Brief note on the use of third person singular imperatives in Late Antique and Byzantine literary epistolography

By Valentina Barrile

Abstract

This note presents an analysis of the occurrence of third-person singular imperatives in Late Antique and Byzantine literary epistolography. After collecting data from the TLG to quantify the phenomenon, it proceeds to examine the data and propose the use of this grammatical feature as a marker of high style.

Keywords: Late Antique Epistolography, Byzantine epistolography, Planoudes

Maximos Planoudes is arguably one of the most prominent figures in Byzantine literature, even among those outside this field of specialisation. His role in transmitting Greek poetry into the modern era is undisputed,[1] and so is his importance as an intellectual and political leader, therefore many aspects of his work have been thoroughly studied. While the *Anthology* was initially the main focus of scholarly attention, together with translations from Latin authors, recent years have witnessed a surge in research activity concerning Planoudes' lesser-known literary works. In particular, his epistles have been the subject of recent French and, partially, Italian translations and commentaries,[2] accompanied by detailed analyses of their contents.

While undertaking a detailed examination of the text of Planoudes' letters in order to establish the manner in which grammar was taught in the Byzantine era, I encountered a particular feature that attracted my attention: his usage of the 3rd person singular imperative.[3] In

---

[1] On this matter see Hunger 1981; Rhoby 2019:264-304.

[2] Schneider 2020; Pascale 2007.

[3] One of the instances that caught my attention was Ep. 5.77, where the imperative in the 3rd singular is closely followed by a μή+subjunctive, thus playing with variation in construction.

general, it is not a form that occurs often in speaking, as it conveys an impersonal order: it lacks some of the directness and forcefulness of a direct order, which has the drawback of being too abrupt, yet it conveys some regard, despite not being as polite as more complex circumlocutions. The form is absent from the Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek,[4] which serves as a clear indication of its decline in later language.[5] Even in the context of classical grammar, it represents a sufficiently well-preserved relic. One would not expect to find it often outside of legal and legislative documents, and the form abounds in documentary papyri letters as well: and that is exactly the reason why its use in literary epistles is so fascinating. Thus, what might at first glance feel like a quirk of an author deciding to revive a marginal form might become in fact a useful tool for further investigation:[6] the 3rd person imperative has indeed the advantage of a very characteristic ending (-$\tau\omega$, -$\sigma\theta\omega$), which allows for easy selection of suitable samples.[7]

Accordingly, I have selected a corpus of plausible *comparanda* among literary letter writers, spanning from the 2nd to the 15th century AD. The survey includes letters by Libanius, Julian, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Synesius, Alciphron, Aelianus, and Philostratus for Late Antiquity and Michael Psellus, Demetrius Kydones and Manuel Calecas, in addition to Planoudes, as representatives of Byzantine literary epistolography. Some *corpora* are larger than Planoudes', some smaller, yet I contend that they are suitable for comparison in terms of the writers' education and the expectations of the addressees, with comparable levels of prose.[8] In order to check whether the usage in question is restricted to portraying actual conversation rather than mimicking it, I have elected to include the fictional letters as a control group. For the

---

[4] See chapter 4.5.

[5] Cfr. Hinterberger 2014:179. Modern Greek only has 2nd person imperatives, cfr. Triantafyllides 1976; Sophianos' grammar too confirms that for demotic there was a 2nd person, but the third would be expressed with a periphrasis, see Sophianos 1870:48, 51, 55, 58, 61, 64, 66, 67, 69.

[6] Cfr. Jannaris 1897:563-565 on how the imperative retreated in front of the subjunctive, in particular point 16 for the third person.

[7] For the sample used see appendix I.

[8] In addition, the Cappadocian fathers became models of style in the Byzantine period, see Ševčenko 1981:300. Cfr. Browning 1983:49-50 and Rollo 2021.

same reasons, I will also compare findings with an overview of the form in documentary papyri, to briefly showcase the differences. In the absence of an official postal service or replies preserved from an addressee it is impossible to state with absolute certainty that a letter was sent and read rather than composed as a literary piece, but, with the exclusion of Aelianus, Philostratus and Alciphron, all the other letters were sent with a specific, real addressee in mind. This implies that stylistic and linguistic choice reflect the author's personal preferences and are tailored within reason to meet the receiver's expectations. Fictional letters are the only ones where both the sender and the addressee are invented, and the real author is trying to create both sides, making them a profitable term of comparison.

