A Look at an Alleged Morpho-syntactic Isogloss between Greek and Anatolian: The Modal Particle in Epic Greek

Filip De Decker
Università degli Studi di Verona

1. *Introduction*

In their recent discussion of the (alleged) Graeco-Anatolian *Sprachbund* Domenica Romagno listed three and Michele Bianconi four possible morpho-syntactic isoglosses between Anatolian and Greek (Romagno [2015: 436-440], Bianconi [2015: 149-160]).

In this extensive article I address one of them: the use of a modal particle (MP henceforth) to indicate potential, futurative and counterfactual meaning (in the terminology of Classical Philology the term "irrealis" is used), in Greek this is ἄν and in Hittite *man*.

By focusing on the Homeric evidence, I will show that the assumption of a *Sprachbund* is not supported by the evidence. For my analysis I focus on epic Greek, and use *Iliad* 16 as basis, and when that book does not have sufficient instances, a corpus of 5267 verses from the *Iliad* (books 1, 5, 9, 11, 16, 22, 24). After pointing out some general problems in equalling the Hittite and Greek "modal particles" (§2), I will show that the MP had deictic and emphatic value in epic Greek and was used predominantly in speeches, and did not convey modal meaning (§3), that a sharp distinction between possibility, remote possibility and unreality cannot be made in epic Greek, that the optative was the original mood in the counterfactual and potential constructions, that it was the mood that communicated the notion of (remote) possibility and contrafactitivity and that the use of the indicative mood

was an inner-Greek innovation that had not yet been completed at the time of epic Greek (§4).[1]

2. *General observations on the evidence used*

Before discussing the issue in detail, some important observations have to be made regarding the (im)probability and/or even (im)possibility of language contact in analysing the modal particle (MP). As was stated above, Romagno and Bianconi compared the use of the particle *man* in Hittite to convey non-realis meaning to the verb forms in the past to that of ἄν in Greek, which marks potential, futurative and counterfactual[2] meaning.[3] There are three problems with this equation. In their descriptions, Romagno and Bianconi used the description of Attic Greek as if it were "Greek" *tout court*, but the linguistic data of Attic Greek differ significantly from those of epic Greek and the other Greek dialects. First, even if we assume that the comparison is valid, the time depth poses problems. Attic Greek prose is attested from the 5th century BC, but Hittite texts are attested until the 12th century BC. Second, even if we agree that the difference between realis and not-realis in both Hittite and Greek was related to the MP, the constructions are still different: Hittite uses *man* in both main and subordinate (conditional) clause, while Greek never uses ἄν with the indicative in the conditional clause (not even in Homer this use is attested, contrary to the subjunctive and the optative, which can be used with the MP in the conditional clause). Third, the question of the moods and modal mean-

2. In Classical Philology, especially in non-Anglophone scholarship, the term "irrealis" is used to refer to the counterfactual (*irréel*, *Irrealis*). This will be discussed in more detail in §4.

3. Romagno (2015: 435-436), Bianconi (2015: 149-150). Bianconi considered the use of the MP as a borrowing by Greek or as *Sprachbund*-feature, though not excluding that it is a typologically common occurrence, while Romagno interpreted it as a *Sprachbund*-feature.

ings in Greek and Hittite is fundamentally different as well. As Hittite has only two moods (indicative and imperative), the mood alone cannot mark modality and therefore the particle *man* is used,[4] but Greek has a rich system of moods, the indicative, injunctive,[5] subjunctive, optative and imperative, and the question is whether the mood, the modal particle or both convey the modal meaning. Moreover, while the use of the modal particle ἄν is rigidly regulated in Attic Greek (although exceptions are occasionally transmitted), the use of the modal particles in epic is less straightforward and the Attic uses are the product of a grammaticalisation process within Greek. In my opinion already on methodological grounds this isogloss should not be used as evidence for the *Sprachbund*.[6] I now proceed to the analysis of the epic Greek data. First, I discuss the use of the MP in epic Greek and then I proceed to a discussion of the potential and counterfactual constructions.

3. *The use of the modal particle in epic Greek, based on the data of Iliad 16*

In this subchapter I analyse the MP in epic Greek. I use the data of a large corpus of 5267 verses with 625 instances of a subjunctive or optative without MP and 267 with it, and discuss the data of *Iliad* 16 in more detail. This book has 867 verses, being one of the longest books of Homer, and provides 107 instances of indicatives, subjunctives and optatives that could have been used with an MP. First, I provide an overview of the existing scholarship. Second, I determine the instances, I catalogue them per mood, tense and type of sentence and in a third step, I proceed to the actual analysis. I will analyse the use of the MP in epic Greek and compare it with that of *man* in Hittite starting from the research hypothesis that the MP does not change the meaning of the mood, but has particularising and emphasising value and is incompatible with a deontic and jussive meaning.

4. Hoffner – Melchert (2008: 314-316, 366-374, 419-423).

5. I consider the injunctive to be a living mood in the oldest Greek texts: it was attested in Mycenaean (there are virtually no augmented forms) and in epic Greek, there are more unaugmented froms (injunctives) than augmented forms, and there is a difference in meaning between them: for the injunctive use in Hesiod one can refer to West (1989), Clackson (2007: 130-132) and De Decker (2016).

6. For a more skeptical approach of the contact issue, see Yakubovich (2010: 140-157), Hajnal (2014, 2018), Oreshko (2018), Simon (2018), Giusfredi (forthcoming).

3.1. *Previous scholarship*

According to the standard Greek grammars,[7] the use of the MP ἄν is governed by the following strict rules in Classical Greek prose: it is mandatory in the main clause and any other subordinate clause (except the conditionals) with a potential optative, a counterfactual indicative and an iterative indicative and forbidden with the same forms in a conditional clause (exceptions are attested, but generally corrected by the different editors);[8] it is mandatory with a subjunctive in any subordinate clause, except in the purpose clauses (where it can appear) and clauses after *verba timendi* (where it never appears); it is forbidden with a future indicative and a subjunctive in the main clause (instances of these uses are attested, but they are generally to be corrected by the editors).[9] In Homeric Greek, not only ἄν is used as MP, but also κεν; moreover, a future indicative and a subjunctive in the main clause can be used with an MP as well and so can optatives in conditional clauses and, inversely, the MP can also be left out. The differences between the presence and absence of the MP have not been conclusively explained.

The following explanations have been given for the use of the MP in Homer.[10]

7. Goodwin (1865: 54-64), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 200-260, 1904: 347-557), Gildersleeve (1900: 168-190), Smyth – Messing (1956: 491-527), Humbert (1960: 110-132, 182-246), Delaunois (1988: 76-134), and Rijksbaron (2002: 39-94), van Emde Boas et al. (2019: 438-550). Recent treatments of the particle in Attic are Goldstein (2012), dealing with the repetition of the particle, and Beck – Malamud – Osadcha (2012), discussing the use in conditional clauses. A recent historical Greek syntax is still missing, the only ones still being Stahl (1907) and Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950); Chantraine (1964) has very little observations on syntax and Rix (1976, 1992) is limited to the morphology and phonology.

8. The standard grammars follow this editorial practice, but some grammars are more cautious and point out that the many exceptions cannot simply be disregarded as transmission errors (Schwyzer – Debrunner [1950: 324-325], Humbert [1960: 120], Crespo [1997: 50], Montanari [2015: 127]). Even Stahl (1907: 298-302) who argued for the correction of the instances where the particle was missing, nevertheless voiced some doubts, as he admitted that the amount of instances to be corrected was relatively high.

9. Hermann (1831) provided a monumental analysis of all instances of Greek literature known at that time; since that work, a canonical use seems to have been established and deviations from what Hermann explained were no longer accepted (see already Hartung [1833: 281] for criticism: "allein ist das seltene Vorkommen einer Erscheinung ein Grund zu ihrer Tilgung" – words still valid today).

10. The most recent surveys are Gerö (2000), Colvin (2012) and De Mol (2015). It was not addressed in the Oxford or Cambridge Commentaries. In the new *Basel Kommentar*, instances with MP are discussed (as e.g. *Iliad* 1,60 and 1,64), but the absence is not (see following note).

1. "Dubitative".

1.1. One of the first suggestions was that the particle could be used to add some doubts to the statement.[11]

1.2. This explanation might explain the use of the particle, but not its absence.

2. "Conditional".

2.1. The second explanation was that it described the conditions under which the action occurred and that it was used in sentences with a conditional meaning.[12]

2.2. The problem with this assumption is that it does not explain why the particle is missing in some conditional clauses and relative clauses with a quasi-conditional meaning.

3. Specific versus generic.

3.1. The third explanation was that the particle was used in sentences that referred to a specific instance and that it remained absent in generic statements. This explanation, first made by Hartung and von Bäumlein,[13] was reiterated by Delbrück (who added that the prospective subjunctive could be used with an MP, but the voluntative one – i.e. the one used in wishes and exhortations – could not)[14] and accepted by the standard Homeric grammars of Monro and Chantraine and scholars after them.[15]

3.2. This explanation seems convincing, but the number of exceptions is considerable and they cannot all be emended away by changing τε into κε and vice versa (as Monro tried to do).[16] Ruijgh showed that many instances Monro consid-

11. This had been noted in the very early treatises by Devarius (1587: 45, edited by Klotz in Devarius – Klotz [1835: 26]) and Hoogeveen (1769, edited by Schütz in Hoogeveen – Schütz [1813: 30-34]) and in Buttmann (1810: 496-497; 1819: 323) and Aken (1861: 55-56, about the potential and unreal in the indicative). It has been reiterated by Latacz – Nünlist – Stoevesandt (2002: 51, "*betont die Potentialität noch stärker als ohne*").

12. See already von Thiersch (1818: 533-538), Matthiae (1826: 981, 1195), Bernhardy (1829: 397), Hermann (1831) and in 1832 in the *Philological Museum* on page 102 (the author is only known by his initials H.M.), Ahrens (1852: 194-195), Aken (1865: 27-30), Wilhelmi (1881: 23).

13. Hartung (1832: 294-297), von Bäumlein (1846: 208-245, especially 219-220).

14. Delbrück (1871: 83-86), but his explanation was somewhat unclear as he also spoke about "das Eintreten der Handlung", but on page 86 he stated that the particle was much more absent in generic statements than in specific ones. See also Gildersleeve (1882), who applied it to Pindar.

15. Monro (1891: 250, 259, 266, 327-335), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 208), Leaf (1900: 17), Brugmann (1900: 499), Chantraine (1948: 279; 1953: 210-211), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 305-306), Valgiglio (1955: 50), Ruijgh (1971 *passim* but especially page 275 and pages 286-302; 1992: 80-82), Dunkel (1990; 2014: 33-35, 397, 430), Wakker (1994: 207-209 with reference to Monro, Basset and Ruijgh).

16. Monro (1891: 259, 266-267).

ered to be generic and to be in need in for correction, were not (but this does not explain all the exceptions).[17] Assuming a common origin for τε and κε (cf. supra) does not solve this issue either and would only account for the fact that these two particles never co-occur.

4.   Very early on, there were doubts as to the exact meaning and use. Already von Bäumlein, who argued that there was a distinction between generic and specific instances, stated that there were many contexts in which one could not distinguish between the forms with and without MP.[18] The validity of this "particularising theory" was doubted, because there were too many exceptions to the rule,[19] and therefore the use of the MP was considered to be "poetic" or "metrically motivated".[20] The metrical explanation can always be invoked in Homer[21] and there are several instances in which the particle is not metrically secure; yet, this theory does not explain why in some instances κ(ε) was used and in other τ(ε), both being metrically equivalent. Many commentaries and lexica mention "wohl, zwar" as meaning, but do not discuss when it was used and when it remained absent.[22]

5.   Emphatic value.

5.1.   Other scholars assumed the MP (especially ἄν, cf. supra) had an emphatic value.[23] Camerer ascribed an "emphatischen Grundwert" to ἄν and Gerö analysed it as "intensional" (*sic*).[24] This was also assumed for non-Homeric Greek: in her

---

17. Ruijgh (1971: 286-288).

18. Von Bäumlein (1846: 216-217)

19. Howorth (1955), Basset (1988a: 29; 1989: 205); Willmott (2007: 199-210). See also above. Many exceptions involve the use of the so-called *τε-épique*. Chantraine (1953: 349) had some reservations on the "particularising" meaning (in spite of his own analyses), as did Gonda (1956: 147-148), but he did not ascribe his doubts to the number of exceptions.

20. Already Devarius (1587: 46; Devarius – Klotz [1835: 27]), Hermann (1831: 143) and later Ebeling (1885: 692) had observed this. Wakker (1994: 207) admitted that the metre played a role, but did not consider it to be the sole factor.

21. The metre has been used as explanation for the augment use, the use of the tenses and the use of the dual. In all of these instances, the metre played – in my opinion – only a limited role.

22. A good example is Ebeling (1885: 691-735), who described all the uses but did not discuss the absence. The commentaries by Faesi (1858a, 1858b, 1860) and Ameis (1868:12) described the meaning as "wohl", but do not speak about the examples where the MP is missing.

23. As can be seen in Faesi's explanation of *Iliad* 1,137: "die kecke doch gemessene Zuversicht des Sprechenden" (Faesi [1858a: 50]); see also Camerer (1968). The emphatic value seems also accepted in Buttmann (1810: 496-497; 1819: 323) and Latacz – Nünlist – Stoevesandt (2002: 50, 52) where they stated that the MP strengthened the potential value of the optative when used in a protasis and emphasises the expected outcome, when used in a relative clause with final nuance.

24. Gerö (2000).

study on the ὅπως clauses in Attic, Amigues argued that ὅπως ἄν with the subjunctive was more emphatic and outspoken than the simple ὅπως with the subjunctive.[25]

5.2. There is one important shortcoming, however: if the meaning were indeed intensive or emphatic, one would expect the particle to occur with exhortative subjunctives and in wishes, but these subjunctives are almost never constructed with an MP. Moreover, Amigues's explanation of ὅπως ἄν as being the more emphatic form is not necessarily correct: as many instances occur in legal texts (inscriptions) and in oratory, an explanation of the MP as particularising is also possible.[26]

6.   Main versus subordinate clauses.

6.1. Howorth observed that the "specific instance theory" had too many exceptions and could therefore not be correct, and suggested that the MP was originally only used in main clauses with verbs referring to a future action; then it could appear in a subordinate clause, but still referred to the verbal action of the main clause.[27] Finally, it would have spread to the subordinate clauses that did not depend on future actions anymore and it became generalised. In Attic, certain clauses generalised the use, while in others the absence became the rule.[28]

6.2. This cannot account for the examples in which the MP is missing in the main clause nor does it explain why in Homer the MP could be missing and present within the same category (although one could argue that the transition was still in progress). If Howorth's explanation were correct, one would expect the vast majority of instances in the main clause to have an MP (including the wishes and desiderative forms, cf. infra), but this is not the case.

7.   Confronted with the exceptions of the particularising theory, Basset adapted the explanation to state that the MP was only used when an action near to the speaker was related (*actualité du locuteur*), but not when actions in a remote past or future were described.[29]

8.   Finally, Willmott argued that the particles did not contain any additional meaning and were in the process of being grammaticalised as part of the eventual and potential constructions.[30] This is only partly true; as she stated herself, the MP

25. Amigues (1977: 142-169).

26. See already Kühner – Gerth (1904: 385-386) and Ruijgh (1971: 276). For the use of ὅπως ἄν in inscriptions, see Meisterhans (1885: 109). For criticism of Amigues's theory, see also Bers (1984: 164-165).

27. Howorth (1955).

28. Howorth (1955).

29. Basset (1988a; 1989: 204-205).

30. Willmott (2007: 199-210). Probert (2015: 85) referred to Willmott to state that the presence or absence of the MP did not change the meaning of the relative clause.

was used much less in the relative clauses with a generic meaning than in those with a specific meaning and in the purpose clauses of the *Odyssey* the MP was more often absent than present.[31]

9.   Independent from the exact meaning, it was also noted that in a sequence of optatives and subjunctives the MP usually only appeared with the first form.[32] This is a sort of *conjunction reduction*: if one verb is already marked for particularity, it is not necessary to mark it with the following verb forms.[33]

3.2. *Working hypothesis*

Limitations in time and space prevent me from discussing the scholarship on the *Grundbedeutung* of the optative and subjunctive and the difference in meaning between these two modes,[34] but Allan distinguished three dimensions on which Greek moods are used: deontic (obligation, permission) vs. epistemic (beliefs of the speaker regarding the proposition) modality, speaker vs. event oriented modality and the scale of modality (realis, necessity, possibility and counterfactuality).[35] The Greek subjunctive and optative mood can convey one or more of these meanings, with the exception of the notion "realis", which is limited to the indicative only.

In what follows, I will investigate in which of Allan's three axes the MP is allowed and will use as working hypothesis a combination of the explanations by especially Monro and Basset, which can be summarised as follows: the MP was

31. Willmott (2007: 202-204); the data of the purpose clauses could be found in Weber (1884) already, but she did not quote that book.

32. Madvig (1847: 152), Krüger (1859: 181), Buttmann (1854: 401), Aken (1861: 42, pointing out that this is by no means an absolute rule), Frohberger (1863), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 248-249), Goodwin (1865: 63-64), Smyth – Messing (1956: 400), Ruijgh (1971: 767), Adrados et al. (1986: 26), Gerö (2001: 193).

33. This principle was first noted for Greek by Kiparsky (1968), but he did not discuss the MP among the instances of possible reductions.

34. The literature is large, see most recently Greenberg (1986), Tichy (2006) and Willmott (2007), and earlier, Delbrück (1871, 1879), Masius (1885), Mutzbauer (1903a, 1903b, 1908), Methner (1908), Walter (1923), Gonda (1956), Brunel (1980), besides the discussions in the standard grammars of Kühner – Gerth (1898: 217-289) and Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 301-338, with a bibliography until 1950).

35. Allan (2013), building on Bybee – Perkins – Pagliuca (1994), Palmer (2001), Nuyts (2006) and De Haan (2006); see also van der Auwera – Plungian (1998) for a discussion and definitions. For an application of modality to the Greek moods, see Horrocks (1995), Willmott (2007), Allan (2013), Veksina (2017), Méndez Dosuna (2018: 271).

used in specific instances with a link to the present situation, and was omitted in a generic instance or an instance referring to the more remote future or past.

3.3. *Determining the instances of* Iliad 16

1.　Before I proceed to the actual analysis, I first have to determine when the (absence of) MP is secure. In my analysis, I will start from the transmitted text, but it is necessary to discuss the instances where the metre does not guarantee the use of the MP (as was stated above, especially Monro suggested to change the text and add/remove the particle when needed). One can always change τε into κε and vice versa, τ᾽ into κ᾽ and vice versa, (ὅς/ἥ) τις into (ὅς/ἥ) κεν and vice versa, αἴ κε into αἴ θε, αἴ κ᾽ into αἴ θ᾽ and sometimes one can subsitute κεν for καί or vice versa. Moreover, instances with ἐπειδήν, ἐπήν or ἤν are insecure when a word starting with a consonant follows, because in that case ἐπειδή, ἐπεί or εἰ (without particle) could also have been used; in case a word with a vowel follows, the MP is secure, because otherwise we would have an hiatus and the "Attic" forms ἐπειδήν or ἐπήν could contain an older ἐπεί κ', ἐπειδή κ' or εἴ κ'.[36] In those latter instances the MP is metrically secure (albeit the exact form is not).[37] Wackernagel argued that ἐπὴν δή was only found in the *Odyssey* and would be the normal order, since ἄν takes precedence over δή; ἐπειδάν would have been Attic and would have replaced the Homeric ἐπεί κεν.[38] I discuss one example:

> (EX.03.01) αὐτὰρ *ἐπὴν δὴ / ἐπεὶ δὴ* τόν γε <u>λίπῃ</u> ψυχή τε καὶ αἰών (*Iliad* 16,453).
> "But when his soul and life have left him, …"[39]

The codices have both the reading with MP (ἐπὴν δή) and without MP (ἐπεὶ δή), but the metre does not allow to distinguish between the variant readings and therefore this instance is insecure. The same applies for *Iliad* 16,39 and 95.

---

36. See van Leeuwen (1885 *passim*) for a detailed study on the oldest forms of the MP (but see following note).

37. I am very skeptical about reconstructing the *Urform* of the poems, as has been attempted by Fick (1883, 1885, 1887) and Tichy (2010). In my opinion the transmitted text should serve as basis, with the metre as confirming factor, whenever possible, but I do not think that one should start changing the text or rewriting it into an older form (as has been done in West's editions as well).

38. Wackernagel (1916: 191-195), but see preceding note.

39. Unless noted otherwise, the translations are my own.

By applying this method, I obtained 25 instances of a metrically secure MP in *Iliad* 16 and 276 in the large corpus.

2.   A second problem is the distinction between the future indicative and the subjunctive aorist. As is known, the subjunctive aorist of the sigmatic aorist is metrically equivalent to the future indicative (unless the verb is a semi-deponent or belongs to the *verba liquida*) and those forms would have been written the same in the most alphabets anyway: λύσω can be either future indicative or subjunctive aorist, and λύσωσι and λύσουσι are metrically equivalent and would have written ΛΥΣΟΣΙ in the oldest Greek alphabet and in that of Athens from before 403 BC.[40] Chantraine argued that one should make a difference between the two forms based on the transmission (thus distinguishing λύσωσι from λύσουσι),[41] and consider the form a subjunctive, when an MP is used,[42] but in my opinion this fails to take into account the transmission problems (as in several cases both forms are found in the codices) and the fact that in Homer's time one could not have differentiated between the forms (at least in writing). The verbs without an aorist or with a non-sigmatic aorist build their future on the Indo-European desiderative *-(h₁)s-:[43] the verb ἄγω has a reduplicated aorist ἤγαγον with a subjunctive aorist ἀγάγω, but has a future form ἄξω which is built on *h₂eǵ-s-. The same applies to the semi-deponent future forms.[44] For that reason I catalogued the forms of the type λύσω as a special category "future-subjunctives". In my classification I use the following categories: subjunctives (present, aorist, perfect), future-subjunctives (those subjunctive aorist and future indicative forms that have the same metrical form, type λύσω and λύσωσι and λύσουσι), future-desiderative forms (type ἄξω and the so-

---

40. This was also noted in De Mol (2015: 10-11). In 403/2 BC the Athenian arkhon Eukleides, on suggestion of Arkhinos, suggested to adopt the Ionic alphabet with its 24 letters (including the eta and the omega, which the Athenians did not use until then). It is that alphabet that will become the "Greek" one in use until today.

41. Chantraine (1953: 225).

42. Chantraine (1953: 206-212).

43. For the present investigation it is irrelevant whether the suffix was *-s- or *-h₁s- or whether or not both suffixes existed.

44. Contrary to e.g. Willi (2011, 2018: 441-447) I believe that the Greek future continues both the subjunctive and the desiderative, or better said, that the old desiderative and the subjunctive of the sigmatic aorist merged in the Greek future. The first one to state that the future originated in the subjunctive were Buttmann (1830: 398; 1854: 396) and also Aken (1865: 13), whereas Franke (1861) stated that all future forms were in origin present forms. I cannot address that issue in detail here (already Brugmann (1880: 58-64) stated that the issue could not be solved), nor the question whether there is a difference in meaning between the future and the subjunctive aorist forms.

called semi-deponents of the type ἀκούσομαι), optatives (present, aorist, perfect) and rarely, in case of the counterfactuals, indicatives (imperfect, aorist, pluperfect).

3. The root *h_3ek^w- is a problem, because one could interpret the form ὄψομαι as a desiderative form (as is done in the Rix 2001[2]),[45] but given the fact that there is a present ὄσσομαι (from *h_3ek^w-ye/o-), one cannot exclude that the form was in origin a subjunctive aorist (although the aorist is only attested in a fragment of Pindar and in Sophokles, but not in epic Greek).[46] For that reason I catalogued the form as a special category.

4. The root *h_1ed- poses a special problem, because it is attested as a "normal" present, but in the middle forms its apparent "present" conjugation is used as a future. There is one such instance in *Iliad* 16:

(EX.03.02) ἦμαρ ἀναγκαῖον· σὲ δέ τ᾽ ἐνθάδε γῦπες <u>ἔδονται</u> (*Iliad* 16,836).

"(I will ward off) the day of fate, but here the vultures will eat you."

In this verse the form ἔδονται refers to the future and is in all likelihood an old subjunctive.

There is one instance in which the subjunctive seems to be used with an MP:

(EX.03.03) (41) σχέτλιος· αἴθε θεοῖσι φίλος τοσσόνδε γένοιτο
(42) ὅσσον ἐμοί· τάχα κέν ἑ κύνες καὶ γῦπες <u>ἔδονται</u>
(43) κείμενον· ἦ κέ μοι αἰνὸν ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἄχος ἔλθοι· (*Iliad* 22,41-43).

"A hard man. Ah, were he loved inasmuch by the gods as he were by me. Soon the dogs and the vultures will eat him (lying there) and a sharp pain would go away from my chest."

In these lines, Priam describes that he hoped the gods would love Akhilleus in the same manner as he did, because in that case he would soon be eaten by dogs and vultures and his sorrows would be solved. All codices have the middle subjunctive ἔδονται, but Aristarkhos changed it into the optative ἔδοιεν (ἔδοιεν and

---

45. Rix (2001[2]: 297).

46. As was suggested by Ruijgh (1992: 76) and Kölligan (2007: 256) with a detailed argumentation as to why this is better interpreted as a subjunctive aorist. For the aorist form in Pindar and Sophokles, see Veitch (1873: 495, 504); Kölligan (2007: 256); the sigmatic aorist forms are not mentioned in Chantraine (1968-1980: 812, 832) nor in Rix (2001[2]: 297).

