. and Phyllada

[F,E,V,K: four versions of Late-Byz. Φ: Phyllada (see note 4). -: no parallel example is found. +¢: not followed by (pro)noun, (i.e. intransitive use). I omitted the chapter and paragraph numbers of E, which correspond to those of F.]

1. απανώθευν, α/-επάνωθευν [α.: απανώθευν]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>V/K</th>
<th>Φ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 12, 3</td>
<td>απάνωθευν+ACC</td>
<td>a.+ACC</td>
<td>V27,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 26,2</td>
<td>α. εἰς</td>
<td>a.+GEN</td>
<td>V35,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 46, 3</td>
<td>ανωθευν+GEN</td>
<td>V54,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 46, 4</td>
<td>a.+ACC</td>
<td>V54,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 49,13</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
<td>a.+GEN</td>
<td>V58,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 49,23</td>
<td>α. +ACC</td>
<td>V60,21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 55,17</td>
<td>επάνωθευν+ACC</td>
<td>K358,20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 57,6</td>
<td>α. εἰς</td>
<td>απάνωθευν+ACC</td>
<td>K356,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 60,1</td>
<td>a.+ACC</td>
<td>απάνου εἰς</td>
<td>V73,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 80,16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 108,1</td>
<td>a.+ACC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 111,2</td>
<td>a.+ACC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 125,3</td>
<td>απάνου εἰς</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. καταπάνων/-ω [κ.: καταπάνων]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>V/K</th>
<th>Φ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κ.+ACC 3,1</td>
<td>καταπάνων+ACC</td>
<td>κ.+GEN</td>
<td>V22,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ.+ACC 78,13</td>
<td>καταπάνως εἰς</td>
<td>κ.+CLIT/ACC</td>
<td>V54,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ.+ACC 107,1</td>
<td>καταπάνω+CLIT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>καταπάνω του</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3. αποκάτω/-ω, ὑποκάτω [α.: αποκάτω]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>V/K</th>
<th>Φ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>αποκάτω+GEN 31,3</td>
<td>από κάτω εἰς</td>
<td>a.+ACC</td>
<td>V39,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αποκάτω+ACC 36,2</td>
<td>από κάτω εἰς</td>
<td>αποκάτω+ACC</td>
<td>V42,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 38,1</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
<td>κοντά εἰς</td>
<td>V45,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 39,4</td>
<td>a. εἰς</td>
<td>αποκάτων+ACC</td>
<td>V46,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.+ACC 49,27</td>
<td>α. +ACC</td>
<td>V61,14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αποκάτω+ACC 66,5</td>
<td>αποκάτω+GEN</td>
<td>a.+ACC</td>
<td>K344,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>από</td>
<td>66,8</td>
<td>εἰς</td>
<td>V77,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. ο-/εμπρός, εμπροσθεν, κατέμπροσθεν [ο.:ομπρός, κ.:κατέμπροσθεν]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Φ</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>V/K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ο. +ACC 66,12</td>
<td>ο. είς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ο. +ACC 80,3</td>
<td>αποκάτω εις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>αποκάτω +ACC 88,1</td>
<td>αποκάτω +GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>α. +ACC 111,2</td>
<td>αποκάτω εις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>α. +ACC 125,11</td>
<td>αποκάτω +ACC/GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>α. +ACC 126,4</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>α. +ACC 128,2</td>
<td>αποκάτω +ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5. ολόγυρα, τρι-/τραγύρου [ο.:ολόγυρα, τ.:τραγύρου]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Φ</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>V/K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ο. +ACC 39,3</td>
<td>τ. +ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ο. +ACC 45,4</td>
<td>ο. +ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ο. +ACC 47,1</td>
<td>τ. +ACC47,4 (sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>−</td>
<td>ο. είς 49,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τ. +ACC 53,1</td>
<td>τ. +ACC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τ. +ACC 53,9</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τ. +ACC 55,17</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τ. +ACC 80,16</td>
<td>τραγύρου +ACC K354,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τ. +ACC 84,2</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τ. +ACC 107,2</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τ. +ACC 121,1</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
『後期ビザンツ版アレクサンドロス物語』における空間表現の統語構造

橋 李司

ギリシャ語における空間表現は、古代から現代にいたる変遷の中で、多くの語義の異形を有しているが、その統語構造は比較的安定している。すなわち、古代語では、前置詞＋名詞ないし副詞＋属格名詞、現代語では、前置詞＋対格名詞、副詞＋前置詞＋対格名詞、副詞＋接辞代名詞が許されるに過ぎない。ところが、ビザンツ末期（ないしポスト・ビザンツ期）のテキスト中には、これら以外のパターンが観察される。例えば、『後期ビザンツ版アレクサンドロス物語』（以下『後期ビザンツ版』）には、副詞＋対格名詞の例が見いだされる。本稿の中心課題は、このパターンがどの程度の安定性を持ち、どの程度の空間的・時間的広がりを有していたのかを明らかにする点にある。

まず第一節では、『後期ビザンツ版』の代表的な二つの版及び二つの簡約版を網羅的に調査し、「上方」「下方」「前方」「中間」「周囲」などの空間概念を示す副詞のうちのあるものが、問題の対格パターンを体系的に受け入れることを明らかにする。

第二節では、年代上『後期ビザンツ版』に先行し、その基となった『仮カリステネス版』（7-8世紀）及び後代の『現代ギリシャ語版』（18世紀）との対照が行われる。その結果、この二つの作品中では標準的なパターンが副詞＋対格名詞に対応しており、後のパートはビザンツ後期の現象であることが示される。

第三節では、他のビザンツ後期の民衆語テキストが調査され、韻文・散文からの散発的な例が提示される。すなわち、問題のパターンは、少数派であるが、準標準的な位置を占めていたと考えられる。

第四節では、ギリシャ語の通史内で問題のパターンの持つ意味が検討される。対格形の意味領域の拡大は、従来より指摘されており、多くの自動詞や斜格支配の前置詞が対格を支配するようになった点に明瞭に観察される。本稿で考察した、副詞の属格支配から対格支配への移行もこの通時的変遷の一端として解釈することが可能である。

最後に第五節では、一般言語学的視点からの解釈が示される。副詞から前置詞への移行は、「文法化」の過程として汎言語的に見られるものである。問題のパターンは、この過程上で、ある副詞グループが前置詞へと統語上の特性を変化させる際に現れたものと考えられる。