The following data was extracted from the TLG. For clarity, the numbers represent how many times the 3rd person singular imperative occurs against the total word count of each corpus. By dividing the number of occurrences by the total word count I have extrapolated a value that I will then use to compare the authors. To avoid multiple decimals, frequency values are given in ‰ instead of %: the reader should always bear in mind that the frequency is per thousand instead of per hundred words in order to avoid magnifying what is a small phaenomenon.

Usage of 3rd person singular imperatives (in order of frequency)			
Author	Number of occurrences in *Letters*	Total world count of the *corpus*	Percentage of frequency (‰)
Cydones	137	52.058	2,63
Julian	46	19.518	2,35
Libanius	424	216.490	1,95
Aelianus	4	2.179	1,83
Gregory of Nazianzus	71	41.516	1,71
Synesius	58	38.256	1,51
Philostratus	11	7.594	1,44
Planoudes	69	54.609	1,26

Basil	146	134.186	1,08
Psellus	176	169.882	1,03
Calecas	43	47.778	0,89
Gregory of Nyssa	16	18.672	0,85
Alciphron	16	19.541	0,81

Usage of 3rd person singular imperatives (in chronological order, III-XVI century CE)			
Author	Number of occurrences in *Letters*	Total world count of the *corpus*	Percentage of frequency (‰)
Aelianus	4	2.179	1,83
Philostratus	11	7.594	1,44
Alciphron	16	19.541	0,81
Libanius	424	216.490	1,95
Gregory of Nazianzus	71	41.516	1,71
Basil	146	134.186	1,08
Julian	46	19.518	2,35
Gregory of Nyssa	16	18.672	0,85
Synesius	58	38.256	1,51
Psellus	176	169.882	1,03
Planoudes	69	54.609	1,26
Cydones	137	52.058	2,63
Calecas	43	47.778	0,89

A small clarification is due before discussing the results. While I mentioned that the form declined in usage and became a rarity in Byzantine times, this situation, and the reasonings that will follow on high style in prose writing, only pertain literary production. The situation illustrated by documentary papyri is different. Here the form remained vital for quite longer, but its role changed as a form of politeness. As demonstrated by Bentein,[9] the evolution of the third person pronoun as a form of politeness could be "parallel to the rise of impersonal forms of address", which could be dated to the fourth century, thus while the grammatical form was still used, its function substantially changed. In her dissertation on private papyri letters, Nachtergaele[10] offers a few examples of how the authors in her corpus treated the imperative. She maintains that the form is found mostly in letter from superior to lower ranking individuals; sometimes a harsh request was softened by ἐάν θέλῃς or εἴ σοι δοκεῖ. The most common polite request would nevertheless be expressed with καλῶς ποιήσεις or similar.[11] So, while the usage of imperative in papyri letter is more frequent, it is less striking than in literary epistolography, where it is not as expected. I shall now proceed to illustrate the findings.[12]

In terms of frequency, Planoudes is attested in the lower half of the table; nevertheless, the data sample allows for some interesting considerations. First, the occurrences appear to be in agreement with the decline of usage of this form in the spoken language. So, higher occurrences in earlier periods when the form was more vital and lower in later periods when it had disappeared entirely from spoken language. In short, earlier authors should use the form more than later ones, which holds true with the exception of two extremes: Cydones and Alciphron.

When the data is instead arranged in order of chronology a wavy pattern emerges in which usage percentages ebb and flow. Within this frame, it is possible to assume, for groups of authors that wrote in similar styles and ages, that some sort of motivation must lie behind both the spikes and the dips in usage. Aelianus, Philostratus and Alciphron all wrote fictional letters, and yet

---

[9] Bentein 2017.
[10] Nachtergaele 2015:313-319
[11] Cfr. Leiwo 2010.
[12] Compare for example P.Oxy 2787 and BGU 2.417.

while the first two show a similar frequency, the last shows a sharp drop that would be unreasonable to consider as a coincidence. While all three might have shared a same intended audience, Alciphron is endeavouring to mimic conversation happening among the lowest social strata of the population: a cultivated reader, for whose entertainment these letters are meant, would appreciate the craftsmanship of the author in using forms suitable for the speakers. It is often assumed that these letters are based on declamation exercises, and more specifically *ethopoeia*, in which the student is required to talk in character, expressing thoughts suitable for the assigned personality in an appropriate language.[13] Within the collection, most examples of the third person imperative occur in book 4, the letters of courtesans; books 1 (fishermen) and 2 (peasants) show similar amounts, but it is quite significant that only one can be found in book 3 (parasites). It can be said that this proves the argument further: a rare form is generically unsuitable for farmers, fishermen, parasites and courtesans, and especially for parasites whose education cannot even rely on work or company of more educated individuals, as it could be assumed for the other categories.