ἔδονται are metrically equivalent). La Roche, Allen and West adopted the correction, while Van Thiel preserved the transmitted text. La Roche argued that τάχα κέν was almost always used with the optative and Leaf, Richardson and De Jong admitted that the future could be used with an MP, but argued that Priam only imagined Akhilleus' death and the optative would be more in line with the optatives used by Priam in the other lines.[47] As Van Thiel noted, a transition of optative into subjunctive is not uncommon, so that the transition from one mood to another could have occurred here as well.[48] Besides this fact, it should be noted that not only the optative ἔλθοι is transmitted, but also the subjunctive ἔλθη, so that stating that the optative ἔδοιεν has preference over ἔδονται because it would be in line with the other optatives, is not convincing. One could, at least theoretically, imagine that Priam considered it not impossible that Akhilleus be killed. For other alternations in moods, I refer to e.g. *Iliad* 24,565-566.

5.   The root $*g^{w}(e)ih_3$- has a similar problem, because the verb βέ(εί)ομαι has an apparent present indicative conjugation, but has future meaning and thus seems to be a subjunctive present.[49]

(EX.03.04) οὔ θην οὐδ᾿ αὐτὸς δηρὸν β<u>έη</u>, ἀλλά τοι ἤδη (*Iliad* 16,852).

"Indeed, you will not live long yourself anymore, but already (black Fate) …"

The form βέη could formally be both a present indicative as a subjunctive, but the meaning is a future.[50]

<hr>

47. La Roche (1876: 286: "*τάχα κέν omnibus fere locis cum optativo iungitur*"), Leaf (1888: 352), Richardson (1993: 110), De Jong (2012: 69-70), West (2000: 42). The commentaries by La Roche (1871: 32, 142) and Ameis – Hentze (1906: 6) adopted Aristarkhos' correction, but did not discuss it.

48. Van Thiel (2011: 422), with reference to Chantraine (1953: 225) and to Leaf's commentary, but Leaf nevertheless agreed with the correction.

49. Veitch (1879: 130) and Ameis – Hentze (1885: 95-96) catalogue it as a present indicative with future meaning, but Chantraine (1968: 176), in spite of his skepticism in (1948: 452-453), Janko (1992: 248), Beekes (2010: 216-217) and Brügger (2018: 371) see it as a subjunctive form; Rix (2001[2]: 215) states that the subjunctive evolved into a future. Schwyzer (1939: 780) interpreted it as a subjunctive aorist of ἐβίων, but did not address why these forms were middle (Schwyzer – Debrunner 1950: 265 only catalogued the form as a subjunctive, not as a subjunctive aorist). The issue is not discussed in Rix (1992[2]: 225-226) and Frisk (1960: 238) is agnostic ("kann indesssen nicht als sicher betrachtet werden").

50. There is no need to change the form into βέε' with elision of the diphthong -αι (as done in West's edition), which is not impossible, but still quite unusual before the bucolic caesura (having

6.   There are also many instances where the optative and the subjunctive are metrically equivalent: this is the case for the paradigms of the verbs in -μι, and for the active optative forms in -ειε and the subjunctives in -ῃσι, the optatives in -οι- to the subjunctives in -η/ω-, and, especially at the end of the verse, the optative in -οιτο and the subjunctive in -ηται. I always use the transmitted form as basis, but sometimes, both forms are transmitted, and in such instances, determining which of the variants is the most likely one is only possible by a detailed study on the moods of this book, but space constraints prevent me from performing such a study here.

7.   In six instances it is impossible to determine the tense: ἀμύνῃς (32), ἀγείρω (129), τείνῃ (365), κρίνωσι (387, in this passage, the form κρίνωσι was preceded by the aorist χαλεπήνῃ, so that κρίνωσι could very well be an aorist), ἐποτρύνω (525) and ἐποτρύνῃσι (690) can be aorist and present, and therefore I tagged them only for mood but not for tense.

3.4. *The facts and figures of the MP in* Iliad 16

1.   The figures for the large corpus are:

Overall data for the MP use in speech and narrative in the large corpus

Speech	260	524
Narrative	16	100
Total	276	624

2.   The overall data for *Iliad* 16 are:

Data of MP use in *Iliad* 16

Speech	22	58
Narrative	3	24
Total	25	82

both an elision of a diphthong and an elision before this caesura make West's reading unnecessary; moreover, it is not the editor's task to recover the oldest linguistically possible text, but to edit the text as it is most likely to have been composed by the poet and/or writer).

3.   The figures for mood and tense for *Iliad* 16 are:

MP use per mood and tense in *Iliad* 16

Form	With MP	No MP
Aorist subjunctive	8	16
Present subjunctive	1	11
Perfect subjunctive	0	2
Subjunctive, tense undetermined	2	4
Aorist optative	6	13
Present optative	0	7
Perfect optative	0	1
Optative, tense undetermined	0	0
Future-subjunctive	3	13
Future-desiderative	0	10
Indicative aorist	5	4
Indicative imperfect	0	0
Indicative pluperfect	0	0
Double particle use	0	0
The root *$*h_1ed$*-	0	1
The root *$*g^wieh_3$*-	0	1
Total	25	82

4.   The data per type of sentence is as follows:

The MP use per type of sentence in *Iliad* 16

Wish with αἲ γάρ	0	2
Negative purpose/negative wish	0	9
Purpose clauses	2	16
Conditional clauses	7	14
Temporal clauses	2	9
Relative clauses	2	7
Deliberative (indirect) questions	0	7

Exhortative	0/1 (cf. infra)	2
Other main clause instances	11	14[51]
Total	25	82

I now proceed to the actual analysis of *Iliad* 16. As the figures show that there are much more instances without MP, I will start by discussing the categories without it.

3.5. *The actual analysis: the instances without MP*

1.   Before proceeding to the actual analysis, it is necessary to observe that in many instances it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide which explanation is possible: especially in cases with a verb in the first person singular or plural, it can be difficult to distinguish between exhortative or simple future meaning, or between a deliberative or simple future meaning.

(EX.03.05) οἴκαδέ περ σὺν νηυσὶ <u>νεώμεθα</u> ποντοπόροισιν (*Iliad* 16,205).

"Let us return / We will return home with the ships that carry (us) over the seas."

In this instance the verb form νεώμεθα can be conceived as a simple subjunctive present "we will return" or as an exhortative subjunctive "let us return".

2.   The MP is missing in exhortative clauses, but there are only two certain instances of this (16,60 and 16,205), and as was stated above, one could also interpret them as simple future forms.

(EX.03.06) ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν προτετύχθαι <u>ἐάσομεν</u>: οὐδ᾽ ἄρα πως ἦν (*Iliad* 16,60).

"But we shall let / let us leave this (to) be things completed before, it was not my intention (to be enraged forever)."

---

51. In *Iliad* 16,456 and 674 the different editors (and manuscripts) differ on the interpretation of the sentences and use different punctuation, and depending on their interpretation of the sentences as subordinate or main clauses. I have therefore left them out from the data.

In this verse, it is more likely to interpret ἐάσομεν as exhortative "let us leave this", but a plain future meaning "we shall let this" cannot be excluded either.

In one instance, a subjunctive form is used with an MP, but could be exhortative as well:

(EX.03.07) (128) μὴ δὴ νῆας ἕλωσι καὶ οὐκέτι φυκτὰ πέλωνται
(129) δύσεο τεύχεα θᾶσσον, ἐγὼ δέ κε λαὸν <u>ἀγείρω</u> (*Iliad* 16,128-129).

"That they do not take or ships and that they (the ships) do not become impossible to flee in (i.e. that we can no longer flee by using them), dress yourself quickly in the battle gear and I will / let me gather the soldiers."

This passage describes how Akhilleus notices the dramatic situation of the Greek army and agrees with Patroklos' suggestion to have him (P) dressed in Akhilleus' battle gear to relieve the Greeks and frighten the Trojans. The subjunctive ἀγείρω (aorist or present, the distinction cannot be made) is combined with an imperative δύσεο (of the desiderative stem) and is combined with two negative purpose clauses, so that one could argue that ἀγείρω meant "let me gather" and not "I will gather".

3.   The same applies to the so-called deliberative questions, be they direct or indirect.[52] They can be explained as plain future-referring subjunctives "I will do this" or optatives after a verb of a past tense, but also as being exhortative "Let me do this" or being deliberative "should I do this?". They also occur after verbs of thinking and asking, especially in the past and in those cases the optative is used.[53] I analyse one example:

(EX.03.08) (435) διχθὰ δέ μοι κραδίη μέμονε φρεσὶν ὁρμαίνοντι,
(436) ἤ μιν ζωὸν ἐόντα μάχης ἄπο δακρυοέσσης
(437) <u>θείω</u> ἀναρπάξας Λυκίης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ,
(439) ἦ ἤδη ὑπὸ χερσὶ Μενοιτιάδαο <u>δαμάσσω</u>. (*Iliad* 16,435-438).

_____

52. The instances are *Iliad* 16,437 (θείω, aorist subjunctive), 438 (δαμάσσω, future-subjunctive), 650 (δηώσῃ, future-subjunctive), 650 (ἕληται, aorist subjunctive), 651 (ὀφέλλειεν, present optative), 713 (μάχοιτο, present optative), 714 (ὁμοκλήσειεν, aorist optative).
53. As stated already, I cannot discuss the so-called *Grundbedeutung* of both moods nor can I address the issue of the so-called *optativus obliquus*. For a discussion of the last type, see Mein (1903).

"In my breast my heart is divided in two, while I ponder whether I should take him alive out of the tearbringing battle and put him in the fertile land of Lykia or let him be tamed by the hands of the son of Menoitios."

In this passage Zeus ponders whether he should save his son Sarpedon from Patroklos' hands or have fate take its course and let him die. Here the deliberative question refers to the present and the subjunctive is used. The aorist subjunctive θείω and the future-subjunctive δαμάσσω can be interpreted as indirect deliberative questions depending on ὁρμαίνοντι, but one could also argue that they are independent main clauses.[54]

4.   In negative wishes, negative purpose clauses,[55] and after the *verba timendi* the MP is not used. The difference between a negative purpose clause and a negative wish is very small and the *verba timendi* might very well have been negative wish clauses in origin and many negative wishes have a notion of fear in them.[56] There 9 negative purpose clauses without MP.[57] I give one example:

(EX.03.09) (80) ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς Πάτροκλε νεῶν ἄπο λοιγὸν ἀμύνων
(81) ἔμπεσ' ἐπικρατέως, μὴ δὴ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο
(82) νῆας ἐνιπρήσωσι, φίλον δ' ἀπὸ νόστον ἕλωνται. (*Iliad* 16,80-82).

"In that way fall down on them strongly, Patroklos, warding off the destruction from the ships, lest they do set the ships ablaze with the burning fire and take away our beloved homecoming!"

---

54. I cannot address the origins of subordinations nor the degree to what extent subordinate clauses in Homer are still older paratactic constructions.

55. Weber (1884: 32-38), Monro (1891: 262), Chantraine (1953: 266-273). The only in-depth investigation of the Homeric purpose clauses is Weber (1884); for an historical comparison between the Homeric and the RigVedic final clauses, see Hettrich (1987) and for Attic Greek, see Amigues (1977).

56. Aken (1865: 64-65), Delbrück (1871: 23), Weber (1884: 4-9), Kühner – Gerth (1904: 390-391), Hentze (1907: 368), Chantraine (1953: 208-209, 288), Brunel (1980: 251). See also Ameis – Hentze (1901: 87), Chantraine (1953: 208) and Fernández Galiano (1992: 186) on *Odyssey* 21,324.

57. The instances are *Iliad* 16,30 (λάβοι, aorist optative), 80 (ἐνιπρήσωσι, future-subjunctive), 80 (ἕλωνται, aorist subjunctive), 94 (ἐμβήῃ, aorist subjunctive), 128 (ἕλωσι, aorist subjunctive), 128 (πέλωνται, present subjunctive), 446 (ἐθέλησι, present subjunctive), 545 (ἕλωνται, aorist subjunctive), 545 (ἀεικίσσωσι, future-subjunctive).

In these verses Akhilleus wants Patroklos to push back the Trojan army and save the ships, so that the Greeks can still sail home. In this instance the future-subjunctive ἐνιπρήσωσι (the aorist subjunctive ἐνιπρήσωσι and the future indicative ἐνιπρήσουσι are metrically equivalent and would have been written ΕΝΙΠΡΕΣΟΣΙ by Homer, hence the cataloguing as future-subjunctive) and the subjunctive aorist ἕλωνται appear in a negative purpose clause or negative wish "may they not" or "lest they". The difference between negative purpose and negative wish is very thin.

5.   Positive wish clauses do not have the MP either. In *Iliad* 16 there are only 2 instances where we can state with absolute certainty that we are dealing with a positive wish (267 and 722, but for that instance see later); in the larger corpus there are 20. Given the close link between conditional clauses and wishes (cf. infra), many instances of a conditional clause with an optative could be old wish clauses as well. I give one example of a wish.

(EX.03.10) ἀσκηθής μοι ἔπειτα θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας <u>ἵκοιτο</u> (*Iliad* 16,247).

"May he come (back) unharmed to the fast ships!"

In this instance Akhilleus prays to Zeus that Patroklos may return home safely after his expedition against the Trojans. The aorist optative ἵκοιτο is used without MP.
Reversely, the instances of a conditional clause with αἴ κε could be interpreted as old wish clauses as well and in those instances the use of the MP can only be explained as a grammaticalisation of the MP in conditional clauses. It be noted that αἴ κε is only used with the subjunctive and not the optative (the mood of possibility and wish).

6.   The MP is also very rarely used in positive purpose clauses. There are 16 instances without MP and 2 with it.[58] I give one example.

(EX.03.11) ἐξαύδα, μὴ κεῦθε νόῳ, ἵνα <u>εἴδομεν</u> ἄμφω (*Iliad* 16,19).

"Speak up, do not hide it in your heart, so that we know it both!"

58. The instances without MP are *Iliad* 16,10 (ἀνέληται, aorist subjunctive), 19 (εἴδομεν, perfect subjunctive), 83 (θείω, aorist subjunctive), 86 (ἀπονάσσωσιν, future-subjunctive), 86 (πόρωσιν, aorist subjunctive), 100 (λύωμεν, present subjunctive), 243 (εἴσεται, future-desiderative), 243 (ἐπίστηται, present subjunctive), 273 (γνῷ, aorist subjunctive), 423 (δαείω, aorist subjunctive), 525 (ἐποτρύνω, subjunctive, could be present or aorist), 526 (μάχωμαι, present subjunctive), 568 (εἴη, present optative), 576 (μάχοιτο, present optative), 655 (ὤσαιτο, aorist optative), 655 (ἕλοιτο, aorist optative).

In the two instances in a purpose clause with an MP, an alternative explanation is possible.

(EX.03.12) (83) πείθεο δ᾽ ὥς τοι ἐγὼ μύθου τέλος ἐν φρεσὶ θείω,
(84) ὡς ἄν μοι τιμὴν μεγάλην καὶ κῦδος <u>ἄρηαι</u>
(85) πρὸς πάντων Δαναῶν, ἀτὰρ οἳ περικαλλέα κούρην
(86) ἂψ ἀπονάσσωσιν, ποτὶ δ᾽ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα πόρωσιν. (*Iliad* 16,83-86).

"Obey, so that I can put the purpose of this word in your heart, so that / in a way that you obtain the greatest honour and fame among all the Danaans and that they can indeed bring home the very beautiful girl and provide in addition shining gifts!"

In these verses, one could argue that the two purpose clauses are in fact old relative clauses and especially in the second example ἄρηαι, this seems possible. In that case one would have to translate "that I put in your mind the purpose in such a way that you should obtain glory", but if this is an old relative clause, it certainly has a purpose nuance as well.[59] One could even argue that the first sentence contains an older paratactic construction *πείθεο·τώς τοι ἐγὼ μύθου τέλος ἐν φρεσὶ θείω "Obey. That way I will put in your mind the purpose of this word in such a way that …". In that case θείω would belong to the main clause and ἄρηαι would be part of the relative clause (in which case the absence of the MP with θείω would require an explanation, unless one interprets it as exhortative). The fact that the future-subjunctive ἀπονάσσωσιν and the aorist subjunctive πόρωσιν are used without an MP might be due to the fact that they occur in a purpose clause (in which case the use of ἄρηαι with MP would require an explanation) or could be due to the so-called "reduction rule" (cf. infra).

(EX.03.13) (270) ἀνέρες ἔστε φίλοι, μνήσασθε δὲ θούριδος ἀλκῆς,
(271) ὡς ἂν Πηλεΐδην <u>τιμήσομεν</u>, ὃς μέγ᾽ ἄριστος (*Iliad* 16,270-271).

"Friends, be men and remember your furious strength, so that we / that way we will honour the son of Peleus, who the most powerful …"

59. These instances were not discussed in Probert (2015).

In this instance the future-subjunctive τιμήσομεν could belong to a purpose clause "so that we will honour", but it can also be interpreted as a main clause "this way we will honour".

As will be discussed later on in the subchapter of the relative clauses, several purpose clauses could be interpreted as relative clauses with purpose nuance, or even as simple relative clauses.

7.   The future-desideratives rarely have the MP. In *Iliad* 16 there are no instances with it,[60] and in the larger corpus we have 145 instances of a future-desiderative without MP and only 2 with it. The notion of desire and wish explains the absence of the MP, as was the case with the (negative) purpose clauses and (negative) wishes.

8.   The same applies to the future-subjunctives, but the figures are less outspoken: 13 instances without it and 3 with.[61] In the larger corpus, there are 137 instances of a future-subjunctive without it and 28 with it. Although the future-subjunctives clearly have a notion of wish and desire in them, in *Iliad* 16 there are other explanations possible for the absence of the MP: ἀναπνεύσωσι (42) is preceded by another verb form that is already marked by the MP (cf. infra), ἐάσομεν (60) could be interpreted as exhortative, ἐνιπρήσωσι (82) appears in a negative purpose/wish clause, ἀπονάσσωσιν (86) is preceded by another verb form that is already marked by the MP, κινήσῃ (264) appears in a simile with an undefined subject τις (and is thus less specific, cf. infra), δαμάσσω (438) appears in an indirect deliberative question, ἀεικίσσωσι (545) appears in a negative purpose/wish clause, χωρήσουσι (629) appears in a negative sentence (cf. infra), 650 (δῃώσῃ), 674 (ταρχύσουσι). For κινήσῃ (298), ἀντήσω (423) and ταρχύσουσι (456, 674) there is no other explanation than that they are future-subjunctives, the first one appears in a temporal clause in a simile (cf. infra), while the three other instances refer to specific instances in the main clause. The 3 instances with the MP appear twice in a conditional clause (πέμψῃς, 445 and συλήσωσι, 500) and once in a purpose clause that could have been an original relative clause (τιμήσομεν, 271, cf. supra).

---

60. The instances of the future-desideratives are *Iliad* 16,31 (ὀνήσεται), 90 (θήσεις), 239 (μενέω), 243 (εἴσεται), 444 (ἐρέω), 449 (ἐνήσεις), 499 (ἔσσομαι), 629 (καθέξει), 673 (θήσουσ᾿), 851 (ἐρέω).

61. The instances of the future-subjunctives without MP are *Iliad* 16,42 (ἀναπνεύσωσι), 60 (ἐάσομεν), 82 (ἐνιπρήσωσι), 86 (ἀπονάσσωσιν), 264 (κινήσῃ), 298 (κινήσῃ), 423 (ἀντήσω), 438 (δαμάσσω), 456 (ταρχύσουσι), 545 (ἀεικίσσωσι), 629 (χωρήσουσι), 650 (δῃώσῃ), 674 (ταρχύσουσι); those with it are 271 (τιμήσομεν), 445 (πέμψῃς), 500 (συλήσωσι).

9.   The old subjunctive forms of the roots *h_1ed- and *$g^wi(e)h_3$- are also used without MP. Given the fact that they appear in the middle in the subjunctive present and in the active in the indicative, it is possible that the middle form (and thus the notion of more subject-related and desiderative involvement) was incompatible with the MP.

10.   As was stated above, the MP is often missing with verb forms if the form was preceded by another form with an MP on the same syntactic level. There are five instances of this in *Iliad* 16, and no exceptions.[62] In the large corpus we find 34 indicatives (injunctives), optatives and subjunctives without an MP, because they are preceded by another form with an MP on the same syntactic level and 15 instances where this rule is broken.[63]

---

62. The instances are *Iliad* 16,42 (ἀναπνεύσωσι, future-subjunctive, preceded by ἀπόσχωνται, with MP), 86 (ἀπονάσσωσιν, future-subjunctive preceded by ἄρηαι, with MP), 86 (πόρωσιν, aorist subjunctive preceded by ἄρηαι, with MP), 273 (γνῷ, aorist subjunctive, preceded by τιμήσομεν with MP), 725 (δώη, aorist subjunctive, preceded by ἕλης, with MP).

63. The instances are *Iliad* 1,510 (ὀφέλλωσιν, present subjunctive without MP, preceded by the future-subjunctive τίσωσιν with MP), 5,211 (ἐσόψομαι, without MP, preceded by the future-subjunctive νοστήσω with MP), 9,501 (ἁμάρτη, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ὑπερβήη with MP), 9,510 (ἀποείπη, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀνήηται with MP), 9,610 (ὀρώρη, perfect subjunctive without MP, preceded by the present subjunctive μένη with MP), 9,703 (ὄρση, future-subjunctive without MP, preceded by the perfect subjunctive ἀνώγη with MP), 11,194 (δύη, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀφίκηται with MP), 11,194 (ἔλθη, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀφίκηται with MP), 11,210 (δύη, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀφίκηται with MP), 11,210 (ἔλθη, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀφίκηται with MP), 11,310 (γένοντο, injunctive aorist without MP, preceded by the imperfect indicative ἔην with MP), 11,668 (κτεινώμεθ᾽, present or aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the present subjunctive θέρωνται with MP), 11,800 (ἀναπνεύσωσι, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀπόσχωνται with MP), 16,42 (ἀναπνεύσωσι, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἀπόσχωνται with MP), 16,86 (ἀπονάσσωσιν, future-subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἄρηαι with MP), 16,86 (πόρωσιν, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἄρηαι with MP), 16,273 (γνῷ, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the future-subjunctive τιμήσομεν with MP), 16,725 (δώη, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive ἕλης with MP), 22,113 (ἔλθω, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive καταθείομαι with MP), 22,114 (ὑπόσχωμαι, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive καταθείομαι with MP), 22,257 (ἀφέλωμαι, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive δώη with MP), 22,350 (ὑπόσχωνται, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the future-subjunctive στήσωσ᾽ with MP), 22,388 (ὀρώρη, perfect subjunctive without MP, preceded by the present subjunctive μετέω with MP), 24,38(κτερίσαιεν, aorist optative without MP, preceded by the aorist optative κήαιεν with MP), 24,77 (λύση, future-subjunctive without MP, preceded by the

3.6. *The actual analysis: the instances with an MP*

1.   So far we have focused on the absence of the MP and what is striking is that most of these instances belong to Allan's axis of "jussive / deontic". I want to discuss the instances where it is used and below I also treat the instances that do not belong to the deontic/jussive axis. As was stated above, my starting hypothesis is that the MP was used with specific instances close to speaker and hearer, and absent in mythical stories, repeated actions and undefined instances. This explains why of the 25 instances where the MP is used, 22 appear in a speech and the 3 instances in narrative all appear with an indicative in a counterfactual main clause (which is an innovation, as will be shown in the next subchapter).[64] In the larger corpus we have 276 instances with an MP, of which 260 appear in speeches and only 16 in narrative, and 624 instances without an MP, of which 100 in narrative and 524 in a speech. This confirms what we noted for *Iliad* 16, namely that the MP

aorist subjunctive λάχῃ with MP), 24,116 (λύσῃ, future-subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive δείσῃ with MP), 24,151 (ἄγοι, present optative without MP, preceded by the present optative ἰθύνοι with MP), 24,180 (ἄγοι, present optative without MP, preceded by the present optative ἰθύνοι with MP), 24,222 (νοσφιζοίμεθα, present optative present optative without MP, preceded by the present optative φαῖμεν with MP), 24,264 (ἐπιθεῖτε, aorist optative without MP, preceded by the aorist optative ἐφοπλίσσαιτε with MP), 24,665 (δαινῦτο, present optative without MP, preceded by the present optative θάπτοιμεν with MP), 24,667 (πολεμίξομεν, future-subjunctive without MP, preceded by the present optative θάπτοιμεν with MP), 24,688 (γνώωσι, aorist subjunctive without MP, preceded by the aorist subjunctive γνώῃ with MP).

The "violations" are *Iliad* 1,256 (κεχαροίατο, optative aorist with MP, preceded by the optative aorist γηθήσαι with MP), 5,484 (ἄγοιεν, present optative, with MP, preceded by the present optative φέροιεν, with MP), 5,887 (ἔα, imperfect indicative, with MP, preceded by the imperfect indicative ἔπασχον, with MP), 9,359 (μεμήλῃ, perfect subjunctive, with MP, preceded by the present subjunctive ἐθέλῃσθα, with MP), 9,619 (μένωμεν, present subjunctive, with MP, preceded by the present subjunctive νεώμεθ᾽, with MP), 9,702 (μένῃ, with MP, preceded by the present subjunctive ἴῃσιν, with MP), 11,311 (πέσον, aorist injunctive, with MP, preceded by the imperfect indicative ἔην, with MP), 22,43 (ἔλθοι, aorist optative (cf. infra), with MP, preceded by the subjunctive ἔδονται (optative,cf. infra), with MP), 22,246 (δαμή/είη, aorist optative or subjunctive (both are transmitted) with MP, preceded by the present indicative φέρηται, with MP), 22,253 (ἀλοίην, aorist optative, with MP, preceded by the aorist optative ἕλοιμι, with MP), 24,566 (λάθοι, aorist optative, with MP, preceded by the aorist optative τλαίη, with MP), 24,567 (μετοχλίσσειε, aorist optative, with MP, preceded by the aorist optative τλαίη, with MP), 24,566 (γένηται, aorist subjunctive, with MP, preceded by the aorist optative ἐξείποι, with MP), 24,665 (θάπτοιμεν, present optative, with MP, preceded by the present optative γοάοιμεν, with MP), 24, 666 (ποιήσαιμεν, aorist optative with MP, preceded by the present optative γοάοιμεν, with MP).

