

# An Analysis of the Modal Particle in *Iliad* 24, Part 2: Syntactic and Semantic Analyses

Filip De Decker  
*Universiteit Gent*  
*Università di Verona*

In this article, I discuss the use and absence of the modal particle (MP) ἄν and κεν in *Iliad* 24. In the first part of the article, I discussed the etymology, determined the usable forms for the investigation and tagged and classified all instances. In the second part, I proceed to the actual analysis of the future-desiderative, future-subjunctive, subjunctive and optative forms of *Iliad* 24 (for these labels, see previously in Part 1). This book, one of the longer ones of the *Iliad*, offers about 160 instances to discuss, and has both many speeches and longer narrative passages. The investigation is based on two previous theories, namely that by Hartung and von Bäumlein that the MP was preferred in concrete instances and absent in generic statements (a theory followed by Delbrück, Monro, Chantraine and Ruijgh) and that by Basset, who argued that the MP was only used in instances closely related to the realm of the speaker. My analysis will check if these theories can be used to explain the use of the MP in *Iliad* 24.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The article was made possible by a fellowship BOF.PDO.2016.0006.19 of the research council of the Universiteit Gent (BOF, Bijzonder Onderzoeksfonds), by a travel grant V426317N for a research stay in Oxford and a travel grant V403120N for a research stay in Verona (both provided for by the FWO Vlaanderen, Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Vlaanderen, Science Foundation Flanders) and by a postdoctoral fellowship 12V1518N, granted by the FWO Vlaanderen. It was conducted while working as a visiting scholar in Verona at the ERC Starting Grant Project Pre-Classical Anatolian Languages in Contact (PALaC), under the guidance of the Principal Investigator, Professor Federico Giusfredi, and was finalised during the project *Particles in Greek and Hittite as Expression of Mood and Modality* (PaGHEMMo), which has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant Agreement Number 101018097.

I thank Mark Janse, Geert De Mol, Isabelle de Meyer (Universiteit Gent), Paola Cotticelli-Kurras, Federico Giusfredi, Alfredo Rizza, Valerio Pisaniello, Stella Merlin-Defanti (Università degli Studi di Verona) and Zsolt

## 1. The facts and figures of the MP in Iliad 24

Before we start I recapitulate the figures established for Iliad 24 (after Van Thiel's text):

Form	With MP	No MP
Aorist subjunctive	17	16
Present subjunctive	2	12
Perfect subjunctive	0	0
Subjunctive, tense undetermined	0	2
Aorist optative	12	18
Present optative	11	11
Perfect optative	1	0
Optative, tense undetermined	0	2
Future-subjunctive	4	20
Future-desiderative	0	25
Double particle use	1	0
The root *h3ekw	0	2
Aorist indicative	0	0
Imperfect indicative	1	2
Pluperfect indicative	0	0
Total	49	110

## 2. Syntactic and semantic criteria

Now we need to determine the absence and presence of the MP per type of text (speech, narrative) and type of sentence (main clause, subordinate clause, type of subordinate clause).

### 2.1. Speech versus narrative

For the distinction between speech and narrative the data can be provided relatively easily:

	With MP	Without MP
Speech	47	96
Narrative	2	14
Total	49	110

---

Simon (Ludwig Maximilians Universität München) for their input and observations on different versions of this article and research topic.

Finally, I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers and the editors of *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*. All shortcomings, inconsistencies and/or errors are mine and mine alone.

Before we can provide the data of the type of sentence, we first need to discuss the categories we want to use.

## 2.2. Semantic categories

Before proceeding to the actual analysis, we have to point out that there are many instances where different analyses are possible and often it is difficult, if not impossible, to decide which explanation is the correct one: especially in cases with a verb in the first person singular or plural, one cannot always sharply distinguish between the exhortative or the simple future meaning, as can be seen in the first example. The same applies to establishing a difference between a wish and a “potential” optative, as in the second example (in both instances, the verbs under discussion are put in bold face):

(EX.01) (71) ἀλλ' ἦτοι κλέψαι μὲν **ἔάσομεν**, οὐδέ πη ἔστι,  
 (72) λάθρη Ἀχιλλῆος θρασὺν Ἴεκτορα: ἦ γάρ οἱ αἰεὶ  
 (73) μήτηρ παρμέμβλωκεν ὁμῶς νύκτας τε καὶ ἡμαρ. (*Iliad*  
 24,71-73)

But we will / let us dismiss (the idea of) stealing the body without Akhilleus noticing, there is no way to do so. Indeed, his mother is constantly walking around him, night and day.

In this instance the future-subjunctive **ἔάσομεν** can either be a future indicative or a subjunctive aorist with a short vowel as thematic vowel. The meaning is either exhortative “let us”, or refers to a specific event “we will ... “. In my opinion, the exhortative meaning seems more suited and I have therefore catalogued all these instances as exhortative.

(EX.02) (225) τεθνάμεναι παρὰ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν  
 χαλκοχιτώνων  
 (226) βούλομαι: αὐτίκα γάρ με **κατακτείνειεν** Ἀχιλλεὺς  
 (227) ἀγκὰς ἐλόντ' ἐμὸν υἱόν, ἐπὶν γόου ἐξ ἔρον εἶην. (*Iliad*  
 24,225-227)

I want to die at the ships of the Akhaians with their bronze tunics. Akhilleus can / Let Akhilleus kill me immediately, after I have held my son in my arms and have satisfied my need for wailing.

In these three verses Priam states that Akhilleus can kill him at the Greek ships, after he has had the chance to touch his son and cry for him. The verb form κατακτείνειεν can either be a wish “let Akhilleus kill me immediately” or it can refer to a specific event “Akhilleus could then kill me immediately”. Both are possible, although the former explanation seems more likely.

An additional complication is that we cannot always distinguish between indicative and subjunctive, as in the example quoted below:

(EX.03) ἀυτάρ ἐγώ τόδε κῦδος Ἀχιλλῆϊ προτιάπτω. (*Iliad* 24,110)

But I still grant the honour (sc. to give back Hektor's body) to Akhilleus.

In this instance it is uncertain whether we are dealing with an indicative present (in which case no MP is to be expected) or with a subjunctive present. If an indicative present, we could be dealing with a present with future value.<sup>2</sup> In the latter case, it would be possible to interpret the subjunctive as either exhortative “let me ... “ or as a specific instance “I will”. In that case, the absence of the MP would be “regular” if we accept the first interpretation, but “irregular” in case of the second interpretation. Personally, I believe the interpretation of a present indicative to be the most likely.

(EX.04) (664) ἐννήμαρ μὲν κ' αὐτὸν ἐνὶ μεγάροις γοάοιμεν,  
(665) τῆ δεκάτῃ δέ κε θάπτοιμεν δαινυτό τε λαός,  
(666) ἐνδεκάτῃ δέ κε τύμβον ἐπ' αὐτῷ ποιήσοιμεν,  
(667) τῆ δὲ δωδεκάτῃ πολεμίζομεν / πολεμίζομεν εἴ περ  
ἀνάγκη. (*Iliad* 24,664-667)

Nine days we would cry for him in the palace, on the tenth day we would bury him and the people would feast (beside him), on the tenth we would make a tomb for him and on the twelfth we will resume the hostilities, if only by necessity.

---

<sup>2</sup>MacLeod (1982: 99). I owe this reference to an anonymous referee of the journal.

As was stated above, both *πολεμίζομεν* and *πολεμίζομεν* are transmitted; the former is a future-subjunctive, while the latter can either be an indicative present or a subjunctive present with a short vowel. If one accepts the present form, it could either be a present with future meaning or an exhortative subjunctive, but I argued above, *πολεμίζομεν* has preference, but this form could also be either an exhortative form or a form simply referring to the future.

### 2.3. Sentence type

When determining the type of sentence, we need to take into account that the rigid distinction of main and subordinate clauses as known for Classical Greek and Latin cannot be applied to epic Greek. It is often difficult to distinguish between negative purpose clauses introduced by *μή* alone, negative wishes and the constructions of the *verba timendi* (the *verba timendi* might have been negative wish clauses in origin and many negative wishes had a notion of fear in them).<sup>3</sup> I therefore catalogue them into one single category, namely that of the negative wish “may ... not...”. Although I cannot discuss neither the origins of subordination nor the question whether all Homeric hypotactic constructions were once paratactic, I believe that these three categories originated all from one single category, that of the negative wish.

Positive purpose clauses pose a similar problem:<sup>4</sup> often it is not straightforward to decide whether one is dealing with a relative, temporal or purpose clause, or a relative clause with a final nuance.<sup>5</sup> Initially, it was assumed that PIE did not have subordinate clauses (Windisch 1869, especially 326 and 413-419 and E. Hermann 1895), but most scholars assume that it had at

---

<sup>3</sup>See 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 and Hentze (1901: 87), Chantraine (1953: 208), Fernández Galiano (1992: 186) in their analyses of *Odyssey* 21,324.

<sup>4</sup>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 an analysis of the purpose clauses in Attic Greek, one is referred to Amigues (1977).

<sup>5</sup>See especially Weber (1884) for a discussion of the (origin of) purpose clauses.

least relative clauses,<sup>6</sup> and that from those, the other subordinate clauses (such as purpose and temporal clauses) were created.<sup>7</sup> In this article I consider those sentences to be relative clauses when they are introduced by a relative pronoun and to be purpose clauses, when the sentence is introduced by a relative adverb that can have purpose nuance (ὡς, ἵνα, ὄφρα, ὅπως), and when the context has indeed a purpose nuance (although, admittedly, this might seem somewhat arbitrary).

The exact nature of conditional clauses is also debated. Lange (1872, 1873) argued that originally Greek did not have subordinate conditional clauses (nor final and indirect questions introduced by εἰ), but that they were independent wish clauses (with varying degrees of fulfilment) that later became subordinate clauses. Although adopted by the standard grammars on Homeric Greek,<sup>8</sup> this thesis is not universally accepted,<sup>9</sup> but it cannot be denied that Homer has a preference for paratactic structures.<sup>10</sup> As the conditional clauses are

---

<sup>6</sup>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) 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) and Lühr (2008: 122). For different viewpoints on historical syntax, see the contributions in Ramat (1980). More recently, Fykias and Katzikadeli (2013) provided a survey and discussion of the arguments adduced in E. Hermann (1895) and applied their findings in an analysis of the Greek evidence from indirect speech.

<sup>7</sup>This had been noted before already, e.g. by Buttmann (1810: 542-543), von Naegelsbach (1834: 7), Windisch (1869, especially page 377, who was very skeptical about the existence of subordinate clauses) and Vogrinz (1889: 349-353). See also Delbrück (1900: 295-345), Leumann (1940), Jeffers and Pepicello (1978), Hettrich (1987), Lühr (2000, 2008, 2012), but they did not agree on the details. See also Kiparsky (1995: 151) and Keydana (2018: 2213-2214).

<sup>8</sup>Brugmann (1890: 191-192, but cf. *infra*), Monro (1891: 290-294), Chantraine (1953: 274-276), Schwyzer and Debrunner (1950: 557, 682-684).

<sup>9</sup>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 Lange and Tabachovitz, see Risch (1953, 1954). It has not been addressed in Willmott (2007) nor in Jacquino (2017), the most recent treatises on Homeric and Greek syntax.

<sup>10</sup>Delbrück (1871: 20-25), see also Monro (1891: 254-255), Notopoulos (1949), Schwyzer and Debrunner (1950: 631-636), Chantraine (1953: 12), and more

introduced by specific conjunctions and can thus easily be distinguished from other sentence types, I catalogued them as conditional clauses.

#### 2.4. Data for the type of clause

By using the data and criteria described above, we can break down the data per type of clause:

	With MP	No MP
Wish clauses	0	4 <sup>11</sup>
Negative purpose clauses	0	17
Affirmative purpose clauses	2	16
Exhortative clauses	0	10
Temporal clauses	7	4
Conditional clauses	5	11
Relative clauses	11	8
Main clauses (no wish or exhortation)	24	40
Overall data	49	110

### 3. Working hypothesis

In his analysis of Greek modality, Allan (2013) 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).<sup>12</sup> The Greek subjunctive and optative mood can convey one or more of these dimensions, 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 a working hypothesis a combination of the explanations by Hartung (1832: 294-297),

---

recently, Bakker (1997: 35-85, 125-155), Wachter (2000: 104), Minchin (2014); surprisingly enough the issue has not been addressed in Willmott (2007).

<sup>11</sup>Iliad 24,212 has a wish in a relative clause and is counted as a relative clause (see below).

<sup>12</sup>Allan (2013), building on Bybee et al. (1994), Palmer (2001), Nuyts (2006) and De Haan (2006); see also Van der Auwera and Plungian (1998) for a discussion and definitions. For an application of modality to the Greek moods, see Horrocks (1995), Willmott (2007), Sampanis (2011, 2014, 2017), Allan (2013), Veksina (2017), Méndez Dosuna (2018: 271).

von Bäumlein (1846: 208-245, especially 219-220) and Basset (1988, 1989: 204-205), which can be summarised as follows: the MP was used in specific instances with a link to the present situation, and was omitted in generic instances or in instances referring to the more remote future, and check if this is confirmed by the facts.<sup>13</sup>

Limitations in time and space prevent me from discussing the *Grundbedeutung* of the optative and subjunctive and the difference in meaning between these two moods.<sup>14</sup>

#### 4. Analysing the absence of the MP

I now proceed to the actual analysis of *Iliad* 24. We note that the instances without MP are much more frequent than those with it and will therefore start with the instances without.

##### 4.1. The difference between speech and narrative

The first distinction that has to be made is that between speech and narrative. The data, albeit limited, are clear and show that the MP is more common in speech than in narrative.

	With MP	Without MP
Speech	47	96
Narrative	2	14
Total	49	110

When we apply these findings to a larger corpus of 5267 verses (Books 1, 5, 9, 11, 16, 22 and 24 of the *Iliad*) we obtain an even clearer picture:

<sup>13</sup>See also Chantraine (1953: 210-211): *L'étude des exemples nous montre qu'elles* (sc. the modal particles, FDD) *ne s'emploient pas mécaniquement: elles soulignent un cas particulier, marquent une emphase et s'emploient avec le subjonctif éventuel plutôt qu'avec le subjonctif de volonté.*

<sup>14</sup>The literature is large, see most recently Tichy (2006), Willmott (2007) and Lillo (2020), 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 and Gerth (1898: 217-289) and Schwyzer and Debrunner (1950: 301-338, with a bibliography until 1950).



Speech	261	524
Narrative	16	100
Total	277	624

While the MP is more absent than present in speeches still, the vast majority of cases where it is used does occur in speeches and this is no coincidence, since speeches are by definition closer to what the speaker and hearer say, hear and see. There are very few cases in narrative because the events related there do not have a (close) connection to speaker and audience. This is thus in agreement with the working hypothesis. In the following subchapters I will delve deeper into the different categories and address the verb forms without MP.