Moving on to the opposite extreme, Cydones shows a predilection for the form that was accosted only by Julian, both among his predecessors and his contemporaries. Before attempting an explanation, it is worth establishing some more general points of assessment. It is not striking in itself to find a rare form in such late writers: Psellus, Planoudes, Cydones and Kalekas were all teachers and grammarians,[14] and wrote their letters in the so-called high style, which would be the customary choice for epistolography in the Byzantine period. So far nothing incongruous: epistolography was among the genres the one that kept closest ties with its tradition,[15] and letter writers of this era were also grammarians, so it could be argued that, given the rarity of the phenomenon under discussion and its subsequent disappearance from the linguistic landscape,

---

[13] On the letters see Biraud & Zucker 2019, in particular chapters 4 and 9 on the ties between rhetorical teaching and their composition.

[14] For grammarians as guardians of the language see Kaster 1988. On a synthetic definition of learned Greek see Hinterberger 2014:3.

[15] See Hinterberger 2021:25.

the authors chose to preserve it and present it to their readers as an erudite contribution,[16] offering insights that would otherwise be inaccessible to those lacking the requisite learning or opportunities for engagement with learned individuals.[17] Such an explanation would suffice for the preservation of the form in itself, yet it does not account for the variation in frequency between authors.

I shall follow the lead of Ševčenko, who said that every reader of Byzantine prose knows what high style is because it is intensely felt upon close contact with the text, and say that whoever ventured in the realm of Cydones' prose writing would not be in the least surprised to see the results highlighted by this survey. In the absence of specific studies on the style of these authors a definitive answer cannot be given here, but I would like to advance the idea that a thorough analysis of smaller details can help us differentiate the multiple layers of high-register Byzantine prose, and lead us to a fuller understanding of personal tastes between authors, thus differentiating what is clumped together under the high-style label. This in turn would lead to portray with more fidelity the change in taste on the audiences' side as well: like any other writer, Cydones must have crafted his hyper-sophisticated, hyper-atticizing style based on a reader that would appreciate it.[18] On the other hand, Kalekas was his student, and he acquired some of the stylistic mannerisms from his teacher, but mostly dropped this feature: was he incapable of handling the structure? Was it not to his taste? Or did he anticipate that his readers would not appreciate it?

---

[16] In the Late Byzantine period letters were recited in front of an audience and for a patron, see Gaul 2020; reading for aesthetic pleasure was a habit fostered by grammatical training, see Papaioannou 2021:534-536.

[17] Cfr. Giannouli 2014:71 "grammatical and rhetorical knowledge is understandably reflected in the written language. The survival of the classical tradition and the coexistence of learned and spoken Greek were ensured as a result of this education, not least because of the rhetorical theory of mimēsis." Giannouli clearly states that language competency was a frequent object of discussion in letters, with criticisms or praise of the writer's command of his means of expression.

[18] It is worth noting that three of the ten letters that display more than two third person singular imperatives are addressed to the emperor Emmanuel Palaeologus. As mentioned above, according to Nachtergaele 2015 the use of imperative in her corpus appears to be restricted to orders when a superior writes to a lower-ranking addressee. This would mean that in literary prose the preciousness of a rare detail overrode the norms of politeness in private papyrus letters.

In order to complete the puzzle, a detailed analysis of moods and their usage, especially independent subjunctives, would be of great use to establish whether one form prevails over another equivalent or they are used alternatively as ingredients for *variatio*.[19] Other elements, like the usage of synthetic perfects and the construction traditionally called Sophoclean perfect can definitely contribute to collect "key hallmarks" of high style for each author.[20] On the basis of my analysis so far, I am convinced that further investigation of this stylistic phenomenon will yield further interesting results.

