

# An Analysis of the Modal Particle in *Iliad* 24, Part 1: Etymology and Formal Analysis

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 part 1 I first discuss the etymology of the two modal particles in Greek, give an overview of the previous explanations for their use and absence and discuss these theories critically, and then determine the corpus of forms where the particles did and did not occur. Applying etymological, philological and textual-critical methods and distinguishing between tense and mood, I found that there were more modal indicatives, subjunctive and optative forms without an MP than with one, and that the forms that could be traced back to future-desiderative and future-subjunctive forms were less likely to be used with an MP in contrast to the “genuine” subjunctive and optative forms, where the MP was still more often absent than present.<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 Simon (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München) for their input and observations on different versions of this article and research topic.

### 1. *Problemstellung*

According to the standard Greek grammars,<sup>2</sup> the use of the modal particle (MP) ἄν is governed by the following strict rules in Classical Greek prose: it is mandatory in the main clause and any other subordinate clause (except the conditionals) with a potential optative, an irrealis indicative and an iterative indicative and forbidden with the same forms in a conditional clause (exceptions are attested, but generally corrected by the different editors);<sup>3</sup> it is mandatory with a subjunctive in any subordinate clause, except in purpose clauses (where it can appear) and clauses after *verba timendi* (where it never appears); it is forbidden with a future indicative and a subjunctive in the main clause (instances of these uses are attested, but they are generally to be corrected by the editors).<sup>4</sup> In Homeric Greek, not only ἄν is used as MP, but also κεν and κε; moreover, a future indicative and a subjunctive in the main clause can be used with an MP as well and so can optatives in conditional clauses and, inversely, the MP can also be left out.

---

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.

<sup>2</sup>Goodwin (1890: 54-64), Kühner & Gerth (1898: 200-260, 1904: 347-557), Gildersleeve (1900: 168-190), Smyth & Messing (1956: 491-527), Humbert (1960: 110-132, 182-246), Delaunois (1988: 76-134), and Rijksbaron (2002: 39-94), Van Emde Boas, De Bakker, Huitink & Rijksbaron (2019: 438-550). Recent treatments of the particle in Attic are Goldstein (2012), dealing with the repetition of the particle, and Beck, Malamud & Osadcha (2012), discussing the use in conditional clauses.

A recent historical Greek syntax is still missing, the only one still being Stahl (1907).

<sup>3</sup>The standard grammars follow this editorial practice, but some grammars are more cautious and point out that the many exceptions cannot simply be disregarded as transmission errors (Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 324-325, Humbert 1960: 120, Crespo 1997: 50, Montanari 2015: 127). Even Stahl (1907: 298-302) who argued for the correction of the instances where the particle was missing, nevertheless voiced some doubts, as he admitted that the number of instances to be corrected was relatively high.

<sup>4</sup>G. Hermann (1831) provided a monumental analysis of all instances of Greek literature known at that time; since that work, a canonical use seems to have been established and deviations from what Hermann explained were no longer accepted (see already Hartung 1833: 281 for criticism: *allein ist das seltene Vorkommen einer Erscheinung ein Grund zu ihrer Tilgung?* - words still valid today).

The differences between the presence and absence of the MP have not been conclusively explained. In the first part of the article, I will discuss the origin and etymology of the particles (§2), provide an overview of the scholarship on their meaning and use (§3), determine a corpus of metrically and philologically secure forms (§4) and provide facts and figures (§5).

## 2. Homeric ᾄν and κεῖν

### 2.1. The appearances in the different dialects

In Homeric Greek, not only ᾄν is used as MP, but also κεῖν and κ(ε), and the question is whether these particles have the same origin, meaning and uses. Most dialects chose one of the two, Doric has κᾶ (with short α) and κᾷ (with long α) and only Arkadian seems to have both ᾄν and κε. Upon closer inspection, the Arkadian “κε” is attested as κ' but only in εἴ κ' before a vowel. Following Schulze, it is therefore better to reinterpret εἴ κ' as εἰκ and to assume that the conjunction εἴ “if” had a variant εἰκ, used in prevocalic conditions (just as οὐ and οὐκ).<sup>5</sup> If we read it as εἰκ instead of εἴ κ', Arkadian only has ᾄν and in that case, there would be no dialect with both particles attested. The Doric forms pose more problems because the form with long α is only found in poetry, while in the inscriptions the vowel is often elided (cf. *infra*).<sup>6</sup>

### 2.2. The etymology

In this subchapter I will discuss the five different suggestions that have been proposed for ᾄν, κε, κεῖν (and κᾶ and κᾷ), each of them being followed by some critical observations.