#### 4.2. Allan's deontic axis and the absence of the MP in specific sentence types

When we look at the types of sentences that have no or very few instances of the MP, we see that they all belong to Allan's "deontic axis".

##### 4.2.1. Exhortative clauses

The MP is not used in exhortative clauses.<sup>15</sup> It has to be said that in several cases it is unclear whether we are dealing with exhortative clauses or with "simple" future clauses, or with wishes or modal optatives without particle (as was stated above already).

##### 4.2.2. (Affirmative) wishes

In positive wishes the MP is not used either.<sup>16</sup> Often there is a thin line between wish and exhortation, as can be seen in the example below.

(EX.05) (149) κῆρύξ τις οἱ ἔπειτο γεραιτερος, ὅς κ' ἰθύνουι  
(150) ἡμίονους καὶ ἄμαξαν εὐτροχον, ἠδὲ καὶ ἀῖτις

<sup>15</sup>The instances are 71 (ἔασομεν), 139 (ἄγοιτο), 148 (ἔπειτο), 178 (ἔπειτο), 208 (κλαίωμεν), 356 (φεύγωμεν), 357 (λιτανεύσομεν), 523 (ἔασομεν), 601 (μνησώμεθα), 618 (μεδώμεθα).

<sup>16</sup>The instances are 139 (εἶη - this could be an exhortative optative as well), 212 (ἔχομι), 213 (γένοιτο), 556 (ἀπόναιο), 556 (ἔλθοις).

(151) νεκρὸν ἄγοι προτὶ ἄστυ, τὸν ἔκτανε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.  
(*Iliad* 24,149-151)

Let one elder herald follow him, who should lead the mules and the smooth-running chariot and should also bring back to the city the body of him, whom shining Akhilleus killed.

In this instance ἔποιτο can either be a wish “may someone” or an exhortation “let someone” (and theoretically it could even be a potential optative with an undefined subject and no MP “someone could ...”, but this is less likely).

#### 4.2.3. Negative wishes, negative purpose clauses and *verba timendi*

The MP is missing in negative purpose clauses (Weber 1884: 32-38, Monro 1891: 262, Chantraine 1953: 266-273), negative wishes and after *verba timendi*.<sup>17</sup> I give one example:

(EX.06) (336) βάσκ' ἴθι καὶ Πρίαμον κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας  
Ἀχαιῶν  
(337) ὧς ἄγαγ', ὧς μήτ' ἄρ τις ἴδῃ μήτ' ἄρ τε νοήσῃ  
(338) τῶν ἄλλων Δαναῶν, πρὶν Πηλεΐωνα δ' ἰκέσθαι. (*Iliad*  
24,336-338)

Go and bring Priam to the hollow ships of the Akhaians, without anyone of the other Danaans seeing or noticing him, before he reaches the son of Peleus.

The subjunctives ἴδῃ and νοήσῃ appear in negative purpose clauses and have therefore no MP.

#### 4.2.4. Affirmative purpose clauses

In affirmative purpose clauses the MP is missing in most instances, but not always (Weber 1884: 32-38, Monro 1891: 262, Chantraine 1953: 266-273). We have 2 purpose clauses with and

<sup>17</sup>The instances are 21 (ἀποδρόφοι), 53 (νεμεσηθηῶμεν), 337 (ἴδῃ), 337 (νοήσῃ), 436 (γένηται), 568 (ὀρίνης), 569 (ἐάσω), 570 (ἀλίτωμαι), 583 (ἴδοι), 584 (ἐρύσαιτο), 585 (ὀρινθείη), 586 (κατακτείνειε), 586 (ἀλίτηται), 650-651 (ἐπέλθῃσιν), 672 (δείσει), 778-779 (δείσητ'), 800 (ἐφορμηθεῖεν).

16 without MP.<sup>18</sup> I give one example of a purpose clause without MP:

(EX.07) (465) τύνη δ' εἰσελθὼν λαβὲ γούνατα Πηλεΐωνος,  
 (466) καὶ μιν ὑπὲρ πατρός καὶ μητέρος ἠϋκόμοιο  
 (467) λίσσαιο καὶ τέκεος, ἵνα οἱ σὺν θυμὸν ὀρίνης. (*Iliad*  
 24,465-467)

You, when you enter, grasp the knees of Peleus' son and beg him on his father and his mother with the beautiful hair and his son, so that you move his spirit.

In these verses the sentence introduced by ἵνα only has a purpose nuance and is constructed with a simple subjunctive.

If we assume that many purpose clauses with an MP were in origin other subordinate clauses (relative or temporal) with a nuance of purpose, the use of the MP could be explained. In many relative clauses introduced by a relative pronoun, one could notice a purpose meaning as well. As they could appear with an MP, the use of the MP appeared also in clauses with this purpose nuance.<sup>19</sup> From there the particle intruded also into the “normal” purpose clauses and became the standard in the Attic inscriptions. The examples in *Iliad* 24 involve ὄφρα and ὥς, the former being an original temporal clause and the latter a relative/comparative clause. The two instances are:

(EX.08) (429) ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τόδε δέξαι ἐμεῦ πάρα καλὸν  
 ἄλειςον,  
 (430) αὐτόν τε ῥῦσαι, πέμψον δέ με σὺν γε θεοῖσιν,  
 (431) ὄφρα κεν ἐς κλισίην Πηληϊάδεω ἀφίκομαι. (*Iliad*  
 24,429-431)

But then accept this beautiful drinking vessel from me, protect me and send me with the help of the gods, until/so that I reach the tent of Peleus' son.

<sup>18</sup>The instances without MP are 43 (λάβησιν), 75 (εἶπω), 75-76 (λύση), 264 (πρήσωμεν), 285 (κιοίτην), 295 (ἴης), 313 (ἴω), 350 (πίοιεν), 382 (μίμνη), 467 (ὀρίνης), 555 (ἴδω), 581 (δοίη), 635-636 (ταρπώμεθα - in some codices the MP is transmitted), 658 (μένω), 658 (ἐρύκω), 680-681 (ἐκπέμψειε) and those with 75-76 (λάχη) and 431 (ἀφίκομαι).

<sup>19</sup>This had been suggested already by von Naegelsbach (1834: 7). For ὄφρα see Weber (1884: 17-18) and for ὥς Weber (1884: 11-13).

In this example one can see that the subordinate clause introduced by ὄφρα κεν clearly has a purpose nuance, but one could still interpret it as temporal as well (“guard and send me until I reach” or “guard and send me so that I reach”). In the other example, quoted below, one can only see the purpose nuance:

(EX.09) (75) ὄφρα τί οἱ εἶπω πυκινὸν ἔπος, ὥς κεν  
Ἀχιλλεὺς

(76) δῶρων ἐκ Πριάμοιο λάχῃ ἀπό θ' Ἑκτορα λύση. (*Iliad*  
24,75-76)

So that I could speak a word to her, so that Akhilleus  
receives gifts from Priam and releases Hektor.

In this instance we have two purpose clauses, one without (ὄφρα εἶπω) and one with MP (ὥς κεν ... λάχῃ - the absence in λύση will be discussed later). One could argue that ὥς κεν ... λάχῃ is still a relative clause (“in such way so that ...”),<sup>20</sup> but the purpose nuance is clearly present.

#### 4.3. Allan's deontic axis and the absence of the MP with certain verb forms

##### 4.3.1. Future-desiderative forms

Closely related to the observations in §4.2 is the fact that the MP is also missing when it is used with future-desiderative forms because they still maintain their old voluntative meaning. A reviewer raises the issue whether these forms maintain their desiderative and voluntative meaning in epic Greek and points to the form ἔψει, discussed below, which describes how Andromakhe and her child will forcibly be taken away in slavery. In that case, one can hardly speak about a “desiderative” or voluntative form. The objection is obviously correct, but what is meant, is that these verb forms still have that desiderative meaning, but that they can also appear in contexts where the subject might not necessarily desire to perform the action. In *Iliad* 24 there are 25 desiderative future forms, and none has an MP.<sup>21</sup> I give one example:

<sup>20</sup>Weber (1884: 11-13) - this specific instance was not discussed.

<sup>21</sup>The instances are 57 (θήσετε), 66 (ἔσσειται), 92 (ἔσσειται), 106 (ἐρέω), 117 (ἐφήσω), 154 (ἄξει), 156 (κτενέει), 156 (ἐρύξει - this verb has only a

(EX.10) αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Πριάμῳ μεγαλήτορι Ἴριν ἐφήσω. (*Iliad* 24,117)

But I will send out Iris to the magnanimous Priam.

In this example there is no MP with ἐφήσω because this is the future-desiderative form from ἐφήμι, which has an alpha-kappatic aorist ἐφέηκα and a subjunctive aorist ἐφέω.

The absence of the MP in the purpose, desiderative and exhortative clauses is an important argument against the “intensive” theory because especially exhortative sentences have an intensified meaning, and one would therefore expect the MP to appear in these contexts, if its meaning were to intensify the verbal action. The same applies to negative purpose clauses because this is something the speaker really does not want to happen, and therefore the “intensive” particle would have been expected.

#### 4.3.2. Future-subjunctive forms

The same can be said about the absence of the MP with the so-called future-subjunctives: they have the meaning of the subjunctive aorist and the (future-)desiderative. The desiderative element of these forms makes the MP much less common, as can be seen when we compare these forms to the “real” subjunctive aorists: while the future-subjunctives have 20 instances without an MP and 4 with it, the subjunctive aorists have 17 instances with an MP and 14 without it. The fact that some of these future-subjunctive forms could nevertheless appear with an MP, is in my opinion (and in that of one of the reviewers) due to the fact that the forms could have a future and a subjunctive meaning, and that they were used in clauses where “genuine” subjunctive aorists also appeared. The example below has future-subjunctives and future-desideratives and none of them has an MP (the verb forms are put in bold face):

---

reduplicated aorist in Homer, as the sigmatic one is first attested with Aiskhylos), 158 (πεφιδήσεται), 182 (ἔψεται), 183 (ἄξει), 184 (κτενέει), 184 (ἐρύξει), 185 (πεφιδήσεται), 206 (αἰρήσει), 224 (ἔσσεται), 242 (γνώσεσθε), 243 (ἔσεσθε), 296 (δώσει), 402 (θήσονται), 462 (εἴσομαι), 620 (ἔσται), 669 (ἔσται), 670 (σχήσω), 733 (ἔψεται), 742 (λελείψεται).

(EX.11) (728) ἦβην ἴξεσθαι: πρὶν γὰρ πόλις ἦδε κατ' ἄκρης  
 (729) **πέρσεται**: ἦ γὰρ ὄλωλας ἐπίσκοπος, ὅς τέ μιν αὐτήν  
 (730) ῥύσκει, ἔχεις δ' ἀλόχους κεδνάς καὶ νήπια τέκνα,  
 (731) αἶ δὴ τοι τάχα νηυσὶν **ὀχήσονται** γλαφυρῆσι,  
 (732) καὶ μὲν ἐγὼ μετὰ τῆσι: σὺ δ' αὖ τέκος ἦ ἐμοὶ αὐτῇ  
 (733) **ἔψεται**, ἐνθά κεν ἔργα ἀεικέα ἐργάζοιο  
 (734) ἀθλεύων πρὸ ἄνακτος ἀμειλίχου, ἦ τις Ἀχαιῶν  
 (735) **ρίψει** χειρὸς ἐλὼν ἀπὸ πύργου λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον  
 (736) χωόμενος, ᾧ δὴ πού ἀδελφεὸν ἔκτανεν Ἔκτωρ. (*Iliad*  
 24,728-736)

I do not think that he will reach adulthood. Sooner the city will be destroyed from the top down. For you, its protector, have died, who used to protect it and who kept (safe) the diligent wives and the little children, who now will be taken away on the hollow ship, and I with them. You, child, will either follow me to the same place and then there you would be doing unfitting work, toiling for a pitiless master, or some Akhaian will take you by the hand and throw you from the tower, angry because of the baneful death that Hektor inflicted on his brother.

In these lines Andromakhe laments Hektor's death and expresses her fear that Troy will soon fall, as its protector has died and that, as a consequence, she and the other Trojan women will be carried away in slavery. Their child awaits either slavery or a gruesome death inflicted upon him by a Greek soldier who lost a relative at the hands of Hektor.

In this passage there are three future-subjunctives (*πέρσεται*, *ὀχήσονται* and *ρίψει*) and one future-desiderative (*ἔψεται*), and none of these forms has an MP.

The four instances with an MP are problematic because they either have a purpose nuance (as in the first two ) or the nuance of a wish (in the last two):

(EX.12) ὅς ἄξει εἴως κεν ἄγων Ἀχιλῆϊ πελάσση (*Iliad*  
 24,154)  
 (...) who will guide him until he carries and brings him  
 near Akhilleus

(EX.13) ὅς σ' ἄξει εἴως κεν ἄγων Ἀχιλῆϊ πελάσση (*Iliad*  
 24,183)

(...) who will guide you until he carries and brings you near Akhilleus

In these two verses reference is made to Hermes who is supposed to protect Priam and guide him to Akhilleus' tent.

(EX.14) ἐσθλὸν γὰρ Διὶ χεῖρας ἀνασχέμεν αἶ κ' ἐλέησῃ.  
(*Iliad* 24,301)

It is honourable to stretch out one's hands to Zeus, to see if he will show pity.

(EX.15) γούνων ἀψάμενοι λιτανεύσομεν αἶ κ' ἐλέησῃ.  
(*Iliad* 24,357)

We shall / Let us grasp him by the knees and beg him, (hoping/wishing) that he may show pity.

In the first instance, Priam tells Hekabe that he will not listen to her and stay at home, but will plead with Zeus to show pity and protection and embark on the mission to ransom Hektor's body. In the second instance, Priam's herald notices an unknown person (Hermes in disguise) and suggests to Priam that they should either flee or approach him, touch his knees and beg for mercy.

#### 4.3.3. Certain specific forms

The issue of the root  $*h_3ek^w$  has been discussed already (cf. §4.3 in part 1): it is either a future-desiderative or a future-subjunctive, but in both cases it fits the schema here.

Related to the absence of the MP with the future-desideratives and the future-subjunctives is the use of the MP with the Greek future forms of the root  $*h_1ed$  "eat", namely ἔδομαι, and that of the root  $*g^w ieh_3$  "live", namely βέομαι / βείομαι, which pose problems: formally they are neither desiderative nor future subjunctives, but cannot be simple subjunctive presents either, given the fact that they are middle forms. In the following verse both forms are used and there is no MP.

(EX.16) (128) τέκνον ἐμὸν τέο μέχρις ὀδυρόμενος καὶ  
ἀχεύων  
(129) σὴν ἔδεαι κραδίην μεμνημένος οὐτέ τι σίτου

(130) οὐτ' εὐνής; ἀγαθὸν δὲ γυναικί περ ἐν φιλοτήτι

(131) μίσγεσθ': οὐ γάρ μοι δηρὸν βέη, ἀλλὰ τοι ἦδη

(132) ἄγχι παρέστηκεν θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή. (*Iliad* 24,128-132)

My child, how long will you eat your heart in sorrow and mourning, not thinking about food or love. It is good to make love to a woman. You shall not live long anymore and near to you are standing death and powerful Fate.