---

[19] The study of metaphrases, transpositions of a text across registers, could point us in the right direction to understand the overlap between exhortative subjunctive and imperative, See Efthymiadis 2021.
[20] I have borrowed the definition from Hinterberger 2014:187; see also idem:177, on how the aorist slowly replaced the perfect.

Appendix I

The samples are constituted by the following forms, listed by author with the number of occurrences in parentheses if more than once:

Aelianus: ἔστω (3), προαγέτω.
Philostratus: ἔστω (2), ἀφείσθω, φοβείτω, ἐχέτω, ἤτω, ἀντιπνείτω, κεκληρώσθω, παρευδοκιμείτω, μελέτω, ἐνοχλείτω.
Alciphron: ἐχέτω (3), ἀφέτω, συλλαμβανέτω, γινέσθω, ἐπελθέτω, χαιρέτω, ἐκβιαζέσθω, λαβέτω, εὐτυχείτω, προσίτω, γενέσθω, διδασκέτω, ἔστω, πεπαχύνθω.
Libanius: ἔστω (74), γενέσθω (30), προσέστω (9), ἴστω (8), τυγχανέτω (7), δοκείτω (7), κείσθω (7), γιγνέσθω (7), ἀφείσθω (7), μαθέτω (7), ποιείτω (6), πραττέσθω (5), ἐχέτω (5), ἐξέστω (5), πειθέτω (4), δότω (4), φαινέσθω (4), καλείσθω (4), μελέτω (4), γινέσθω (3), παραμυθείσθω (3), ἀπολαυσάτω (3), σκοπείτω (3), λανθανέτω (3), ἐρχέσθω (3), χωρείτω (3), μελλέτω (3), λεγέσθω (3), κρατείτω (3), σωζέσθω (3), λαβέτω (3), δεδόσθω (3), ἐξαλειφέσθω (2), νομιζέτω (2), παυσάσθω (2), σεμνυνέσθω (2), εἰσπραττέτω (2), ἐπιτρεπέτω (2), πραχθήτω (2), ἀρχέτω (2), μενέτω (2), εὐφραινέτω (2), φιλείτω (2), μεμφέσθω (2), μελησάτω (2), ἀναβεβλήσθω (2), ὁράτω (2), αἰτείτω (2), μιμείσθω (2), ὑπαρξάτω (2), κτησάσθω (2), ῥείτω (2), λεγέτω (2), τετολμήσθω (2), πασχέτω (2), γνώτω (2), ταραττέτω (2), δοξάτω (2), κινείτω (2), θαυμαζέτω (2), πεμπέσθω, ἀπολογείσθω, νικάτω, πειθέσθω, ἐπανερχέσθω, νικησάτω, καταφρονηθήτω, τιμάσθω, ἀκουσάτω, ὁμολογείτω, ἀτιμαζέσθω, διατελείτω, σπαραττέσθω, ποιησάτω, ἀπαλλαττέτω, κεκωλύσθω, δεικνύτω, μεμνήσθω, τιμηθήτω, εἰσπραττέσθω, παιέσθω, μετέστω, ἀγωνιζέσθω, χρήσθω, εἰπάτω, ἐπέστω, ὠφελείσθω, ἐκβαλλέσθω, ἠμελήσθω, ὠφελείτω, θαρρυνέτω, προστιθέτω, περινοστείτω, τυχέτω, προσαπτέσθω, εἰργέτω, ἰσχυέτω, ἐλθέτω, παρεχέτω, λαμβανέτω, χαριζέσθω, λυπείσθω, λυπείτω, προσαιτείτω, ἐννοείτω, φροντιζέτω, μεταβαλλέτω, θηρευέτω, τικτέτω, γεγράφθω, θαρρείτω, ἐργαζέσθω, ποιείσθω, ἀναγεγράφθω, μανθανέτω, ἀκολουθείτω, πλείτω, ἀποφαινέτω, διαφθειρέτω, τετάχθω, φερέτω, πεισθήτω, ἰασάσθω, τερπέτω, ἐχέσθω, διαδότω, εἰσίτω, οἰέσθω, μετεχέτω, κομιζέτω, ἀρκείτω, στήτω, ληξάτω, κεκρίσθω, ἀποκρινάσθω, συμβουλευέτω, φιλονεικείτω, ζητείτω, ἀδέτω, ἐπανίτω, ἀπολλύσθω, ἐξενεχθήτω, φευγέτω, βλαπτέσθω, ἀπέστω, διασπάσθω, παροφθήτω, κατηγορείσθω, ἐπαγέτω, κτάσθω, πληρούτω, προσκείσθω, σφαττέτω, πληρούσθω, ἀνίστω, ὀρεγέτω, ἱστάσθω, ἀρξάτω, λογιζέσθω, ἐπειγέτω, κεντείσθω, ἐπιστάσθω, ὡρίσθω, ἐγκωμιαζέτω, ἐάσθω, καταγελάτω, κινείσθω, παρακολουθείτω, σεσιγήσθω, τετιμήσθω, ἐπεισίτω, μεταδότω, διαφευγέτω, νομισθήτω, ἀσκείτω, ἀποστερείσθω, λελύσθω, λυθήτω, εἰρήσθω, δεδόχθω, προτρεπέτω, κακούσθω, ἀπολαυέτω, εἰξάτω, ἐπιθυμείτω.
Gregory of Nazianzus: ἔστω (9), φανήτω (6), ἐχέτω (3), ἡκέτω (2), ἴστω (2), καταξιωσάτω (2), γενέσθω (2), δεδόσθω (2), προσκείσθω (2), προσαδέτω, δυσωπησάτω, πειθέτω, πεττευέτω, κομάτω, ποιείτω, προστεθήτω, παυσάσθω, κεκωλύσθω, μεταρριπτείτω, ἀπατάτω, ἐπιζητείσθω, θεραπευσάτω, ἀποφευγέτω, ἐγειρέτω, παραστήτω, στεφανούτω, λεγέτω, ὑπαρχέτω, κοπασάτω, ἐπαινείτω, συγγινωσκέτω, μελέτω,