64. The ones in a speech are *Iliad* 16, 16, 32, 41, 45, 63, 72, 84, 88, 129, 246, 271, 445, 455, 500, 618, 621, 625, 723, 725, 747, 848, 861 and the ones in narrative 639, 687, 698.

is more common in speech than in narrative. It is remarkable that 13 out of the 16 instances of the MP (in the large corpus) in narrative occur in (past) potential or counterfactual contexts,[65] and in 10 of those instances the indicative or injunctive is used.[66] It can therefore not be ruled out that the MP "intruded" first in these contexts and/or it grammaticalised there first. The 3 other instances occur in a simile (against 35 where it was missing). I will now show how most of these instances in *Iliad* 16 indeed have a specific meaning and that the instances without it can be explained by the elements quoted above. Of the 22 instances only the following three could pose some problems: 84, 129 and 246, but they have been discussed above (129 could be exhortative or specific, and 84 and 246 belong to a purpose clause, but could have been a relative clause as well or even a main clause). The 58 instances without MP can be explained by the factors mentioned above,[67] with the following (possible) exceptions, which will be discussed below:

65. The instances are *Iliad* 5,22 (ὑπέκφυγε, aorist injunctive), 5,85 (γνοίης, aorist optative), 5,311 (ἀπόλοιτο, aorist optative), 5,388 (ἀπόλοιτο, aorist optative), 5,679 (κτάνε, aorist injunctive), 11,310 (ἔην, imperfect indicative), 11,311 (πέσον, aorist injunctive), 11,504 (χάζοντο, present injunctive), 16,639 (ἔγνω, aorist indicative), 16,687 (ὑπέκφυγε, aorist injunctive), 16,698 (ἕλον, aorist injunctive), 22,202 (ὑπεξέφυγεν, aorist indicative), 24,714 (ὀδύροντο, present injunctive). The other three instances occur in a simile: 11,269 (ἔχῃ, present subjunctive), 22,192 (εὕρῃ, aorist subjunctive), 24,480 (λάβῃ, aorist subjunctive).

66. The instances are *Iliad* 5,22, 5,679, 11,310, 11,311, 11,504, 16,639, 16,687, 16,698, 22,202, 24,714.

67. The instances are *Iliad* 16,10 (aorist subjunctive in a purpose clause), 19 (perfect subjunctive in a purpose clause), 30 (aorist optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 31 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 41 (future-subjunctive in a conditional clause preceded by an aorist subjunctive with MP), 53 (present subjunctive in a temporal clause with iterative meaning or debated), 54 (perfect subjunctive, debated), 60 (future-subjunctive in a main clause, possibly exhortative), 73 (perfect optative in a conditional clause), 82 (future-subjunctive in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 82 (aorist subjunctive in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 83 (aorist subjunctive, debated), 86 (future-subjunctive in a relative or purpose clause, preceded by an aorist subjunctive with MP), 86 (aorist subjunctive in a relative or purpose clause, preceded by an aorist subjunctive with MP), 90 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 94 (aorist subjunctive in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 98 (aorist optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 99 (aorist optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 100 (present subjunctive in a purpose clause), 128 (aorist subjunctive optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 129 (present subjunctive negative wish / negative purpose clause), 205 (present subjunctive, exhortative in the main clause), 239 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 243 (future-desiderative in a purpose clause), 243 (present subjunctive in a purpose clause), 245 (present subjunctive in a temporal clause, debated and/or unexplained), 247 (aorist optative in a positive wish), 273 (aorist subjunctive in a relative or purpose clause, preceded by an future-subjunctive with MP), 423 (future-subjunctive in a main clause), 423 (aorist subjunctive in a purpose clause), 437 (aorist subjunctive in a deliberative

(EX.03.14) (52) ἀλλὰ τόδ' αἰνὸν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἱκάνει,
(53) ὁππότε δὴ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἀνὴρ ἐθέλησιν ἀμέρσαι
(54) καὶ γέρας ἂψ ἀφελέσθαι, ὅτε κράτεϊ προβεβήκῃ: (*Iliad* 16,52-54).

"But this sharp pain comes to my heart and spirit, namely whenever a man wants to rob his equal and steal his gift, when he exceeds him in power."

In this instance Akhilleus complains about his mistreatment by Agamemnon and states that he regrets that a man robs his equal only because he himself is in a stronger (hierarchical) position. Both ὅτε κράτεϊ προβεβήκῃ and ὅτε κράτεϊ προβεβήκει have been transmitted, but the unaugmented pluperfect form is less likely here in the context of a generic statement referring to the present. As such, we have two subjunctives in this passage, both without MP. At first sight, this seems unexpected, because Akhilleus is speaking about his specific situation and compares his own experience to that of another person mistreated by his superior. In this interpretation, it would be near to the speaker and one would therefore have expected the MP. The generalising subjunctive without MP would then come as a surprise.[68] It is possible to "correct" the problem, by reading the perfect προβέβηκε (which does not violate the metre) or by adding the MP, reading ὁππότε κεν τὸν instead of ὁππότε δὴ τὸν and ὅτ' ἂν κράτεϊ (or even ὅ κε κράτεϊ) instead of ὅτε

question), 437 (future-subjunctive in a deliberative question), 444 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 446 (present subjunctive in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 449 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 456 (future-subjunctive in the main clause or in a relative clause, depending on how one interprets it), 499 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 525 (subjunctive, present or aorist, in a purpose clause), 526 (present subjunctive in a purpose clause), 545 (aorist subjunctive optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 545 (future-subjunctive optative in a negative wish / negative purpose clause), 569 (aorist optative in a conditional clause, which was an original wish clause), 570 (aorist optative in a conditional clause, which was an original wish clause), 571 (aorist optative in a conditional clause, which was an original wish clause, unless this form is the main clause, in which case the absence is unexplained), 618 (aorist indicative in a conditional clause), 623 (aorist optative in a conditional clause), 629 (future-subjunctive in the main clause), 629 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 673 (future-desiderative in a relative clause), 674 (future-subjunctive in the main clause or in a relative clause, depending on how one interprets it, cf. 456), 722 (present optative in a wish), 725 (aorist subjunctive in a conditional clause preceded by an aorist subjunctive with MP), 746 (aorist optative in a conditional clause), 748 (present optative in a conditional clause), 846 (present subjunctive middle of the root $*h_1ed$- in the main clause), 847 (aorist indicative in a conditional clause), 851 (future-desiderative in the main clause), 852 (present subjunctive middle of the root $*g^wieh_3$- in the main clause).

68. That the subjunctive was unfit here was noted by von Christ (1880:234), also quoted in Ameis – Hentze (1881: 42).

κράτεϊ, but in doing so we would be changing the text simply to make it conform to our own rules, and that is not a sound scientific practice. These verses can also be interpreted as a generic statement. The first subjunctive is used with the undefined / generalising relative ὁππότε and not with ὅτε. More important in this discussion is the fact that Akhilleus used generic statements to refer to his own situation before as well. In the discussion about Agamemnon's intention to take Briseis away from Akhilleus, he described Agamemnon's abuse of power as follows:

(EX.03.15) (229) ἦ πολὺ λώϊόν ἐστι κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν
(230) δῶρ' ἀποαιρεῖσθαι ὅς τις σέθεν ἀντίον εἴπῃ (*Iliad* 1,229-230).

"Indeed it is better throughout the broad army of the Akhaians to take away the gifts of anyone who speaks back at you."

In this case, one would expect a modal particle to occur, because Akhilleus is referring to his specific situation, but he describes the situation as in more generic terms, and states that Agamemnon always takes the gifts from people who dare to stand up to him.[69] This is seen in the (iterative) present form ἀποαιρεῖσθαι[70] instead

---

69. Ameis – Hentze (1884: 19), Latacz (2000b: 98).

70. Ameis – Hentze (1884: 19), Kirk (1985: 77). I agree here with Chantraine (1953: 183-197) and with van Emde Boas – Huitink (2010) and García Ramón (2012) that the difference in tenses in subjunctive, imperative, optative and infinitive was aspect-based and not random or metrically motivated, as Fournier (1946: 60-65), Chantraine (1966) and Basset (2000a, 2000b) have argued for. For recent studies in Homeric aspect, see Romagno (2005) and Napoli (2006). It has been noted very early on already that Homeric aspect and that of Attic Greek differ, and that the difference between imperfect and aorist might not have been so rigid in Homer. For this see already von Thiersch (1826: 516-518), Matthiae (1826: 957-958), Buttmann (1854: 391), Krüger (1859: 90-91), Goodwin (1865: 7-8), Kühner (1870: 123-124, 144), Monro (1891: 64-65), Brugmann (1900: 487-489), Wackernagel (1924: 182-184). Kühner – Gerth (1904: 143-144) also noted that the use of the imperfect in Homer differed from that in later Greek and referred to Delbrück (1879: 105-106; 1897: 302-306), who argued that his were remnants from a period when the imperfect was still the only narrative tense. Recently, Hollenbaugh (2018) followed Delbrück and argued that the imperfect in Homer could be used for all the different past meanings whereas the aorist only referred to the recent past (Delbrück [1876: 6]: "durch den Aorist bezeichnet der Redende etwas als eben geschehen"). See also Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 280-282), but they did not go as far as to say that the original past tense form for Homer was the imperfect. I am not certain that Hollenbaugh and his predecessors are right, but the issue needs a more thorough investigation and I cannot perform this here. Hollenbaugh uses the *verba dicendi* as evidence for the fact that aorist and imperfect were not always distinguished, but a closer look at the speech introductions and conclusions in Homer shows that the aorist and imperfect are not interchangeable: in speech conclusions, the aorist is used when the speaker proceeds to something

of the expected aorist, in the use of the generic ὅς τις,[71] and in the subjunctive εἴπῃ without modal particle. As such, Agamemnon's behaviour is not interpreted as an individual *faux pas* but an illustration of his systemic abuse of power. Ruijgh noted that the modal particle was used with the relative ὅς, but much less often with the indefinite relative and generic ὅς τις.[72] This agrees with the specifying value of the modal particle: when a specific person is referred to, the modal particle is used, but not when a generic situation is described.

Just as in *Iliad* 1,229-230, one could argue that Akhilleus used a generic statement here in *Iliad* 16,52-54 as well and the absence of the MP would be in agreement with that.

There is one last element that needs to be discussed in this instance. The codices have ὅτε κράτεϊ προβεβήκῃ and this was printed by Van Thiel, but most editions (La Roche, Monro, and West) adopted ὅ τε κράτεϊ προβεβήκῃ. When reading ὅ τε we would have a pronoun ὅ instead of the more common ὅς and a *τε-épique* which would then explain the more general nature of the example.[73] In my opinion this is not necessary, because one can also explain the sentence by interpreting ὅτε as a temporal conjunction,[74] and it is always better to maintain the transmitted text instead of "improving" it.

The instance 16,83 (related to that of 16,84, where the MP was used) has been discussed above. If it is a purpose clause, the absence is expected, but when it contains an older main clause or relative clause, the absence is irregular.

(EX.03.16) μαίνονθ᾽, ὁππότ᾽ ἐγώ περ ἴω μετὰ μῶλον Ἄρηος. (*Iliad* 16,245).

"(His hands) rage, whenever I go to Ares' turmoil."

---

else (and the action is then completed), whereas the imperfect is used when the speech "receives" or provokes a reaction. See De Decker (2015: 195-211, 2018, forthcoming) for more details. The first to notice this were von Naegelsbach (1834: 249-252) for Homer, Blass (1889) for Attic and Svensson (1930) for all Greek dialects. See also Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 277-278), Chantraine (1953: 192), Hettrich (1976: 59-60 states that "der PSt [Präsensstamm – FDD] bezeichnet a) den Akt des Sagens unter Einschluß des fortwirkenden Zustandes, der durch diesen Akt hervorgerufen wird, bis zur Reaktion des Angesprochenen; b) den Akt des Sagens allein in seiner Erstreckung") for Herodotos, Braswell (1988: 107) and Hummel (1993: 240) for Pindar, and Rijksbaron (2002: 18-19) for Attic Greek. This applies to other verbs, such as πέμπω as well.

71. Kirk (1985: 77), Latacz (2000b: 98).

72. Ruijgh (1971: 448-449), Basset (1989: 204-205). See also De Decker (2015: 219, 319).

73. See already La Roche (1870: 108), Ameis – Hentze (1885: 6), Brügger (2018: 44).

74. For a recent defence of the transmitted text, see Janko (1992: 323).

In this verse, the subjunctive ἴω appears in a temporal clause and at first sight, we would have expected the MP, but the subjunctive refers to a repeated action here,[75] and as such, the absence of the MP is logical. The relative/temporal adverb ὁππότε means "whenever".

There are two instances with the middle subjunctives of the roots *h_1ed- and *$g^wi(e)h_3$- (quoted and discussed above), which both lack the MP, probably because the middle marks a more desiderative meaning (as was the case with the semi-deponent future forms as well).

2. There are 2 instances of a relative clause with an MP (455, 622) and 7 without an MP, of which 6 appear in narrative and one in a speech. The one in the speech is a desiderative form (θήσουσ᾽, 673), of the 6 other forms, 5 belong to a simile (for the absence of the MP in the *similia*, cf. infra),[76] and in the instance below two explanations are possible:

(EX.03.17) πάπτηνεν δὲ ἕκαστος ὅπη <u>φύγοι</u> αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον (*Iliad* 16,283).

"Everyone was looking sharply how he could escape sharp death."

In this instance both the subjunctive φύγῃ and the optative φύγοι are attested in the codices. One can explain the optative as an optative of indirect speech and that this form would have been a deliberative subjunctive in direct speech "how shall I escape". In that case the absence of the MP would be expected. One can also argue that the MP is missing, because the relative clause describes a potential optative in a repeated action: each Trojan is looking to escape death. We are thus not dealing with a single action, but with a repeated action and an undefined subject ἕκαστος. These two explanations (the deliberative and the iterative one) do not exclude each other.

As 3 cases in a speech (2 with MP, 1 without it) are not enough to allow for a solid judgement, I will analyse the large corpus. There are 45 instances of a relative clause in a speech with an MP and 35 without an MP, and in narrative there are 19 instances without MP and none with an MP. I will now focus on the instances where the MP is missing in a speech. The rules described above, apply to the relative clauses as well (for generic and gnomic statements, and the *similia*, see later):

---

75. For this interpretation, see Ameis – Hentze (1885: 19) and Brügger (2018: 117).

76. The instances are *Iliad* 16,260 (ἐριδμαίνωσιν, present subjunctive), 387 (κρίνωσι, subjunctive, but it could be an aorist or a present), 388 (subjunctive aorist ἐλάσωσι), 429 (μάχωνται, present subjunctive), 590 (ἀφέῃ, aorist subjunctive).

the MP is therefore absent, when a future-desiderative or future-subjunctive is used,[77] when the verb is preceded by another verb with an MP,[78] and when repeated actions are described.[79] When the relative clause is dependent on a main clause with an optative expressing a wish or potentiality, it often takes the optative without an MP and seems to have the meaning of a subordinate conditional clause (as we will see below, conditional clauses with the optative take the MP much less than those with the subjunctive). Alternatively, one could argue that in those cases *attractio modalis* occurred, but given the fact that the optative in those instances can be explained as an optative of wish or potentiality, that assumption is not necessary.[80] The examples are:

(EX.03.18) οὔ κεν ἀλήϊος εἴη ἀνὴρ ᾧ τόσσα γένοιτο (*Iliad* 9,125 = 9,267).

"Not without possessions would the man be, to whom so many (possessions won by the horses) came."

γένοιτο is dependent on the potential optative εἴη and the relative clause could be translated as a conditional clause "if so many (possessions) came to him."[81]

In the following instances, the optative clearly has the nuance of a wish:

(EX.03.19) ὡς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὃς σῆς γε κύνας κεφαλῆς ἀπαλάλκοι (*Iliad* 22,348).

"So there will not be anyone who may/will/can ward off the dogs from your head."

---

77. The instances are *Iliad* 1,164 (future-subjunctive), 1,211 (future-desiderative), 9,25 (future-subjunctive), 9,302 (future-subjunctive), 16,673 (future-desiderative), 22,61 (future-subjunctive), 22,341 (future-desiderative), 24,154 (future-desiderative), 24,181 (future-desiderative), 24,731 (future-subjunctive).

78. This is the case in *Iliad* 9,510, 11,194, 11,194, 11,209, 11,209, 11,668, 24,38, 24,151, 24,180.

79. The instances are *Iliad* 1,543, 1,554.

80. For this use of the optative, see Monro (1891: 282-283, 296) and Chantraine (1953: 222-224, 248, 299). Willmott (2007) did not discuss the issue of the *attractio modalis* in detail, but assumed that the optatives in contexts where this attraction could have occurred, had maintained their "optative" meaning (e.g. on page 165, where she discussed such instances in the purpose clauses), a statement I agree with.

81. Chantraine (1953: 248).

Akhilleus threatens Hektor that there will be no mortal who can save his body from being defiled. The optative contains a notion of a wish "may there be no-one …". Alternatively, one could try to change γε into κε, but that does not solve the underlying problem and would violate Wackernagel's Law, as κε would have to follow ὅς and not σῆς. Chantraine seemed to imply that the optative should be corrected into a subjunctive,[82] but that would not solve the problem of the absence of the MP. The same nuance of wish is expressed in the following verse:

(EX.03.20) (212) ἀνδρὶ πάρα κρατερῷ, τοῦ ἐγὼ μέσον ἧπαρ <u>ἔχοιμι</u>
(213) ἐσθέμεναι προσφῦσα: τότ᾽ ἄντιτα ἔργα γένοιτο (*Iliad* 24,212-213).

"Near a very strong man, whose liver I wish I could grasp the middle of and eat it. That would be vengeance (for my child)."

In these lines, Hekabe states that she wishes she could eat Akhilleus' liver: ἔχοιμι appears in a relative clause with the nuance of a wish.

In the following instance, the nuance is that of a wish and/or an exhortation:

(EX.03.21) τῇδ᾽ εἴη: ὃς ἄποινα <u>φέροι</u> καὶ νεκρὸν ἄγοιτο (*Iliad* 24,139).

"So may it be, let he who brings the ransom, also carry home the body."

The optative φέροι is dependent on the exhortation or wish in ἄγοιτο, but one could argue that the nuances of ἄγοιτο are present in φέροι as well. In this instance, one codex has the indicative φέρει, which cannot be excluded either.

3.   In *Iliad* 16, there are 2 temporal clauses with an MP and 3 without one in the speeches and in the large corpus there are 14 instances of a temporal clause in a speech without an MP against 30 instances with MP; in narrative there are 2 instances with an MP and 19 without. The same distinctions as noted for the relative clauses apply to the temporal ones as well: the MP is missing, when the verb form is preceded by another verb with an MP,[83] when a repeated action is described,[84] or

---

82. Chantraine (1953: 248).
83. This is the case in *Iliad* 9,501, 9,703, 22,388.
84. This is the case in *Iliad* 9,489 (depending on an iterative form with -σκ-), 16,245 (cf. supra), 22,502 (depending on an iterative form with -σκ-), 22,502 (depending on an iterative form with -σκ-), 24,417.

when an undefined character is the subject.[85] Besides the gnomic and/or generic instances and the *similia* (which will be discussed below), there is only one exception:

(EX.03.22) (780) πέμπων μ᾽ ὧδ᾽ ἐπέτελλε μελαινάων ἀπὸ νηῶν
(781) μὴ πρὶν πημανέειν πρὶν δωδεκάτη <u>μόλη</u> ἠώς. (*Iliad* 24,780-781).

"(Akhilleus) sent me and confirmed that there will be no sorrow from the black ships, before the tenth dawn has come."

In these verses Priam informs the Trojans that Akhilleus has guaranteed them that there will be no warfare for nine days. When the tenth day comes, the Greeks will resume fighting. The subjunctive μόλη is not undefined and refers to something that is close to both hearer and speaker, and yet the MP is missing. This absence is unexplained.

4. Normally, the MP would be missing in a generic statement and would be used in specific instances, but in case of the general truths, this distinction is problematic, because a description of a general truth (often called *gnome*) could be interpreted as a generic statement, but also as a specific instance when it is used as illustration for one's argument. This problem occurs in both temporal and relative clauses, both in narrative and in the speeches as well. As was argued above, Akhilleus sometimes uses generic descriptions when he is speaking about his own situation (*Iliad* 1,230 and 16,53-54, discussed above, which are not gnomes), but not always, as can be seen in the lines below:

(EX.03.23) ὅς κε θεοῖς <u>ἐπιπείθηται</u> μάλα τ᾽ ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ (*Iliad* 1,217).

"He who obeys the gods, to him they (the gods) do indeed listen (when he prays)."

In these lines, he agrees with Athene's suggestion to not kill Agamemnon and states that the man who obeys the gods, will have his prayers fulfilled. This could very well be a generic statement.

(EX.03.24) (529) ᾧ μέν κ᾽ ἀμμίξας <u>δώη</u> Ζεὺς τερπικέραυνος,
(530) ἄλλοτε μέν τε κακῷ ὅ γε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ᾽ ἐσθλῷ·
(531) ᾧ δέ κε τῶν λυγρῶν <u>δώη</u>, λωβητὸν ἔθηκε,
(532) καί ἑ κακὴ βούβρωστις ἐπὶ χθόνα δῖαν ἐλαύνει,
(533) φοιτᾷ δ᾽ οὔτε θεοῖσι τετιμένος οὔτε βροτοῖσιν (*Iliad* 24,529-533).

---

85. *Iliad* 24,369.

"To whom Zeus, who enjoys the thunder, gives after mingling (in the jars), he makes him meet evil on one occasion and prosperity on another. The person to whom he gives from the painful jar, him Zeus makes hated and pitiful misery sends him over the shining earth, and he wanders around, not being honoured by gods or humans."

In these verses Akhilleus tells Priam that the gods know no suffering, but that mortals have to endure what the gods send them. Zeus has two jars, one with happiness and one with misery and he takes and sends what he wants; if he wants to honour a human being, he does so, but if he decides to put misery on someone, the mortal man can only endure it, even if it means living in infamy. The two subjunctives δώῃ have gnomic meaning and describe general truths, and are thus very close to the world of both Akhilleus and Priam. Both verbs are thus constructed with an MP (the same explanation is valid for the augment in ἔθηκε). One could, however, also argue that they are generic and that they should have been constructed with τε-*épique* and there does not seem to be much difference with the generic examples, unless one assumes that he deliberately wanted to stress that Agamemnon constantly overstepped his boundaries, while Priam is not to blame for the misery that strikes him so hard.

In the large corpus, there are 7 instances of a gnomic statement without MP and 7 with it.[86] At first sight, such a distribution does not allow to make a judgement, but upon closer inspection, most instances can be explained by the factors above: either because they are preceded by another gnomic form with an MP,[87] or because they are a future-subjunctive form.[88] This is best illustrated by the following passage:

(EX.03.25) (508) ὃς μέν τ᾽ <u>αἰδέσεται</u> κούρας Διὸς ἆσσον ἰούσας,
(509) τὸν δὲ μέγ᾽ ὤνησαν καί τ᾽ ἔκλυον εὐχομένοιο·
(510) ὃς δέ κ᾽ <u>ἀνήνηται</u> καί τε στερεῶς <u>ἀποείπῃ</u>,
(511) λίσσονται δ᾽ ἄρα ταί γε Δία Κρονίωνα κιοῦσαι
(512) τῷ ἄτην ἅμ᾽ ἕπεσθαι, ἵνα βλαφθεὶς ἀποτίσῃ. (*Iliad* 9,508-512).

---

86. The instances with MP are *Iliad* 1,217, 9,407 (a future-subjunctive!), 9,501, 9,510, 11,409, 24,529, 24,531; the ones without are *Iliad* 1,80, 1,81 (in a conditional clause), 9,117, 9,313, 9,501, 9,509, 9,510.

87. The instances are *Iliad* 9,501, 9,510.

88. The instances are *Iliad* 1,80 (temporal clause), 1,81 (conditional clause), 9,117 (relative clause), 9,508 (relative clause).

"Who shows respect to the daughters of Zeus when they come nearer, him they favour greatly and hear his prayers; who spurns them and harshly refuses them, for him they go to Zeus and plead that (fatal) blindness follows him, so that he be hurt and pay the price."

In these verses, Phoinix tries to warn Akhilleus that one should not challenge the Fate Goddesses nor refuse their gifts when one receives them, because refusing respect to the gods will eventually hurt every mortal man. At first, the use of the MP could seem random, but αἰδέσεται is a future-subjunctive and has therefore no MP, while ἀνήνηται is an aorist subjunctive and has an MP, and ἀποείπῃ, also an aorist subjunctive, has no MP, because it is preceded by another verb form with an MP.

There is one instance in which the presence cannot be explained:

(EX.03.26) (406) ληϊστοὶ μὲν γάρ τε βόες καὶ ἴφια μῆλα,
(407) κτητοὶ δὲ τρίποδές τε καὶ ἵππων ξανθὰ κάρηνα,
(408) ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν οὔτε λεϊστὴ
(409) οὔθ' ἑλετή, ἐπεὶ ἄρ κεν <u>ἀμείψεται</u> ἕρκος ὀδόντων. (*Iliad* 9,406-409).

"Cattle and rich sheep can be taken away as booty, tripods and the fair heads of horses can be acquired, but the soul of a man cannot be acquired or be taken to (make it) come back, once it has left the fence of the teeth."

In these lines, Akhilleus responds to the Greek embassy and states that booty and goods can be won anywhere, but once one's life has gone, it will not return. In this instance, the MP is used in a gnome with a future-subjunctive (ἀμείψεται) against the rules described above.

There is one instance, in which the absence cannot entirely be accounted for:

(EX.03.27) (312) ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν
(313) ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν <u>κεύθῃ</u> ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ <u>εἴπῃ</u> (*Iliad* 9,312-313).

"Equally hated to me as the gates of Hades is he who hides one thing in his heart, but says another."