In these verses Thetis tries to convince Akhilleus that he should not continue his anger and grief for Patroklos, but that he should at least try to enjoy some aspects of life, as it is his destiny to die soon as well. If we interpret ἔδεαι and βέη as simple subjunctives, the absence of the MP is unexplained; if we take into account that they are linked to an active present paradigm and are used in the middle in the future, we could assume that they have some kind of desiderative meaning after all, as was the case with the so-called *semi-deponent* sigmatic future forms (the middle βέομαι would then convey the same meaning as the middle βιώσομαι, besides the active βιώω). In that case the absence of the MP would be less surprising.

#### 4.4. Summary of Allan's deontic axis

Summarising, we can say that the MP is incompatible with the volutative meaning. The table below gives the data of the clauses in which a volutative meaning can be discerned:

Form	With MP	No MP
The root * <i>h<sub>3</sub>ek</i> <sup>w</sup>	0	2
Perfect subjunctive	0	0
Future-subjunctive	4	15 <sup>22</sup>
Future-desiderative	0	26
Wish clauses	0	5
Negative purpose clause	0	17
Affirmative purpose clauses	2	16
Exhortative clauses	0	10
Conditional clauses as old wishes	0	3
Overall data	6	94

<sup>22</sup>There are 20 future-subjunctives, but 5 of them appear in a purpose clause, an exhortative or negative purpose clause, and are therefore already included in other data.



We see that the absence of the MP can be explained in most instances by the presence of voluntative meaning in the sentence: this explains 94 (or 91 if one assumes that the examples from the conditional clauses do not count) of the 110 instances without an MP. Below we will look at the 16 (19) remaining instances of a missing MP (and later also at the 6 instances where the MP appeared in a voluntative context).

#### 4.5. The absence of the MP in repeated actions

The MP is missing in those contexts where a repeated action is described.<sup>23</sup> This explains the absence in the following 3 instances (the verb is put in bold face):

(EX.17) (14) ἀλλ' ὃ γ' ἐπεὶ ζεύξειεν ὑφ' ἄρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους,

(15) Ἔκτορα δ' ἔλκεσθαι δησάσκετο δίφρου ὀπισθεν. (*Iliad* 24,14-15)

When he had yoked the swift horses under the chariot, he would bind Hektor behind the two-span to drag him around.

These lines describe the repeated character of Akhilleus' mistreatment of Hektor's body, more specifically they relate how he puts the horses before the chariot and how he binds Hektor to the chariot to drag him around the city. As this is a repeated action, we have the iterative form δησάσκετο in the main clause and the optative ζεύξειεν without MP in the subordinate clause. The use of an iterative together with the optative without MP in the subordinate clause is a common construction.<sup>24</sup> Such constructions mostly, but not always, occur in narrative and we have noted before that narrative parts use the MP considerably less than speeches.

---

<sup>23</sup>Delbrück (1871: 172-176), Hentze (1907), Howorth (1955), Hettrich (1992: 266-267; 1996: 136), Ruijgh (1992: 80-81).

<sup>24</sup>This specification was first made by Stolpe (1849: 38-39), Týn (1860: 682) and later by Zerdin (1999: 298) and Pagniello (2002: 87-102, 2007), and is also visible in speech introductions of the so-called *tis-Reden*, see De Decker (2015: 64-65). Kluge (1911: 35-36) also mentioned this analysis, but he explicitly denied its correctness.

(EX.18) (416) ἧ μὲν μιν περὶ σῆμα ἐοῦ ἐτάροιο φίλοιο  
 (417) ἔλκει ἀκηδέστως ἠὼς ὅτε δῖα φανήη. (*Iliad* 24,416-417)

Truly, he (repeatedly) drags him without respect around the grave of his beloved friend, until the daylight appears.

These lines refer to the same mistreatment, but as they are put in the present, the verb is a present indicative combined with the subjunctive. Since we are dealing with a repeated action, there is no MP with the subjunctive φανήη.

(EX.19) (768) ἀλλ' εἷ τις με καὶ ἄλλος ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν  
**ἐνίπτοι**  
 (769) δαέρων ἢ γαλόων ἢ εἰνατέρων εὐπέπλων,  
 (770) ἢ ἔκυρή, ἔκυρὸς δὲ πατήρ ὡς ἦπιος αἰεὶ,  
 (771) ἀλλὰ σὺ τὸν ἐπέεσσι παραιφάμενος κατέρυκες  
 (772) σῆ τ' ἀγανοφροσύνη καὶ σοῖς ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσσι. (*Iliad* 24,768-772)

But if somebody else insulted me in the halls, someone of the brothers-in-law, sisters-in-law, or wives of your brothers, or my mother-in-law - my father-in-law was always friendly -, but then you would speak back with words and restrain them with your friendliness and your friendly words.

In these lines Helen relates how Hektor would always rebuke Trojans whenever they were insulting her for being the cause of the Trojan misery. In this instance, the optative ἐνίπτοι refers to a repeated action and is used without MP, but there is no iterative form. In addition, the subject is undefined, and this contributed to the absence as well (as will be discussed in the next subchapter).

#### 4.6. The absence of the MP in sentences with an undefined subject

The MP is absent in instances where the subject is undefined such as τις “anyone, someone” and/or the sentence is determined by a word with undetermined meaning, such as the adverb ποτέ. This word means “someday, some time” and is unspecified. It is therefore less frequently combined with the specific value of the MP: ποτέ is combined 46 times with a

future, subjunctive or optative,<sup>25</sup> and in 39 instances there is no MP.<sup>26</sup> In *Iliad* 24 there are 13 instances of τις being subject and 11 of them have no MP. In some instances, however, there are also other elements leading to the absence of the MP, such as the use in a (negative) purpose clause, in a wish (cf. the use with ἔποιτο discussed above), the appearance in a clause referring to a repeated action or with a desiderative form. Below are some examples.

(EX.20) (218) εἰ μὲν γάρ τις μ' ἄλλος ἐπιχθονίων ἐκέλευεν,  
 (219) ἢ οἱ μάντιές εἰσι θυοσκόοι ἢ ἱερῆες,  
 (220) ψεῦδος κεν φαίμεν καὶ νοσφιζοίμεθα μᾶλλον. (*Iliad*  
 24,218-220)

If someone else from the people living on the earth ordered this, be they seers, helpers with the sacrifices or priests, we would call it a lie and would reject it heavily.

In this instance ἐκέλευεν (the aorist ἐκέλευσεν is also transmitted in some of the codices) has no MP because it is used with an undefined subject.

(EX.21) (366) τῶν εἴ τις σε ἴδοιτο θοῖν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν  
 (367) τοσσάδ' ὀνειάτ' ἄγοντα, τίς ἂν δὴ τοι νόος εἴη;  
 (368) οὐτ' αὐτὸς νέος ἐσσί, γέρων δέ τοι οὗτος ὀπηδεῖ,  
 (369) ἄνδρ' ἀπαμύνασθαι, ὅτε τις πρότερος χαλεπήνη.  
 (*Iliad* 24,366-369)

If only someone saw you through the black night carrying so many goods, what would then be your plan? You yourself are not young (anymore), and that old man is guiding you, (so he is unable) to ward off a person, when he would attack you first.

<sup>25</sup>The instances are *Iliad* 1,166; 1,205; 1,213; 1,234; 1,240; 1,340; 2,97; 2,325; 2,379; 4,164; 4,182; 6,448; 6,459; 6,462; 6,479; 7,87; 7,91; 7,343; 8,148; 8,150; 9,495; 10,453; 13,625; 14,481; 15,40; 18,283; 22,106; 23,575 and *Odyssey* 1,308; 2,76; 2,137; 2,203; 2,256; 2,342; 3,216; 8,461; 17,249; 18,141; 19,22; 19,81; 21,324; 21,403; 24,196.

<sup>26</sup>The instances are *Iliad* 1,213; 1,234; 1,240; 1,340; 2,97; 2,325; 2,379; 4,182; 6,459; 6,462; 6,479; 7,87; 7,91; 7,343; 8,148; 8,150; 9,495; 10,453; 13,625; 14,481; 15,40; 18,283; 22,106; 23,575 and *Odyssey* 1,308; 2,137; 2,203; 2,256; 2,342; 8,461; 17,249; 18,141; 19,22; 19,81; 21,324; 21,403; 24,196.

(EX.22) (653) τῶν εἴ τις σε ἴδοιτο θοὴν διὰ νύκτα  
μέλαιναν,

(654) αὐτίκ' ἄν ἐξείποι Ἀγαμέμνονι ποιμένι λαῶν,

(655) καὶ κεν ἀνάβλησις λύσιος νεκροῖο γένηται. (*Iliad*  
24,653-655)

If someone saw you here through the swift black night, he would immediately tell Agamemnon, the shepherd of men and there will/would be a delay in the return of the body.

#### 4.7. A syntactically motivated absence of the MP: the reduction rule

In instances where the MP has been used already with a preceding verb in the same construction (and the same semantic description and action), it is not necessary to use it again (cf. *supra*). This can explain the absence in the following cases (the verb form with an MP is underlined, the one without is put in boldface):

(EX.23) (35) τὸν νῦν οὐκ ἔτλητε νέκυν περ ἐόντα σαῶσαι

(36) ἢ τ' ἀλόχῳ ἰδέειν καὶ μητέρι καὶ τέκεϊ ᾧ

(37) καὶ πατέρι Πριάμῳ λαοῖσιν τε, τοί κε μιν ᾧκα

(38) ἐν πυρὶ κῆαιεν καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρεα **κτερίσαιεν**. (*Iliad*  
24,35-38)

Would you not dare to save him, although he is a corpse, so that it is possible for his wife to see (him), for his mother, for his child, for his father Priam and for the people, who would quickly burn him in the fire and bury him with the (deserved) honours.

Here, *κτερίσαιεν* has no MP because there is already an MP with the preceding *κῆαιεν*.

(EX.24) (149) κῆρὺξ τις οἱ ἔποιτο γεραιτερος, ὃς κ' ἰθύνει

(150) ἡμίονους καὶ ἄμαξαν εὐτροχόν, ἠδὲ καὶ αὐτίς

(151) νεκρὸν ἄγοι προτὶ ἄστει, τὸν ἔκτανε διὸς Ἀχιλλεύς.  
(*Iliad* 24,149-151)

Let one elder herald follow him, who should lead the mules and the smooth-running chariot and should also bring back to the city the body of him, whom shining Achilleus killed.

Taking into account the discussion from above about the different readings for ἤδὲ ... ἄγοι, I believe that the optative ἄγοι has no MP because it is already expressed with ἰθύνοι.

(EX.25) (218) εἰ μὲν γὰρ τίς μ' ἄλλος ἐπιχθονίων ἐκέλευεν,  
(219) ἢ οἱ μάντιές εἰσι θυοσκόοι ἢ ἱερῆες,  
(220) ψεῦδος κεν φαῖμεν καὶ νοσφιζόμεθα μᾶλλον. (*Iliad* 24,218-220)

If someone else from the people living on the earth ordered this, be they seers, helpers with the sacrifices or priests, we would call it a lie and would reject it very much.

Here there is an MP with φαῖμεν, but not with the following νοσφιζόμεθα.

(EX.26) (263) οὐκ ἂν δὴ μοι ἄμαξαν ἐφοπλίσσαιτε  
τάχιστα,  
(264) ταῦτά τε πάντ' ἐπιθεῖτε, ἵνα πρήσσωμεν ὁδοῖο; (*Iliad* 24,263-264)

Would you not prepare a waggon very soon and put everything on it, so that we can make our journey?

The presence of an MP with ἐφοπλίσσαιτε makes that it remains absent with ἐπιθεῖτε.

(EX.27) (686) σεῖο δέ κε ζωοῦ καὶ τρίς τόσα δοῖεν ἄποινα  
(687) παῖδες τοὶ μετόπισθε λελειμμένοι, αἳ κ' Ἀγαμέμνων  
(688) γνώη σ' Ἀτρεΐδης, γνώωσι δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί. (*Iliad* 24,686-688)

To have you back alive your children left behind there would give threefold these ransom gifts, (since) when Agamemnon notices you and when all the Akhaians do (see you).

In the conditional clause the first subjunctive γνώη is constructed with an MP, whereas the second one, γνώωσι, is not. When one interprets only γνώη to belong to the conditional clause, the meaning is “When Agamemnon notices you here, all the Akhaians will know it”. In that case δέ would be apodotic and the absence of the MP in γνώωσι would be unexplained.

## 5. The use of the MP: general observations

### 5.1. Closeness to the speaker and specific instances

Now that we have discussed the instances without MP, we need to analyse the examples with MP. There are 49 examples and as a starting hypothesis it was stated that the MP was used in specific instances. We have already shown that it was absent in contexts with volunative meaning, when the verbal action involved an undefined person or referred to a repeated action, and when the MP had already been used with a preceding verb. In what follows, we have to analyse examples that support this explanation and also address the exceptions. There are many examples of an instance close to the speaker with an MP. Below I discuss several passages in which verbs with and without MP occur (the verbs with an MP are underlined, the ones without are put in bold face):

(EX.28) εἶμι μὲν, οὐδ' ἄλιον ἔπος ἔσσεται ὅτι κεν εἶπη.  
(*Iliad* 24,92)

I will go. The word that he speaks, will not be fruitless.

In this instance, Priam had just been instructed by Hermes to go to the camp of the Greek army and to Akhilleus's tent in order to ransom Hektor's body. In this verse, he told Hekabe that he was planning to do that and said that he was certain that he would succeed because he had received the confirmation of a god. The MP refers to the specific speech (and assurance) by Hermes (De Decker 2015: 320).

(EX.29) (193) δαίμονι Διόθεν μοι Ὀλύμπιος ἄγγελος ἦλθε  
(194) λύσασθαι φίλον υἷον ἰόντ' ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν,  
(195) δῶρα δ' Ἀχιλλῆϊ φερέμεν τά κε θυμὸν ἰήνη. (*Iliad*  
24,193-195)

Dear wife, the Olympian messenger has come to me, sent by Zeus, to (tell me to) go to the ships of the Akhaians, to buy free our beloved son and to carry gifts to Akhilleus, that will appease his mind.

In these verses Priam informs Hekabe that he has received a visit from Hermes, who has told him to go to Akhilleus and

bring him gifts, to persuade him to return Hektor's dead body. The subjunctive ἴηνη is used with an MP because it refers to a single action that Priam will do in the near future.