παιζέτω, μορφούτω, παιζέσθω, λογισθήτω, καταψευδέσθω, ξενισάτω, πλεκέτω, κειράσθω, ρωννύτω, ἀπαιτείσθω, ἐπίστω, ποιείσθω, παρέστω, δεδόχθω, φερέτω, πεισθήτω, ἐνεγκάτω, περικείσθω

Basil: ἔστω (18), γενέσθω (5), εἰρήσθω (4), ἐχέτω (3), γινέσθω (2), καταξιούσθω (2), εἰπάτω, προσκλαιέτω (2), λεγέσθω (2), λεγέτω (2), χρησάσθω, ἀγέτω, ἀπολογείσθω, διαιτησάτω, φοβείτω, λαλείσθω, φανήτω, ἐωρείσθω, πεπαύσθω, γινωσκέτω, ἐρρώσθω, προχυθήτω, ἐπιτρεπέσθω, δεξάσθω, βεβαιούτω, ποιησάτω, δεικνύτω, φυλασσέσθω, ὑποκείσθω, κρινέσθω, ἀποκρινάσθω, ἀξιούσθω, δειχθήτω, ὑποκρουέτω, λανθανέτω, δειξάτω, κατανεμέτω, ἐκβαλλέσθω, μεταλαβέτω, προσκείσθω, καθισάτω, ἀράτω, διαγγελήτω, διηγησάσθω, διατηρείσθω, φερέσθω, γενηθήτω, κατεχέτω, κρινέτω, διωκέσθω, λυπείτω, μεμνήσθω, συγκινηθήτω, ἀπονεμέτω, προηγείσθω, ἀπαγέτω, ἐπιζητησάτω, σαλευέτω, δεχέσθω, μανθανέτω, ἀκολουθείτω, διακρινέσθω, διορθωθήτω, πιπτέτω, διωκέτω, ἀπαρνησάσθω, ὀκνείτω, λειτουργείτω, θρυλείτω, ἀναγνωσθήτω, ἀποστειλάτω, κεχωρίσθω, φυσιολογείτω, οἰέσθω, ὀνομαζέσθω, σαθρούτω, ἡκέτω, παραδεχθήτω, ἑρμηνευσάτω, ἀρκεσάτω, προβαλλέσθω, ζητείτω, ἀμφιβαλλέτω, σπουδασάτω, δυσωπείτω, κατηγορείτω, διελεγχέτω, ὑπαρξάτω, πληρούτω, δεχθήτω, νουθετείτω, τεθείσθω, δοκιμασθήτω, διορθούσθω, ψυχαγωγησάτω, καρφολογείτω, προβληθήτω, κρατείτω, μισείτω, παρακρουέσθω, εὐλογείτω, ταραττέτω, ἑτοιμαζέσθω, διδόσθω, ἐγκείσθω, κατασοφιζέσθω, μεταδότω, καταδικαζέτω, ἀντιμαχέσθω, ἐξαπατάτω, ἐπιδεικνύσθω, ἀποκλεισθήτω, τυπωθήτω, πτοείτω.