In these verses, Akhilleus scathingly rebukes Odysseus for being not truthful and accuses him of having the possibility to think one thing and say another. There is no agreement as to whether this passage is generic or specific. Chantraine argued that the meaning was generic, because Akhilleus expressed his disapproval by a

maxim but also specific at the same time, because it involved a specific instance,[89] while Ruijgh argued that the presence of μοι made the statement clearly personal and individual and that this explained the use of the MP.[90] The presence of the MP is not entirely metrically secure, because one could argue that the particle had been inserted after the *h* of ἕτερον ceased to operate as a genuine consonant and that the MP was nothing more than a *Hiatustilger*.[91] One could therefore remove the MP, but that would be a case of solving difficulties by discarding them. Given the presence of the pronoun μοι, I would tend to agree with Ruijgh's explanation, and if the MP were present with κεύθῃ, the absence with εἴπῃ would be explained by the fact that εἴπῃ is preceded by another verb with an MP but as the MP is not secured by the metre, we cannot be certain. In general, we could therefore state that the use of the MP in the gnomes is in agreement with what has been noted before.

5.   More problematic is the fact that the MP is very often missing in the *similia*, both in the relative as in the temporal clauses. In the large corpus, there are 35 optatives and subjunctives without MP and only 4 with it,[92] and in *Iliad* 16 there are 11 subjunctives in a simile and none of them has an MP. The absence is not easily explained, especially since *similia* compare the story to scenes of everyday life and are thus close to the world of the speaker, hearer and narrator, and do not belong to the remote past nor future (reason why the augment is so common in these passages). In many debated instances, one could, with Monro, change the text (cf. supra), but that does not solve the problem and there are also (a few) instances of *similia* in the speeches. We note, however, that the *similia* occur mostly in narrative (where the MP tends to be absent much more often) and that the poets use *τε-épique* and not the MP, because they describe what Ruijgh called *un fait permanent*.[93]

---

89. Chantraine (1953: 247).

90. Ruijgh (1971: 286-287).

91. Surprisingly enough, this was not noted by Ruijgh (1971: 286-287), in spite of the fact that he was one of the first scholars to note that Homer sometimes preserved the *h* as a full consonant as was the case in Mycenaean.

92. The instances without MP are *Iliad* 5,6, 5,91, 5,138, 5,138, 5,161, 5,501, 5,524, 5,598, 9,323, 9,481 (in a speech), 9,592 (in a speech), 11,68, 11,116, 11,293, 11,415, 11,477, 11, 478, 11,559, 16,212, 16,260, 16,264, 16,298, 16,365, 16,386, 16,387, 16,388, 16,429, 16,590, 16,642, 22,23, 22,93, 22,163, 22,189, 22,191, 24,43; those with it are *Iliad* 9,324 (in a speech), 11,269, 22,192, 24,480.

93. Ruijgh (1969, 1971 *passim*).

6.   In addition to the problems mentioned above, often it is not straightfor-ward to decide whether one is dealing with a relative, temporal or purpose clause, or a relative clause with a final nuance.[94] One example makes this clear:

(EX.03.28) (575) οἳ δ᾽ ἅμ᾽ Ἀχιλλῆϊ ῥηξήνορι πέμπον ἕπεσθαι
(576) Ἴλιον εἰς εὔπωλον, ἵνα Τρώεσσι <u>μάχοιτο</u> (*Iliad* 16,575-576).

"They sent him to follow Akhilleus, the breaker of men, towards Troy, rich in horses, where he would/was going to fight the Trojans."

In these verses one can interpret ἵνα μάχοιτο as "where he was going to fight", "where he was going (with the intention) to fight", "where he would fight" or "to fight with". Instances such as these (or with ὄφρα) seem to confirm that many sub-ordinate clauses could be explained as original relative clauses. Initially, it was assumed that PIE did not have subordinate clauses,[95] but it now seems accepted that it had at least relative clauses,[96] and that from those, the other ones (such as purpose and temporal clauses) were created.[97]

7.   The last issue is the use of the MP in conditional clauses. There are 7 in-stances with an MP (all in a speech) and 14 without one in *Iliad* 16 (of which 3 occur in narrative) and in the large corpus, there are 65 with it and 67 without it and in speeches there are 65 with it and 55 without, and in narrative there are no instances with MP and 12 without MP. At first sight there seems to be no real dis-tinction, but when we look at the data per mood, as shown in the table below, a difference becomes clear (the figures between brackets indicate the numbers in narrative):

94. See already Weber (1884) for a discussion of the purpose clauses.
95. Windisch (1869), Hermann (1895).
96. This was first noted by Delbrück (1900: 295-417). See the discussion of the scholarship on co- and sub-ordination in PIE in Hettrich (1988: 1-35), Viti (2007, 2008, 2013, 2015) and Probert (2015: 6-20). Many scholars now believe that PIE had subordinate clauses, see e.g. Lehmann (1980, although in 1974: §4.9 he seemed to argue otherwise), Lühr (2008: 122), but also see the works by Viti on this issue (2007, 2008, 2012, 2015). For different viewpoints on historical syntax, see the contributions in Ramat (1980). More recently, Fykias – Katsikadeli (2013) provided a survey and discussion of Hermann (1895), and an analysis of the Greek evidence from indirect speech.
97. Delbrück (1900: 295-345), Leumann (1940), Jeffers – Pepicello (1978), Hettrich (1987), Lühr (2000, 2012), but they did not agree on the details. See also Kiparsky (1995: 151) and Keydana (2018: 2213-2214).

	MP	No MP
Subjunctive	47	11 (3)
Optative	9	26 (3)
Indicative (past)	0	5 (6)
Future-desiderative	0	5 (0)
Future-subjunctive	9	6
Root *h_3ek^w-	0	2 (0)
Totals	65	55 (12)

The optative prefers not to "have" an MP in conditional clauses, contrary to the subjunctive. At first sight there seems to be no real explanation for this fact, but when we look at the origins of the conditional clauses in Greek, we can solve this problem. Many conditional clauses, final and indirect questions introduced by εἰ were in origin independent wish clauses (this will be discussed in the subchapter on counterfactual and unreal clauses),[98] and this explains why they often have no MP. In many cases with the optative, they can still be interpreted as an old wish. The instances with the subjunctive seem more conditional-like and thus more prone to adhere to the rules of specific/non-specific. In *Iliad* 16 there are 11 conditional clauses in a speech without an MP and of those, 7 are in the optative and they can all be considered old (un)fulfillable wishes, "if only",[99] and 2 in the indicative with unreal/counterfactual meaning (which is an innovation);[100] the 2 instances of the subjunctive are preceded by another subjunctive with an MP.[101] Of the 11 subjunctive forms without MP in a speech in the large corpus, 7 are preceded by another form with an MP,[102] 1 is used in a generic context,[103] 1 is preceded by ποτέ "whenever" and is thus more undefined and less specific,[104] and in 2 instances the absence of the MP seems problematic, because they refer to a specific context, near to speaker and hearer. These two problematic instances are

98. Lange (1872, 1873). See also Monro (1891: 290-294), Chantraine (1953: 274-276), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 557, 682-684). Tabachovitz (1951), followed by Hettrich (1992: 265-266) argued that the conditional clauses had always been subordinated and were never independent paratactic wish clauses.

99. The instances are *Iliad* 16,73, 559, 560, 561 (if it is not the main clause), 623, 746, 748.

100. The instances are *Iliad* 16,618, 847.

101. The instances are *Iliad* 16,42, 725.

102. The instances are *Iliad* 11,800, 16,42, 16,725, 22,113, 22,114, 22,257, 22,350.

103. *Iliad* 1,81.

104. *Iliad* 1,341.

(EX.03.29) (257) τούτω δ' οὐ πάλιν αὖτις ἀποίσετον ὠκέες ἵπποι
(258) ἄμφω ἀφ' ἡμείων, εἴ γ' οὖν ἕτερός γε <u>φύγῃσιν</u>. (*Iliad* 5,257-258).

"The two fast horses will not carry away these two from us, even if one or the other might escape."

These verses belong to Diomedes's angry exhortation to Sthenelos: after convincing him that they should face Aineias and Pandaros, he explains that maybe one of the enemies might successfully escape, but certainly not both of them. In this instance the ancient scholar Didymos stated that he had heard that there was also a reading κ᾽οὖν. If that were indeed the correct reading, the problem of the absence would be solved. In these verses one could argue that ἕτερός γε is somewhat undefined and that could explain the absence of the MP.

(EX.03.30) (86) σχέτλιος: εἴ περ γάρ σε <u>κατακτάνῃ</u>, οὔ σ' ἔτ' ἔγωγε
(87) κλαύσομαι ἐν λεχέεσσι φίλον θάλος, ὃν τέκον αὐτή (*Iliad* 22,86-87).

"Hard one, if indeed he kills you, not even I will weep for you on the dead bed, my beloved offspring, whom I bore myself."

After seeing the raging Akhilleus Hektor's parents urge him not to face him and to remain inside. In these verses Hekabe shows her breasts to Hektor and implores him not to go to battle, because if Akhilleus kills him, they will not even be able to mourn him anymore. The verses clearly refer to something specific in the near future and something near to the *actualité du locuteur*, and yet the MP is missing.

Now that I have addressed all problematic instances of the speeches, I will focus on some problematic general issues.

8.   Besides being absent in the negative purpose clauses / negative wishes, the MP is also often missing in clauses with a negative element. In *Iliad* 16 there are 2 instances with MP and 3 without it in a negative sentence, but in the large corpus there are 26 instances in which an MP appears in a negative sentence and 69 in which an MP is missing. Of these 69, 28 have a desiderative form (and they would not have had the MP anyway) and 29 have a future-subjunctive form (which is also rarely used with an MP), so that only 11 instances without an MP remain. Of the 26 instances with an MP, 22 occur in a speech. What is remarkable, is that 21 of them have a clear link with a (remote) possibility or even with the irrealis (as we will see later on, these two notions are not so clearly distinguishable in epic Greek): 9 occur in the combination οὔ κεν or οὐκ ἄν with a (potential or counter-

factual, cf. infra) optative and 7 with the same optative (but with οὐδέ κεν or another variant), and 4 with a counterfactual indicative against 1 with οὐκ ἄν with a subjunctive, 4 with a subjunctive in another context, and one instance, we have a future-subjunctive (*Iliad* 9,60 where ἀτιμήσει and ἀτιμήσῃ are both transmitted, but where most editions adopted Barnes' correction ἀτιμήσει',[105] i.e. an optative with elision before the caesura). The reason for this is that the negation removes the link with the speaker and hearer. A negative fact is something that by definition cannot have been close to the speaker or hearer, and therefore, the MP is more often absent in those contexts. As such, the connection between negation and absence of the MP seems clear, but some questions remain: do the future-subjunctives lack the MP because they are negated or because they have the notion of desiderative in them or both, do the negative wishes lack the MP because they are negated or because they have the notion of wish in them or both, and why is the MP so common in negated remotely possible and/or counterfactual contexts?

3.7. *Conclusion*

In this subchapter I addressed the use of the MP in Homeric Greek, analysing the aforementioned large corpus and providing a more detailed investigation of *Iliad* 16. My analyses showed that the MP was mostly used in speeches and only rarely in narrative. It is incompatible with the deontic and jussive axis as described in Allan 2013: this is the reason why it is missing in negative purpose/wish clauses, in positive wishes and purpose clauses, in deliberative (indirect) questions and with future-desiderative and future-subjunctive forms. It is used when a specific instance in the near future and close to the speaker and hearer is related (in Basset's words, close to the *actualité du locuteur*). This explains why almost all instances can be found in speeches and not in narrative, and why it is not used in negative contexts, in descriptions of repeated actions (both in the optative and the subjunctive) and in generic and generalising statements (where the poet preferred the so-called τε-*épique*). The only mood where the MP could add modal meaning is the indicative in the so-called past potential and counterfactual constructions, but as will be discussed in the next subchapter, this use is not universal in Homer and is also an inner-Greek innovation. The MP thus does not add modal meaning to the different moods, contrary to *man* in Hittite. As such, the use of an MP to convey modal meaning cannot be considered a morpho-syntactic isogloss between Greek

105. Barnes (1711: 320).

and Anatolian. I will now show that there are also differences between Greek and Anatolian in the remotely possible and counterfactual constructions.

4. *The counterfactual ("irrealis") constructions in epic and later Greek*

In this subchapter I discuss the Greek counterfactual constructions, focusing on the differences between epic and later Greek, using mostly examples from the large corpus of 5267 verses. By analysing the Homeric data I will show that the use of the past indicative with an MP to mark the counterfactual is an inner-Greek innovation and cannot be equated with the Hittite use of *man* and the past indicative, and that the original Greek construction was that of the optative in both main and conditional clause. The transition from optative into indicative had already started in Homer, but had not been completed yet and even in Attic Greek, there are still relics of the older optative construction. I first briefly discuss the terms (past) potential(is), irrealis and counterfactual, show that the boundaries between these terms are not always clear in Homer, then I describe the Homeric data based on the larger corpus, discuss previous scholarship on the use of indicative and optative in the counterfactual constructions and finally analyse the instances from *Iliad* 16 and occasionally also from the larger corpus. I argue that one cannot adequately distinguish between present potential and potential of the past, and counterfactual of the present and past, that the differences between these constructions are more based on the aspect than on the past/presence reference (and I will show this for all instances quoted) and that the optative was the oldest construction for all types of (remote) possibility ranging from possible to unreal.

4.1. *Terminology and examples from Homer*

In Classical Philology and non-Anglophone Indo-European scholarship the term irrealis is mostly used to refer to what in general linguistics is called "counterfactual" (German *Irrealis*, French *irréel*), while *irrealis* in general linguistics refers to everything that is not realis (often including the future).[106]

With the exception of Anatolian, many old Indo-European languages have counterfactual/remote possibility-constructions that contain the Indo-European

---

106. The term *irrealis* itself is debated among linguists as well, for an overview with (some) references, see De Decker (2015: 205-206), but the list is not exhaustive, since the literature on the concept *irrealis* is very large.

optative or forms that continue old optative forms,[107] such as Germanic (originally the perfect optative),[108] Tocharian,[109] Indo-Iranian (originally the perfect optative),[110] Celtic,[111] and Italic (even in Old Latin).[112] Starting from earlier scholars who noted that all these languages use different constructions, Hettrich concluded that the PIE verbal system used the optative for both present and past potential without distinguishing between past potential and present counterfactual and without having a past counterfactual.[113] He suggested the term *fiktiv*, which referred to something unreal but did not indicate the degree of "un-reality".[114] Although I cannot provide here a detailed discussion of the exact meanings of the Greek moods, I still think that the traditional description of a continuum with the indicative being

---

107. For an overview of the scholarship, see the references in Hettrich (1998) and also De Decker (2015: 222-223).

108. Delbrück (1897: 405-409; 1904: 201, 262-264), Slotty (1915: 86-87), Krisch (1986: 10), Euler (1994), Dahl (1997: 104-107).

109. This was observed by Thomas (1952: 43-46; 1970: 466-469), Krause – Thomas (1960: 192) and by Pinault (1997: 475-477), who pointed out that the present counterfactual was expressed by remnants of the optative and the past counterfactual by the gerund and the optative of copula "be".

110. Renou (1952: 372), Hoffmann (1967: 47), Brunel (1980: 258-259), Krisch (1986: 11-12), Hettrich (1988: 365; 1992: 270-274; 1996: 133; 1998: 264), Euler (1994: 35-38), Lazard (1998: 240), Kümmel (2000: 89-90), Tichy (2002: 194), Knobl (2007: 110), Dahl (2010: 393 for the potential of the past, and 2010: 399-401 for counterfactuals), Mumm (2011: §2.3), Rieken (2012: 411-417). For Avestan, see Jolly (1871: 34), Reichelt (1909: 323-324), Lazard (1975; 1998: 240, limiting it to the past counterfactual), Kellens (1984: 423, limiting it to the past counterfactual), Rieken (2012: 415). For Old Persian see also Kellens (1985: 121). Jamison (2009: 39-40) was very skeptical about the Indo-Iranian evidence.

111. Krisch (1986: 11), Hettrich (1998: 264); Rieken (2012) is the most thorough investigation of conditionals in Old Irish.

112. Draeger (1874: 280-284; 1878: 692-704), Delbrück (1897: 401), Nutting (1901), Bennett (1910: 190-207), Brunel (1980: 259), Harris (1986: 265-269), Hettrich (1992), Meiser (1993: 183).

113. Delbrück (1871: 28-29; 1897: 371, 401), Brugmann (1916: 861-863; 1925: 215), Greenberg (1986: 248), Hettrich (1988: 365; 1992; 1998), Strunk (1997: 148), Tichy (2002: 194; 2009: 98), Mumm (2011: §2.3).

114. Hettrich (1988: 365), adopted by Tichy (2002: 194) and Mumm (2011: §2.3). Cristofaro applied the term *irrealis* to the Greek (for both Homeric and Classical Greek) optative (2012: 132-133 and 142-143), but did not distinguish between present potential, past potential and *optativus obliquus*. Already Delbrück (1871: 28-29) had shown that the optative could be used for all nuances of (un)likelihood. The term *modus fictivus* had been used already in Lattmann (1903). I refer to the editors' note before Harris 1986: "however, <u>the boundary between potential and unreal conditionals is less clear-cut than between real and either of them</u>, and the time parameter is less clear-cut in potential and unreal conditions than in real conditions" (underlining is mine).

the most "realistic" and the optative the least certain explains the data the best.[115] In that continuum, the optative expressed a wish and a possibility in all nuances (likely, possible, unlikely).[116] Below I will illustrate with examples that the distinction between potential of the present and past and the present and past counterfactual is not so straightforward as one would think. I will therefore consider the optative the mood of (remote) possibility and wish.[117]

> (EX.04.01) (255) ἦ κεν <u>γηθήσαι</u> Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
> (256) ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν <u>κεχαροίατο</u> θυμῷ
> (257) εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα <u>πυθοίατο</u> μαρναμένοιϊν (*Iliad* 1,255-257).

"Now Priam would feel happiness and his sons and the other Trojans would greatly rejoice in their heart, if they heard all this about the both of you fighting each other."

In this instance, Nestor laments that the current rift between Agamemnon and Akhilleus would create great joy among the Trojans, if they knew about it. As it is unclear how (un)likely Nestor considered this to be,[118] the optatives could have potential or contrafactual meaning. Moreover, all verbs are in the aorist, but they do not refer to the past alone. In these verses I believe that the choice for the aorist

---

115. This is sometimes referred to as "Greenberg's irrealis continuum" (based on Greenberg 1986: 247-248 – such a continuum had been suggested before already, see e.g. Aken [1865: 21] or Seiler [1971]), but in these continua, however, the modal indicative is at the outmost extreme and as will be shown, this is an innovation. Greenberg discussed Classical Greek and did not treat Homeric nor non-Attic Greek. For the optative being *irrealis* see Cristofaro (2012: 132-133, 142-143). For a continuum in Homeric Greek with the optative as the most unlikely, see Vogrinz (1889: 267-274). Willmott (2007) explained the optative as *negative epistemic stance*, but maybe *uncertain epistemic stance* would have been more accurate. In spite of what she argued herself, there is not so much difference between her analysis of the optative and that of the more traditional or earlier scholars, such as Delbrück, Kühner – Gerth, Schwyzer – Debrunner or Chantraine.

116. As had already been noted by Delbrück (1871: 28-29; 1897: 371). For Homer, see also Gerth (1878), van Pottelbergh (1939: 8), Chantraine (1953: 218), Brunel (1980: 240), Strunk (1997: 148), and Willmott (2008). Surprisingly enough, Monro (1891: 275) claimed that there was no difference between the Homeric optative in the main clause and that of later Greek (this had been argued for by Wilhelmi 1881 as well).

117. I refer for more details to De Decker (2015: 205-210 and 221-240).

118. See also Wilhelmi (1881: 11) for the uncertainty: *incertum est, num discordiam Troiani comperiant.*

stem was based on the aspect (the single notion of hearing and starting to rejoice) and not on the notion of present or past potential or counterfactual.

(EX.04.02) (444) ὡς ἂν ἔπειτ᾽ ἀπὸ σεῖο φίλον τέκος οὐκ ἐθέλοιμι
(445) λείπεσθ᾽, οὐδ᾽ εἴ κέν μοι ὑποσταίη θεὸς αὐτὸς
(446) γῆρας ἀποξύσας θήσειν νέον ἡβώοντα, (*Iliad* 9,444-446).

"So I would not want to be separated from you, my beloved child, not even if a god himself came and stood next to me, scraping away old age to make me a fresh young man again."

In this instance Phoinix states that he would not want to be left alone by Akhilleus, not even if a god promised him to make him young again. The notion expressed by ὑποσταίη, the divine intervention, is clearly only remotely possible (if possible at all), while the statement expressed in ἐθέλοιμι is clearly much more likely. As such, we have a construction in which the same mood is used twice with distinctively different meanings. The difference in tense is based on aspect: ὑποσταίη refers to a single divine intervention and is put in the aorist (reason why the participle ἀποξύσας is in the aorist as well), while ἐθέλοιμι is in the present, because it describes the continuous preference of Phoinix not to be separated from Akhilleus.

(EX.04.03) (565) οὐ γάρ κε τλαίη βροτὸς ἐλθέμεν, οὐδὲ μάλ᾽ ἡβῶν,
(566) ἐς στρατόν: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν φυλάκους λάθοι, οὐδέ κ᾽ ὀχῆας
(567) ῥεῖα μετοχλίσσειε θυράων ἡμετεράων. (*Iliad* 24,565-567).

"No mortal man would have dared to come here to the army, not even if he was young and strong. Nor would he have escaped the guards, nor would he easily have removed the bolts of our doors."

In this instance, Akhilleus expresses his surprise that Priam had been able to enter the Greek camp and his own tent without being noticed and assumed that a god had helped him. The optatives could be potential or unreal, but they clearly refer to the past. The use of the aorist is not because of the past reference, but because of the aspectual value: the opening of the doors, the entering of the camp and the misleading of the guards happened only once.

(EX.04.04) ἦ γὰρ ἂν Ἀτρείδη νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο. (*Iliad* 1,232).

"Indeed, son of Atreus, you would then have committed your last outrage."

In this instance Akhilleus attacks Agamemnon for his arrogance and threatens him that it could have been the last time that he acted so arrogantly. As Akhilleus did not actually kill Agamemnon, his statement "you would have committed your last outrage" is known to be false, and is yet considered a past potential, although there is no reason why one could not state that this is a counterfactual. The use of the aorist here is again only aspectual and has no temporal notion (one can commit his last outrage only once).

(EX.04.05) Τυδεΐδην δ᾽ οὐκ ἂν <u>γνοίης</u> ποτέροισι μετείη
ἠὲ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὁμιλέοι ἦ μετ᾽ Ἀχαιοῖς. (*Iliad* 5,85-86).

"You would not be able to know / You would not have known to whom of both sides the son of Tydeus belonged, whether he was fighting on the side of the Trojans or with the Greeks."

In this instance the potential optative γνοίης could refer to the past "you would not have known", but could also be interpreted as a present potential "you would not be able to know". The tense use is aspectual and does not indicate temporal reference. A sentence such as "you could have seen the son of Tydeus fighting" implies "if you had been present, you could have seen him fighting", but in most cases the addressee was not there. Some argue that a counterfactual is a past poten-tial that had been proved to be non-realised:[119] a sentence as "you could have no-ticed" is considered past potential, while "you could have noticed it, if you had been there" is counterfactual, because you were not there, but that distinction is very thin.

(EX.04.06) (388) κούρην δ᾽ οὐ γαμέω Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο
(389) οὐδ᾽ εἰ χρυσείη Ἀφροδίτη κάλλος <u>ἐρίζοι</u>,
(390) ἔργα δ᾽ Ἀθηναίη γλαυκώπιδι <u>ἰσοφαρίζοι</u>: (*Iliad* 9,388-390).

"I will not marry the daughter of Agamemnon, son of Atreus, not even if she competed in beauty with golden Aphrodite and equalled Athene in (house-hold) works."

In this instance Akhilleus refuses the gifts presented to him by the Greek em-bassy and emphatically states that he will not marry Agamemnon's daughter, not

---

119. Athanasiadou – Dirven (1997: 74), Verstraete (2005: 230-243).

even if she equals Aphrodite in beauty and Athene in household capabilities. The question is whether Akhilleus considers this to be a (real) possibility or simply suggests this as a mere hypothesis or even as an unreal event. The present stem is used here, because the verbs refer to the characteristics of Agamemnon's daughter and they are (almost by definition) durative and not punctual.

Reversely, there are also examples in the indicative which supposedly had past potential and counterfactual meaning, but which could be interpreted as being "real" or at least possible:

(EX.04.07) (638) οὐδ ἂν ἔτι φράδμων περ ἀνὴρ Σαρπηδόνα δῖον
(639) ἔγνω, ἐπεὶ βελέεσσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσιν (*Iliad* 16,638-639).

"A sharpthinking man would not have recognised shining Sarpedon, since he was (covered) with missiles, blood and dust."

In this specific instance, the potential of the past with the indicative could be interpreted as a present potential (note that ἔγνω and γνοίη are metrically equivalent). The use of the aorist here is aspectual, as the recognition is conceived as a punctual action.

(EX.04.08) (202) πῶς δέ κεν Ἕκτωρ κῆρας ὑπεξέφυγεν θανάτοιο,
(203) εἰ μή οἱ πύματόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἤντετ᾽ Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 22,202-203).

"How would Hektor have escaped the fate-goddesses of death, if Apollon had not been near him for the uttermost and last time?"

In this instance Homer described that Hektor could not have escaped death if he had not received help from Apollon for the last time, but as this is an event that actually occurred, one could argue that this is in fact a potential and not a counterfactual. The aspectual differences apply here as well: ὑπεξέφυγεν is an aorist, because it refers to the last time that Hektor escapes death and ἤντετ᾽ is an imperfect (present stem), because Apollon's support is described in its duration (Apollon had been supporting and protecting Hektor for a very long time).

The examples quoted above serve as illustration for the fact that there are no clear distinctions in the notions of potential and unreal. It might therefore be better to assume that Greek only possessed a potential with different degrees of

(im)possible and/or (un)likely realisation and different aspectual values,[120] and to use a term such as Hettrich's *Fiktiv* (or Lattmann's *modus fictivus*) and argue that the differences in tense usage are only aspect-based, but for the sake of uniformity, I will use potential and counterfactual.