(1) The first theory goes back to Kuhn and links κεῖν with Sanskrit *kam* and later also with OCS *kq* and/or Latin *com-*,

---

<sup>5</sup>This suggestion was first made by Schulze (1890: 1502-1503) and was accepted by Bechtel (1921: 372-373 against his own earlier views, Bechtel 1884: 305), Brugmann (1900: 543-544), Schwyzer (1939: 406), Schwyzer & Debrunner (1950: 568) and Gallavotti (1991/1992). See also Chantraine (1968: 507) and Colvin (2012), who both suggested εἴ κ' should be read as εἰκ but did not mention Schulze's name. For a recent discussion on the issue, see Gallavotti (1991/1992) and Colvin (2012).

<sup>6</sup>See e.g. Ahrens (1843: 382-383) and Bechtel (1923: 500) about the form in the Argolic dialect.

which marks perfectivity,<sup>7</sup> and after the discovery of Hittite, some also added the Hittite particle *-kan*.<sup>8</sup> With few exceptions,<sup>9</sup> most scholars accepted this reconstruction and describe the value as “etwa, wohl”. The reconstruction would then be *\*kem/kom*. This theory has one (perhaps apparent) shortcoming. Osthoff (1884: 341-343) and Meister (1889: 302, 1890: 32-34) noted that if the reconstruction of *κεν* were *\*kem* the expected Sanskrit form would have been *\*\*cam* and not *kam*, and if the reconstruction were *\*kom*, the Greek form would be *\*\*kov*. They therefore linked *κεν* with Sanskrit *śam* (in their notation *çam*). This criticism is only apparent because one can assume a reconstruction *\*kem/kom*, as is visible from the Slavic and Latin cognates as well (as had been noted already by Brugmann 1900: 543-544 and also by Götze & Pedersen 1934: 53-54).

(2) The second etymology reconstructs *\*k<sup>w</sup>em* for *κεν*. Initially (in pre-Neogrammarian times), the particle was linked with the pronominal stem *\*k<sup>w</sup>i/k<sup>w</sup>e*,<sup>10</sup> but this idea was quickly abandoned after Kuhn's suggestion. Following the discovery of Mycenaean, the suggestion that *κε* had a labiovelar was reiterated, as there appeared to be instances of the particle *qe* which did not seem to have the meaning “and” (from the connective *\*k<sup>w</sup>e*). L. Palmer stated that in these instances (where no connective value could be established), the Mycenaean particle *qe* was in fact the modal particle. In his opinion the modal particle was *\*k<sup>w</sup>em* and became *ken* in the sequence *\*ou k<sup>w</sup>em* in post-Mycenaean times and this led to the creation of

---

<sup>7</sup>Beekes and Van Beek (2010: 661) reconstructed *\*ken* with an *n* which renders the Sanskrit form difficult to explain.

<sup>8</sup>Kuhn (1846: 845-846, 1847: 174, 1866: 405), Sonne (1863: 275), Delbrück (1871: 89-90), Grassmann (1873: 314), Hinrichs (1875: 147), Monro (1891: 335), Solmsen (1898: 463-472), Monier-Williams (1899: 251-252), Brugmann (1900: 543-544, 1904: 620, 1916: 100), Prellwitz (1905: 213), Boisacq (1916: 424), Walde & Pokorny (1930: 326), Pokorny (1959: 515-516), Chantraine (1968: 507), Mayrhofer (1986: 304), Melchert & Hoffner (2008: 373), Beekes & Van Beek (2010: 661).