Julian: ἴστω (7), ἔστω (7), ταραττέτω (2), προτεθήτω (2), διωκέσθω, ἐναντιούσθω, εἰσίτω, ἐξέστω, ἀντικείσθω, ἐπέσθω, γινέσθω, ἀποκλινέτω, πειθέσθω, ἡγείσθω, ἀφείσθω, προσίτω, τιμάτω, ἀναγινωσκέτω, παραβαλλέτω, ζητείσθω, ὑποκείσθω, ἀπιστείτω, ἐξίτω, πληρούτω ἀπατάτω, ποιείσθω, ἐγκάθηται, ἀδικείτω, ἀποδεικνύσθω, εἰσαγέτω, ὑπαντάτω, ἀνακείσθω.

Gregory of Nyssa: ἔστω (6), δεδόσθω (2), βλαπτέσθω, νοησάτω, ἐπισκεψάσθω, ὑβριζέσθω, γενέσθω, βραδυνέτω, προσκείσθω, πεπείσθω, σκανδαλιζέτω, ἡγείσθω.

Synesius: ἔστω (7), ἴστω (3), ἡγείσθω (2), εἰρήσθω (2), ἐπανίτω (2), γενέσθω (2), ἀποκεκλείσθω, γινέσθω, παραπολαυέτω, ἀνηρήσθω, ἐξευρέτω, τιμάσθω, δείτω, ἀποτυγχανέτω, κεχρήσθω, βοηθησάτω, ἐπανηκέτω, κωλυσάτω, ἀποφηνάτω, πληρούτω, μαθέτω, περιμενέτω, ὑπαρχέτω, ἀρχέτω, ἐχέτω, ὀνάσθω, προσκείσθω, καλείτω, ἐγκεχειρήσθω, κρατείτω, δυνάσθω, πειραθήτω, μελέτω, κατασπευδέτω, ἀνοιγνύσθω, πλείτω, ἀπολαυέτω, βουλευσάσθω, γυμναζέσθω, διατετειχίσθω, ἀποκτιννύτω, δεξάσθω, εὐφημείσθω, αἰσχυνέσθω, ἀπεληλάσθω, προσειρήσθω.

Psellus: ἔστω (45), γενέσθω (7), κείσθω (6), ἐχέτω (6), ἴστω (3), προσκείσθω (3), τυχέτω (3), ἐρρέτω (3), ἀπολαυσάτω (2), ἤτω (2), ζήτω (2), ὑποδεχέσθω (2), τερπέτω (2), λεγέσθω (2), μελέτω (2), προστετρίφθω, ἐγκεχύσθω, ἀναφθήτω, φοβείτω, παραμυθείσθω, διεφθάρθω, ἡρμόσθω, κεκλήσθω, ἀκουσάτω, διδασκέσθω, εὐωχείτω, ἐπικαχλαζέτω, σεμνυνέτω, περιτρεπέτω, ἐξαρθήτω, ἀπαγαγέτω, χείσθω, ἀποκρινάσθω, εὐμοιρησάτω, λανθανέτω, ἀναπεπλάσθω, ὀλλύσθω, γενηθήτω, προσφερέσθω, ἀκουέτω, ὑποτιθέσθω, βιβρωσκέτω, ἀποκομισάτω, συμφθειρέσθω, ἐμπεπλήσθω, ἠρεμείτω, περιρρείτω, ἀποδότω, ἀνεωχθήτω, ὑπεξηρήσθω, δοκιμασάτω, ἐπαυξανέτω, τετάχθω, ἀναπαυέτω, γευσάσθω, ἐχέσθω, μεταπλασθήτω,