4.2. *The data in Homeric Greek*

As had been noted already, Homer uses both the optative and the indicative in the counterfactual and the potential of the past (as is the rule in Attic Greek). In Homer, one can thus find:

a) a "past potential" in the optative:

(EX.04.09) (85) Τυδεΐδην δ᾽ οὐκ ἂν <u>γνοίης</u> ποτέροισι μετείη
(86) ἠὲ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὁμιλέοι ἦ μετ᾽ Ἀχαιοῖς. (*Iliad* 5,85-86).

"you would not be able to know / you would not have known to whom of both sides the son of Tydeus belonged, whether he was fighting on the side of the Trojans or with the Greeks."

b) a "past potential" with the indicative:

(EX.04.10) (438) οὐδ᾽ ἂν ἔτι φράδμων περ ἀνὴρ Σαρπηδόνα δῖον
(439) <u>ἔγνω</u>, ἐπεὶ βελέεσσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσιν (*Iliad* 16,438-439).

"A sharpthinking man would not have recognised shining Sarpedon, since he was (covered) with missiles, blood and dust."

c) a counterfactual with an optative in the main and a preposed conditional clause:[121]

(EX.04.11) (515) εἰ μὲν γὰρ μὴ δῶρα <u>φέροι</u> τὰ δ' ὄπισθ' <u>ὀνομάζοι</u>
(516) Ἀτρεΐδης, ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἐπιζαφελῶς <u>χαλεπαίνοι</u>,
(517) οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγέ σε μῆνιν ἀπορρίψαντα <u>κελοίμην</u> (*Iliad* 9,515-517).

---

120. Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 346-347). Delaunois (1975; 1988: 96-106) and Basset (1988b; 1989: 224-226) stated that there was only a past potential, while Wakker (2006) argued for only a counterfactual in Greek. This is simply a terminological discussion.
121. This example was also discussed in Hettrich (1992: 267).

"If Atreus's son were not bringing you gifts, but still called you names and forever carried a heavy grudge (against you), I would not advise you to give up your wrath."

In this instance, Odysseus tried to persuade Akhilleus to let go of his anger, by arguing that Agamemnon was not angry with him but was even offering him rich gifts. The present stem is used, because the offering, scolding and advising are durative actions (as is confirmed by the presence of αἰέν "always" and ὄπισθ' "further on").

d) a counterfactual with an optative in the main and a postposed conditional clause:

(EX.04.12) ἦ σ' ἂν <u>τισαίμην</u>, εἴ μοι δύναμίς γε <u>παρείη</u>. (*Iliad* 22,20).

"I would have made / make you pay, if the power had been / were inside me."
Akhilleus complained here that Apollon stopped him from killing more Trojans. The statement is in all likelihood unreal, because Akhilleus knows that he cannot challenge the god. The aspectual difference is clear: τισαίμην is an aorist, because the punishing is conceived as a single act, while παρείη is a present, because the presence of physical force is more durative (this example will be discussed later on as well).

e) a counterfactual with an optative in the main clause and an indicative in the postposed conditional clause:

(EX.04.13) (388) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' <u>ἀπόλοιτο</u> Ἄρης ἆτος πολέμοιο,
(389) εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια
(390) Ἑρμέα <u>ἐξήγγειλεν</u>· ὃ δ' ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα (*Iliad* 5,388-390).

"And now Ares, insatiable for war, would have died there, had the stepmother Eeriboia with her shining beauty, not informed Hermes. He then snatched Ares away."

In this passage Homer related how Ares would have died, if Eeriboia had not called on Hermes to save him, which he did by removing him from the battle scene. The aorists refer to the single actions of the dying, warning and stealing. The aorist ἐξήγγειλεν is remarkable, because *verba dicendi* usually appear in the present stem, as they imply the effect of the speech on the audience (one could argue that the imperfect and aorist were metrically equivalent and that Homer would have

written °ΗΓΕΛΕ with single writing for double consonants and no indication for spurious diphthongs, but this does not explain why only the aorist was transmitted). It is possible that ἐξέκλεψεν is coordinated to ἐξήγγειλεν and is still part of the subordinate conditional clause introduced by εἰ μή, but it can also be a new independent main clause (the aorist is used because of the punctual notion).

f) a counterfactual with an optative in the main clause and an indicative in the preposed conditional clause:

(EX.04.14) (220) εἰ μὲν γάρ τίς μ᾽ ἄλλος ἐπιχθονίων ἐκέλευεν,
(221) ἢ οἳ μάντιές εἰσι θυοσκόοι ἢ ἱερῆες,
(222) ψεῦδός κεν φαῖμεν καὶ νοσφιζοίμεθα μᾶλλον: (*Iliad* 24,220-222).

"If any other man of the mortals had told me this, or the soothsayers, offering-seers or priests, we would have called it a lie and rather rejected it."
In this instance the verbs are in the present stem, because the *verba dicendi* often appear in the imperfect, indicating the durative effect of the speaking: the speaking is not considered on its own, but seen together with its consequences (reaction of the addressees).[122] In this instance, several codices have the aorist ἐκέλευσεν instead of the imperfect ἐκέλευεν.

g) a counterfactual with an indicative in the main and postposed conditional clause:[123]

(EX.04.15) (713) καί νύ κε δὴ πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα
(714) Ἕκτορα δάκρυ χέοντες ὀδύροντο πρὸ πυλάων,
(715) εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ἐκ δίφροιο γέρων λαοῖσι μετηύδα (*Iliad* 24,713-715).[124]

"And now they would have wailed for Hektor, in front of the gates shedding tears the entire day until the setting of the sun, had not the old man addressed the people from his chariot."

122. See De Decker (2015: 195-211; 2018, forthcoming) for a more references and a detailed study (cf. n. 74).
123. For this example see De Decker (2015: 207, 238).
124. De Decker (2015: 207).

In this instance, the imperfect is used, although there is a clear reference to the past.[125] The use is not tense, but aspect-based: the *verba dicendi* appear in the imperfect to indicate a lasting effect on the audience (cf. supra). The aspectual difference also applies to the main clause: ὀδύροντο is an imperfect, because it refers to the durative wailing and mourning by the Trojans.

h) a counterfactual with an indicative in the main and preposed conditional clause:

(EX.04.16) (897) εἰ δέ τευ ἐξ ἄλλου γε θεῶν <u>γένευ</u> ὧδ᾽ ἀΐδηλος
(898) καί κεν δὴ πάλαι <u>ἦσθα</u> ἐνέρτερος Οὐρανιώνων (*Iliad* 5,897-898).

"If you had been born from any other god and had been so destructive, you would have become lower than the gods of the Ouranos a long time ago (i.e. thrown out of the group of the gods)."

In this instance Zeus chastises Ares for his warmongering and fighting and states that he would have been thrown out of the Olympos long time ago, if he had not been his own son. The aspectual difference is clear here as well: one can only be born once and can only be thrown out of the Ouranos once. ἦσθα is an imperfect, but has aoristic value (there is no formal aorist for the root *h_1es- in Greek).

4.3. *Some examples from post-Homeric Greek*

We see that in Homer many different types of constructions with both the optative and the indicative are used. For Attic Greek, most grammars argue that the present counterfactual is expressed by the imperfect of the indicative, while the aorist indicative was used for the past counterfactual.[126] As the imperfect and aorist (and also the pluperfect) can all refer to the past and have no relative chronology towards each other but are only distinguished by their aspectual value (cf. supra), this rigid distinction would be surprising. Even in later Greek – in Ionic prose, mostly in Herodotos, and in Attic drama and prose – there are still instances of the

---

125. Hettrich (1992: 267).
126. Krüger (1845: 190-191), Madvig (1847: 116-117), Aken (1861: 47-48), Gildersleeve (1900: 169), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 231-233; 1904: 468-472), Goodwin (1965: 93-94), Bizos (1961: 158-161, but see also below). This was recently stated by Greenberg (1986: 249), Rijksbaron (2002: 73). Van Emde Boas et al. (2018: 442-443) accept the aspectual difference, but nevertheless state that the aorist usually refers to the past counterfactual, while the imperfect refers to the present.

optative, but the Attic prose examples are often corrected into indicatives.[127] Two examples for a past potential taken from Herodotos are:[128]

(EX.04.17) εἴησαν δ᾽ ἂν οὗτοι Κρῆτες (Herodotos 1,2).

"That could have been Cretans."

(EX.04.18) ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ φθόνῳ ἂν εἴποιεν (Herodotos 9,71).

"But they might also have said that also out of envy."

Two *Paradebeispiele* of a counterfactual in the optative from Attic drama are:[129]

(EX.04.19) οἶκος δ᾽αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβοι, σαφέστατ᾽ἂν λέξειεν (Aiskhylos, *Agamemnon* 37-38).

"The house itself woud have said it most clearly, if it had had a voice."

(EX.04.20) φαίη δ᾽ ἂν ἡ θανοῦσά γ᾽, εἰ φωνὴν λάβοι. (Sophokles, *Elektra* 548). "The dead woman would have said it (herself), if she (still) had a voice."

Two examples from Attic prose are:[130]

(EX.04.21) οὐκ ἂν οὖν νήσων ἔξω τῶν περιοικίδων, αὗται δὲ οὐκ ἂν πολλαὶ εἶεν, ἠπειρώτης ὢν ἐκράτει, εἰ μή τι καὶ ναυτικὸν εἶχεν (Thoukydides 1.9,4).

---

127. The examples are taken from Aken (1861: 44-45), Gerth (1878, accepting the corrections), Gildersleeve (1900: 173-175, accepting the corrections as well), Kieckers (1926: 35-36, 53-58), Chantraine (1953: 213).

128. Other Herodotean examples can be found in 1,70; 2,98; 5,59; 7;180; 7,184; 7,214; 8,136; 9,71. See von Bäumlein (1846: 294-295), Koppin (1878: 125-126), Gerth (1878), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 231-233) and Gildersleeve (1900: 173-175) for a discussion of these passages.

129. The commentaries by Fraenkel (1950: 24) and Page – Denniston (1957: 70) printed the optatives, but did not discuss the use of this mood. The example from Aiskhylos was discussed in Greenberg (1986: 259-260), but he did not explicitly state that this was a counterfactual or not, nor did he discuss the peculiarity of the optative here.

130. For more examples from Attic prose, see von Bäumlein (1846: 294-295), Gerth (1878), Koppin (1878: 125-126), Gildersleeve (1900: 173-175) and Gerö (2001).

"He, being an inhabitant of the mainland, would not have ruled (for so long) over the islands outside the ones near him, there would not have been many, if he had not had a fleet as well."

In this instance, Thoukydides combined an optative for the past potential with an imperfect for the counterfactual of the past. The use of the imperfects is clearly durative, "he would not have ruled (for so long)" and "if he had not held for a long time".

(EX.04.22) εὖ γὰρ ἂν <u>εἰδείην</u> ὅτι ἐπ᾽ ἐκείνοις ἦν καὶ ἐμὲ τιμωρήσασθαι καὶ αὐτοῖς μηνύσασιν ἐλευθέροις γενέσθαι. (Lysias 7,16).

"I should have known that it was in their power to enact vengeance on me and obtain their freedom by denouncing me."[131]

The optative εἰδείην was transmitted, but was changed into the pluperfect forms ᾔδειν by Emperius and into ᾔδη by Hude.[132]

While the use of the optative in the Ionic and dialectal examples is generally accepted,[133] the Attic examples are corrected in most editions, but by doing so, one removes a syntactic peculiarity and archaism from the text in order to make the text fit into the Procrustean bed of the prescriptive grammar.[134]

These examples show that the optative and the indicative could appear in contexts with varying degrees of (im)possibility, but the questions are: how can their use(s) be explained or put differently, is there a difference between them, which construction was the oldest (if they have different meanings, they might be both original) and how did the indicative become the standard construction for the unreal events.[135]

---

131. This translation is based on that by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

132. As can be seen in the apparatus of Carey (2007 on this passage).

133. Delbrück (1871: 201), Monro (1891: 301-302), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 231-233), Mutzbauer (1908: 172), Slotty (1915: 73-74, 132), Stahl (1907: 264-267), Dubois (1986: 222-223), Crespo (1997: 56, for Homer and Herodotos), Rijksbaron (2002: 71, for Herodotos).

134. Gerö (2000, 2001). The term *Procrustean* was used by Gerö (2001: 183). See also the words by Hartung (1833: 281, quoted above already: "allein ist das seltene Vorkommen einer Erscheinung ein Grund zu ihrer Tilgung?").

135. For the fact that this change occurred, see Gerth (1878), Brugmann (1890: 191-194), Monro (1891: 293-294), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 344-345), Chantraine (1953: 229: "nous observons dans ces faits le développement de l'emploi irréel qui prend la place de l'optatif"), Brunel

4.4. *Different explanations*

The use of the indicative in a sequence that is presented as contrary-to-fact is surprising, because the indicative is "the mood of reality", or is at least modally neutral, i.e. it does not have the nuance of fear, hope, expectation or wish.[136] Although I cannot address the issue in detail here, the tenses used in these constructions are past tenses and it is not uncommon that they are used in counterfactual or non-realis contexts.[137]

How can this situation be explained? Six different suggestions have been given.

1. The first explanation focused on the temporal reference and perceived the difference between optative and (past) indicative in the fact that the indicative could only refer to past actions, while the optative could theoretically refer to present, future, and also the past. Starting from the assumption that the past indicative originally referred to something that had not happened, Aken and Wilhelmi argued that the constructions with the indicative clearly referred to (unreal or possible) events in the past that had not happened (*Nichtwirklichkeit*), while those events described the optative could theoretically also refer to the past, but mostly had present or future reference (*das rein Gedachte*), and that the construction of the indicative was the past variant of that of the optative.[138] In their opinion a construction with the indicative described an action that most certainly never happened, while one with the optative could maybe refer to the past, but could theoretically still have happened. Wilhelmi illustrated the difference by these two examples:[139]

(EX.04.23) (255) ἦ κεν <u>γηθήσαι</u> Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
(256) ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν <u>κεχαροίατο</u> θυμῷ
(257) εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα <u>πυθοίατο</u> μαρναμένοιϊν (*Iliad* 1,255-257).

(1980: 240-245), Horrocks (1995: 161-162) and Wathelet (1997: 260-262), but most scholars offered an explanation of how the substitution could have happened. This issue is not addressed in Jacquinod (2017).

136. Kühner – Gerth (1898: 202), Brugmann (1900: 513), Chantraine (1953: 205), Strunk (1975: 233, 1992: 29-30), Rijksbaron (2002: 6: "the speaker represents the state of affairs as a fact"), Jacquinod (2017: 687).

137. See the discussion in De Decker (2015: 206) with some references (the list is obviously not exhaustive). One of the first to note this was Aken (1861: 45-48).

138. Aken (1861: 26-48), Wilhelmi (1881, especially page 11 where he discussed *Iliad* 5,679-680 and 1,257-259).

139. Wilhelmi (1881: 11).

"For sure Priam would now feel happiness, and his sons and the other Trojans would greatly rejoice in their heart, if they heard all this about the both of you fighting each other."

(EX.04.24) (679) καί νύ κ᾽ ἔτι πλέονας Λυκίων <u>κτάνε</u> δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
(680) εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ὀξὺ <u>νόησε</u> μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ: (*Iliad* 5,679-680).

"And now shining Odysseus would have killed many (more) of the Lykians, if great Hektor with the waving helmet had not sharply noticed."

In *Iliad* 5,679-680 the indicative was used because Odysseus did not kill the Trojans and the action thus did not occur, while in *Iliad* 1,255-257 the optative was used, because it was unclear if the Trojans had heard about the Greek rift.

This explanation is difficult for instances such as:

(EX.04.25) (388) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' <u>ἀπόλοιτο</u> Ἄρης ἆτος πολέμοιο,
(389) εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια
(390) Ἑρμέᾳ <u>ἐξήγγειλεν</u>: ὃ δ' ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα (*Iliad* 5,388-390).

"And now Ares, insatiable for war, would have died there, had the stepmother Eeriboia with her shining beauty, not informed Hermes. He then snatched Ares away."

If the above mentioned scenario were correct, the optative ἀπόλοιτο would be unexpected because it is very unlikely that a god would die (cf. infra). In the Aken-Wilhelmi-scenario this would need to be expressed by the indicative. Wilhelmi tried to explain this by assuming that the optative was either wrongly expanded from another instance or used ironically.[140]

It be noted that according to Aken this distinction had only become rigid in Attic Greek, but that Homeric Greek was still more supple in its application.

This explanation is less far-fetched than it might seem, as that many languages use one or more past tenses as a marker for the unreal, but it is debated whether pastness alone is sufficient to mark contrary-to-fact situations.[141] It is true that not all counterfactuals refer to the past, but many of them do. Moreover, there are sev-

---

140. Wilhelmi (1881: 12).
141. See De Decker (2015: 206) with a discussion of (some) the literature on this issue. As is the case with conditionals, the literature on counterfactuals and on "irrealis" is immense.

eral examples of an optative that refers to the past and there are instances in the indicative and optative where both present and past reference are possible (cf. the use of γνοίη(ς) and ἔγνω(ς) discussed above). In spite of their emphatic statements, both Aken and Wilhelmi admitted that the optative could be used in instances that referred to the past and Aken added that the different constructions became only rigidly separated in Attic and were not the original ones in the oldest Greek.[142] As such it would seem to me that, at least implicitly, Aken assumed that a change occurred within Greek itself (and that the past reference was the pivotal element)?

2. Koppin and Brugmann argued that the optative initially expressed the potential and counterfactual nuance, but that it was replaced by the indicative of the past in those instances that referred to a past event: as the optative could refer to past, present and future,[143] it did not allow for a clear temporal distinction, while the indicative did allow for a distinction to be made between "this could happen (in the present or future)" and "this could have happened (in the past)".[144] Debrunner added that a parallel evolution occurred in later (post-Classical) Greek with the iterative optative of the past: a past iterative action in a subordinate clause could be expressed by the optative, but in later Greek the optative was replaced by a past indicative when the action was clearly situated in the past (sometimes this even occurs in Homer: occasionally, one can find iterative forms with -σκ- instead of the optative in subordinate clauses, as in *Iliad* 5,788 or 24,752).[145] The past indicative

142. Aken (1861: 27).

143. That the optative could refer to the past in Homer, was first noted by von Bäumlein (1846: 294-295), see also Koppin (1878: 124-131), Vogrinz (1889: 273-275), Kühner – Gerth (1898: 225, 231-233), Brugmann (1904:584), Mein (1903: 6), Chantraine (1953: 220-221) and n. 119. This is not discussed in Wachter (2000). Neisser (1927: 283) and Benveniste (1951) argued that the optative could be used as a past tense in Indo-Iranian, while Benveniste (1951) and Evangelisti (1955) also thought that the past tense in Armenian could be traced back to the optative. This cannot be discussed here. See also Brunel (1980).

144. Koppin (1878: 126-131), Brugmann (1890: 191-194, 1904: 584, 586), Brugmann – Thumb (1913: 590-591), Debrunner (1921), Chantraine (1953: 226-228: "Mais, pour marquer plus nettement le passé, on a commencé a à se servir de l'imparfait ou de l'aoriste de l'indicatif, à qui la particule conférait une valeur modale"), Brunel (1980: 236). Brunel (1980: 236) agreed, but did not mention any of these scholars. This suggestion was not addressed in Krisch (1986), Ruijgh (1992) nor in Hettrich (1998). Willmott (2007: 48-52) only discussed Ruijgh, but did not mention the others.

145. For the co-occurrence of optatives and iterative forms, see especially Stolpe (1849: 36-39), Týn (1860: 677-681, 685-686), Delbrück (1897: 62-63), Kluge (1911: 56-57), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 335-336, explaining this form as a past potential), Zerdin (2002: 117-118), and Pagniello (2007, also interpreting this form as a past potential). Monro (1891: 279, 282-283) described the iterative use of the optative, but did not link it with the iterative forms, while Chantraine (1953: 223-

was used to stress the pastness of the action.[146] This scenario is the simplest one, has the advantage that it can point at a similar evolution in later Greek and explains the use of the past tense as simply indicating the past tense and not as a counterfactual marker, as Aken and Wilhelmi had already argued for. There is only one problem with this scenario, namely that the conditional and the main clauses use both the indicative and the injunctive (although I cannot address the issue here, I believe that epic Greek still distinguished between the augmented indicative and the injunctive when referring to the past).[147] As such, the transition would have been from optative into the tenses referring to the past. A detailed study would have to analyse when the indicative and when the injunctive was used.

3. Krisch argued that the Greek indicative went back to an older injunctive that had replaced the Indo-European optative.[148] In his opinion the augment could be removed from almost all modal indicatives, and as such, they were original injunctives. He started from the postposed conditional clause introduced by εἰ μή,[149] and considered the verbal form in the εἰ μή-clause to be an original injunctive. The original meaning of these sentences was "Y should have done something, or else X would have happened", from which the conditional sequence "X would have happened if Y had not done this" was extracted.[150] The injunctive was then reinterpreted as unaugmented indicative and the indicative was subsequently extended to the entire construction to distinguish the potential optative from the counterfactual constructions.[151] Ruijgh and Hettrich criticised this, because in their opinion Greek did not have a productive injunctive category anymore.[152] Hettrich added that the modal injunctive referred to the present or future and was not used in counterfactu-

---

224) was more hesitant and ascribed to the optatives in such constructions the meaning of "possibility" rather than the notion of repetition.

Willmott (2007:174-184) discussed the so-called iterative notion of the optative and subjunctive, but argued that it was not the mood per se, but the context that determined the iterative notion.

146. Debrunner (1921).

147. For the difference between augmented ("indicative") forms and unaugmented ("injunctive") forms in Greek, see Koch (1868), Platt (1891), Drewitt (1912a, 1912b, 1913), West (1989), Bakker (1999, 2001), Mumm (2004), De Decker (2016, 2019, 2020).

148. Krisch (1986).

149. That they were the starting point for the creation of the conditional counterfactual constructions had been noted by Gerth (1878) and Mutzbauer (1902) already, cf. infra. For a discussion of negative conditionals, see Koppers (1959).

150. Krisch (1986: 17-19).

151. Krisch (1986: 29).

152. Ruijgh (1992: 81), Hettrich (1998: 262).

al contexts.[153] While it is true that the injunctive is not used for counterfactual constructions in Indo-Iranian, it is still a living category in the oldest Greek texts (Mycenaean and epic Greek, especially in Hesiod).[154] The use of the injunctive as such is not the problem, but the issue is that the injunctive in Vedic and Greek is used for timeless and remote contexts, and not for specific instances.[155] In the sequences of the type "X would have happened, if Y had not done Z", the action Z is not unreal or remote, but is something that did occur and the injunctive would have been unfit for those contexts. Moreover, there is a difference between injunctives and indicatives in epic Greek, so that one cannot simply remove the augment to uncover older injunctive forms without altering the meaning. Krisch is right, however, in assuming that the postposed εἰ μή-clauses might have played a pivotal role in the evolution, but as was stated above, the transition probably went from optative into the tenses referring to the past (both indicative and injunctive).

4.   Dunkel argued that there were three different particles with different uses in PIE, which merged in Homeric Greek: PIE *án was used with the indicative in counterfactual contexts, *ke was deictic and *kem was emphatic. In epic Greek, these three particles lost their mutually distinctive meaning and conveyed two meanings, namely counterfactual and limiting values.[156] Greek ἄν had always expressed the counterfactual when used with the indicative and had a parallel in the Hittite particle *man* which is used to introduce wishes, potential and counterfactual sentences, as in *man=us=kan Huzziyas kuenta* "Huzziya would have killed them" (KBo 3.1 ii 11). Dunkel interpreted *man* as a merger of *ma* and *an*.[157] Dunkel's

---

153. Lazard (1975, 1998), Kellens (1985), Hettrich (1998: 262-263) and most recently Hollenbaugh (2020: 3.2.3: "modal uses of the injunctive are in fact of extremely limited occurrence"). The modal injunctive seemed to have survived in one or two relic forms in Middle Iranian (Tedesco 1923: 289-290). Yoshida (2009 for Sogdian) and Kunamoto (2009 for Khotanese) seem to imply that the injunctive could be used in counterfactual contexts in Iranian, but the remnants of Sogdian and Khotanese are so fragmentary and late that a conclusive judgement is not possible.

154. Cf. supra, n. 9.

155. For Vedic this use of the injunctive present was noted by Avery (1885: 330), Delbrück (1888: 354-355: "so habe ich mich doch überzeugt, dass der Injunctiv nicht selten [die Stellen s. bei Avery] in dem Sinne des Indicativ Praesentis gebraucht wird, doch so, dass die Beziehung auf die Gegenwart des Sprechenden nicht hervortritt, vielmehr nur in dem Sinne, dass eine Verbalaussage ausgedrückt werden soll, welche sich weder auf die Zukunft, noch auf die Vergangenheit bezieht", underlining is mine), Renou (1928: 71-73), Gonda (1956: 33-46), Hoffmann (1967 *passim* but especially 119), Strunk (1968: 290-294), Euler (1995), Mumm (1995). Kiparsky (1968, 2005) considered the injunctive to be tenseless and moodless.

156. Dunkel (1990: 108-130).

157. Dunkel (1990: 128).

scenario would have the advantage that the Greek indicative was a syntactic archaism shared with Hittite and would thus be dating from Indo-Hittite. There are some problems with it, however. While it cannot be ruled out that there would have been three different modal particles, Forbes's explanation of ἄν, κε and κεν as originating from the particle *kem in a context with negation still seems more economical:[158] in a negative context, this particle would have been οὔ κεν and in the zero grade *οὔ kṃ, which lead to οὔ καν, which was then falsely segmented into οὐκ ἄν. Another problem is that Dunkel needed to distinguish between potential and counterfactual, which seems to be contradicted by the evidence of the other Indo-European languages.[159] A third problem is that there are several modal indicatives that can be reconstructed as older optatives, but that there are no optatives in counterfactual/past potential contexts that can be reconstructed as indicatives. This seems to indicate that the optative in this context was older than the indicative. Fourthly, Dunkel's scenario cannot explain how the optative would have intruded into the field of the indicative, if the counterfactual and potential were as sharply distinguished as he argued. At the same time the optative did not replace / "compete with" the indicative in the εἰ μή clauses. If both coexisted and intruded in each other's domain, one would have expected to find examples of that as well. This is an indication that the εἰ μή clauses must have played an important role in the substitution. Fifthly, the reconstruction of Hittite *man* as *ma an* is unlikely at best,[160] and seems to be contradicted by the fact that *man* has a short *a*.[161] Sixthly, the assumption that there were in origin three different particles with three different meanings, which evolved into three particles used interchangeably, each having only two meanings, is unfalsifiable, because any difference in meaning between these three can be countered by saying that the meanings had merged.