<sup>9</sup>Only Schwyzer and Debrunner (1950: 568) and Frisk (1960: 805) denied the connection between Greek and the other Indo-European languages.

<sup>10</sup>The first ones were Pott (1836: 303, 433) and Benfey (1842: 146), but they did not use the sign *\*k<sup>w</sup>* yet.

the particle  $\kappa\epsilon\nu$  in alphabetic Greek.<sup>11</sup> Ruijgh (1967: 43, 321, 1971: 211-226, especially 220-222) criticised this etymology by stating (a) that the labiovelars had become plain velars before and after a  $u$  already in Proto-Greek times, as could be seen in the words  $qo\ u\ ko\ ro$  “cowherd” ( $\beta\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  in alphabetic Greek, from  $*g^wouk^wolos$ ) versus  $a\ pi\ qo\ ro$  “servant” ( $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\iota\pi\acute{o}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  in alphabetic Greek, from  $*h_2(e)mb^hik^wolos$ ), both from the root  $*k^wel$  “turn” and (b) that it would not be logical that  $*ou\ k^we$  would have become  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  already in Mycenaean, while  $*ou\ k^we(m)$  would have yielded  $\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\epsilon\nu$  only in the post-Mycenaean period.<sup>12</sup> Ruijgh's criticism is only partly valid, however. It is true that the so-called *boukolos*-rule that states that a labiovelar loses its labial element when immediately preceded or followed by an  $u$ -sound has already applied in Proto-Greek and in PIE (and hence also in Mycenaean),<sup>13</sup> and it is equally true that assuming an evolution  $*ou\ k^we(m) > *ou\ ke(m)$  in post-Mycenaean times would seem illogical, but this does not rule out that analogical restitutions could have occurred,<sup>14</sup> nor does it exclude that the restitution might have occurred *during* the Mycenaean period. It is possible that the labiovelar in the sequence  $*ou\ ke$  (dissimilated from  $*ou\ k^we$ ) was restored in contexts where  $*k^we$  had connective value, due to analogy with the use of  $*k^we$  in contexts where there was no  $u$  involved, but that the labial element was lost when  $*k^we$  did not have any connective value. It is also possible that from this “non-connective” sequence  $ou\ ke$  a modal particle  $ke(n)$  was extracted (Lillo 1993, especially 218, Colvin 2012: 80). If this were correct, one could even assume that  $\tau\epsilon\text{-}\acute{e}p\iota\kappa\upsilon\epsilon$  and the modal particle  $\kappa\epsilon$  had the same origin (which had been suggested already before

<sup>11</sup>L. Palmer (1963: vi-vii, 189-190, 1980: 40-41, 51-52, 67); for this reconstruction, see also Sánchez-Ruipérez (1987, 1997: 531-534) and Lillo (1993, 1996).

<sup>12</sup>For the occurrence of the *boukolos*-rule in Mycenaean, see also Bartoněk (2003: 447, 479) and Bernabé & Luján (2006: 90-92, but cf. *infra*).

<sup>13</sup>Weiss (1993: 153-160 and 1994) showed that the *boukolos*-rule was of Indo-European date. De Saussure is the inventor of this sound law (De Saussure 1889); it had been posited already by Brugmann (1881: 307) for some Indo-European languages, but he explicitly ruled out its validity for Greek.

<sup>14</sup>For the analogical restitutions see also Bernabé and Luján (2006: 90-92) and Colvin (2012: 79-80).

the discovery of Mycenaean),<sup>15</sup> and would explain why these two particles never co-occur. If this etymology is correct, the link between Greek  $\kappa\epsilon\nu$  and Hittite *kan* and Vedic *kam* becomes more difficult because in order to keep the connection, one would then have to assume that the same resegmentation and reanalysis occurred in Vedic and Hittite. In light of the similarities in use and meaning, separating the Greek, Vedic and Hittite particles seems less preferable. Another, in my opinion more methodological, problem is that this etymology is possible, but at the same time neither provable nor falsifiable.