(EX.30) (416) ἦ μὲν μιν περὶ σῆμα ἐοῦ ἐτάροιο φίλοιο

(417) ἔλκει ἀκηδέστως ἠὼς ὅτε διὰ φανήη

(418) οὐδέ μιν αἰσχύνει: θηοῖό κεν αὐτὸς ἐπελθῶν

(419) οἶον ἔερσήεις κεῖται, περὶ δ' αἶμα νένιπται. (*Iliad* 24,416-419)

Truly, he (repeatedly) drags him without respect around the grave of his beloved friend, until the daylight appears, but he does not (succeed in doing) harm (to) him. When you get there, you could see yourself how fresh he lies there and how the blood has been washed away.

In these verses Hermes describes to Priam how he would be able to see that Hektor's body has not been disgraced in spite of Akhilleus' repeated attempts to do so. The optative θηοῖο refers to something that Priam will be doing in the near future. As the action will be performed by Priam, who is Hermes' interlocutor, the particle is used with θηοῖο. The absence in φανήη has been discussed before (it describes a repeated action).

(EX.31) (618) ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ καὶ νῶϊ μεδώμεθα διε γεραῖε

(619) σίτου: ἔπειτά κεν αὐτε φίλον παῖδα κλαίοισθα

(620) Ἴλιον εἰσαγαγών: πολυδάκρυτος δέ τοι ἔσται. (*Iliad* 24,618-620)

But come then, bright old man, let us enjoy the food. Afterwards you can then weep for your son after you have brought him to Troy. There will be much crying to do.

In these verses Akhilleus suggests that Priam and he should take pleasure in having some food before he starts crying for his son. The optative κλαίοισθα is used with an MP because it refers to an action in the near future. The subjunctive μεδώμεθα has no MP because it is exhortative and the form ἔσται has none because it is a future-desiderative.

In the two examples the MP is missing, although the situation is very concrete, there is neither an undefined subject nor reference to a repeated action.

(EX.32) οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις, **πρὶν** καὶ κακὸν ἄλλο  
**πάθησθα**. (*Iliad* 24,551)

You will not make him stand up again, before that you will  
suffer another evil.

This instance has been discussed before: although *πάθησθα* clearly refers to the near future and to an event close to Priam, Akhilleus' interlocutor, the MP is missing. As Akhilleus is talking to Priam and referring to something very near, we are dealing with a specific instance and would expect an MP, but it is missing. One could add an MP by changing *καί* into *κεν*, but that would not be sound scientific practice and would not explain why the MP was lost in the manuscripts.

(EX.33) (780) πέμπων μ' ὧδ' ἐπέτελλε μελαινῶων ἀπὸ νηῶν  
(781) μὴ πρὶν πημανέειν **πρὶν** δωδεκάτῃ μὶ μόλη ἡώς. (*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.

## 5.2. Double particle use

There is one instance in which we have a double particle use.

(EX.34) (437) σοὶ δ' ἄν ἐγὼ πομπὸς καὶ κε κλυτὸν Ἄργος  
ἰκοίμην,

(438) ἐνδυκέως ἐν νηϊ θοῇ ἢ πεζὸς ὀμαρτέων:

(439) οὐκ ἄν τις τοι πομπὸν ὄνοσσάμενος μαχέσαιτο.  
(*Iliad* 24,437-439)

I would even come as a herald to renowned Argos,  
diligently guiding you either in a fast ship or on foot.  
Nobody would fight with you when such a guide was  
helping you.



In this instance the MP is used with one verb and then again with the verb following it. The use of the MP in these verses refers to speaker and hearer and adds emphasis. At first sight one could ask why the MPs were used here, as the verbs refer to possible (or even unreal) events, but the actions Hermes describes involve both him and Priam, and Hermes wants to depict them as very likely to reassure Priam: if Hermes accompanies him (P), he (P) could even go to Argos (here almost synonymous for Greece) without being attacked (Ameis & Hentze 1906: 127, MacLeod 1982: 122, Richardson 1993: 317, Brügger 2017: 162). Ameis and Hentze (1906: 127) argued that ἄν was used to emphasise Hermes' role as guide and protector, and κε to highlight that Priam would be safe even in Argos. There is one papyrus (P 14) which has σοὶ μὲν ... , This which would mean that there was only one particle.<sup>27</sup> Peppmüller (1876: 205, with reference to La Roche 1870c: 82) suggested reading σοὶ δ' αὖ because in his opinion ἄν and κεν needed to be separated by μέν, as was the case in *Iliad* 11,187. In my opinion, a correction is not necessary,<sup>28</sup> and the reading with the two MPs is clearly the *lectio difficilior*, as it is difficult to see how σοὶ μὲν would have become σοὶ δ' ἄν ..., whereas the inverse evolution is more likely. An alternative explanation is that by Ruijgh (1990: 232-233), who stated that the parallel passages with double MP were artificial and suggested that in this specific instance the sentence σοὶ δ' ἄν ἐγὼ πομπὸς καὶ κε κλυτὸν Ἄργος ἰκοίμην was actually constituted by a protasis (εἰ) σοὶ δ' ἄν ἐγὼ πομπὸς (εἶην) “if I act as your guide” and an apodosis καὶ κε κλυτὸν Ἄργος ἰκοίμην “then I would even go with you to the renowned Argos”. That is possible, but not necessary. The double (or triple) use of the particle to convey emphasis is not unknown in later Greek either (Goodwin 1865: 62, Gildersleeve 1900: 190, Smyth & Messing 1956: 399, MacLeod 1982: 122, Goldstein 2012).

---

<sup>27</sup>Chantraine (1953: 345). Already Van Leeuwen (1885: 77) stated that the double use was wrong and that all the instances needed to be corrected.

<sup>28</sup>The commentaries by Faesi (1858b: 418, 1860: 173), La Roche (1870c: 82 on *Iliad* 11,187, 1871: 119), Richardson (1993: 317) and Brügger, but less outspoken (2017: 162) see no reason for a change and point at parallel passages. See also Lange (1872: 353).

In the next subchapters I will discuss the types of sentences individually, addressing the examples and the exceptions.

### 5.3. Exceptions to the reduction rule

As was stated above, the MP is not repeated when it has already been used with a previous verb in the construction. There are some apparent exceptions to this rule, but upon closer look these instances do not belong to the same construction.

(EX.35) (565) οὐ γάρ κε τλαίη βροτὸς ἐλθέμεν, οὐδὲ μάλ' ἦβῶν,

(566) ἐς στρατόν: οὐδὲ γάρ ἄν φυλάκουσ λάθοι, οὐδέ κ' ὄχηας

(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 were young and strong. Nor would he have escaped the guards, nor would he easily have removed the bolts of our doors.

In these verses, discussed above already, Akhilleus answers Priam's order that he be given Hektor's body. Akhilleus tells him that he is well aware of the fact that he has to return the body as his mother has already told him to do so. He adds that he knows that Priam must have received divine support to reach his tent alive and to enter it because no other man would have been able to remain unseen by the Greeks and to open the doors. The verbs in this construction all belong to independent main clauses and are thus not part of the same construction. Moreover, they all describe an individual action, near to speaker and hearer, and are all equally emphasised, hence the use of the MP with each verb.

(EX.36) (653) τῶν εἴ τίς σε ἴδοιτο θοῖν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν,

(654) αὐτίκ' ἄν ἐξείποι Ἀγαμέμνονι ποιμένι λαῶν,

(655) καὶ κεν ἀνάβλησις λύσιος νεκροῖο γένηται. (*Iliad* 24,653-655)

If someone saw you here through the swift black night, he would immediately tell Agamemnon, the shepherd of men and there will/would be a delay in the return of the body.

These verses, again pronounced by Akhilleus, serve to warn Priam that he should go. Remaining longer in the camp might lead to him being discovered and when this happens, someone might tell Agamemnon and then there will not be a return of the body anymore. In this specific instance one could argue that the two verbs, which clearly refer to a specific instance close to speaker and hearer, belong to the same construction, but the verbs differ in subject and (probably also) in mood (cf. *supra*), so that they can be considered separate clauses. Moreover, both the informing of Agamemnon and the failure of the embassy are clearly highlighted here, hence the use of the MP with both verb forms.

(EX.37) (664) ἐννῆμαρ μὲν κ' αὐτὸν ἐνὶ μεγάροις γοάοιμεν,  
 (665) τῇ δεκάτῃ δέ κε θάπτοιμεν δαινῦτό τε λαός,  
 (666) ἐνδεκάτῃ δέ κε τύμβον ἐπ' αὐτῷ ποιήσαιμεν,  
 (667) τῇ δὲ δωδεκάτῃ πολεμίξοιμεν εἴ περ ἀνάγκη. (*Iliad* 24,664-667)

Nine days we would cry for him in the palace, on the tenth day we would bury him and the people would feast (beside him), on the eleventh we would make a tomb for him and on the twelfth we will resume the hostilities, if only by necessity.

In this passage, mentioned before already, Priam explains to Akhilleus that they would need eleven days to mourn and bury Hektor and that on the twelfth day the hostilities could resume. If the reduction rule were strict, we would expect an MP only with γοάοιμεν. In this instance, three verbs in the same mood and with the same subject appear nevertheless with the MP. It is clear that these verbs all belong to the closeness of speaker and hearer, and in my opinion, the use and absence in this passage has a semantic explanation. It is present with γοάοιμεν, θάπτοιμεν and ποιήσαιμεν, as it serves to highlight what Priam and his people want to do on the different days (mourn for Hektor on the ninth, bury him on the tenth and erect a funerary

monument for him on the eleventh day),<sup>29</sup> while it remains absent with δαινῦτο because feasting is not what Priam wants to emphasise because it refers to the people alone (without Priam) and because it happens on the tenth day (together with θάπτομεν). The absence in πολεμίζομεν is remarkable from a semantic point of view because Priam states that they would only fight, if they were forced to do so, but as this is a future-subjunctive form, the fact that the MP is not used is less surprising (and it could be an exhortative subjunctive as well).

#### 5.4. General truths (the “gnomic MP” versus *τε-épique*)

A special case of nearness to the speaker can be found in the general truths in speeches. Normally, the MP is used in specific instances and missing in a generic statement,<sup>30</sup> but in the case of general truths, this distinction is problematic because a general truth or gnome could be interpreted as a generic statement in which case the verb form would be used with *τε-épique*, but also as a specific instance when it is used as illustration for one's argument, in which case the MP could appear. This problem occurs in both temporal and relative clauses. In *Iliad* 24 we only have two examples, both from a speech by Akhilleus, and in both instances, the MP is used.

(EX.38) (529) ᾧ μὲν κ' ἀμμίξας δῶη Ζεὺς τερπικέραυτος,  
 (530) ἄλλοτε μὲν τε κακῶ ὃ γε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ' ἐσθλῶ:  
 (531) ᾧ δέ κε τῶν λυγρῶν δῶη, λαβητὸν ἔθηκε,  
 (532) καὶ ἐ κακῆ βούβρωστις ἐπὶ χθόνα διὰν ἐλαύνει,  
 (533) φοιτᾷ δ' οὔτε θεοῖσι τετιμένος οὔτε βροτοῖσιν. (*Iliad*  
 24,529-533)

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. Whom he (Zeus)

<sup>29</sup>For this explanation, see already von Bäumlein (1846: 377-378).

<sup>30</sup>Ruijgh (1971: 286): *En grandes lignes, Homère tend à employer la particule lorsqu'il s'agit d'un fait temporaire, mais à s'en passer dans le cas d'un fait permanent.*

The meaning and the etymology of the *τε-épique* are controversial and the literature on the topic is large (see for an overview of earlier scholarship Ruijgh 1971: 1-97 and the critical review by Gonda 1975, besides Gonda 1954a and 1954b), thus I cannot address the topic in detail here nor discuss all the different suggestions.

gives from the painful (jars), that man 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 take 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 someone, he does so, but if he decides to put misery on someone, the mortal man has no choice but to endure it, even if it means living in infamy. The two subjunctives δῶη have gnomic meaning and describe general truths, and seem to describe a *fait permanent*, but at the same time they also describe a situation that is very close to the world of both Priam and Akhilleus. In that case, one could interpret the forms as having a “near-deictic” value. This apparent contradiction is not uncommon. Examples outside *Iliad* 24 are:

(EX.39) ὅς κε θεοῖς ἐπιπέιθηται 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 as well. We note that the MP is used in the relative clause, but that the *τε-épique* is used with the gnomic aorist ἔκλυον.

In other instances, however, Akhilleus described general truths without the MP, as in the following two examples:

(EX.40) (229) ἦ πολὺ λωΐόν ἐστι κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν

(230) δῶρ' ἀποαιρεῖσθαι ὅς τις σέθεν ἀντίον εἴπη. (*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 makes the situation more generic and states that Agamemnon always takes gifts from people who dare to stand up to him (Ameis & Hentze 1884: 19, Latacz 2000b: 98). This is seen in the (iterative) present form ἀποαιρείσθαι (Ameis & Hentze 1884: 19, Kirk 1985: 77) instead of the expected aorist, in the use of the generic ὅς τις (Kirk 1985: 77, Latacz 2000b: 98), and in the subjunctive εἶπη without modal particle (De Decker 2015: 219, 319). As such, Agamemnon's behaviour is not interpreted as an individual *faux pas*, but as 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 (Ruijgh 1971: 448-449, Basset 1989: 204-205, De Decker 2015: 219, 319). This agrees with the specifying value of the modal particle: when a specific person is referenced, the modal particle is used, but not when a generic situation is described.

(EX.41) (52) ἀλλὰ τόδ' αἰνὸν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν  
 ἰκάνει,

(53) ὀππότε δὴ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἀνὴρ ἐθέλησιν ἀμέρσαι

(54) καὶ γέρας ἄψ' ἀφελέσθαι, ὅτε / ὅ τε κράτει  
**προβεβήκη**. (*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 / who 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. In this passage we have three problems to address. First, there are two subjunctives without MP. Second, besides the subjunctive προβεβήκη, the form προβεβήκει is transmitted as well. Third, besides ὅτε, also ὅ τε is found in the codices. I believe that all three problems can be resolved jointly. As to προβεβήκει, a pluperfect is less suited here and is very rare in *similia*, especially considering the fact that most forms in a simile tend to be augmented. In several instances of the perfect subjunctive in -η the forms in -ει were transmitted as well, although a pluperfect makes no sense whatsoever in these

contexts (La Roche 1893: 127). It thus seems that προβεβήκει cannot be a pluperfect, but assuming a short vowel subjunctive in the perfect stem, as done by Van Thiel (2011: 76 when discussing *Iliad* 4,483 and 16,633), would be unprecedented (as was noted already by Chantraine 1948: 460 before Van Thiel's edition and by West 2001: 190). It is possible to "correct" the problem, by changing the transmitted pluperfect into the perfect προβέβηκε (which does not violate the metre), as in *Iliad* 16,633 where besides the form ὀρώρει the perfect ὀρώρεν was also transmitted (but there clearly as *lectio facillior*), but as will be shown later, the subjunctive can be defended. Second, ὅτε is also written as ὄ τε in the codices. Most editors print ὄ τε (Faesi 1860: 119, La Roche 1870d: 108, Ameis & Hentze 1881: 42, 1885: 6, Leaf 1888: 131, Monro & Allen 1902b on this passage, no page numbers), M. West 2000: 102), with the exception of Van Thiel (2011: 303) who printed ὅτε. The form ὄτε would be the temporal conjunction "when", while ὄ τε can be seen as nominative masculine singular, nominative neuter singular and accusative neuter singular, all followed by the particle τε (genuinely connective or *épique*).<sup>31</sup> When interpreted as neuter accusative, it can be explained as being a temporal accusative "at the moment when" (Buttmann 1825b: 227, Wentzel 1847: 2-3, Vogrinz 1889: 352-353, Jacobsohn 1910: 115), or a causal one "on the grounds that" (Capelle 1877a), or containing both meanings.<sup>32</sup> When we interpret ὄ τε as a masculine form of the relative pronoun, the particle τε could be interpreted as τε-*épique* and it would then describe the general qualities of the the antecedent ἀνὴρ.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup>Brugmann (1900: 253-254) explicitly argues against this etymology. Delbrück (1900: 320) accepted the connection, but argued that determining the exact meanings of ὅτε, ὄ and ὄ τε was in fact impossible.