ἐλαττωσάτω, ἐμβομβείτω, παραπολαυέτω, τρυγάτω, ἀνιπτάσθω, προβαλλέσθω, δαπανάτω, ἐπικουφιζέτω, ὑπομεινάτω, ἀπέστω, ὑποκείσθω, πεπήχθω, πληρούτω, ἐπιδειξάτω, ἐπιρρείτω, ἀλλαττέτω, ἀναγαγέτω, κουφιζέτω, προσαγορευθήτω, ἐπικεκαλύφθω, ἐρριζώσθω, κοπασάτω, ἐπαινείτω, γνώτω, κρατείτω, προτετιμήσθω, συγκεχωρήσθω, αἰτιάτω, σκυθρωπαζέτω, μετεωριζέτω, προκείσθω, ὑποστρεψάτω, γνωρισάτω, κεντριζέτω, ἀναμεινάτω, δυσχεραινέτω, ἀρθήτω, εἰρήσθω, δεδόχθω, νυμφευθήτω, δεδόσθω, φειδέσθω.

Planoudes: ἔστω (6), λεγέσθω (3), οἰέσθω (2), ἀρκείτω (2), ἴστω (2), ἐπανίτω (2), δοκείτω (2), τυχέτω (2), διδότω (2), κείσθω (2), ἀπαιτείσθω (2), μανθανέτω (2), χρησάσθω, ἐξέστω, πεμπέσθω, σκεδαζέτω, πειθέτω, παραμυθείσθω, κομιζέτω, φοιτάτω, τιθέσθω, ἐπιφερέτω, σῳζέσθω, μεμνήσθω, κατηγορείτω, ἀπιστείτω, προσκείσθω, εὐεργετείσθω, ἡγείσθω, διατιθέτω, κουφιζέτω, ἀφανισάτω, λανθανέτω, ἀπερρίφθω, γενέσθω, ὀνομαζέτω, περιληφθήτω, βαπτέτω, ἐκστησάτω, γνώτω, ἐλθέτω, συντηρείσθω, γεγράφθω, ἀναζευγνύτω, νοείσθω, ἀπεώσθω, ἤτω, καθιστάτω, ἀπολαυέτω, προσδεχέσθω, δεδόσθω, πεισάτω.

Cydones: ἔστω (40), πειθέτω (5), γινέσθω (5), ἀφείσθω (5), ἐμποιείτω (4), δεδόσθω (4), οἰέσθω (3), ποιείτω (3), δοκείτω (3), ἐξέστω (2), νομιζέτω (2), προσέστω (2), ἀναβεβλήσθω (2), διδασκέσθω (2), μαθέτω (2), ἀφαιρείτω (2), κινείτω (2), ἀναπληρούτω, ἐπέσθω, ἀρκείτω, ἀνῃρήσθω, νομιζέσθω, ἴστω, ὁράτω, παυσάσθω, δεδέσθω, θορυβείτω, διδασκέτω, μιμείσθω, ζητείτω, στεργέσθω, βουλευέσθω, ἀπέστω, πληρούτω, ἡγείσθω, ἐγειρέτω, οἰκείτω, ἀνίστω, γενέσθω, ἀκροάσθω, προστιθέτω, καλείτω, ἐπαινείσθω, λογιζέσθω, τηρείτω, τηρείσθω, κωλυέτω, μελέτω, φυλαττέσθω, λυπείτω, διδότω, κείσθω, διδόσθω, παρίτω, μεμφέσθω, ἐρχέσθω, παρεφθέγχθω, ἐπίστω, πεπαίχθω, ποιείσθω, δηλούτω, δυσχεραινέτω, ἐκκρουέτω, ἀνταλλαττέσθω, εἰρήσθω, ἀπολαυέτω

Calecas: ἔστω, ἐξέστω (2), παραμυθείσθω (2), ἀρκείτω (2), ἀφείσθω (2), κείσθω (2), γενέσθω (2), κρατείτω, πειθέτω, γινέσθω, ἐγκαλείτω, φερέσθω, παρῃτήσθω, παυσάσθω, ἐπικείσθω, ἐψέσθω, ἐπανίτω, παρεφθέγχθω, ἐπίστω, προσκείσθω, οἰκονομείτω, ἀγέσθω, λεγέτω, ἐκχείσθω, λεγέσθω, ἀπερρίφθω, παραιτείσθω.