Both etymologies (*\*kem* and *\*k<sup>w</sup>e*) have the problem that  $\kappa\epsilon$  ( $\kappa'$ ) and  $\kappa\epsilon\nu$  exist beside each other, and that the forms are attested in different dialects (although some have argued, cf. supra, to remove the instances of  $\epsilon'$   $\kappa'$ , as it would have been a prevocalic of  $\epsilon$ ). Buttman, and later Hoffmann, followed by many others (often implicitly), argued that  $\kappa\epsilon$  was original and that  $\kappa\epsilon\nu$  was a later creation with *nu ephelkystikon*.<sup>16</sup> Others argued that  $\kappa\epsilon\nu$  was the original form and explained that  $\kappa\epsilon$  was reinterpreted as a variant without *nu ephelkystikon* (e.g. Schwyzler 1939: 406), or as a crossing of  $\kappa\epsilon\nu$  and  $\alpha\nu$  (Osthoff 1884: 327-341, 1889: 302, 1890: 32-34), or a mixture of  $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\nu$  and  $\kappa\alpha$  (all from *\*kem* and *\*k<sup>m</sup>* for vowels and consonants, as e.g. Chantraine 1968: 507). Some have argued that there were two particles, *kem* and *ke* (Brugmann 1900: 543-544, 1916: 1000 and later also Dunkel 1990, cf. infra).

(3) The next problem are the Doric forms,  $\kappa\alpha$  (with short  $\alpha$ ) and  $\kappa\bar{\alpha}$  (with long  $\bar{\alpha}$ ). While the former can be explained as a zero grade of *\*kem*, the latter is more difficult. Several etymological dictionaries pass over this form in silence (such as Prellwitz 1905: 213, Frisk 1960: 805 and Beekes and Van Beek 2010: 661), but scholars who did address the form, mostly link it

<sup>15</sup>See already Kvičala (1864b) and Hoffmann (1890: 903), who suggested this equation before the discovery of Mycenaean. See most recently Lillo (1993, 1996). Sánchez-Ruipérez (1987, 1997: 531-534) accepted the labiovelar, but did not discuss the issue of  $\kappa\epsilon$  and  $\tau\epsilon$ -épique having the same origin. Colvin (2012: 78) considered it possible.

<sup>16</sup>See already Buttman (1810: 58, 396), and later and more explicitly, Hoffmann (1890: 903), Solmsen (1898: 471-472, with reference to Hoffmann), and Frisk (1960: 805). Beekes and Van Beek (2010: 661) mentioned the possibility, but considered Forbes' explanation more likely. Delbrück (1879: 84-62) and Prellwitz (1905: 213) did not address this issue.

with the adverbs in  $-\bar{\alpha}$ , such as  $\pi\bar{\alpha}$  (and  $\pi\bar{\eta}$ ) and reconstruct an adverb  $*k^w\bar{a}$  from a pronominal stem (Pott 1836: 303, 1859: 426, Benfey 1842: 143, Solmsen 1898: 463-472, stating that the long vowel was necessary to account for the Slavic forms, Brugmann 1900: 544, 1916: 1000, Boisacq 1916: 424), or assume the particle was created after forms such as  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\bar{\alpha}$  (Chantraine 1968: 507, Colvin 2012: 81). Others have explained the long vowel as a metrical commodity (as was suggested by Buttmann 1839: 370, Ahrens 1843: 382 and Forbes 1958: 180), while H. Weber (1864) tried to remove all instances of  $k\bar{\alpha}$  from Doric poetry, claiming that the long vowel was the result of errors during transmission. Osthoff (1884: 331) explained  $k\alpha$  as the zero-grade  $*k\eta$ , but  $k\bar{\alpha}$  as a long  $*k\eta$  (with a long *nasalis sonans*), however these phonemes are no longer accepted. Already in 1950 Schwyzer and Debrunner (1950: 568) doubted the metrical explanation, and later also Colvin (2012: 81) objected to this (without addressing Weber's suggestion), on the grounds that poets could not simply lengthen vowels at their own volition. He proposed that the long vowel was a relic from fossilised case endings in  $-\bar{\alpha}$ , which created adverbs in the dialects outside Ionic-Attic. As example Colvin gave  $\acute{\alpha}\mu\bar{\alpha}$  "at the same time" and  $\pi\bar{\alpha}$  "how/anyhow". That latter form could be reconstructed as  $*k^w\bar{a}$  and would have become  $\pi\bar{\alpha}$  regularly, but  $k\bar{\alpha}$  when preceded by an *u*-sound such as in the negative contexts (cf. supra). In that way, the particle  $k\bar{\alpha}$  would have originated. Weber's suggestion raises the issue as to why and how forms such as  $k\acute{\alpha}$  or  $k\acute{\alpha}\nu$  could have been replaced by such a rare form as  $k\bar{\alpha}$  and in my opinion, assuming a metrical licence should only be the last resort, if all other explanations have failed. In this case I believe that the explanation of the  $-\bar{\alpha}$  as an adverbial ending seems an acceptable alternative.