<sup>32</sup>Delbrück's initial explanation (1871: 55) that the accusative was due to the fact that the subordinate clause was the object of the main clause is no longer tenable.

<sup>33</sup>Faesi (1860: 119), La Roche (1870d: 108), Ameis & Hentze (1881: 42, 1885: 6), Monro (1891: 232 - interpreting ὄ as the article), Wackernagel (*apud* Horn 1895: 108-109, 1940, edited posthumously), Brügger (2018: 44).

For the rare masculine form see also Windisch (1869: 287), La Roche (1893: 124), Kühner & Gerth (1904: 237), Schwyzer & Debrunner (1950: 648), Ruijgh (1971: 464, who admitted that the masculine form ὄ existed).

Chantraine (1953: 286) asked if we should not prefer ὄτε over ὄ τε, Ruijgh (1971: 464) argued that ὄτε with temporal value was more likely to be correct because a nominative singular ὄ was very rare and Janko (1992: 323) argued that the temporal reading ὄτε was confirmed by the subjunctive προβεβήκη. The problem is that this is the *lectio facilior* and that it does not really address the issue of the subjunctive without MP. This brings us to the third problem, that of the subjunctives without MP. The absence of the MP 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 (that the subjunctive was unfit here was noted by von Christ 1880b: 234, who was also quoted in Ameis and Hentze 1881: 42). It is possible to “correct” the problem by changing the subjunctive perfect προβεβήκη into the indicative perfect προβεβήκε (cf. *supra*), but in that case the first subjunctive would still remain problematic. Alternatively, one could add the MP, reading ὀππότε κεν τὸν instead of ὀππότε δὴ τὸν and ὄτ’ ἄν κράτεῖ (or even ὄ κε κράτεῖ) instead of ὄ τε κράτεῖ, 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, however. The first subjunctive is used with the undefined / generalising relative ὀππότε and not with ὄτε (and could be interpreted as a repeated action as well). Moreover, if we accept the interpretation of a masculine ὄ followed by *τε-éripique*, the use of the subjunctive προβεβήκη without MP would be explained, as it would describe a general habit and not a specific instance.

There is even a passage in which both constructions (subjunctive with MP and subjunctive with *τε-éripique*) are used beside each other:

- (EX.42) (508) ὃς μὲν τ’ αἰδέσεται κούρας Διὸς ἄσπον  
 ἰούσας,  
 (509) τὸν δὲ μέγ’ ὤνησαν καὶ τ’ ἔκλυον εὐχομένοιο:  
 (510) ὃς δὲ κ’ ἀνήνηται καὶ τε στερεῶς ἀποείπη,



(511) λίσσονται δ' ἄρα ταί γε Δία Κρονίωνα κιοῦσαι

(512) τῷ ἄτην ἄμ' ἔπεσθαι, ἵνα βλαφθεὶς ἀποτίσῃ. (*Iliad* 9,508-512)

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 follow 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.

One could of course argue that αἰδέσεται, being a future-subjunctive, has no MP, while ἀνήνηται, an aorist subjunctive, has an MP, and that finally, ἀποείπη, also an aorist subjunctive, has no MP because it is preceded by another verb form with an MP. This does not explain, however, why both αἰδέσεται and ἀποείπη have a *τε-épique*. Ruijgh considered the different uses such as the one in this passage to be stylistically and metrically motivated,<sup>34</sup> but as *κε* and *τε* have the same form, the metre cannot have been the explanation. The use of the MP therefore seems random, and even if we assume that both particles had the same origin, the different use in these contexts still poses problems.

## 6. The use of the MP in the other types of clauses

So far, we have explained the presence of the MP as particularising and emphasising. Now we have to determine if the different types of clauses where the MP can occur, confirm this.

### 6.1. The main clauses.

The first category are the main clauses. There are 24 instances of an MP in a main clause and 23 of them appear in a speech. Of those 23 speech instances, 22 are in the optative and 1 in the subjunctive; the instance in narrative occurs in the indicative. All instances appear in a specific context (some

<sup>34</sup>Ruijgh (1971: 287) *il s'agit donc d'une variation stylistique imposée par les conditions métriques.*

examples have been discussed above) and involve hearer and speaker, with the exception of the instance below:

(EX.43) (713) καί νύ κε δὴ πρόπαν ἡμᾶρ 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.

This is a special case, as it belongs to the narrative, but announces a speech introduction. It is a specific instance, as it describes the context of Priam's entry into the city of Troy and the mourning of the Trojans.

There are 54 instances in a main clause without an MP, which all occur in a speech. Of those 54, 14 appear either in a wish or an exhortative clause. Of the remaining 40 instances, 36 are either a future-desiderative or a future-subjunctive. The four remaining instances are *Iliad* 24,233, 264, 551 and 665. They have been discussed already. In 223 and 264 the verb without MP is directly connected and on the same semantic and syntactic level as the verb with MP that precedes it; 24,665 has no MP because it is preceded by a verb that has an MP and because it is less focused than the other verbs in the context. This leaves us with 24,551, which is a problematic instance where the absence is unaccounted for (cf. *supra*).

## 6.2. The MP in relative clauses

As was stated already, we have 11 instances of a verb form (optative or subjunctive) in a relative clause with an MP and 8 without it. In the 11 instances of a relative clause with an MP, a specific instance is described and they all occur in a speech.<sup>35</sup> Several examples have been discussed already (24,92, 195, 529, 531). Below I discuss another example.

<sup>35</sup>The instances are *Iliad* 24,38 (κήαιεν), 92 (εἴπη), 119 (ιήνη), 147 (ιήνη), 149 (ιθύνοι), 176 (ιήνη), 177 (ιθύνοι), 196 (ιήνη), 529 (δῶη), 531 (δῶη), 745 (μεμνήμην).

(EX.44) (35) τὸν νῦν οὐκ ἔτλητε νέκυν περ ἔοντα σαῶσαι  
 (36) ἧ τ' ἀλόχῳ ἰδέειν καὶ μητέρι καὶ τέκεϊ ᾗ  
 (37) καὶ πατέρι Πριάμῳ λαοῖσί τε, τοί κέ μιν ᾧκα  
 (38) ἐν πυρὶ κήαιεν καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερίσαιεν. (*Iliad*  
 24,35-38)

Would you not dare to save him, although he is a corpse, so that it is possible for his wife to see (him), for his mother, for his child, for his father Priam and for the people, who would quickly burn him in the fire and bury him with the (deserved) honours.

In this instance Hermes wants to incite the gods to allow Hektor's body to be saved and for it to be given to the Trojans so that they can pay him the last honours. The verbs in the relative clause refer to a specific instance (Hektor's funeral) that is very near to hearers and speakers (they are witnessing the events as they speak and hear). Therefore, κήαιεν has an MP; κτερίσαιεν, on the other hand, has no MP because there is already an MP with the preceding κήαιεν.

Similarly, there is an MP in 24,149-151 (= 24,178-180) with the first verb form because it is a specific case and not with the next verb form because the MP has already been used in the sentence.

The MP is absent in 8 instances in a relative clause (they also occur in a speech). In three instances (24,38, 24,149-151 and 24,178-180, quoted and discussed above) the MP is missing because the preceding verb had already been used with an MP. In two instances the verb in the relative clause is a future-desiderative.<sup>36</sup> In another instance a future-subjunctive.<sup>37</sup> And in one of those instances the verb has the nuance of a wish:

(EX.45) (212) ἀνδρὶ πάρα κρατερῷ, τοῦ ἐγὼ μέσον ἦπαρ  
 ἔχομι  
 (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).

<sup>36</sup> *Iliad* 24,154 = 24,183 (ἄξει).

<sup>37</sup> *Iliad* 24,730 (ὀχθήσονται).

In these verses Hekabe states that Priam's plan to go to Akhilleus' tent and try to retrieve Hektor's body is sheer madness, as he will be killed as well. She voices her hatred for Akhilleus by stating that she would even be willing to eat his liver as vengeance for Hektor. ἔχοιμι is used in a relative clause and has no MP because it is not a potential optative, but an optative with the nuance of a wish.

In one instance the verb form without MP is debated:

(EX.46) τῆδ' εἴη: ὃς ἄποινα **φέρου** καὶ νεκρὸν ἄγοιτο. (*Iliad* 24,139)

Let it be like this. He who carries the ransom, let him also carry the body. / Let him bring the ransom and also carry the body.

In the instance quoted above (and discussed already) the optative φέρου is disputed because the indicative φέρει is also transmitted. If one accepts that reading, the sentence means “he who brings, let him also carry”; in case of the optative, one could think of either modal attraction under influence of ἄγοιτο or it can be a wish as well “Let him bring the ransom and let him also carry the body.”

### 6.3. The use in temporal clauses

There are 7 verb forms with an MP and 4 without it in a temporal clause.<sup>38</sup> 6 of the 7 instances with MP and 3 of the 4 instances without it appear in a speech. When we look at the instances with MP, we see that they all refer to specific instances, of which I discuss one below.

(EX.47) ἄσεσθε κλαυθμοῖο, ἐπὶν ἀγάγωμι δόμονδε. (*Iliad* 24,717)

Satiate your wailing, when I have brought him home.

In this verse Priam enters the city of Troy with Hektor's body and tells his fellow Trojans that they can weep and mourn for

<sup>38</sup>The instances with MP are *Iliad* 24,154 (πελάσση, future-subjunctive [!]), 155 (ἀγάγησιν), 183 (πελάσση), 184 (ἀγάγησιν), 480 (λάβη), 454 (κεῖται), 717 (ἀγάγωμι) and those without are 14 (ζεύξειεν), 369 (χαλεπήνη), 417 (φανήη), 781 (μόλη).

Hektor as soon as he has brought him to his own house. The verb ἀγάγωμι refers to a single event that occurs near speaker and hearers and therefore the MP is used (for the fact that the MP is secure here, cf. supra).

There is one instance that remains to be addressed and that is the one with MP in a narrative passage:

(EX.48) (480) ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ἄνδρ' ἄτη πυκινὴ λάβῃ, ὅς τ' ἐνὶ  
πάτρῃ

(481) φῶτα κατακτείνας ἄλλων ἐξίκετο δῆμον

(482) ἄνδρὸς ἐς ἀφνειοῦ, θάμβος δ' ἔχει εἰσορόωντας.  
(Iliad 24,480-482)

As when a disastrous misfortune strikes a man, who has killed a man in his fatherland and arrives in the land of others, to (the house) of a wealthy man, and wonder strikes all the ones who are beholding this.

In this instance the reactions of surprise at Priam's arrival in Akhilleus' tent are compared to that of people gazing in disbelief at a suppliant who fled his homeland after he murdered a relative in a moment of madness. The verb λάβῃ is used with an MP in spite of the fact that it appears in a simile. The verb forms in *similia* tend to be used without MP and with the *τε-épique*, as they describe generic events: in the large corpus of 5267 verses (cf. supra) there are 35 optatives and subjunctives without an MP against only 4 with it and, according to Ruijgh (1969, 1971 *passim*, but especially pages 513 and 629-634), there are 11 instances with an MP in a simile and 35 without in the entire *Iliad*. One could try to emend the problem by reading ὥς δ' ὅτε τ' ἄνδρ' instead of ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἄν ἄνδρ', but that does not solve the problem as to why the MP was used specifically here and not more often.

For three of the four instances without MP, an explanation has been given already: 24,14 and 24,417 refer to repeated actions and 24,369 has an undefined subject. There is one problematic instance (24,780-781, discussed above already).

#### 6.4. The use in conditional clauses

The next type we need to discuss are the conditional clauses. We have 5 instances with an MP and 11 without.<sup>39</sup> The instances without can be explained and most have been discussed before. Three have a desiderative form,<sup>40</sup> one a form of the root *\*h<sub>3</sub>ek<sup>w</sup>*,<sup>41</sup> one is a future-subjunctive,<sup>42</sup> four have an undefined subject,<sup>43</sup> one refers to a repeated action and has an undefined subject,<sup>44</sup> and one occurs in an εἰ μή-clause.<sup>45</sup> Problematic are the ones with an MP. They refer to specific instances but are all constructed with αἶ κε and all have the notion of wish and purpose. The use of the MP can only be explained as a grammaticalisation of the MP in conditional clauses. It should be noted that αἶ κε is only used with the subjunctive and not the optative (the mood of possibility and wish).

#### 7. The interaction between tense and MP-use

A reviewer points out that the figures of *Iliad* 24 show that the forms in the aorist tend to have the MP much more often than the present, both in the subjunctive as in the optative. This is indeed a remarkable fact, but when we take a larger corpus (the above-mentioned corpus of 5267 verses), we see that there is a slight preference for MP use in the aorist, but less outspoken than in *Iliad* 24. Below I repeat the data for *Iliad* 24 and also quote the data for the larger corpus.

---

<sup>39</sup>The instances with MP are *Iliad* 24,116 (δείσῃ), 301 (ἐλεήσῃ, future-subjunctive [!]), 337 (ἐλεήσῃ, future-subjunctive [!]), 592 (πύθηαι), 687 (γνώῃ) and the ones without are 24,58 (θήσετε), 74 (καλέσειε), 116 (λύσῃ), 206 (αἰρήσει), 206 (ἐσόψεται), 220 (ἐκέλευεν), 296 (δώσει), 366 (ἴδοιτο), 654 (ἴδοιτο), 715 (μετηύδα), 768 (ἐνίπτοι).

<sup>40</sup>The instances are *Iliad* 24,58, 206, 296.

<sup>41</sup>*Iliad* 24,206

<sup>42</sup>*Iliad* 24,116.