Bibliography

Bachmann, Ludwig. 1965. *Anecdota Graeca: E Codd. Mss. Bibl. Reg. Parisin*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Bentein, Klaas. 2017. "Politeness in Pronouns: Third-Person Reference in Byzantine Documentary Papyri." *Philologus* 161 (2):256–267.

Biraud, Michèle, and Arnaud Zucker. 2019. *The "Letters" of Alciphron: A Unified Literary Work?* Leiden: Brill.

Browning, Robert. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]: Cambridge University Press.

Browning, Robert. 1989. *History, Language and Literacy in the Byzantine World*. Northampton, England: Variorum Reprints:103-133.

Efthymiadis, Stephanos. 2021 "Rewriting" In Papaioannou, Stratis. *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature.* New York: Oxford University Press:348-364.

Gaul, Niels. 2020. "The Letter in the Theatron: Epistolary Voice, Character, and Soul (and Their Audience)". In *A Companion to Byzantine Epistolography*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Giannouli, Antonia. 2014. "Education and literary language in Byzantium". In Hinterberger, Martin. *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature.* Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols:52-71.

Hinterberger, Martin. 2014. "The synthetic Perfect in Byzantine Literature", in Hinterberger, Martin. *The Language of Byzantine Learned Literature.* Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols :176-204

Hinterberger, Martin. 2021a. "Language", in Papaioannou, Stratis. 2021. *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature.* New York: Oxford University Press. :21-44.

Holton, David, Geoffrey C. Horrocks, Marjolijne Janssen, Tina Lentarē, Iō Manōlessou, and Panagiotis Toufexis. 2019. *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2014. "High-register Medieval Greek: 'Diglossia' and What Lay Behind it", in Carpinato, Caterina, and Olga Tribulato, eds. *Storia E Storie Della Lingua Greca*. Prima edizione. Venezia: Edizioni Ca' Foscari–Digital Publishing:49–72.

Hunger, Herbert. 1981. "The classical tradition in Byzantine Literature: the importance of Rhetoric". In Margaret Mullett & Roger Scott, eds. *Byzantium and the classical tradition. (University of Birmingham Thirteenth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies.)* Birmingham: The University.

Jannaris, Antonius N. 1897. *An Historical Greek Grammar: Chiefly of the Attic Dialect as Written and Spoken from Classical Antiquity down to the Present Time, Founded upon the Ancient Texts, Inscriptions, Papyri and Present Popular Greek*. London: Macmillan.

Kaster, Robert A. 1988. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Leiwo, Martti. 2010. "Imperatives and Other Directives in the Greek Letters from Mons Claudianus". In: Trevor Evans & Dirk Obbink (eds.), *The language of the papyri*, 97–119. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Melazzo, Lucio. 2013. "Imperative". In Giannakis, Georgios K., ed. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill.

Nachtergaele, Delphine. 2015. *The Formulaic Language of the Greek Private Papyrus Letters*. Ghent, Belgium: Ghent University. Faculty of Arts and Philosophy.

Papaioannou, Stratis, ed. 2021. *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Literature*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Pascale, Giuseppe. 2007. *Massimo Planude. Epistole a Melchisedek.* Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.

Rhoby, Andreas. 2019. "Poetry on Commission in Late Byzantium (13th–15th Century)". In Hörandner, Wolfram, Andreas Rhoby, and Nikos Zagklas, eds. *A Companion to Byzantine Poetry*. Leiden: Brill.

Rollo, Antonio. 2021. "La lingua greca nel Medioevo bizantino" in *Periptero* (13-14):18-29.

Schneider, Jean. 2020. *Maxime Planoudès, Lettres: Traduction et Annotation*. Leuven: Peeters.

Ševčenko, Ihor. 1981. "Literarische Gebrauchsformen: Levels of style in Byzantine prose". *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* vol. 31:289-312.

Sophianos, Nicolaos, and Émile Legrand. 1870. *Grammaire de La Langue Grecque Vulgaire*. Paris: Maisonneuve et Cie.

Triantaphyllidēs, Manolēs A. 1976. *NeoellēNikē Grammatikē*. Athēna: Organismos Ekdoseōs Didaktikōn Vivliōn.