    5.   The next scenario is that based on suggestions by Gerth, Mutzbauer, Ruijgh and Hettrich. They noticed that there were 69 counterfactual constructions with at least one indicative (either in the protasis or/and in the apodosis) in Homer.[162] Of these 69, 57 constructions had a postposed conditional clause and in

---

158. Forbes (1958), Palmer (1960: 176-177).

159. Hettrich (1998: 264).

160. Hettrich (1998: 264): "Die vorgeschlagene Segmentierung von man in ma plus an ist bestenfalls eine sehr hypothetische Möglichkeit." (my underlining).

161. Hittite had two different particles, *man* and *mān*, only the former being the modal particle under discussion (cf. Kloekhorst [2008: 551-552]).

162. The counterfactual instances are *Iliad* 2,80-81; 2,155-156; 3,373-374; 3,453; 5,311-312; 5,388-390; 5,679-680; 5,897-898; 6,73-75; 7,104-106; 7,273-275; 8,90-91; 8,130-132; 8,217-218; 8,366-369; 11,310-312; 11,504-506; 11,750-752; 12,290-293; 13,723-725; 14,258-259; 15,121-126;

46 instances the postposed conditional clause was introduced by εἰ μή. As such, they considered the εἰ μή to be the starting point for the substitution.[163] Gerth noticed the parallel between a counterfactual sentence followed by another main clause introduced by ἀλλά and a counterfactual sentence followed by a negative conditional introduced by εἰ μή, and suggested that they influenced each other, but did not elaborate any further.[164] Although Mutzbauer did not state that the optative was replaced by the indicative nor that there was a difference between the constructions with the optative and the indicative (in his opinion there was neither a *modus irrealis* nor a specific counterfactual construction, and the counterfactual meaning was only visible from the context), his input was nevertheless important as he explained how the constructions evolved from two coordinated main clauses to a main clause followed by negative conditional clause, then a positive conditional clause and in a final stage the conditional clause could even precede the main clause.[165] Ruijgh started from an original paratactic construction, in which the clauses were separated by ἀλλά and in which the action of one clause was prevented by the action in the second clause,[166] and suggested that the action of the first sentence was expressed in the subjunctive and meant "I expect X to happen / X can happen", and the second meant "but Y had done and prevented it". If this was related by a person who did not witness the actual action, the subjunctive was replaced by an optative and meant "X could have happened, but Y had done and

15,459-460; 16,617-618; 16,686-687; 16,698-701; 16,847-848; 17,70-71; 17,530-531; 17,613-614; 18,165-167; 18,397-398; 18,454-456; 20,288-291; 21,211-212; 21,544-545; 22,202-203; 23,154-155; 23,382-383; 23,490-491; 23,526-527; 23,540-542; 23,733-734; 24,220-222; 24,713-715 and *Odyssey* 1,237-240; 3,255-256; 4,171-173; 4,292-293; 4,363-364; 4,502-503; 4,732-734; 5,39-40; 5,426-427; 5,436-437; 9,497-499; 11,317; 13,137-138; 13,384-385; 14,67; 16,220-221; 21,226-227; 23,21-23; 23,218-220; 23,241-242; 24,41-42; 24,50-51; 24,284-285 and 24,528-530.

The εἰ μή clauses are *Iliad* 2,155-156; 3,373-374; 5,311-312; 5,388-390; 5,679-680; 6,73-75; 7,104-106; 7,273-275; 8,90-91; 8,130-132; 8,217-218; 8,366-369; 11,310-312; 11,504-506; 11,750-752; 12,290-293; 13,723-725; 14,258-259; 15,121-126; 16,698-701; 17,70-71; 17,530-531; 17,613-614; 18,165-167; 18,397-398; 18,454-456; 20,288-291; 21,211-212; 21,544-545; 22,202-203; 23,154-155; 23,382-383; 23,490-491; 23,540-542; 23,733-734; 24,713-715 and *Odyssey* 4,363-364; 4,502-503; 5,426-427; 5,436-437; 13,384-385; 16,220-221; 21,226-227; 23,241-242; 24,41-42; 24,50-51; 24,284-285 and 24,528-530. See Basset (1989: 16).

163. This suggestion was first made by Gerth (1878) and by Mutzbauer (1902). That it was the basis for the substitution, was noticed by Chantraine (1953: 226-227) and Brunel (1980: 242), but they did not elaborate on it.

164. Gerth (1878).

165. Mutzbauer (1902).

166. Ruijgh (1992), Hettrich (1998). This had been suggested already by Krisch (1986) and Mutzbauer (1902).

prevented it". In a second stage, ἀλλά was replaced by εἰ μή and the indicative appeared thus in a conditional clause. From the negative conditional, the indicative was first expanded to the positive conditional and then to the protasis. The extension to the protasis was triggered by the Greek preference to have the same mood in both the apodosis and the protasis for the different constructions: as potentialis and realis used the same mood in both clauses, the counterfactual would have followed this parallelism as well.[167] Hettrich also observed that most counterfactuals of the past had the apodosis put after the main clause.[168] Agreeing with Ruijgh's chronology, he suggested that the first clause was expressed in the optative as it was only a possibility (past potential),[169] and the second one in the indicative, as that action did occur. Once it had been expanded to the main clause of the counterfactual, it was also expanded to the modal indicatives that were not used in a conditional construction. Four problems remain, however. A first problem for this explanation is that it assumes many intermediary stages, but has one important advantage, namely that it explains why there are no postposed conditional clauses with εἰ μή and the optative. There are examples of the optative in the "unreal" clause, followed by the "unless" clause introduced by εἰ μή, as can be seen in the two examples quoted below:

(EX.04.26) (311) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ᾽ <u>ἀπόλοιτο</u> ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
(312) εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ὀξὺ <u>νόησε</u> Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη (*Iliad* 5,311-312).

"And now there the ruler of men, Aineias would have died there, if Zeus' daughter, Aphrodite, had not sharply noticed."

(EX.04.27) (388) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ᾽ <u>ἀπόλοιτο</u> Ἄρης ἆτος πολέμοιο,
(389) εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια
(390) Ἑρμέᾳ <u>ἐξήγγειλεν</u>· ὃ δ᾽ ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα (*Iliad* 5,388-390).

"And now Ares, insatiable for war, would have died there, had the stepmother Eeriboia with her shining beauty not informed Hermes. He then snatched Ares away."

167. Ruijgh (1992: 81-82).
168. Hettrich (1998: 267), see also Wakker (1994: 206-214), who stated that in 47 out of 70 instances, the εἰ μή-clause followed the main clause.
169. The interpretation of the optative as past potential in such sentences was already made by Kühner – Gerth (1898: 232), Brugmann (1900: 505) and Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 328).

The aorist is used here, because single actions are related.

The second objection could be that the initial paratactic scenario with the optative in the main unreal clause, followed by the second clause with the "actual event" introduced by ἀλλά or νῦν δέ is not attested. We have examples of this construction, but in those instances the "unreal" sentence has already the injunctive or indicative. Below I give two examples from our corpus:

(EX.04.28) (22) οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς <u>ὑπέκφυγε</u> κῆρα μέλαιναν
(23) ἀλλ᾽ Ἥφαιστος <u>ἔρυτο</u>, σάωσε δὲ νυκτὶ καλύψας, (*Iliad* 5,22-23).

"He himself then would not have escaped black fate, but Hephaistos protected him/snatched him away and saved him by covering him with the night."

In these verses Homer relates how Dares, a priest of Hephaistos, would have died, if Hephaistos had not intervened. In this instance, the "unless" element is related by another main clause, introduced by ἀλλά. The verb in the "unreal" clause is in the injunctive, ὑπέκφυγε, and the optative cannot be reconstructed here:

(EX.04.29) (15) ἔβλαψάς μ᾽ ἑκάεργε θεῶν ὀλοώτατε πάντων
(16) ἐνθάδε νῦν τρέψας ἀπὸ τείχεος: ἦ κ᾽ ἔτι πολλοὶ
(17) γαῖαν ὀδὰξ <u>εἷλον</u> πρὶν Ἴλιον εἰσαφικέσθαι.
(18) νῦν δ᾽ ἐμὲ μὲν μέγα κῦδος <u>ἀφείλεο</u>, τοὺς δ' ἐσάωσας
(19) ῥηϊδίως, ἐπεὶ οὔ τι τίσιν γ᾽ ἔδδεισας ὀπίσσω.
(20) ἦ σ᾽ ἂν τισαίμην, εἴ μοι δύναμίς γε παρείη. (*Iliad* 22,15-20).

"You have caused me harm, Farshooter, most destructive of all the gods, after driving me now here away from the wall. Certainly, many would have bitten the earth with their teeth before reaching Ilion. Now you have taken away great fame from me and you saved them without problems, since you did not fear punishment afterwards. I would have made / make you pay, if the power had been / were inside me."

In these lines, Akhilleus complains to Apollon that many more Trojans would have died, had he not intervened. The "unless, if … not …" clause is expressed by another main clause, introduced by νῦν δέ and the indicative ἀφείλεο and by ἐσάωσας (but as the augment in this form is metrically insecure, it could also be an injunctive). The verb of the "unreal" clause is in the indicative, εἷλον (one could argue that the optative could be reconstructed, γαῖαν ἕλοιεν ὀδὰξ πρὶν Ἴλιον

εἰσαφικέσθαι, but it has not been transmitted and then ὀδάξ would have to be put after the verb). The use of the aorist forms here (εἶλον, ἀφείλεο, ἐσάωσας) can be explained by the punctual meaning. It be noted that Akhilleus' threat to Apollon is expressed in the optative, τισαίμην and παρείη (the example was discussed above already).

A third problem was raised by Hettrich himself: why would a syntactic change have occurred / started in Homer and expanded into later Greek.[170] Hettrich stated that the influence of Homer could not be overestimated. This is true, as can be seen by his profound influence on prose writers such as Herodotos. In addition, also in later times poetry could influence prose, as can be seen in Attic prose.[171] As possible parallel I could refer to the influence of the Bible translations on the vernaculars: many sayings and syntactic turns that are found in the Bible have made their way into the spoken and written language. I therefore do not think that it is a problem that a syntactic change would have occurred in Homer. Moreover, it is not certain that the evolution *started* in Homer. It might have been ongoing already and Homer's use might have accelerated the process. Fourth, one could ask why a postposed conditional could influence the construction of the main sentence. There are three elements that played a role. First of all, there is the metrical convenience:[172] εἰ μή could be used before a long vowel, a short vowel, a word starting with one consonant or a word starting with more than one consonant (provided that the first syllable of this word was long); ἀλλά could not be used when a word starting with a vowel followed or when it was followed by a word with one consonant and an initial long syllable. A second factor involves the marked position of the conditional clause. As was stated above, 57 of the 69 counterfactual constructions had a postposed conditional. While postposed conditionals are not impossible, they are less common,[173] as even languages that have postposed subordinate clauses prefer to put their conditional clause before the main clause.[174] As such, the Greek conditional schema of the type "p, if not q" with postposed εἰ μή clause was very marked and might have exerted influence on the other constructions. In the *Odyssey* postposed conditionals are much less common,[175] and in Classical Greek, more than 2/3 of the protases precede the apodosis.[176] A third factor is that the substitu-

---

170. Hettrich (1998: 267).
171. The standard work on this issue is Bers (1984).
172. Ruijgh (1992: 81-83).
173. Greenberg (1963: 68), Comrie (1986: 83-84), Hettrich (1998:268).
174. Comrie (1986: 83-84).
175. Lang (1989).
176. Seiler (1997: 309).

tion of the optative by an indicative in the conditional clause created a difference in construction between protasis and apodosis. By extending the mood of the conditional clause to the main clause this disequilibrium was resolved.[177] As such, there seem to be no real objections against the substitution scenario. As was stated above, the transition probably went from optative into the tenses referring to the past (both indicative and injunctive). The only problem is the distinction between injunctive and indicative and a detailed study should analyse when the injunctive and when the indicative was used in the εἰ μή-clauses.

6. The last explanation is that there was no substitution, but that the constructions with the indicative and optative differed in meaning: Basset (implicitly) and Willmott argued that the modal indicatives distinguished themselves from the optative in that they were in situations that could have occurred, while the optatives could not be used in such contexts.[178] They referred for this to Seiler's analysis of the optative as *dissociative*.[179] Willmott used the following two examples to prove the difference between indicative and optative:[180]

(EX.04.30) (155) ἔνθά κεν Ἀργείοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος <u>ἐτύχθη</u>
(156) εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην Ἥρη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 2,155-156).

"And then there would have been a homecoming against their fate for the Argives, had Here not spoken a word towards Athene."

(EX.04.31) (311) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' <u>ἀπόλοιτο</u> ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
(312) εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη (*Iliad* 5,311-312).

"And now there the ruler of men, Aineias would have died there, if Zeus' daughter, Aphrodite, had not sharply noticed."

The first example described how the Greeks would have returned home before Troy was conquered, if Here had not told Athene to intervene. The second example referred to the salvation of Aineias by Aphrodite during battle. Willmott stated that the indicatives in the first example showed that the return was a genuine possibil-

177. Ruijgh (1992: 83).
178. Basset (1989: 220-230) noticed the differences between the constructions, but did not state that the indicative replaced the optative. Willmott (2007: 48-52); in 2008 she discussed the potential optatives but did not address the issue of the substitution nor the counterfactivity.
179. Seiler (1971, 1993, 1997). See also Basset (1984, 1986).
180. Willmott (2007: 48-52, 120-122).

ity, while the optative was used to indicate that the event of Aineias's death was very unlikely, given his divine lineage.[181]

That both indicative and optative coexisted and were semantically distinct is in my opinion problematic. First, it is indeed true that some examples of the indicative do indeed show a relationship with the real world (see *Iliad* 22,202-203 treated above, but not discussed by Willmott), but some of the optatives did this well. Second, a substantial part of the modal indicatives in conditional constructions occurred in instances that could never have occurred.[182] Thirdly, Willmott's distinction is not correct: it is not true that Aineias could not have died because he was the son of a goddess, since divine descent is by no means a guarantee against death, as is proved by the deaths of Akhilleus and Sarpedon, who were children of a god(dess) and nevertheless both died. In addition, the return of the Greeks cannot have been considered a real possibility, because everybody *knows* that Troy will eventually fall. Polsley, focusing the narrative implication of the use counterfactual constructions, argues that "De Decker 2015 (esp. 21 (sic)-240) challenges Willmott (although, problematically, he does not differentiate between speakers' diegetic levels)",[183] but does not address the issue as to why two equally (im)possible contexts have different modal constructions. In my opinion this can only be explained by the fact that a substitution was ungoing. Fourthly, Seiler attributed the notion of dissociation both to the optative and to the modal indicative, and not to the optative alone. Fifthly, in many cases the indicative in the counterfactual construction is equivalent to an optative form, but reversely the optatives in these constructions are always metrically secure, which seems to point in the direction of a substitution of the optative in favour of the indicative (this metrical fact is in my opinion too often neglected).[184] A sixth and final element arguing in favour of the substitution scenario is that there are no conditional clauses with an MP attested in the indicative, neither in Attic nor in Homer. Conditional clauses with the subjunctive or the optative can have the MP. This is in my opinion an indication that this construction originated in a period where the MP use was already much stricter, and would therefore be another indication that this construction is of a younger date.

In short, I believe that there is no difference in meaning between the indicative and the optative in the sentences with an unreal or remotely possible meaning. The

181. Willmott (2007: 49, 120-122).

182. The instances were analysed in De Jong (1987: 67-81), Lang (1989), Nesselrath (1992: 1-38) and Polsley (2019, discussing the "Aineias-episodes").

183. Polsley (2019: 8).

184. I refer for more details to De Decker (2015: 323-332).

use of (forms that go back to) the optative to express the remotely possible and/or unreal in other Indo-European languages and the fact that some relics of the optatives in these contexts still exist in post-Homeric Greek make it more likely that the optative was the oldest mood for this type of meaning and this makes a substitution scenario the most likely. In the next subchapter I will discuss the instances of *Iliad* 16 in detail and occasionally provide examples from the large corpus.

4.5. *The instances of* Iliad 16

> (EX.04.32) (71) ἐγγύθι λαμπομένης τάχα κεν φεύγοντες ἐναύλους
> (72) <u>πλήσειαν</u> νεκύων, εἴ μοι κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
> (73) ἤπια <u>εἰδείη</u>· νῦν δὲ στρατὸν ἀμφιμάχονται (*Iliad* 16,71-73).

> "… of my (helmet) shining nearby. Soon they would have filled the rivers beds in their flight with their corpses, if (only) rules Agamemnon had known (to act) appropriately towards me, but now, they (sc. the Trojans) are pressing on the (Greek) army."

This is probably one of the most important examples in this discussion, because it illustrates the original use of the optative in counterfactual constructions and also shows that the distinction between the tense forms is aspectual rather than temporal. In these verses, Akhilleus complained here that he was mistreated by Agamemnon; if he had received respect, the Trojans would have been dying in large numbers, but now they are attacking the Greeks and have already surrounded them. We note a very clear difference between the situation that could have been and the one from the reality, introduced by νῦν δέ. The perfect stem is used because the verb "know" in Greek is resultative (i.e. it describes a state, "having seen", hence "know"), and the filling of the river is described in the aorist, because one can only fill a river with his corpse once. This instance is also a good example for Lange's theory that Greek originally did not have subordinate conditional clauses, but that they were independent wish clauses (with varying degrees of fulfilment) that later became subordinate clauses.[185] This instance would then have to be interpreted as "they would have … if only he had known to treat me …". Although adopted by the standard grammars on Homeric Greek,[186] this thesis is not

---

185. Lange (1872, 1873).
186. Brugmann (1890: 191-192, but cf. infra), Monro (1891: 290-294), Chantraine (1953: 274-276), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 557, 682-684).

universally accepted.[187] It is somehow related to the issue whether or not the oldest Greek (and Indo-European) had subordinate clauses (see the subchapter on the MP). For the discussion on the counterfactuals, this issue is irrelevant, but there are other examples that indicate that Lange's construction might very well have been correct (and it cannot be denied that Homer as a preference for paratactic structures).[188] One of the most striking examples of the optative expressing a wish and a remote possibility within the same passage is:

(EX.04.33) (722) αἴθ᾽ ὅσον ἥσσων εἰμί, τόσον σέο φέρτερος εἴην
(723) τώ κε τάχα στυγερῶς πολέμου ἀπερωήσειας. (*Iliad* 16,722-723).

"Were I so much stronger than you than I am weaker than you, in that case you would quickly and painfully withdraw from battle."

In this instance, Asios (Apollon in disguise) shouts to Hektor that only if he were stronger than Hektor, he (H) would be able to withdraw from battle. The sentences clearly have an unreal meaning. In the first sentence we have a wish (εἴην) and the second one a main clause with an optative (ἀπερωήσειας). Both optatives clearly refer to something that is only remotely possible and actually even contrary to fact. From this type of paratactic constructions the later conditional constructions would have arisen.

Two other examples are:

(EX.04.34) (558) κεῖται ἀνὴρ ὃς πρῶτος ἐσήλατο τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν
(559) Σαρπηδών· ἀλλ᾽ εἴ μιν ἀεικισσαίμεθ᾽ ἑλόντες,
(560) τεύχεά τ᾽ ὤμοιιν ἀφελοίμεθα, καί τιν᾽ ἑταίρων
(561) αὐτοῦ ἀμυνομένων δαμασαίμεθα νηλέϊ χαλκῷ. (*Iliad* 16,558-561).

---

187. This theory was criticised, because it could not explain all instances, see Brugmann (1890: 192 – he accepted the theory, but noted that there were nevertheless cases that could not be analysed as old wishes), Lattmann (1903: 415), Tabachovitz (1951), followed by Hettrich (1992: 265-266). For a critical survey of both theories, see Risch (1953, 1954). It has not been addressed in Willmott (2007) nor in Jacquinod (2017), the most recent treatises on Homeric and Greek syntax.

188. Delbrück (1871: 20-25), see also Monro (1891: 254-255), Notopoulos (1949), Schwyzer – Debrunner (1950: 631-636), Chantraine (1953: 12), and more recently, Bakker (1997: 35-85, 125-155), Wachter (2000: 104), Minchin (2014); surprisingly enough the issue has not been addressed in Willmott (2007).

"There lies the man who first assaulted the wall of the Akhaians, Sarpedon. But if we could take and dishonour him, take his armour from his shoulders (and) maybe we could (also) tame with the pitiless bronze some of his friends who are now defending him."

In this example it seems that there are only verb forms that depend on the εἰ-clause (unless one interprets δαμασαίμεθα as the verb of the main clause, which case we would have to interpret καί as "also" and not as "and"). In this specific instance an interpretation as a remote possibility of contrary-to-fact is not likely, given the fact that Sarpedon has just fallen and that robbing him of his armour is not impossible; on the other hand, since Sarpedon's body is being defended at the time, taking the armour is not seen as realis either. The aorist is used, since the robbing can only be done once.

(EX.04.35) (686) νήπιος: εἰ δὲ ἔπος Πηληϊάδαο φύλαξεν
(687) ἦ τ᾽ ἂν ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα κακὴν μέλανος θανάτοιο. (*Iliad* 16,686-687).

"(…) the fool! If he had heeded the word of Peleus' son, for sure he would have escaped the evil fate of black death."

In this instance Homer laments that Patroklos could have survived if only he had listened to Akhilleus' warnings. The first sentence could very well have been an old wish "if only he had …" and although the indicative φύλαξεν is used (or put better, the injunctive, since the absence of the augment in φύλαξεν is secured by the metre),[189] the form could "hide" an older optative φυλάξαι (as will be argued below, several indicatives contain older optatives, while almost all optatives in these contexts are metrically secure). The main clause has unreal meaning, but the verb ὑπέκφυγε appears in the injunctive and is metrically secure.
There are other examples of older wishes in the large corpus as well:

(EX.04.36) (255) ἦ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
(256) ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυμῷ
(257) εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο μαρναμένοιϊν (*Iliad* 1,255-257).

189. It is guaranteed by Meyer's Third Law, which states that there should not be word end at 3a and 5a in the hexameter. The augmented Πηληϊάδα᾽ ἐφύλαξεν or Πηληϊάδεω ἐφύλαξεν would have word end at 5a and 3a.

"For sure Priam would now feel happiness, and his sons and the other Trojans would greatly rejoice in their heart, if they heard all this about the both of you fighting each other."

In this instance (discussed above already), one could interpret the conditional clause as "Would they find out that … !". This specific case would be an example of a wish that Nestor did not want to be true. Examples such as these were used to state that the theory of an original wish clause was incorrect, because Nestor could never have wished for the Trojans to find out, but this is not really a counterargument, as Nestor could very well have expressed this wish as something that could cause serious harm and could have used it as a negative *exemplum*.

(EX.04.37) ἦ σ᾽ ἂν <u>τισαίμην</u>, εἴ μοι δύναμίς γε <u>παρείη</u>. (*Iliad* 22,20).

"I would have made / make you pay, if the power had been / were inside me."

This instance, which has been discussed above, is clearly unreal, as Akhilleus will never have the power to challenge a god, but it can serve as another example for the original wish construction "if only the power were present in me".

Now I discuss two possible wish constructions that refer to the same event:

(EX.04.38) Μηριόνη τάχα κέν σε καὶ ὀρχηστήν περ ἐόντα
ἔγχος ἐμὸν <u>κατέπαυσε</u> διαμπερές, εἴ σ᾽ <u>ἔβαλόν</u> περ. (*Iliad* 16,617-618).

"Meriones, soon my sword would have stopped you forever, even though you are a dancer, if I had hit you."

This is a counterfactual construction with the indicative in both the main clause and the subordinate conditional clause (as would be the case in Attic Greek). In these verses Aineias complains that he missed Meriones and that he survived the attack. Willmott argued that in this instance the indicative had positive epistemic stance and Aineias genuinely believed that he could have killed Meriones, because otherwise the taunt would not have made sense.[190]

(EX.04.39) (623) εἰ καὶ ἐγώ σε <u>βάλοιμι</u> τυχὼν μέσον ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ,
(624) αἶψά κε καὶ κρατερός περ ἐὼν καὶ χερσὶ πεποιθὼς
(625) εὖχος ἐμοὶ <u>δοίης</u>, ψυχὴν δ᾽ Ἄϊδι κλυτοπώλῳ.᾽ (*Iliad* 16,623-625).

190. Willmott (2007: 49).

"If I had hit you and hit you in the middle with the sharp bronze, soon you would have given me glory and Hades with the famous horses your soul, although you are stronger and trust your hands."

These verses are pronounced by Meriones in response to Aineias' attack quoted above. Here the optative is used. Ascribing negative epistemic stance to these verses means assuming that Meriones considered his own attack to be futile, because he knew that Aineias was stronger, but why would a warrior in a verbal fight concede when he has not even lost yet? I believe that this example shows that the distinction between indicative and optative is invalid. Moreover, the indicative forms can contain an older optative (ἔγχος ἐμὸν κατέπαυσε διαμπερές, εἴ σ᾽ ἔβαλόν περ is equivalent to ἔγχος ἐμὸν παύσειε διαμπερές, εἴ σε βάλοιμί περ), but the optative forms are metrically secure. In several instances the indicative forms can "hide" an older optative, but reversely, almost all optatives are metrically secure (reason why they were preserved). Both instances have only aorist forms, because they refer to single and punctual actions, and not because they refer to the present or past.