<sup>43</sup>The instances are *Iliad* 24,74, 220, 366, 654

<sup>44</sup>*Iliad* 24,768

<sup>45</sup>*Iliad* 24,715

Form	With MP	No MP
Aorist subjunctive	17	16
Present subjunctive	2	12
Perfect subjunctive	0	0
Subjunctive, tense undetermined	0	2
Aorist optative	12	18
Present optative	11	11
Perfect optative	1	0
Optative, tense undetermined	0	2
Future-subjunctive	4	20
Future-desiderative	0	25
Double particle use	1	0
The root <i>*h<sub>3</sub>ek<sup>w</sup></i>	0	2
Aorist indicative	0	0
Imperfect indicative	1	2
Pluperfect indicative	0	0
Total	49	110

The data for *Iliad 24* are (as discussed above):

Form	MP	no MP
Aorist subjunctive	78	95
Present subjunctive	41	73
Perfect subjunctive	3	12
Subjunctive, tense undetermined	3	10
Aorist optative	54	85
Present optative	27	42
Perfect optative	3	1
Optative, tense undetermined	0	2
Future optative	1	1
Future-subjunctive	31	138
Future-desiderative	2	144
Indicative aorist	14	9
Indicative imperfect	8	3
Indicative pluperfect	0	0
Future perfect ( <i>futurum exactum</i> ) / reduplicated future	1	0
Infinitive aorist	2	0
Infinitive present	0	0
MP without verb	2	0
Double particle use	5	0
The root <i>*h<sub>1</sub>ed</i>	1	4
The root <i>*g<sup>w</sup>ieh<sub>3</sub></i>	0	3
The root <i>*h<sub>3</sub>ek<sup>w</sup></i>	1	2
Total	277	624

Broken down for the present versus aorist, this gives the following data and percentages:

	With MP	Without MP	% of MP
Aorist			
<i>Iliad</i> 24	29	34	46
Larger corpus	132	180	42
Present			
<i>Iliad</i> 24	13	23	36
Larger corpus	68	115	37

We see that *Iliad* 24 has a higher proportion of aorist forms with an MP and a lower one with a present form, and also that the difference between aorist and present forms is higher than in the larger corpus. Based on the data of the larger corpus I am inclined to state that there is no direct link between tense and the use of the MP. Further investigations of the *Odyssey* and Hesiod could shed new light on this issue.

## 8. Conclusion

In this article, I discussed the use and absence of the modal particle (MP) ἄν/κεν in *Iliad* 24. In part 1 I discussed the etymology and the different forms in Homer, concluding that there is no certainty about the exact etymology of the different forms. In a second step, I provided an overview and a critical assessment of the previous explanations (of the MP use). Then I determined the corpus of metrically secure instances and outlined the methodology and criteria used to determine and catalogue the different forms. Based on those criteria, I listed the metrically secure forms and proceeded to the actual analysis, which occurred in Part 2. My research showed that the MP was absent in volunative contexts (wishes, exhortations, [negative] purpose clauses and with future-desiderative and future-subjunctive forms) and when repeated actions were described, and that most of the instances where it was used appeared in speeches, more specifically in descriptions of specific actions close to speaker and/or hearer. I also paid attention to the exceptions and found that there were several instances in which the MP did (not) appear contrary to expectations: out of 159 instances, there are 5 instances where



it appeared against expectation (154, 183, 301, 357, 480) and 2 where it remained absent, although we would have expected it to appear (551, 780). Finally, I checked if there was a connection between tense and the use of the MP, but found that the data of a larger corpus did not allow us to state that tense use determined the use of the MP.

## Bibliography

Ahrens, Heinrich

- 1839 *De dialectis aeolicis et pseudo-aeolicis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.  
1843 *De Linguae Graecae Dialectis. Liber Secundus. De dialecto dorica*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.  
1852 *Griechische Formenlehre des Homerischen und Attischen Dialektes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Aken, Adolf Friedrich

- 1861 *Die Grundzüge der Lehre von Tempus und Modus im Griechischen: historisch und vergleichend aufgestellt*. Rostock: Stiller.  
1865 *Die Hauptdata der griechischen Tempus- und Moduler, historisch und vergleichend*. Berlin: Enslin.

Allan, Rutger

- 2013 Exploring modality's semantic space grammaticalization, subjectification and the case of ὀφείλω. *Glotta* 89: 1-46.

Ameis, Karl Friedrich

- 1868a *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Erster Band. Erstes Heft. Gesang 1-3*. Leipzig: Teubner.  
1868b *Anhang zu Homers Ilias Schulausgabe. I. Heft. Erläuterungen zu Gesang I-III*. Leipzig: Teubner.  
1870a *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Erster Band. Zweites Heft. Gesang 4-6*. Leipzig: Teubner.  
1870b *Anhang zu Homers Ilias Schulausgabe. II. Heft. Erläuterungen zu Gesang IV-VI*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, Karl Friedrich & Carl Hentze

- 1875 *Homers Ilias für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Erster Band. Drittes Heft. Gesang VII - IX*. Leipzig: Teubner.  
1877 *Anhang zu Homers Ilias Schulausgabe. 1. Heft Erläuterungen zu Gesang I - III*. Leipzig: Teubner.  
1881 *Anhang zu Homers Ilias Schulausgabe. Erläuterungen zu Gesang XVI - XVIII*. Leipzig: Teubner.  
1884 *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Erster Band, erstes Heft. Gesang I - III*. Leipzig: Teuber.

- 1885 *Homers Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Zweiter Band. Zweites Heft. Gesang XVI - XVIII.* Leipzig: Teubner.
- 1889 *Anhang zu Homers Odyssee Schulausgabe. Erläuterungen zu Gesang VII- XII.* Leipzig: Teubner.
- 1895 *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang 13-24.* Leipzig: Teubner.
- 1900a *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang 1-6.* Leipzig: Teubner.
- 1900b *Anhang zu Homers Odyssee Schulausgabe 4. Gesang 19-24.* Leipzig: Teubner.
- 1901 *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XIX-XXIV.* Leipzig: Teubner.
- 1906 *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang 22-24.* Leipzig: Teubner.
- Amigues, Suzanne  
1977 *Les subordinées finales par ΟΠΩΣ en attique classique.* Paris: Klincksieck.
- Bakker, Egbert  
1997 *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bartoněk, Antonín  
2003 *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch.* Heidelberg: Winter.
- Basset, Louis  
1984 L'optatif grec et la dissociation énonciative. *LALIES* 4: 53-59.  
1988 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*, 27-37. Amsterdam: Brill.  
1989 *La syntaxe de l'imaginaire: études des modes et des négations dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssee.* Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée.  
2000a L'opposition aspectuelle présent/aoriste chez Platon: une paire minimale "peux-tu le dire? ". (= 2004: 123-134).  
2000b Le prévisible et l'imprévu : oppositions de l'imparfait et de l'indicatif de l'aoriste dans Thucydide VI, 50-52. (= 2004: 135-142).  
2004 *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora.* Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée.
- Bechtel, Friedrich  
1884 Die inschriftlichen denkmäler des arkadischen dialects. *Bezenbergers Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* 8: 301-327.  
1921 *Die griechischen Dialekte. Erster Band. Der lesbische, thessalische, böotische, arkadische und kyprische Dialekt.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Beck, Jana, Sophia Malamud & Iryna Osadcha.  
2012 A semantics for the particle ἄν in and outside conditionals in classical Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12: 51-83.
- Beekes, Robert & Lucien Van Beek  
2010 *Greek Etymological Dictionary, by Robert Beekes; with the assistance of Lucien van Beek*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bekker, Immanuel  
1843a *Ilias ex recognitione Immanuelis Bekkeri*. Berlin: Nicolai.  
1843a *Odyssea ex recognitione Immanuelis Bekkeri*. Berlin: Nicolai.  
1858a *Carmina Homerica. Volumen Prius. Ilias*. Bonn: Marcus.  
1858b *Carmina Homerica. Volumen Alterum. Odyssea*. Bonn: Marcus.  
1863 *Homerische Blätter. Erster Band. Beilage zu dessen Carmina Homerica*. Bonn: Marcus  
1872 *Homerische Blätter. Zweiter Band. Beilage zu dessen Carmina Homerica*. Bonn: Marcus.
- Benfey, Theodor  
1842 *Griechische Grammatik. Erste Abtheilung: Griechischen Wurzellexikon, als Grundlage der griechischen Grammatik*. Berlin: Reimer.
- Bernabé, Alberto & Eugenio Luján  
2006 *Introducción al griego micénico: gramática, selección de textos, glosario*. Zaragoza: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza.
- Bernhardy, Gottfried  
1829 *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Berlin: Duncker und Humblot.
- Bers, Victor  
1984 *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age*. Yale: Yale University Press.
- Bloch, Alfred  
1955 Was bedeutet das «epische» TE? *Museum Helveticum* 12: 145-153.
- Boisacq, Émile  
1916 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Brügger, Claude  
2017 *Homer Iliad. The Basel Commentary. Book XXIV*. Translated by S. Douglas Olson. Berlin: De Gruyter.  
2018 *Homer Iliad. The Basel Commentary. Book XVI*. Translated by Benjamin W. Millis and Sara Strack. Edited by S. Douglas Olson. Berlin: De Gruyter.

## Brugmann, Karl

- 1880 Beiträge zur Conjugationslehre. In: Hermann Osthoff & Karl Brugmann (eds.), *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Dritter Theil, 1-91. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- 1881 Griechische Etymologien. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 25: 298-307.
- 1890 *Griechische Grammatik*. München: Beck.
- 1900 *Griechische Grammatik*. München: Beck.
- 1904 *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- 1916 *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Zweiter Band *Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch*. Dritter Teil. Strassburg: Trübner.

## Brugmann, Karl &amp; Albert Thumb

- 1913 *Griechische Grammatik*. München: Beck.

## Brunel, Jean

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

## Buttmann, Philip

- 1810 *Griechische Grammatik*. Fünfte, vermehrte und verbesserte Ausgabe. Berlin: in der Myliussischen Buchhandlung.
- 1819 *Griechische Schulgrammatik*. Fünfte Auflage. Berlin: in der Myliussischen Buchhandlung.
- 1825a *Lexilogus oder Beiträge zur griechischen Wort- Erklärung, hauptsächlich für Homer und Hesiod*. Berlin: Dümmler.
- 1825b *Lexilogus oder Beiträge zur griechischen Wort- Erklärung, hauptsächlich für Homer und Hesiod*. Zweiter Band. Berlin: Dümmler.
- 1830 *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre*. Erster Band. Berlin: Dümmler.
- 1839 *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre*. Zweiter Band. Mit Zusätzen von C.A. Lobeck. Berlin: Dümmler.
- 1854 *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin: Dümmler.

## Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins &amp; William Pagliuca

- 1994 *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

## Camerer, Ruth

- 1968 Über den emphatischen Grundwert des Partikels ἄν. *Glotta* 46: 106-117.

## Capelle, Carl

- 1877a Beiträge zur homerischen syntax: I. ὄ, ὄτ', ὄτι, ὄτε. *Philologus* 36: 193-209.

- 1877b Die neueren arbeite auf dem gebiete der homerischen syntax. *Philologus* 36: 671-712.
- Chantraine, Pierre
- 1948 *Grammaire homérique*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- 1953 *Grammaire homérique. Tome II : Syntaxe*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- 1964 *Morphologie historique du grec*. Paris: Klincksieck. (deuxième édition revue et augmentée).
- 1966 Questions de syntaxe grecque. *Revue de Philologie* III, 40. 37-44.
- 1968-1980 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Colvin, Stephen
- 2012 The modal particle in Greek. *Cambrdige Classical Journal* 62: 65-84.
- 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*, 27-62. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Dawes, Richard
- 1745 *Miscellanea Critica*. Cambridge: Bentham.
- Dawes, Richard, Thomas Burgess & Gottlieb Harless
- 1800 *Ricardi Dawes Miscellanea Critica iterum edita*. Leipzig: Crusius.
- Debrunner, Albert
- 1921 Das hellenistische Nebensatziterativpräteritum mit äv. *Glotta* 11: 1-28.
- De Decker, Filip
- 2015 *A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Speech Introductions and Conclusions in Homer*. PhD thesis Ludwig Maximilians Universität München. Online publication: <https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/17995/>
- 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 Haan, Ferdinand
- 2006 Typological approaches to modality. In: William Frawley (ed.), *The Expression of Modality*, 26-63. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- De Jong, Irene
- 1987a The voice of anonymity: *Tis* Speeches in the *Iliad*. *Eranos* 85: 69-84.
- 1987b *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

- 2001 *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2012 *Homer. Iliad Book XXII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delaunois, Marcel  
1988 *Essai de syntaxe grecque classique*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Delbrück, Berthold  
1871 *Syntaktische Forschungen I. Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- 1879 *Syntaktische Forschungen IV. Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- 1900 *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. III. Strassburg: Karl Trübner.
- De Mol, Geert  
2015 *Het modale partikel ἄν / κε(v) / κα. Een bijdrage aan de Griekse Grammatica DyLEGRam*. MA thesis Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
- Denniston, John Dewar  
1954 *The Greek Particles*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- De Saussure, Ferdinand  
1889 βουκόλος. *Mémoires de la Société Linguistique (de Paris)* 6: 161-162.
- Devarius, Matthaeus (= Matthaios Devarís)  
1587 *De Graecae Linguae Particulis*. Rome: Zanetti.
- Devarius, Matthaeus & Reinhold Klotz  
1835 *Matthaei Devari Liber de Graecae linguae particulis. Edidit Reinholdus Klotz*. Leipzig: Baumgärtner.
- Ebeling, Heinrich  
1885a *Lexicon Homericum*. I. Α-Ξ. Leipzig: Teubner.
- 1885b *Lexicon Homericum*. I. Ο-Ω. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Faesi, Johann Ulrich  
1858a *Homers Iliade, erklärt von J. U. Faesi*. Erster Band. Berlin: Weidmann.
- 1858b *Homers Iliade, erklärt von J. U. Faesi*. Zweiter Band. Berlin: Weidmann.
- 1860 *Homers Odyssee, erklärt von J. U. Faesi*. Berlin: Weidmann.

- Fernández Galiano, Manuel  
1992 Books XXI-XXII. In: Joseph Russo, Manuel Fernández Galiano & Albert Heubeck (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume III: Books XVII – XXIV*, 131-311. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fingerle, Anton  
1939 *Typik der homerischen Reden*. Unpublished PhD thesis LMU München.
- Fournier, Henri  
1946a *Les verbes "dire" en grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.  
1946b Formules homériques de références. *Revue de Philologie* 20: 29-68.
- Franke, August  
1861 *Über die Bildung der Futura im Griechischen*. Lingen: Sattler.
- Frohberger, H.  
1863 Ueber die unterordnung mehrerer verba unter ein ἄπό κοινοῦ stehendes ἔν. *Philologus* 19: 599-613.
- Frisk, Hjalmar  
1960 *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 1:A-Ko. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.  
1970 *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Teil 2. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.  
1972 *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Addenda. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Fykias, Ioannis & Christina Katsikadeli  
2013 The rise of "subordination features" in the history of Greek and their decline. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3: 28-48.
- García-Ramón, José Luis  
2012 Aspect and mood in Indo-European reconstruction. In: Craig Melchert (ed.), *The Indo-European Verb*, 73-85. Bremen: Hempen.
- Garvie, Alexander F.  
1994 *Homer Odyssey. Books VI - VIII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gerö, Eva Carin  
2000 The usage of ἔν and κε in Ancient Greek: Towards unified description. *Glotta* 76: 176-191.  
2001 Irrealis and past tense in Ancient Greek. *Glotta* 77: 178-197.
- Gerth, Berthold  
1878 *Grammatisch-Kritisches zur griechischen Moduslehre*. Dresden: Programm des Königlichen Gymnasiums zu Dresden-Neustadt.