(4) The last scenario involving the forms with a  $\kappa$ - is that  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ,  $k\acute{\alpha}\nu$ ,  $k\epsilon\nu$ ,  $k\epsilon$ ,  $k\alpha$  and  $k\bar{\alpha}$  had the same origin. Forbes (1958) and L. Palmer (1960: 90-92) argued that  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  and  $k\epsilon\nu$  had the same origin from  $*kem$  (as was discussed above in explanation (2), Palmer assumed that  $*kem$  originated from an earlier  $*k^we(m)$ ; his suggestion was accepted by Sánchez-Ruipérez and Lillo) and interpreted  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  as the result of a false segmentation. The sequence  $*ou\ k\eta$  (the zero grade of the full grade  $*kem$  which survived in  $ken$ ) became  $*ou\ kan$ , when the sequence was

used before a word starting with a vowel. This *ou kan* was then reinterpreted as *\*oúk an*, from which a particle *ǎv* was extracted.<sup>17</sup> Forbes argued that in preconsonantic position *\*kḿ* yielded *κᾱ* (with short *ᾱ*). The variant *κᾱ̃* was due to metrical lengthening (cf. supra). Nowadays most scholars accept Forbes' explanation (e.g. in Chantraine 1968: 81-82 and Beekes and Van Beek 2010: 96-97), whereas L. Palmer's connection with *\*k<sup>w</sup>e* is not so often supported. With the exception of the metrical explanation of the long *ᾱ̃* in *κᾱ̃*, Forbes' scenario could very well be correct, but if it is, it means that the connection between *ǎv* and Latin *an* and Gothic *an* has to be given up (see the next point).

(5) Now that we have discussed the forms with *κ-*, we can now address *ǎv* as “stand alone”. The etymology of this particle is at least as complicated as that of *κε* and *κεν*. Since Hartung, Bopp and Benfey, *ǎv* has been linked with the Latin particle *an*, which is used in bi- and multipolar questions, but also in main clauses to express doubt, and with the Gothic interrogative particle *an*.<sup>18</sup> Most recently, Colvin (2012) argued that *ǎv* was the original particle (the same as the Latin and Gothic particle) and that the particles *κεν* and *κε* never existed as such and were inner-Greek creations. Assuming that the conjunction *εἰ* “if” also had a variant *εἰκ*, used in prevocalic conditions (just as *οὐ* and *οὐκ*),<sup>19</sup> Colvin argued that *εἰκ* was reinterpreted as *εἶ κ'*, i.e.

<sup>17</sup>A common origin had been suggested already by von Christ (1880a: 73-74), but with pre-neogrammarian sound laws (or, as Murray 2010: 72 puts it, *Buchstabenschieberei*), so that his reconstructions are no longer tenable.