(EX.04.40) (638) οὐδ ἂν ἔτι φράδμων περ ἀνὴρ Σαρπηδόνα δῖον
(639) ἔγνω, ἐπεὶ βελέεσσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσιν (*Iliad* 16,638-639).

"A sharpthinking man would not have recognised shining Sarpedon, since he was (covered) with missiles, blood and dust."

In this instance (discussed above as to aspect and meaning) we have a form with potential meaning, which could refer to both present and past. Here the indicative note that ἔγνω is used, but this form is equivalent to the optative γνοίη.

(EX.04.41) (698) ἔνθα κεν ὑψίπυλον Τροίην ἕλον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν
(699) Πατρόκλου ὑπὸ χερσί, περὶ πρὸ γὰρ ἔγχεϊ θῦεν,
(700) εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος ἐϋδμήτου ἐπὶ πύργου
(701) ἔστη τῷ ὀλοὰ φρονέων, Τρώεσσι δ᾽ ἀρήγων. (*Iliad* 16,698-701).

"And there the sons of the Akhaians would have taken Troy with the high gates by the hands of Patroklos – since he was raging forward heavily with his sword – if Phoibos Apollon had not put himself before the well-built tower, noticing the danger for it (Troy) and protecting the Trojans."

These verses describe how Patroklos would have led the Greeks to conquer Troy, if Apollon had not intervened. This is one of the instances of the εἰ μή constructions: an action could/would have occurred, if the action in the εἰ μή sentence had not thwarted it. In this specific instance εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων could contain an older paratactic ἀλλ' Ἀπόλλων "but Apollon" (with metrical lengthening of the first syllable of Ἀπόλλων, which is attested elsewhere as well). The original meaning would thus have been "and there the Greeks would have taken … but Apollon stood …". The indicative ἔστη has nothing unreal in it, because it refers to an actual event, namely Apollon's protection. As was noted above, no εἰ μή clause has an optative in it, because none of these sentences refers to an unreal event. The reason why the original optative is replaced by an injunctive ἕλον and not by an augmented indicative cannot be addressed here.

In the larger corpus, there are more examples of this type of postposed εἰ μή-clauses in the larger corpus. There are two examples with the optative, quoted below:

(EX.04.42) (311) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' <u>ἀπόλοιτο</u> ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
(312) εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη. (*Iliad* 5,311-312).

"And now there the ruler of men, Aineias would have died there, if Zeus' daughter, Aphrodite, had not sharply noticed."

(EX.04.43) (388) καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο Ἄρης ἆτος πολέμοιο,
(389) εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια
(390) Ἑρμέᾳ ἐξήγγειλεν: ὃ δ' ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα. (*Iliad* 5,388-390).

"And now Ares, insatiable for war, would have died there, had the stepmother Eeriboia with her shining beauty, not informed Hermes. He then snatched Ares away."

In most examples, however, the indicative is already used in the main clause:

(EX.04.44) (679) καί νύ κ᾽ ἔτι πλέονας Λυκίων <u>κτάνε</u> δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
(680) εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ὀξὺ νόησε μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ: (*Iliad* 5,679-680).

"And now shining Odysseus would have killed many (more) of the Lykians, if great Hektor with the waving helmet had not sharply noticed."

(EX.04.45) (310) ἔνθα κε λοιγὸς <u>ἔην</u> καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα <u>γένοντο</u>
(311) καί νύ κεν ἐν νήεσσι πέσον φεύγοντες Ἀχαιοί,
(312) εἰ μὴ Τυδεΐδη Διομήδεϊ κέκλετ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς. (*Iliad* 11,310-312).[191]

"And there there would have been death and unspeakable actions would have occurred, and now the fleeing Akhaians would have fallen in the ships, if Odysseus had not shouted to Diomedes, son of Tydeus."

(EX.04.46) (713) καί νύ κε δὴ πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα
(714) Ἕκτορα δάκρυ χέοντες ὀδύροντο πρὸ πυλάων,
(715) εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ ἐκ δίφροιο γέρων λαοῖσι μετηύδα. (*Iliad* 24,713-715).

"And now they would have wailed for Hektor, in front of the gates shedding tears the entire day until the setting of the sun, had not the old man addressed the people from his chariot."

The aorist forms refer to single actions (for ἐξήγγειλεν, cf. supra and κέκλετ᾽ is an aorist, because *verba dicendi* are considered to be durative, but *verba clamandi* are not)[192] and the imperfects to more durative actions. In 11,310 the indicative γένοντο could "hide" an older optative γένοιτο (with a single verb for a neutre plural subject).

A last example of a construction with an optative in the conditional clause interpretable as an old wish and a counterfactual optative in the main clause is the following:

(EX.04.47) (746) εἰ δή που καὶ πόντῳ ἐν ἰχθυόεντι <u>γένοιτο</u>,
(747) πολλοὺς ἂν <u>κορέσειεν</u> ἀνὴρ ὅδε τήθεα διφῶν
(748) νηὸς ἀποθρῴσκων, εἰ καὶ δυσπέμφελος <u>εἴη</u> (*Iliad* 16,746-748).

"If only he were somewhere in the sea rich in fishes, this man would satisfy man of them, looking for oysters, jumping overboard from a ship, even if the sea was stormy."

191. De Decker (2015: 236).
192. For more details see De Decker (2015: 195-211, and specifically 207 for this instance; see also De Decker forthcoming).

In this instance, Patroklos mocks the dying Kebriones and states that if he were a diver in a sea full of fish, he would have given food to many of them. This description is clearly unreal and this is another instance in which the optative refers to something that is only remotely possible (at best) and probably contrary-to-fact. Note that they are metrically secure. The first conditional clause can still be interpreted as an old wish clause "if only he were in the sea …", but for the second such a reconstruction is more difficult. The use of the tenses is aspectual, the aorists refer to the single action of Kebriones' dying moments: he falls of his chariot resembling a diver jumping into the sea. As Kebriones can only die once, the aorist is used. The present refers to the stormy sea into which Kebriones as diver would have jumped. The looking for oysters and the diving into the sea are conceived as durative actions, as one has to dive and look for them intensely before finding them.

The final example from *Iliad* 16 is a special case in which two different constructions are combined, but no optatives are used, only injunctives and indicatives:

(EX.04.48) (847) τοιοῦτοι δ᾿ εἴ πέρ μοι ἐείκοσιν <u>ἀντεβόλησαν</u>,
(848) πάντές κ᾿ αὐτόθ᾿ <u>ὄλοντο</u> ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ δαμέντες,
(849) ἀλλά με μοῖρ᾿ ὀλοὴ καὶ Λητοῦς <u>ἔκτανεν</u> υἱός. (*Iliad* 16,847-849).

"If twenty of such men had approached me, they would all have died there on the spot, tamed by my sword, but destructive Fate and the son of Leto have killed me."

In these verses Patroklos refutes Hektor's claim that he should have listened to Akhilleus' warnings not to assault the city. Patroklos replies that even if twenty Trojans had come towards him, he would all have killed them. There is a highly remarkable hiatus here in the injunctive form ὄλοντο ἐμῷ, which could contain an older optative ὀλοίατ᾿ ἐμῷ, but in that case we would have to accept an elision before the 3b caesura, and while not entirely impossible, this is nevertheless very uncommon. In this construction we have a merger of two different constructions: on the one hand, a preposed subordinate conditional clause (which could be an old wish clause) "if only twenty of them had approached me, they would have died!", but the form ἀντεβόλησαν (which does not have a metrically secure augment, and could therefore be an old injunctive or an indicative) cannot be contain an older optative, and on the other hand, a postposed paratactic "ἀλλά-clause", which describes how the unreal action described in the preceding clauses has been thwarted by an actual event, namely the fatal intervention by Fate and Apollon. In this in-

stance the metrical form preserved the ἀλλά-sentence and prevented a substitution into an εἰ μή-clause. The use of the aorist indicative in ἔκτανεν is easily explained, as the aorist refers to a single action and the indicative to an actual event; the use of the aorist in ἀντεβόλησαν and ὅλοντο is less straightforward, as one could think that Patroklos viewed this as durative, but in all likelihood he saw this as one action, "they would have approached me and would have died".

4.6. *Conclusion*

In this subchapter I analysed the data of epic Greek and by using many examples I showed that in epic Greek it is often difficult to distinguish between possibility, remote possibility and contrafactivity, that there is no difference between present and past reference in potential and counterfactual constructions, but that there are only aspectual differences, and that the optative, and not the indicative, was the oldest mood used in these constructions (this is confirmed by other Indo-European language and even Attic poetry and prose have relics of this older construction). The use of (forms that go back to) the optative to express the remotely possible and/or unreal in other Indo-European languages and the fact that some relics of the optatives in these contexts still exist in post-Homeric Greek make it more likely that the optative was the oldest mood for this type of meaning. The exact details about how and why the indicative eventually replaced the optative might not be entirely clear, but the use of both optative and indicative in epic Greek rules out that the use of the indicative with an MP to mark contrafactivity and the indicative without MP to refer to the realis is an isogloss between Greek and Anatolian.

5. *Conclusion*

In this long article I addressed one of the alleged morphosyntactic Graeco-Anatolian isoglosses, namely the use of a modal particle (MP) to convey modal meaning to the verb forms and to distinguish between the realis and the counterfactual / irrealis in the indicative. After making some methodological observations on the *comparanda*, I proceeded first to the use of the MP in Homeric Greek, analysing a large corpus of 5267 verses from the *Iliad* and providing a more detailed investigation of *Iliad* 16. My analyses showed that the MP was mostly used in speeches and only rarely in narrative. It is incompatible with the deontic and jussive axis as described in Allan 2013: this is the reason why it is missing in negative purpose/wish clauses, in positive wishes and purpose clauses, in deliberative (indirect) questions and with future-desiderative and future-subjunctive forms. It is used

when a specific instance in the near future and close to the speaker and hearer is related (in Basset's words, close to the *actualité du locuteur*). This explains why almost all instances can be found in speeches and not in narrative, and why it is not used in negative contexts, in descriptions of repeated actions (both in the optative and the subjunctive) and in generic and generalising statements (where the poet preferred the so-called *τε-épique*). The only mood where the MP could add modal meaning is the indicative in the so-called past potential and counterfactual constructions and would seem to confirm the isogloss, but upon closer inspection, we note first, that sharply distinguishing between past and present counterfactual and past and present potential is not always possible (and that the aspect rather than the distinction past / present is the factor deciding on the tense usage), second, that Homeric Greek used both the indicative and the optative for these constructions, third, that in many other Indo-European languages the optative or constructions and/or forms that can be reconstructed as an optative are used for these constructions, fourth, that even post-Homeric Greek has remnants of the optative in these type of constructions. All these elements make it more likely that the optative was the original mood for the (different degrees of) potentiality and contrafactivity, and that the indicative intruded on this field and gradually replaced the optative. The reason(s) why and the exact details about how the indicative eventually replaced the optative might not be entirely clear, but it is possible that the need to make a distinction between present and past reference might have played a role. In any case, the use of both optative and indicative in epic Greek for (past) potential and counterfactual constructions, the fact that the indicative is in all likelihood not the original mood, and the fact that the MP conveyed specific emphatic and deictic (and not modal) meaning to the verb form rule out that the use of the MP to grant modal (counterfactual) meaning to the indicative is an isogloss between Greek and Anatolian.

6. *References*

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literatur, University of California, Irvine. http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/inst/tsearch.jsp

The Chicago Homer: Ahuvia Kahane – Martin Mueller (eds.) https://homer.library.northwestern.edu/html/application.html

Perseus Digital Library. Gregory R. Crane (ed.). Tufts University. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:collection: Greco-Roman

ADRADOS, Francisco R. et al. (eds.) (1986): *Diccionario griego – español. II: Alla-Apokoinonetos*. Madrid.

AHRENS, Rudolph (1852): *Griechische Formenlehre des Homerischen und Attischen Dialektes*. Göttingen.

AKEN, Adolf Friedrich (1861): *Die Grundzüge der Lehre von Tempus und Modus im Griechischen: historisch und vergleichend aufgestellt*. Rostock.

AKEN, Adolf Friedrich (1865): *Die Hauptdata der griechischen Tempus- und Moduleher, historisch und vergleichend*. Berlin.

ALLAN, Rutger (2013): "Exploring Modality's Semantic Space Grammaticalization, Subjectification and the case of ὀφείλω". *Glotta* 89: 1-46.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich (1868): *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Erster Band. Erstes Heft. Gesang I-III*. Leipzig.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich – HENTZE, Carl (1881): *Anhang zu Homers Ilias Schulausgabe. Erläuterungen zu Gesang XVI – XVIII*. Leipzig.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich – HENTZE, Carl (1884): *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang I-III*. Leipzig.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich – HENTZE, Carl (1885): *Homers Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Zweiter Band. Zweites Heft. Gesang XVI - XVIII*. Leipzig.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich – HENTZE, Carl (1901): *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XIX-XXIV*. Leipzig.

AMEIS, Karl Friedrich – Hentze, Carl (1906): *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XXII-XXIV*. Leipzig.

AMIGUES, Suzanne (1977): *Les subordonnées finales par ΟΠΩΣ en attique classique*. Paris.

ATHANASIADOU, Angeliki – DIRVEN, René (1997): "Conditionality, hypotheticality, counterfactuality". In: id. (eds.): *On Conditionals Again*. Amsterdam, 61-97.

AVERY, John (1885): "The Unaugmented Verb Forms of the Rig and Atharva Vedas". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11, 326-365.

BAKKER, Egbert (1997): *Poetry in Speech. Orality and Homeric Discourse.* Ithaca.

BAKKER, Egbert (1999): "Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer". In: Kazazis, John – Rengakos, Antonios (eds.): *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*. Stuttgart, 50-65.

BAKKER, Egbert (2001): "Similes, Augment and the Language of Immediacy". In: Watson, Jane (ed.): *Speaking Volumes. Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World*. Leiden, 1-23.

BARNES, Joshua (1711): *Homeri Ilias and Odyssea. Et in easdem Scholia, sive INTERPRETATIO, Veterum*. Cambridge.

BASSET, Louis (1984): "L'optatif grec et la dissociation énonciative". *LALIES* 4: 53-59.

BASSET, Louis (1986): "La représentation subjective d'un point de vue passée: l'optatif oblique dans les complétives déclaratives chez Thucydide". In: id. (ed.): *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora* (= 2004). Lyon, 19-40.

BASSET, Louis (1988a): "Valeurs et emplois de la particule dite modale en grec ancien". In: Albert Rijksbaron – Hotze Mulder – Gerry Wakker (eds.): *In the footsteps of Raphael Kühner*. Amsterdam 27-37.

BASSET, Louis (1988b): "Qu'est-ce que l'irréél?". In: N. N. (eds.): *Hediston Logodeipnon. Mélanges de philologie et de linguistique grecques offerts à Jean Taillardat*. Paris, 25-32.

BASSET, Louis (1989): *La syntaxe de l'imaginaire*: *études des modes et des négations dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée*. Lyon.

BASSET, Louis (2000a): "L'opposition aspectuelle présent/aoriste chez Platon: une paire minimale 'peux-tu le dire?'". In: id. (ed.): *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora* (= 2004). Lyon, 123-134.

BASSET, Louis (2000b): "Le prévisible et l'imprévu : oppositions de l'imparfait et de l'indicatif de l'aoriste dans Thucydide VI". In: id. (ed.): *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora* (= 2004). Lyon, 135-142.

BASSET, Louis (2004): *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora*. Lyon.

BECK, Jana – MALAMUD, Sophia – OSADCHA, Iryna (2012): "A Semantics for the Particle ἄν in and OUTSIDE Conditionals in Classical Greek". *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12: 51-83.

BEEKES, Robert S. P. (2010): "Etymological Dictionary of Greek". LIEEDS 10. Leiden – Boston.

BENNETT, Charles (1910): *The Syntax of Early Latin*. Boston.

BENVENISTE, Émile (1951): "Prétérit et optatif en indo-européen". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 47: 11-20.

BERNHARDY, Gottfried (1829): *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Berlin.

BERS, Victor (1984): *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age*. New Haven

BIANCONI, Michele (2015): "Contatti greco-anatolici e *Sprachbund* egeomicrasiatico. Stato della ricerca e nuove prospettive". *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* 100: 129-178.

BIZOS, Marcel (1961): *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris.

BLASS, Friedrich (1889): "Demosthenische Studien III". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 44: 406-430.

BRASWELL, Bruce (1988): *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin.

BRÜGGER, Claude (2018): *Homer Iliad. The Basel Commentary. Book XVI*. Berlin.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1880): "Beiträge zur Conjugationslehre". In: id. – Karl Osthoff (eds.): *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 3. Cambridge, 1-91.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1890): *Griechische Grammatik*. München.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1900): *Griechische Grammatik*. München.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1904): *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indo-germanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1916): *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. II.3*. Strassburg.

BRUGMANN, Karl (1925): *Die Syntax des einfachen Satzes im Indogermanischen*. Berlin.

BRUGMANN, Karl – Thumb, Albert (1913): *Griechische Grammatik*. München.

BRUNEL, Jean (1980): "Les périodes conditionnelles du grec et le problème de l'optatif". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 75, 227-261.

BUTTMANN, Philip (1810[5]): *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin.

BUTTMANN, Philip (1819[5]): *Griechische Schulgrammatik*. Berlin.

BUTTMANN, Philip (1830): *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre. Erster Band*. Berlin.

BUTTMANN, Philip (1854): *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin.

BYBEE, Joan – PERKINS, Revere – PAGLIUCA, William (1994): *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago.

CAMERER, Ruth (1968): "Über den emphatischen Grundwert des Partikels ἄν". *Glotta* 46: 106-117.

CAREY, Christopher (2007): *Lysiae Orationes*. Oxford.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1948): *Grammaire homérique*. Paris.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1953): *Grammaire homérique. II: Syntaxe*. Paris.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1964[2]): *Morphologie historique du grec*. Paris.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1966): "Questions de syntaxe grecque I-II". *Revue de philologie* 40: 37-44.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre (1968-1980): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris.

CLACKSON, James (2007): *Indo-European Linguistics*: *An Introduction*. Cambridge.

COLVIN, Stephen (2012): "The Modal Particle in Greek". *The Cambridge Classical Journal* 62: 65-84.

COMRIE, Bernd (1986): "Conditionals: a typology". In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott – Alice Ter Meulen – Judy Snitzer Reilly – Charles A. Ferguson (eds.): *On Conditionals*. Cambridge, 77-99.

CRESPO, Emilio (1997): "Delbrück y la sintaxis de los modos". In: Emilio Crespo – José Luís García-Ramón (eds.): *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy*. Wiesbaden, 27-62.

CRISTOFARO, Sonia (2012): "Descriptive notions vs. grammatical categories: Unrealized states of affairs and 'irrealis'". *Language Sciences* 34: 131-146.

DAHL, Eystein (2010): *Time, Tense and Aspect in Early Vedic Grammar*. Leiden.

Dahl, Östen (1997): "The relationship between past time reference and COUNTERFACTUALITY: a new look". In: Angeliki Athanasiadou – René Dirven (eds.): *On Conditionals Again*. Amsterdam, 97-113.

DEBRUNNER, Albert (1921): "Das hellenistische Nebensatziterativpräteritum mit ἄν". *Glotta* 11: 1-28.

DE DECKER, Filip (2015): *A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Speech Introductions and Conclusions in Homer*. PhD dissertation. Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.

DE DECKER, Filip (2016): "A contrastive analysis of the Homeric and Hesiodic augment, with special focus on Hesiod". *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 13: 33-128.

DE DECKER, Filip (2018): "The tense usage in the speech conclusions with past reference in Homer". *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 46: 109-151.

DE DECKER, Filip (2019): "Studies in Greek epic diction, metre and language: the augment use in The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite (HH 5)". *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 16: 1-86.

DE DECKER, Filip (2020): "A semantic-pragmatic analysis of the augment in epic Greek, applied to some longer passages". In: Martti Leiwo – Marja Vierros – Sonja Dahlgren (eds.): *Papers on Ancient Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the Ninth International Colloquium on Ancient Greek Linguistics. 30 August – 1 September 2018*. Helsinki, 447-477.

DE DECKER, Filip (forthcoming). "The tense usage in the speech introductions with past reference in Homer".

DE HAAN, Ferdinand (2006): "Typological approaches to modality". In: William Frawley (ed.): *The expression of modality*. Berlin, 26-63.

DE JONG, Irene (1987): *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Bristol.

DE JONG, Irene (2012): *Homer. Iliad Book XXII*. Cambridge.

DELAUNOIS, Marcel (1975): "Contributions à l'étude de la notion du "possible du passé" en grec classique". *L'Antiquité Classique* 44: 5-19.

DELAUNOIS, Marcel (1988): *Essai de syntaxe grecque classique*. Leuven.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1871): *Syntaktische Forschungen. I: Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*. Halle.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1876): *Syntaktische Forschungen. II: Altindische Tempuslehre*. Halle.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1879): *Syntaktische Forschungen. IV: Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*. Halle.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1888): *Syntaktische Forschungen. V: Altindische Syntax*. Halle.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1897): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen II*. Leipzig.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1900): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen III*. Leipzig.

DELBRÜCK, Berthold (1904): "Der germanische optativ in Satzgefügen". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 29: 201-304.

DE MOL, Geert (2015): *Het modale partikel ἄν / κε(ν) / κα. Een bijdrage aan de Griekse Grammatica DyLEGRam*. MA dissertation. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

DEVARIUS, Matthaeus (1587): *De Graecae linguae particulis*. Roma

DEVARIUS, Matthaeus – Klotz, Reinhold (1835): *Matthaei Devari Liber de Graecae linguae particulis. Edidit Reinholdus Klotz*. Leipzig.

DRAEGER, Anton (1874): *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache*. Band I. Leipzig.

DRAEGER, Anton (1878): *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache*. Band II. Leipzig.

DREWITT, John (1912a): "The Augment in Homer". *Classical Quarterly* 6 (1): 44-59.

DREWITT, John (1912b): "The Augment in Homer (continued)". *Classical Quarterly* 6 (2): 104-120.

DREWITT, John (1913): "A Note on the Augment". *Classical Philology* 8 (3): 349-353.

DUBOIS, Laurent (1986): *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien. I: Grammaire*. Louvain-la-Neuve.

DUNKEL, George (1990): "Jakob Wackernagel und die idg. Partikeln *só*, *ke*, *kem* und *an*". In: Helmut Rix – Heiner Eichner (eds.): *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*. Wiesbaden, 110-130.

DUNKEL, George (2014): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*, *II*: *Lexikon*. Heidelberg.

EBELING, Heinrich (1885): *Lexicon Homericum. I: A-Ξ*. Leipzig.

EULER, Wolfram (1994): "Herkunft und ursprüngliche Funktion des Optativs Präteriti im Germanischen". In: Gertrud Bense (ed.): *Diachronie – Kontinuität – Impulse*. Frankfurt. 25-49.

EULER, Wolfram (1995): "Der Injunktiv, die archaischste Verbalkategorie im Indogermanischen". In: Wojciech Smoczyński (ed.): *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume, I*. Cracow. 137-142.

EVANGELISTI, Enzo (1955): *L'imperfetto armeno e l'uso preteritale dell' ottativo indeuropeo*. Arona.

FAESI, Johann Ulrich (1858a): *Homers Iliade, erklärt von J. U. Faesi. Erster Band.* Berlin.

FAESI, Johann Ulrich (1858b): *Homers Iliade, erklärt von J. U. Faesi. Zweiter Band.* Berlin.

FAESI, Johann Ulrich (1860): *Homers Odyssee, erklärt von J. U. Faesi*. Berlin.

FERNÁNDEZ GALIANO, Manuel (1992): "Books XXI-XXII". In: Joseph Russo – id. – Albert Heubeck (eds.): *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. III*: *Books XVII – XXIV*. Oxford, 131-311.

FICK, August (1883): *Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen.

FICK, August (1885): *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen.

FICK, August (1887): *Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen Fassung und Sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen.

FORBES, Kathleen (1958): "The Relations of the Particle ἄν with κε(ν), κα, καν". *Glotta* 37: 179-182.

FOURNIER, Henri (1946): "Formules homériques de références avec verbe 'dire'". *Revue de Philologie* 20: 29-68.

FRANKE, August (1861): *Über die Bildung der Futura im Griechischen*. Lingen.

FRAENKEL, Eduard (1950): *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*. Oxford.

FRISK, Hjalmar (1960): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. I: A-Ko*. Heidelberg.

FROHBERGER, Hermann (1863): "Ueber die unterordnung mehrerer verba unter *ein ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* stehendes *ἄν*". *Philologus* 19: 599-613.

FYKIAS, Ioannis – KATSIKADELI, Christina (2013): "The rise of 'subordination features' in the history of Greek and their decline". *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3 (1): 28-48.

GARCÍA-RAMÓN, José-Luís (2012): "Aspect and Mood in Indo-European Reconstruction". In: H. Craig Melchert (ed.): *The Indo-European Verb. Proceedings of the Conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies, Los Angeles, 13-15 September 2010.* Bremen, 73-85.

GERÖ, Eva-Carin (2000): "The Usage of ἄν and κε in Ancient Greek: Towards a Unified Description". *Glotta* 76: 176-191.

GERÖ, Eva-Carin (2001): "Irrealis and Past Tense in Ancient Greek". *Glotta* 77: 178-197.

GERTH, Berthold (1878): *Grammatisch-Kritisches zur griechischen Moduslehre.* Dresden.

GILDERSLEEVE, Basil Lanneau (1882): "Studies in Pindaric Syntax". *American Journal of Philology* 3: 434-455.

GILDERSLEEVE, Basil Lanneau (1900): *Syntax of Classical Greek.* Baltimore.

GIUSFREDI, Federico (in press): "On the Aegean-Anatolian interface in the Final Bronze Age: some historical considerations and their cultural and linguistic implications". Forthcoming in the proceedings of the conference *The Aegean Interface, 19. Grazer Althistorische Advent gespräche, 12-13 December 2019.*

GOLDSTEIN, David (2012): "Iterated Modal Marking and Polarity Focus in Ancient Greek". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 110: 1-25.