Giese, Albert

1837 *Ueber den Aeolischen Dialekt*. Berlin: Fincke.

Gildersleeve, Basil Lanneau

1882 Studies in Pindaric syntax. *American Journal of Philology* 3: 434-455.

1900 *Syntax of Classical Greek*. New York, Cincinnati & Chicago: American Book Company.

Goldstein, David

2012 iterated modal marking and polarity focus in Ancient Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 110: 1-25.

Gonda, Jan

1954a The history and original function of the Indo-European particle \**k<sup>u</sup>e*, especially in Greek and Latin. Part I. *Mnemosyne* NS IV 7: 177-214.

1954b The history and original function of the Indo-European particle \**k<sup>u</sup>e*, especially in Greek and Latin. Part II. *Mnemosyne* NS IV 7: 265-296.

1956 *The Character of the Indo-European Moods*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

1975 Review Ruijgh, 1971. *Mnemosyne* NS IV 28: 299-301.

Goodwin, William

1865 *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge, MA: Sever and Francis.

Grassmann, Hermann

1873 *Wörterbuch zu Rig Veda*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

Graziosi, Barbara & Johannes Haubold

2000 *Homer Iliad 6*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hagena, K.

1853 Beiträge zur kritik und erklärungs der homerischen gedichte. *Philologus* 8: 385-394.

Hainsworth, John Brian

1988 Commentary Books V - VIII. In: Alfred Heubeck, Stephanie West & John Brian Hainsworth (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume I: Introduction and Books I - VIII*, 249-386. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

1993 *The Iliad. A Commentary III: Books 9-12*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hartung, Johann

1832 *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache. I*. Erlangen: Enke.



- 1833 *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache. II.* Erlangen: Enke.
- Hentze, Carl
- 1905 Die Chorreden in den homerischen Epen. *Philologus* 64: 254-268.
- 1906 Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Finalsätze auf Grund der homerischen Epen. *Philologus* 65: 161-192.
- 1907 Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikeln  $\epsilon\iota$ ,  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$   $\kappa\epsilon$  und  $\eta\upsilon$  mit dem Konjunktiv. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 41: 356-378.
- 1909 Der homerische Gebrauch der  $\epsilon\iota$  Sätze mit dem Indikativ des Futurs. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 42: 131-146.
- Hermann, Eduard
- 1895 Gab es im Indogermanischen Nebensätze? (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 33: 481-534.
- 1901 Über das Rekonstruieren. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 41: 1-64.
- Hermann, Gottfried
- 1831 *De Particula ὅν Libri IV.* Leipzig: Fleischer.
- Hettrich, Heinrich
- 1987 Zur Entwicklung der Finalsätze altindogermanischer Sprachen. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 100: 219-237.
- 1988 *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen.* Berlin: De Gruyter.
- 1992 Lateinische Konditionalsätze in sprachvergleichender Sicht. In: Oswald Panagl & Thomas Krisch (eds.), *Latein und Indogermanisch*, 263-284. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- 1996 Review Wakker, 1994. *Kratylos* 41: 130-137.
- 1998 Die Entstehung des homerischen Irrealis der Vergangenheit. In: Jay Jasanoff, Craig Melchert & Oliver Lisi (eds), *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*, 261-270. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Heubeck, Alfred
- 1989 Commentary Books IX - XII. In: Alfred Heubeck & Arie Hoekstra (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume II: Books IX-XVI*, 3-146. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Heubeck, Alfred, John Brian Hainsworth & Stephanie West (eds.)
- 1988 *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Introduction and Books I - VIII.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Heubeck, Alfred & Arie Hoekstra (eds.)
- 1989 *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume II: Books IX-XVI.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hinrichs, Gustav

- 1875 *De Homerae Elocutionis Vestigiis Aeolicis Scripsit Gustavus Hinrichs*. Jena: Frommann.

Hinze, Paul

- 1887 *De AN particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos vi et usu*. Halle: Wiesike.

Hoffmann, Otto

- 1890 Review Richard Meister, 1889. *Die griechischen Dialekte, auf Grundlage von Ahrens' Werk "De Graecae linguae dialectis". 2 Band Eleisch, Arkadisch, Kyprisch, Verzeichnis zum ersten und zweiten Bande*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1890: 873-904.

Hoogeveen, Henricus

- 1769 *Doctrina Particularum Linguae Graecae*. Leiden: Damme.

Hoogeveen, Henricus & Christian Schütz

- 1813 *Henrici Hoogeveen Doctrina particularum linguae Graecae in Epitomen rededit Christianus Schütz*. Glasgow: Duncan.

Horn, Paul

- 1895 X. internationaler Orientalistenkongress in Genf vom 4. - 12. September 1894. *Anzeiger für Indogermanische Sprach- und Altertumskunde* 5: 101-112.

Horrocks, Geoffrey

- 1995 On condition: Aspect and modality in the history of Greek. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 221 (NS 41): 153-174.

Howorth, R. H.

- 1955 The origin of the use of ἄν and κεν in indefinite clauses. *Classical Quarterly* NS 5: 72-93.

H. M.

- 1832 On certain constructions of the subjunctive mood. *Philological Museum* 1: 96-105.

Humbert, Jean

- 1960 *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Jacobsohn, Hermann

- 1910 Aeolische Doppelkonsonanz. Zur Sprache u. Verstechnik des homerischen Epos. *Hermes* 45: 67-124.  
1913 Got. *ōgs*, lat *vel*. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 45: 342-348.

Jacquino, Bernard

- 2017 The syntax of Greek. In: Matthias Fritz, Brian Joseph & Jared Klein (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics I*, 682-695. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Janko, Richard

- 1982 *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
1992 *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume 13-16*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
2012 *πρῶτον καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν αἰίδειν*. Relative chronology and the literary history of the early Greek epos. In: Øvind Andersen & Dag Haug (eds), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, 20-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jeffers, Robert J. & W. J. Pepicello

- 1979 The expression of purpose in Indo-European. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 84: 1-16.

Keydana, Götz

- 2018 The syntax of proto-Indo-European. In: Matthias Fritz, Brian Joseph, Brian & Jared Klein (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics III*, 2195-2228. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kiparsky, Paul

- 1968 Tense and mood in Indo-European syntax. *Foundations of Language* 4: 30-57.  
1995 Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax. In: Adrian Battye & Ian Roberts (eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 140-172. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kirk, Geoffrey

- 1985 *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
1990 *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 5-8*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kloekhorst, Alwin

- 2008 *The Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill  
2017 The Old Hittite and the proto-Indo-European tense-aspect system. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 122: 295-307.

Kluge, Heinrich

- 1911 *Syntaxis Graecae quaestiones selectae*. Inaugural dissertation Berlin.

## Koppers, Bertha

- 1959 *Negative Conditional Sentences in Greek and Some Other Indo-European Languages*. The Hague: Westerbaan.

## Koppin, Karl

- 1878a Gibt es in der griechischen Sprache einen modus irrealis? *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* 32: 1-20.  
 1878b Gibt es in der griechischen Sprache einen modus irrealis? - forsetzung. *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen* 32: 97-131.

## Krisch, Thomas

- 1986 *Überlegungen zur Herkunft und Entwicklung der irrealen Konditionalsätze des Altgriechischen*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.

## Krüger, Karl Wilhelm

- 1859 *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen. Zweiter Theil: Ueber die Dialekte, vorzugsweise den epischen und ionischen. Zweites Heft: Poetisch-dialektische Syntax*. Berlin: Krügers Verlagsbuchhandlung.

## Kuhn, Adalbert

- 1846 Review Albrecht Weber, 1846. *Vāḡasaneya-Sanhitae specimen cum commentario primus*. Breslau: Max. *Allgemeine Literaturzeitung* Jahrgang 1846, 250: 841-846.  
 1847 *Sanscritica*. (Höfers) *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft der Sprache* 2: 166-176.  
 1866 Ueber das verhältniss einiger secundären medialendungen zu den primären. (Kuhns) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 15: 401-419.

## Kühner, Raphael

- 1835 *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Hannover: Hahn.  
 1870 *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Zweite Auflage in durchaus neuer Bearbeitung. Zweiter Theil, erste Abtheilung. Hannover: Hahn.

## Kühner, Raphael &amp; Berthold Gerth

- 1898 *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre*. Erster Band. Hannover: Hahn.  
 1904 *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre*. Zweiter Band. Hannover: Hahn.

## Kvičala, Jan

- 1864a Ueber die Partikeln δέ und τε. *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 14: 313-334.  
 1864b Ueber die Partikeln δέ und τε. *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 14: 393-422.

## Lange, Ludwig

- 1872 *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel ei*. Leipzig: Hirzel.  
 1873 *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel ei*. Leipzig: Hirzel.

## La Roche, Jacob

- 1866 *Die homerische Textkritik im Alterthum nebst einem Anhang über die Homerhandschriften*. Leipzig: Teubner.  
 1869 *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: Teubner.  
 1870a *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang I-IV*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.  
 1870b *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang V-VIII*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.  
 1870c *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang IX-XII*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.  
 1870d *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XIII-XVI*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.  
 1870e *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XVII-XX*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.  
 1871 *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XXI-XXIV*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.  
 1893 *Homerische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Theil*. Leipzig: Teubner.

## Latacz, Joachim

- 2000a (ed.), *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*. München: Beck.  
 2000b *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Band I.1. Faszikel 1: Text: Gesang und Übersetzung*. München: Beck.

## Latacz, Joachim, René Nünlist &amp; Magdalene Stoevesandt

- 2002 *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar. Band I. Erster Gesang. Faszikel 2: Kommentar*. München: Beck.

## 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.

## Leaf, Walter

- 1888 *Homer: The Iliad. II. Books XIII-XXIV*. London: Macmillan  
 1900 *Homer: The Iliad. I: Books I-XII*. London: Macmillan.  
 1902 *Homer: The Iliad. II. Books XIII-XXIV*. London: Macmillan.

## Lehmann, Winfred

- 1974 *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin: University of Texas Press.  
 1979 Internal reconstruction and historical syntax. *Studies in Language* 3: 65-89.  
 1980 The reconstruction of non-simple sentences in Proto-Indo-European. In: Paolo Ramat (ed.), *Linguistic Reconstruction and*

*Indo-European Syntax. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 19, 113-144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lejnieks, Valdis

1964 *Morphosyntax of the Homeric Greek Verb*. The Hague: Mouton.

Leumann, Manu

1940 Zur Vorgeschichte der lateinischen Finalsätze mit *ut*. In: (no editor), *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à Alfred Ernout*, 231-255. Paris: Klincksieck.

Lillo, Antonio

1993 El us de τε épico con subjuntivo y su relación con la partícula modal. In: Emilio Crespo, José-Luís García-Ramón & Araceli Striano (eds.), *Dialectologica Graeca. Actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Dialectología Griega*, 209-220. Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad autónoma de Madrid.

1996 On the non-copulative *-qe* in Mycenaean. In: Ernesto De Miro, Louis Godart & Anna Sacconi (eds.), *Atti e memorie del secondo congresso internazionale di micenologia*, 315-319. Roma: Gruppo editoriale internazionale.

2020 Oblique optative and inferential evidentiality in Homer. In: Martti Leiwo, Marja Vierros & Sonja Dahlgren (eds.), *Papers on Ancient Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the Ninth International Colloquium on Ancient Greek Linguistics (ICAGL 9). 30 August – 1 September 2018*, 479-494. Helsinki. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Ludwich, Arthur

1892 *Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars prima. Homeri Ilias. Volumen prius*. Leipzig: Teubner.

1897 *Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars prima. Homeri Ilias. Volumen alterum*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Lühr, Rosemarie

2000 Der Nebensatz und seine Konkurrenten in der Indogermania: Der altindische Relativsatz. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 113: 71-87.

2008 Competitive Indo-European Syntax. In: Ferraresi, Gisella & Goldbach, Maria (eds.), *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction*, 121-159. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

2012 Komplementsätze im Indoiranischen. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 125: 227-241.

Macdonell, Arthur Anthony

1910 *Vedic Grammar*. Strassburg: Trübner.

1916 *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

MacLeod, Colin

- 1982 *Homer. Iliad XXIV*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Madvig, Johan

- 1847 *Syntax der griechischen Sprache, besonders der attischen Sprachform, für Schulen*. Braunschweig: Friedrich Dieweg und Sohn.

Maehly, Jacob

- 1868 *Richard Bentley. Eine Bibliographie von Jacob Maehly. Mit einem Anhang Bentley'schen Anecdota zu Homer*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Markopoulos, Theodoros

- 2009 *The Future in Greek. From Ancient to Medieval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Masius, Richard

- 1885 *Über den Gebrauch des Konjunktiv in unabhängigen Sätzen bei Homer*. Glogau: Flemming.

Matthiä, August

- 1825 *Ausführliche griechische Grammatik*. Erster Theil. Zweite verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: Friedrich Vogel.  
1827 *Ausführliche griechische Grammatik*. Zweiter Theil. Zweite verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig: Friedrich Vogel.

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*, 265-296. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Merry, Walter & James Riddell

- 1876 *Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Meister, Richard

- 1889 *Die griechischen Dialekte, auf Grundlage von Ahrens' Werk "De Graecae linguae dialectis"*. 2 Band Eleisch, Arkadisch, Kyprisch, Verzeichnis zum ersten und zweiten Bande. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.  
1890 *Zum eleischen, arkadischen und kyprischen Dialekte*. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient.

Meisterhans, Konrad

- 1885 *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Methner, Rudolph

- 1908 *Die Grundbedeutungen und Gebrauchstypen der Modi im Griechischen*. Bromberg: Dittmann.

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*, 267-288. Leiden: Brill.

Monro, David Binning

- 1884 *Homer Iliad I-XII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.  
1891 *Homeric Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Monro, David Binning & Thomas Allen

- 1902a *Homeri Opera: Iliadis libros I - XII continens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
1902b *Homeri Opera: Iliadis libros XIII - XXIV continens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Montanari, Franco

- 2015 *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden: Brill.

Mutzbauer, Carl

- 1903a Die Grundbedeutung des Conjunctivs und Optativs und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen. *Philologus* 62: 388-409.  
1903b Das Wesen des Optativs. *Philologus* 62: 626-638.  
1908 *Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktiv und Optativ und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

Notopoulos, James

- 1949 Parataxis in Homer. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 80: 1-23.

Nutting, H. C.

- 1901 The unreal conditional sentence in Plautus. *American Journal of Philology* 22: 297-316.

Nuyts, Jan

- 2006 Modality: Overview and linguistic issues. In: William Frawley (ed.), *The Expression of Modality*, 1-26. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Osthoff, Hermann

- 1884 *Zur geschichte des Perfects im Indogermanischen, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Griechisch und Lateinisch*. Strassburg: Trübner.



Pagniello, Frederick

- 2002 *The Augment in Homer*. PhD thesis, University of Georgia at Atlanta. Electronic Publication.  
2007 The past-iterative and the augment in Homer. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 112: 105-123.

Palmer, Frank

- 1986 *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
2001 *Mood and Modality*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palmer, Leonard

- 1960 Chapter 4: The language of Homer. In: Alan Wace & Frank Stubbings (eds.), *A Companion to Homer*, 75-178. London: MacMillan.  
1963 *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.  
1980 *The Greek Language*. London: Faber.

Peppmüller, Rudolph

- 1876 *Commentar des vierundzwanzigsten Buches der Ilias. Mit Einleitung. Als Beitrag zur homerischen Frage bearbeitet*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.

Platt, Arthur.

- 1891 The augment in Homer. *Journal of Philology* 19: 211-237.  
1893 Bentley's notes on the *Odyssey*. *Journal of Philology* 22: 26-42.  
1894 Bentley's notes on the *Odyssey*. *Journal of Philology* 22: 198-221.

Pokorny, Julius

- 1959 *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Franke.

Polsley, Cynthia Carolyn

- 2019 *Contrafactual Structures in Ancient Greek Narrative*. PhD thesis Yale.

Pott, August Friedrich

- 1836 *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen, insbesondere des Sanskrit, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litauischen und Gothischen*. Lemgo: Meyer'sche Hofbuchhandlung.

Prellwitz, Walther

- 1905 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Probert, Philomen

- 2015 *Early Greek Relative Clauses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Ramat, Paolo (ed.)  
 1980 *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax*. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 19. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Richardson, Nicholas  
 1993 *The Iliad: A Commentary. 6: 22-24*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rijksbaron, Albert  
 2002 *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Risch, Ernst  
 1953 Review Tabachovitz, 1953. *Gnomon* 25: 138-140.  
 1954 Review Chantraine, 1953. *Gnomon* 26: 70-74.  
 1965 Review Frisk, 1960. *Gnomon* 37: 1-6.
- Rix, Helmut & Heiner Eichner (eds.)  
 1990 *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Rix, Helmut et al. (eds.)  
 2001 *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. 2nd edn. [LIV<sup>2</sup>] Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Rodríguez-Adrados, Francisco et al.  
 1986 *Diccionario griego - español*. II. Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas.
- Rosén, Hannah  
 2009 Coherence, sentence-modification, and sentence-part-modification - the contribution of particles. In: Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 1. Syntax of the Sentence*, 317-442. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ruijgh, Cornelis Jord  
 1967 *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.  
 1969 Esquisse d'une nouvelle théorie sur "TE épique". *Mnemosyne* IV. 22: 1-69.  
 1971 *Autour de "τε-épique"*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.  
 1990 La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel. In: Helmut Rix & Heiner Eichner (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, 213-233. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.  
 1992 L'emploi le plus ancien et les emplois plus récents de la particule κε/ ᾗν. In: Françoise Létoublon (ed.), *La langue et les textes en grec*

- ancien. Actes du Colloque Pierre Chantraine, 75-84. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- 2011 Mycenaean and Homeric Greek. In: Yves Duhoux & Anna Morpurgo-Davies (eds.), *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek, Texts and their World*, 251-298. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Rutherford, Richard Brown
- 1992 *Homer Odyssey. Books XIX and XX*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sampanis, Konstantinos
- 2011 *A Diachronic and Typological Approach to the Modern Greek Subjunctive Complementation*. PhD thesis Salzburg.
- 2014 *The Interplay Between the Future and the Subjunctive Mood in The Diachrony of the Greek Language*. Presentation held at “Les futurs grecs et leur histoire”, Colloque de Bordeaux on 10.10 - 11.10.2014.
- 2017 The interplay between the future and the subjunctive mood in the diachrony of the Greek language. In: Frédéric Lambert, Rutger Allan & Theodore Markopoulos (eds.), *The Greek Future and its History - Le futur grec et son histoire*, 237-251. Leuven: Peeters.
- Sánchez-Ruipérez, Martín
- 1987 Subjunctive forms in Mycenaean texts. In: Petar Ilievski & Ljiljana Crepajac (eds.), *Tractata Mycenaea. Proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*, 323-331. Skopje: The Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Art.
- 1997 Mycenaean Greek and its contribution to the reconstruction of Indo-European syntax. In: Emilio Crespo & José-Luís García-Ramón (eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy*, 527-536. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.
- Schulze, Wilhelm
- 1890 Review R. Meister, 1889. *Die griechischen Dialekte, auf Grundlage von Ahrens' Werk “De Graecae linguae dialectis”. 2 Band Eleisch, Arkadisch, Kyprisch, Verzeichnis zum ersten und zweiten Bande*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 10: 1502-1506.
- 1892 *Quaestiones Epicae*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.
- Schwyzler, Eduard
- 1939 *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München: Beck.
- Schwyzler, Eduard & Alfred Debrunner
- 1950 *Griechische Grammatik. Teil II. Syntax*. München: Beck.

Seiler, Ernst Eduard

- 1872 *Vollständiges griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch über die Gedichte des Homeros und der Homeriden: zum Schul- und Privatgebrauch.* Leipzig: Hahn.

Seiler, Ernst Eduard & Carl Capelle

- 1889 *Vollständiges Wörterbuch über die Gedichte des Homeros und der Homeriden: zum Schul- und Privatgebrauch.* Leipzig: Hahn.

Seiler, Hansjakob

- 1971 Abstract structures for moods in Greek. *Language* 47: 79-89.  
 1993 Satzverbindung in Konditionalgefüge (besonders im Altgriechischen). *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 47: 143-158.

Skutsch, Franz

- 1892 *Forschungen zur lateinischen Grammatik und Metrik. Erster Band. Plautinisches und Romanisches. Studien zur plautinischen Prosodie.* Leipzig: Teubner.  
 1902 *ur Wortzusammensetzung im Lateinischen. Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* Supplementband 27. Festschrift für C. J. W. Müller: 82-110. (= *Kleine Schriften*. 152-182)  
 1914 *Kleine Schriften.* Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kroll. Leipzig: Teubner.

Smyth, Herbert & Gordon Messing

- 1956 *Greek Grammar.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sonne, Wilhelm

- 1863 Sprachliche und mythologische untersuchungen angeknüpft an RigVeda I.50. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 12: 267-298.

Sjölund, Rode

- 1938 *Metrische Kürzung im Griechischen.* Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.

Stahl, Johann Matthias

- 1907 *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Stoevesandt, Magdalene

- 2008 *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar (Basel Kommentar/BK). Band IV. Sechster Gesang (Z). Faszikel 2: Kommentar.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Stolpe, August

- 1849 *Iterativorum Graecorum vis ac natura ex usu Homeri atque Herodoti demonstrata.* Bratislava: Klein.

- Stolz, Friedrich & Joseph Hermann Schmalz  
1900 *Lateinische Grammatik. Laut- und Formenlehre. Syntax und Stilistik.* München: Beck.
- Strunk, Klaus  
1957 *Die sogenannten Aeolismen der homerischen Sprache.* Köln: Philosophische Fakultät.  
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, 29-42. Amsterdam: Gieben.  
1997 Vom Mykenischen bis zum klassischen Griechisch. In: Heinz-Günther Nesselrath (ed.), *Einleitung in de griechische Philologie,* 135-155. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Tabachovitz, David  
1951 *Homerische ei Sätze. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung.* Lund: Gleerup.
- Taylor, Roxanne  
2020 Present counterfactuals and verbal mood in the Homeric poems In: Martti Leiwo, Marja Vierros & Sonja Dahlgren (eds.), *Papers on Ancient Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the Ninth International Colloquium on Ancient Greek Linguistics (ICAGL 9), 30 August – 1 September 2018,* 529-544. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Tichy, Eva  
2006 *Der Konjunktiv und seine Nachbarkategorien.* Bremen: Hempen.  
2010 *Alter als der Hexameter. Schiffskatalog, Troerkatalog und vier Einzelszenen der Ilias.* Bremen: Hempen.
- 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: Signorelli.
- Van der Auwera, Johan & Vladimir Plungian  
1998 Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2: 79-124.
- Van Emde Boas, Evert & Luuk Huitink  
2010 Syntax. In: Egbert Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language,* 134-150. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Van Emde Boas, Evert, Mathieu De Bakker, Luuk Huitink & Albert Rijksbaron  
2019 *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Vaniček, Alois  
1877 *Griechisch-Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- 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: Claeys-Verheughe.
- Van Thiel, Helmut  
1991 *Homeri Odyssea*. Hildesheim: Olms.  
1996 *Homeri Ilias*. Hildesheim: Olms.  
2011 *Homeri Ilias*. Second edition. Hildesheim: Olms.
- 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*, 189-217. Leiden: Brill.
- Verstraete, Jean-Christophe  
2005 The semantics and pragmatics of composite mood marking: The non-Pama-Nyungan languages of northern Australia. *Linguistic Typology* 9: 223-268.
- Vogrinz, Gottfried  
1889 *Grammatik des homerischen Dialektes*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Von Bäumlein, Wilhelm Friedrich  
1846 *Untersuchungen über die griechischen Modi und die Partikeln κέν und ἄν*. Heilbronn: Johann Ulrich Landherr.  
1861 *Untersuchungen über griechische Partikeln*. Stuttgart: Verlag der Metzlerschen Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Von Christ, Wilhelm  
1880a Der Gebrauch der griechischen Partikel TE mit besonderer Bezugnahme auf Homer. *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische Klasse* Jahrgang 1880: 25-76.  
1880b Die Wiederholungen gleicher und ähnlicher Verse in der Ilias. *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische Klasse* Jahrgang 1880: 221-272.

## Von Hartel, Wilhelm

- 1871 *Homerische Studien I. Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften aus Wien* 68: 383-468
- 1873 *Homerische Studien: Beiträge zur homerischen Metrik und Prosodie*. Berlin: Vahlen.
- 1874a *Homerische Studien II*. Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn. (= separatum from *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften aus Wien* 76: 329-376).
- 1874b *Homerische Studien III*. Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn. (= separatum from *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften aus Wien* 78: 7-87).

## Von Herzog, Ernst

- 1871 *Untersuchungen über die Bildungsgeschichte der griechischen und lateinischen Sprache*. Leipzig: Teubner.

## Von Naegelsbach, Carl Friedrich

- 1834 *Bemerkungen zur Ilias (Buch I; II 1-483), nebst Excursen über Gegenstände der homerischen Grammatik*. Nürnberg: Stein.

## Von Thiersch, Friedrich Wilhelm

- 1818 *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialects*. Leipzig: Fleischer.

## Wachter, Rudolph

- 2000 *Grammatik der homerischen Sprache*. In: Joachim Latacz (ed.), *Homer Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*, 61-108. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- 2012 *The other view. Focus on linguistic innovations in the Homeric epics*. In: Øvind Andersen & Dag Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, 65-79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Wackernagel, Jakob

- 1892 *Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung*. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 333-437.
- 1916 *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer. Glotta* 7: 161-319.
- 1940 *Indogermanisch -q<sup>h</sup>e als alte Nebensatzleitende Konjunktion*. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 67: 1-5.

## Wakker, Gerry

- 1994 *Conditions and Conditionals: An Investigation of Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- 2006 "You could have thought": Past potentials in Sophocles? In: Irene De Jong & Albert Rijksbaron (eds.), *Sophocles and the Greek Language*, 163-180. Leiden: Brill.

- Walde, Alois & Johann Hofmann  
 1938 *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Erster Band: A - L. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Walde, Alois & Julius Pokorny  
 1927 *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II. Band. Berlin: De Gruyter.  
 1930 *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. I. Band. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Walter, Adolf  
 1923 *Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktivs im Griechischen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Weber, Hugo  
 1864 *Die dorische Partikel κα*. Ein Beitrag zu der Lehre von den griechischen Dialekten. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Weber, Philip  
 1884 *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze. I: Von Homer bis zur attischen Prosa*. Würzburg: A. Stuber's Verlagshandlung.
- Weiss, Michael  
 1993 *Studies in Italic Nominal Morphology*. PhD thesis Cornell.  
 1994 Life everlasting. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 55: 131-156.  
 2009 *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.  
 2010 Morphology and word formation. In: Egbert Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, 104-119. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Wentzel, Eduard  
 1847 *Ueber den Gebrauch der Partikel τε bei Homer*. Untersuchungen über die Sprache des Homer. Glogau: Flemming.
- West, Martin.  
 1998 *Homerus Ilias. Volumen I: Rhapsodiae I - XII*. Berlin: De Gruyter.  
 2000 *Homerus Ilias. Volumen II: Rhapsodiae XIII - XXIV*. Berlin: De Gruyter.  
 2001 *Studies in the Text and the Transmission of the Iliad*. München: Saur.
- West, Stephanie  
 1988 Commentary Books I - IV. In: Alfred Heubeck, Stephanie West & John Brian Hainsworth (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume I: Introduction and Books I - VIII*, 51-248. Oxford: Clarendon Press.



Willcock, Malcolm Maurice

1978 *The Iliad of Homer. I - XII.* London: MacMillan.

Willi, Andreas

2011 Morphosyntaktische Überlegungen zum Ursprung des griechischen Futurs. In: Thomas Krisch & Thomas Lindner (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog*, 605-615. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.

2018 *Origins of the Greek Verb.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willmott, Jo

2007 *The Moods of Homeric Greek.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, John

1979 KAI KE TIE ΩΔ ΕΠΕΕΙ: An Homeric device in Greek literature? *Illinois Classical Studies* 4 1-15.

Windisch, Ernst

1869 Untersuchungen über den Ursprung des Relativpronomens in den indogermanischen Sprachen. (*Curtius'*) *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik* 2: 201-420.

Wright, W. A.

1884 Benteleiana I. Notes on Homer, *Iliad* I-VI. *Journal of Philology* 13: 122-145.

1885 Benteleiana II. Notes on Homer, *Iliad* I-VI. *Journal of Philology* 13: 145-163.

Wyatt, William

1969 *Metrical Lengthening in Homer.* Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo.

Zerdin, Jason

1999 *Studies in the Ancient Greek Verbs in -SKŌ.* DPhil thesis Oxford.

2002 The 'Iterative-Intensives' in -σκ. *Oxford Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 103-130.