GONDA, Jan (1956): *The Character of the Indo-European Moods.* Wiesbaden

GOODWIN, William (1865): *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb.* Cambridge.

GREENBERG, Joseph (1963): "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements". In: Joseph Greenberg (ed.): *Universals of Language.* Cambridge, 73-113.

GREENBERG, Joseph (1986): "The realis-irrealis continuum in the Classical Greek conditional". In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott – Alice Ter Meulen – Judy Snitzer Reilly – Charles A. Ferguson (eds.): *On Conditionals.* Cambridge, 247-264.

HAJNAL, Ivo (2014): "Die griechisch-anatolischen Sprachkontakte zur Bronzezeit – Sprachbund oder loser Sprachkontakt?". *Linguarum Varietas* 3: 105-116.

HAJNAL, Ivo (2018): "Graeco-Anatolian Contacts in the Mycenaean Period". In: Jared S. Klein – Brian D. Joseph – Matthias Fritz (eds.): *Handbook of Com-*

parative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics, III. Berlin – Boston, 2037-2055.

HARRIS, Martin (1986): "The historical development of SI-clauses in Romance". In: Elizabeth Closs Traugott – Alice Ter Meulen – Judy Snitzer Reilly – Charles A. Ferguson (eds.): *On Conditionals*. Cambridge, 265-284.

HARTUNG, Johann (1832): *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache I*. Erlangen.

HARTUNG, Johann (1833): *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache II*. Erlangen.

HENTZE, Carl (1907): "Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikeln εἰ, εἴ κε und ἤν mit dem Konjunktiv". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 41: 356-378.

HERMANN, Eduard (1895): "Gab es im Indogermanischen Nebensätze?". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 33: 481-534.

HERMANN, Gottfried (1831): *De Particula ἄν libri IV*. Leipzig.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1976): *Kontext und Aspekt in der altgriechischen Prosa Herodots*. Göttingen.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1987): "Zur Entwicklung der Finalsätze altindo-germanischer Sprachen". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 100 (2): 219-237.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1988): *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen*. Berlin.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1992): "Lateinische Konditionalsätze in sprach-vergleichender Sicht". In: Oswald Panagl – Thomas Krisch (eds.): *Latein und Indogermanisch. Akten des Kolloquiums der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Salzburg, 23.-26. September 1986*. Innsbruck, 263-284.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1996): "Review of G. Wakker, *Conditions and conditionals. An investigation of Ancient Greek*". *Kratylos* 41: 130-137.

HETTRICH, Heinrich (1998): "Die Entstehung des homerischen Irrealis der Vergangenheit". In: Jay Jasanoff – H. Craig Melchert – Oliver Lisi (eds.): *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck, 261-270.

HOFFMANN, Karl (1967). *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg.

HOFFNER, Harry A. – MELCHERT, H. Craig (2008): *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. LANE 1. Winona Lake.

HOLLENBAUGH, Ian (2018): "Aspects of the Indo-European Aorist and Imperfect. Re-evaluating the evidence of the R̥gveda and Homer and its implications for PIE". *Indo-European Linguistics* 6: 1-68.

HOLLENBAUGH, Ian (2020): "Pragmatics, discourse context, and common ground: Hymn-initial injunctives in the R̥gveda". Presentation and Handout presented at the *230th Meeting of the American Oriental Society*. Boston, March 22, 2020.

HOOGEVEEN, Henricus (1769): *Doctrina particularum linguae Graecae*. Leiden.

HOOGEVEEN, Henricus – SCHÜTZ, Christian (1813): *Henrici Hoogeveen doctrina particularum linguae Graecae in epitomen redegit Christianus Schütz.* Glasgow.

HORROCKS, Geoffrey (1995): "On condition: aspect and modality in the history of Greek". *Cambridge Classical Journal* 41: 153-174.

HOWORTH, R. H. (1955): "The Origin of the Use of ἄν and κεν in Indefinite Clauses". *Classical Quarterly* 5 (2): 72-93.

HUMBERT, Jean (1960): *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris.

HUMMEL, Pascal (1993): *La syntaxe de Pindare*. Leuven.

H. M. (1832): "On Certain Constructions of the Subjunctive Mood". *Philological Museum* 1: 96-106.

JACQUINOD, Bernard (2017): "The Syntax of Greek". In: Jared S. Klein – Brian D. Joseph – Matthias Fritz (eds.): *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics I*. Berlin – Boston, 682-695.

JAMISON, Stephanie (2009): "Where have all the optatives gone?". In: Kazuhiko Yoshida – Brent Vine (eds.): *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*. Bremen, 27-45.

JANKO, Richard (1992): *The Iliad: a commentary. Volume XIII-XVI*. Cambridge.

JEFFERS, Robert J. – PEPICELLO, William. J. (1979): "The Expression of Purpose in Indo-European". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 84: 1-16.

JOLLY, Julius (1871): *Die Moduslehre in den altiranischen Dialekten in ihrer Bedeutung für die Classification des arischen Sprachzweigs*. München.

KELLENS, Jean (1984): *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden.

KELLENS, Jean (1985): "Le système modal vieux perse". *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 45: 105-125.

KEYDANA, Götz (2018): "The Syntax of Proto-Indo-European". In: Jared S. Klein – Brian D. Joseph – Matthias Fritz (eds.): *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics, III*. Berlin – Boston, 2195-2228.

KIECKERS, Ernst (1926): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen IV. Syntax. Zweiter Teil*. Berlin.

KIPARSKY, Paul (1968): "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax". *Foundations of Language* 4 (1): 30-57.

KIPARSKY, Paul (1995): "Indo-European Origins of Germanic Syntax". In: Adrian Battye – Ian Roberts (eds.): *Clause Structure and Language Change*. Oxford, 140-172.

KIPARSKY, Paul (2005): "The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and Synchronic Implications". In: Rajendra Singh – Tanmoy Bhattacarya (eds.): *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2005*. Berlin – New York, 219-235.

KIRK, Geoffrey (1985): *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books I-IV*. Cambridge.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. LIEEDS 5. Leiden – Boston.

KLUGE, Heinrich (1911): *Syntaxis Graecae quaestiones selectae*. Berlin.

KNOBL, Werner (2007): "Mind-reading the Poet: Cases of Intended Metrical Irregularity in Vedic Poetry". *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 24: 105-139.

KOCH, Konrad (1868): *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*. Braunschweig.

KÖLLIGAN, Daniel (2007): *Suppletion und Defektivität im griechischen Verbum*. Bremen.

KOPPERS, Bertha (1959): *Negative Conditional Sentences in Greek and some other Indo-European Languages*. The Hague.

KOPPIN, Karl (1878): "Giebt es in der griechischen Sprache einen modus irrealis? Fortsetzung". *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* 32: 97-131.

KRAUSE, Wolfgang – WERNER, Thomas (1960): *Tocharisches Elementar-buch. I: Grammatik*. Heidelberg.

KRISCH, Thomas (1986): *Überlegungen zur Herkunft und Entwicklung der irrealen Konditionalsätze des Altgriechischen*. Innsbruck.

KRÜGER, Karl Wilhelm (1845): *Griechische Grammatik für Schulen*. Berlin.

KRÜGER, Karl Wilhelm (1859): *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen. Zweiter Theil: Ueber die Dialekte, vorzugsweise den epischen und ionischen. Zweites Heft: Poetisch-dialektische Syntax*. Berlin.

KÜHNER, Raphael (1870²): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil, erste Abtheilung.* Hannover.

KÜHNER, Raphael – GERTH, Berthold (1898): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre. Erster Band.* Hannover.

KÜHNER, Raphael – GERTH, Berthold (1904): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre.* Zweiter Band. Hannover.

KÜMMEL, Martin (2000): *Das Perfekt im Indo-Iranischen*. Wiesbaden.

KUNAMOTO, Hiroshi (2009): "The Injunctive in Khotanese". In: Kazuhiko Yoshida – Brent Vine (eds.): *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*. Bremen, 133-149.

LANG, Mabel (1989): "Unreal Conditions in Homeric Narrative". *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 30: 5-26.

LANGE, Ludwig (1872): *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel EI*. Leipzig.

LANGE, Ludwig (1873): *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel EI II: EI KEN/ AN mit dem Optativ und EI ohne Verbum Finitum*. Leipzig.

LA ROCHE, Jakob (1870): *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XIII-XVI*. Berlin.

LA ROCHE, Jakob (1871): *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XXI-XXIV*. Berlin.

LA ROCHE, Jakob (1876): *Homeri Ilias ad fidem librorum optimorum edidit J. La Roche. Pars posterior*. Leipzig.

LATACZ, Joachim (2000): *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Band I.1. Faszikel 1: Text: Gesang und Übersetzung*. München.

LATACZ, Joachim – NÜNLIST, René – STOEVESANDT, Magdalene (2002): *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar. Band I. Erster Gesang. Faszikel 2: Kommentar*. München.

LATTMANN, Hermann (1903): "Die Bedeutung der Modi im Griechischen und Lateinischen". *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und Deutsche Literatur, und für Pädagogik* 6. 410-416.

LAZARD, Gilbert (1975): "La catégorie de l'éventuel". In: Françoise Bader (ed.): *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste*. Paris, 347-358.

LAZARD, Gilbert (1998): "L'expression de l'irréel: essai de typologie". In: Leonid Kulikov – Heinz Vater (eds.): *Typology of Verbal Categories*. Tübingen, 237-247.

Leaf, Walter (1888): *Homer: The Iliad. II. Books XIII-XXIV*. London.

LEAF, Walter (1900): *Homer: The Iliad I. Books I-XII*. London.

LEHMANN, Winfred (1974): *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin.

LEHMANN, Winfred (1980): "The Reconstruction of Non-Simple Sentences in Proto-Indo-European". In: Paolo Ramat (ed.): *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax*. Amsterdam, 113-144.

LEUMANN, Manu (1940): "Zur Vorgeschichte der lateinischen Finalsätze mit *ut*". In: N. N. (ed.): *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à Alfred Ernout*. Paris, 231-235.

RIX, Helmut (ed.) (2001[2]): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen. Unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer, bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer*. Wiesbaden.

LÜHR, Rosemarie (2000): "Der Nebensatz und seine Konkurrenten in der Indogermania: Der altindische Relativsatz". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 113: 71-87.

LÜHR, Rosemarie (2008): "Competitive Indo-European Syntax". In: Gisella Ferraresi – Maria Goldbach (eds.): *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction*. Amsterdam, 121-159.

LÜHR, Rosemarie (2012): "Komplementsätze im Indoiranischen". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 125: 227-241.

MADVIG, Johan (1847): *Syntax der griechischen Sprache, besonders der attischen Sprachform, für Schulen*. Braunschweig.

MASIUS, Richard (1885): *Über den Gebrauch des Konjunktiv in unabhängigen Sätzen bei Homer*. Glogau.

MATTHIAE, August (1826): *Ausführliche griechische Grammatik*. Leipzig

MEIN, Anton (1903): *De optativi obliqui usu Homerico. Pars I. De sententiis obliquis aliunde pendentibus primariis*. Bonn.

MEISER, Gerhard (1993): "Uritalische Modussyntax: zur Genese des Konjunktiv Imperfekts". In: Helmut Rix (ed.): *Oskisch-Umbrisch. Texte und Grammatik*. Wiesbaden, 167-175.

MEISTERHANS, Konrad (1885): *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*. Berlin.

MÉNDEZ DOSUNA, Julián (2018): "The Language of the Dodona Oracular Tablets". In: Georgios Giannakis – Emilio Crespo – Panagiotis Filos (eds.): *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects: From Central Greece to the Black Sea*. Berlin, 265-296.

METHNER, Rudolph (1908): *Die Grundbedeutungen und Gebrauchstypen der Modi im Griechischen*, Bromberg.

MINCHIN, Elisabeth (2014): "Poet, Audience, Time, and Text: Reflections on Medium and Mode in Homer and Virgil". In: Ruth Scodel (ed.): *Between Orality and Literacy: Communication and Adaptation in Antiquity*. Leiden, 267-288.

MONRO, David Binning (1891): *Homeric Grammar*. Oxford.

MONTANARI, Franco (2015): *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden.

MUMM, Peter-Arnold (1995): "Verbale Definitheit und der vedische Injunktiv". In: Heinrich Hettrich – Wolfgang Hock (eds.): *Verba et Structurae*. *Festschrift für Klaus Strunk*. Innsbruck, 169-193.

MUMM, Peter-Arnold (2004): "Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments". In: Thomas Krisch (ed.): *Analecta homini universali dicata*: *Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik*, *Linguistik*, *Philologie*, *Politik*, *Musik und Dichtung*. *Festschrift für Oswald Panagl*. Stuttgart, 148-158.

MUMM, Peter-Arnold (2011): "Optativ und verbale Infinitheit". In: Thomas Krisch – Thomas Lindner (eds.): *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog*. Wiesbaden, 411-420.

MUTZBAUER, Carl (1902): "Die Entwicklung des sogenannten Irrealis bei Homer". *Philologus* 61: 481-502.

MUTZBAUER, Carl (1903a): "Die Grundbedeutung des Conjunctivs und Optativs und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen". *Philologus* 62: 388-409.

MUTZBAUER, Carl (1903b): "Das Wesen des Optativs". *Philologus* 62: 626-638.

MUTZBAUER, Carl (1908): *Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktiv und Optativ und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Leipzig.

NAPOLI, Maria (2006): *Aspect and Actionality in Homeric Greek. A Contrastive Analysis*. Milan.

NEISSER, Walter (1927): "Vedica". *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 5: 281-292.

NESSELRATH, Heinz-Günther (1992): *Ungeschehenes Geschehen. 'Beinahe-Episoden' im griechsichen und römischen Epos von Homer bis zur Spätantike*. Stuttgart.

NOTOPOULOS, James (1949): "Parataxis in Homer. A New Approach to Homeric Literary Criticism". *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 80: 1-23.

NUTTING, Herbert Chester (1901): "The Unreal Conditional Sentence in Plautus". *The American Journal of Philology* 22: 297-316.

NUYTS, Jan (2006): "Modality: overview and linguistic issues". In: William Frawley (ed.). *The expression of Modality*. Berlin, 1-26.

ORESHKO, Rotislav (2018): "Anatolian linguistic influences in Early Greek (1500–800 BC)? Critical observations against sociolinguistic and areal background". *Journal of Language Relationship* 16: 93-118.

PAGE, Denys Lionel –DENNISTON, John Dewar (1957): *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*. Oxford.

PAGNIELLO, Frederick (2007): "The past-iterative and the augment in Homer". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 112: 105-123.

PALMER, Frank (2001[2]): *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge.

PALMER, Leonard (1960): *The Language of Homer*. In: Alan Wace – Frank Stubbings (eds.): *A Companion to Homer*. London, 75-178.

PINAULT, Georges Jean (1997): "Sur l'assemblage des phrases (,Satzgefüge') en tokharien". In: Emilio Crespo – José Luís García-Ramón (eds.): *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy*. Wiesbaden, 449-500.

PLATT, Arthur (1891): "The Augment in Homer". *American Journal of Philology* 19: 211-237.

POLSLEY, Cynthia Carolyn (2019): *Contrafactual Structures in Ancient Greek Narrative*. PhD dissertation. Yale University.

PROBERT, Philomen (2015): *Early Greek Relative Clauses*. Oxford.

RAMAT, Paolo (ed.) (1980): *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax*. Amsterdam.

REICHELT, Hans (1909): *Altawestisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg.

RENOU, Louis (1928): "Les formes dites d'injonctif dans le RgVeda". In: *Étrennes linguistiques offertes par quelques amis à Émile Benveniste*. Paris, 63-80.

RENOU, Louis (1952): *Grammaire sanscrite*. Paris.

RICHARDSON, Nicholas (1993): *The Iliad*: *A Commentary. 6*: *XXII-XXIV*. Cambridge.

RIEKEN, Elisabeth (2012): *Die Konditionalsätze, Irrelevanzkonditionalia und Konzessivsätze des Altirischen*. Münster.

RIJKSBARON, Albert (2002): *The Syntaxis and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*: *an Introduction*. Amsterdam.

RISCH, Ernst (1953): "Review of D. Tabachovitz, *Homerische εἰ-Sätze. Eine sprachpsychologische Studie*". *Gnomon* 25: 138-140.

RISCH, Ernst (1954): "Review of P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique. II: Syntaxe*". *Gnomon* 26: 70-74.

RIX, Helmut (1976): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt.

RIX, Helmut (1992²): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt.

ROMAGNO, Domenica (2005): *Il perfetto omerico. Diatesi azionalità e ruoli tematici*. Pisa.

ROMAGNO, Domenica (2015): "The Greek-Anatolian area in the 2nd millennium B.C.: between language contact, Indo-European inheritance and typologically natural tendencies". *Studi e Saggi Linguistici* 53: 429-446.

RUIJGH, Cornelis Jord (1969): "Esquisse d'une nouvelle théorie sur 'TE épique'". *Mnemosyne* 22 (1): 1-69.

RUIJGH, Cornelis Jord (1971): *Autour de "τε-épique"*. Amsterdam.

RUIJGH, Cornelis Jord (1992): "L'emploi le plus ancien et les emplois plus récents de la particule κε/ ἄν". In: Françoise Létoublon (ed.): *La langue et les textes en grec ancien*. *Actes du Colloque Pierre Chantraine*. Amsterdam, 75-84.

SCHWYZER, Eduard (1939): *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München.

SCHWYZER, Eduard – DEBRUNNER, Alfred (1950): *Griechische Grammatik*. *II: Syntax*. München.

SEILER, Hansjakob (1971): "Abstract Structures for Moods in Greek". *Language* 47: 79-89.

SEILER, Hansjakob (1993): "Satzverbindung in Konditionalgefüge (besonders im Altgriechischen)". *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 47: 143-158.

SEILER, Hansjakob (1997): "Conditionals in dimensional perspective". In: Angeliki Athanasiadou – René Dirven (eds.): *On Conditionals Again*. Amsterdam, 307-320.

SIMON, Zsolt (2018): "Anatolian Influences on Greek". In: Łukasz Niesiołowski-Spanò – Marek Węcowski (eds.): *Change, Continuity, and Connectivity. North-Eastern Mediterranean at the Turn of the Bronze Age and in the Early Iron Age*. Wiesbaden, 376-418.

SLOTTY, Julius (1915): *Der Gebrauch des Konjunktivs und Optativs in den griechischen Dialekten. I: Der Hauptsatz*. Göttingen.

SMYTH, Herbert – Messing, Gordon (1956): *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge.

STAHL, Johann Matthias (1907): *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*. Heidelberg.

STOLPE, August (1849): *Iterativorum Graecorum vis ac natura ex usu Homeri atque Herodoti demonstrata*. Bratislava.

STRUNK, Klaus (1968): "Zeit und Tempus in den altindogermanischen Sprachen". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 73: 279 -311.

STRUNK, Klaus (1975): "Zum Verhältnis von Wort und Satz in der Syntax des Lateinischen und Griechischen". *Gymnasium* 82: 225-239.

STRUNK, Klaus (1992): "À propos de quelques catégories marquées et non-marquées dans la grammaire du grec et de l'indo-européen". In: Françoise Létoublon (ed.): *La langue et les textes en grec ancien. Actes du Colloque Pierre Chantraine*. Amsterdam, 29-42.

STRUNK, Klaus (1997): "Vom Mykenischen bis zum klassischen Griechisch". In: Heinz-Günther Nesselrath (ed.): *Einleitung in de griechische Philologie*. Leipzig, 135-155.

SVENSSON, Arvid (1930): *Zum Gebrauch der erzählenden Tempora im Griechischen*. Lund.

TABACHOVITZ, David (1951): *Homerische ei Sätze. Eine sprach-wissenschaft-liche Untersuchung*. Lund.

TEDESCO, Paul (1923): "*a*-Stämme und *aya*-Stämme im Iranischen". *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 2: 281-315.

THOMAS, Werner (1952): *Die tocharischen Verbaladjektive auf -l. Eine syntaktische Untersuchung*. Berlin.

THOMAS, Werner (1970): "Zu einigen Besonderheiten der tocharischen Syntax". *Orbis* 19: 452-472.

TICHY, Eva (2002): "Zur Funktion und Vorgeschichte der indogermanischen Modi". In: Heinrich Hettrich – Jeong Soo Kim (eds.): *Indogermanische Syntax*: *Fragen und Perspektiven*. Wiesbaden, 189-208.

TICHY, Eva (2006): *Der Konjunktiv und seine Nachbarkategorien*. Bremen.

TICHY, Eva (2009): *Indogermanistisches Grundwissen für Studierende sprachwissenschaftlicher Disziplinen*. Bremen.

TICHY, Eva (2010): *Älter als der Hexameter*? *Schiffskatalog*, *Troerkatalog und vier Einzelszenen der Ilias*. Bremen.

TÝN, Emanuel (1860): "Über den Gebrauch und die Bedeutung der iterativen Imperfecta und Aoriste im Griechischen". *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 10: 677-695.

VALGIGLIO, Ernesto (1955): *Omero. Il IX Libro dell'Iliade*. Rome.

VAN DER AUWERA, Johan – PLUNGIAN, Vladimir (1998): "Modality's semantic map". *Linguistic Tipology* 2: 79-124.

VAN EMDE BOAS, Evert – HUITINK, Luuk (2010): "Syntax". In: Egbert Bakker (ed.): *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Malden, 134-150.

van Emde Boas, Evert et al. (2019): *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge.

VAN LEEUWEN, Jan (1885): "Homerica. De particularum κέν et ἄν apud Homerum usu". *Mnemosyne* 15: 75-119.

VAN POTTELBERGH, Rudolph (1939): *Over de Geschiedenis en de Beteekenis van den EI-zin in het Grieksch*. Gent.

VAN THIEL, Helmut (2011[2]): *Homeri Ilias*. Hildesheim.

VEITCH, William (1879): *Greek Verbs. Defective and Irregular*. Oxford.

VEKSINA, Marina (2017): "Modalized Future and Scheduled Present in Coan Inscriptions". In: Klaas Bentein – Mark Janse – Jorie Soltić (eds.): *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*. Leiden, 189-217.

VERSTRAETE, Jean-Christophe (2005): "The semantics and pragmatics of composite mood marking: The non-Pama-Nyungan languages of northern Australia". *Linguistic Tipology* 9: 223-268.

VITI, Carlotta (2007): *Strategies of Subordination in Vedic*. Milan.

VITI, Carlotta (2008): "The phylogenesis of hypotaxis in Vedic". *Diachronica* 25: 386-409.

VITI, Carlotta (2013): "Forms and functions of subordination in Indo-European". *Kuhns Zeitschrift* 126: 89-117.

VITI, Carlotta (2015): *Variation und Wandel in der Syntax der alten indogermanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen.

VOGRINZ, Gottfried (1889): *Grammatik des homerischen Dialektes*. Paderborn.

VON BÄUMLEIN, Wilhelm Friedrich (1846): *Untersuchungen über die griechischen Modi und die Partikeln κέν und ἄν*. Heilbronn.

VON CHRIST, Wilhelm (1880): "Die Wiederholungen gleicher und ähnlicher Verse in der Ilias". *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissen-schaften. Philosophisch-philologische Klasse* Jahrgang 1880: 221-272.

von Naegelsbach, Carl Friedrich (1834): *Bemerkungen zur Ilias (Buch I; II 1-483), nebst Excursen über Gegenstände der homerischen Grammatik*. Nürnberg.

VON THIERSCH, Friedrich Wilhelm (1818): *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialects*. Leipzig.

VON THIERSCH, Friedrich Wilhelm (1826): *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialektes*. Leipzig.

WACHTER, Rudolph (2000): "Grammatik der homerischen Sprache". In: Joachim Latacz (ed.): *Homer Gesamtkommentar*. Berlin, 61-108.

WACKERNAGEL, Jakob (1916): "Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer". *Glotta* 7: 161-319.

WACKERNAGEL, Jakob (1924): *Vorlesungen über Syntax II*. Basel.

WAKKER, Gerry (1994): *Conditions and Conditionals: An Investigation of Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam.

WAKKER, Gerry (2006): "'You could have thought': past potentials in Sopho-cles?". In: Irene De Jong – Albert Rijksbaron (eds.): *Sophocles and the Greek Language*. Leiden, 163-180.

WALTER, Adolf (1923): *Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktivs im Griechischen*. Heidelberg.

WATHELET, Paul (1997): "Les particules κεν et ἄν dans l'épopée grecque". In: Albert Rijksbaron (ed.): *New Approaches to Greek Particles*. Amsterdam, 247-268.

WEBER, Philip (1884): *Entwickelungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze. I: Von Homer bis zur attischen Prosa*. Würzburg.

WEST, Martin (1989): "An Unrecognized Injunctive Usage in Greek". *Glotta* 67: 135-138.

WEST, Martin (2000): *Homerus Ilias. II: Rhapsodiae XIII - XXIV*. Berlin.

WILHELMI, Wilhelm (1881): *De modo irreali, qui dicitur*. Marburg.

WILLI, Andreas (2011): "Morphosyntaktische Überlegungen zum Ursprung des griechischen Futurs". In: Thomas Krisch – Thomas Lindner (eds.): *Indo-germanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten Der XIII. Fachtagung Der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. 21.-27. September 2008, Salzburg*. Wiesbaden, 605-615.

WILLI, Andreas (2018): *Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge.

WILLMOTT, Jo (2007): *The Moods of Homeric Greek*. Cambridge.

WILLMOTT, Jo (2008): "The 'Potential' Optative in Homeric Greek". *Cambridge Classical Journal* 54: 237-251.

WINDISCH, Ernst (1869): "Untersuchungen über den Ursprung des Relativ-pronomens in den indogermanischen Sprachen". *CS* 2. 201-420.

YAKUBOVICH, Ilya (2010): *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language.* Brill's Studies in Indo-European Languages & Linguistics 2. Leiden – Boston.

YOSHIDA, Kazuhiko (2009): "Minor Moods in Sogdian". In: Kazuhiko Yoshida – Brent Vine (eds.): *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*. Bremen, 281-293.

ZERDIN, Jason (2002): "The 'Iterative-Intensives' in -σκ". *Oxford Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 103-130.