<sup>18</sup>Hartung (1833: 225 without mentioning the Gothic *an*), Bopp (1833: 537), Benfey (1842: 48), Fick (1876: 14-15), Vaniček (1877: 30), Brugmann (1890: 189-190, 1900: 538-539, 1904: 615, 1916: 985), Monro (1891: 334-335), Wackernagel (1892: 377-378), Kühner and Gerth (1898: 208), Prellwitz (1905: 37), Boisacq (1916: 59), Walde & Pokorny (1930: 56), Walde & Hofmann (1938: 44), Feist (1939: 41), Schwyzer & Debrunner (1950: 558), Pokorny (1959: 37), Frisk (1960: 100), Ernout & Meillet (1967: 30-31), Dunkel (1990: 110-130, 2014b: 33-35), De Vaan (2008: 41), Rosén (2009: 367-368). The most in-depth studies defending this link are Meyer (1880), Lee (1967) and Colvin (2012). Lattmann (1919: 91-110) tried to defend the connection by assuming that *ǎv* was a form of the negative *\*n/ne/n̄* and the same as the negative prefix *ǎ(v)*, which is semantically difficult and phonologically very unlikely.

The connection between the Latin and Gothic particles (but not the Greek *ǎv*) goes back to Jakob Grimm (1831: 756-780).

<sup>19</sup>Cf. footnote 5.



a sequence of a conditional conjunction and a modal particle. This reanalysis was facilitated by the fact that the PIE particle  $*k^we$  would have appeared as  $\kappa\epsilon$  in contexts where a  $u$  preceded or followed as in  $o\ddot{u} \kappa\epsilon$  from  $*ou k^we$  and  $(\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}) \nu\acute{o} \kappa\epsilon$  from  $*nu k^we$ .<sup>20</sup> Colvin then argued that the reinterpretation of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota} \kappa'$  and the appearance of  $\kappa\epsilon$  in certain contexts created a particle  $\kappa\epsilon$ . As soon as  $\check{\alpha}v$  and  $\kappa\epsilon$  coexisted, a mixed variant was created, leading to  $\kappa\epsilon v$ . As a result, two additional particles  $\kappa\epsilon$  and  $\kappa\epsilon v$  had been created and eventually became widespread in epic and in other dialects.

Early on – long before the scenario by Forbes 1958 and L. Palmer 1960, discussed under point (4) above – the connection between the Greek, Latin and Gothic forms was already doubted. Ebel (1856: 208), and Skutsch (1892: 59-60, 1902: 105-110 = 1914: 176-182), denied this link and explained the Latin word as an apocope from *atne* (*atne* first became *anne*, then *ann* and finally *an*).<sup>21</sup> Skutsch (1914: 176-180, in response to criticism by Brugmann 1900: 538-539) provided four main grounds for denying the link. First, the Latin and Gothic *an* is not a Wackernagel-clitic,<sup>22</sup> whereas the Greek  $\check{\alpha}v$  is. Second,  $\check{\alpha}v$  is used with verb forms in a certain mood, which is unparalleled in Latin and Gothic. Third, Latin *an* is always used in bi- or multipolar questions, which is not the case for  $\check{\alpha}v$ . Fourth, the meaning is different.<sup>23</sup> Anticipating the objection that a connection *an* and *atne* is contradicted by the short scansion of *an* in Plautus (whereas other words with an original double consonant such as *es* from  $*ess$  could display such a “double-consonant-scansion”, namely *es* being scanned with a long *e* as if it still had two consonants), Skutsch (1892: 60) argued that the double scansion was used before vowels and

<sup>20</sup>As had also been suggested by Lillo (1993), Sánchez-Ruipérez (1987: 330-33, 1997: 532-534, not ruling out the Forbes - L. Palmer scenario either, cf. *infra*), Colvin (2012: 75-80).

<sup>21</sup>See also Döhning (1900), Stolz & Schmalz (1900: 325-326), Jacobsohn (1913: 347-348), Fraenkel (1913: 47-49). Prellwitz (1905: 37) did not rule out this suggestion either, although he linked  $\check{\alpha}v$  with *an*.

<sup>22</sup>I use the term “Wackernagel-clitic” because  $\check{\alpha}v$  is not an enclitic in the strict sense, as it has an accent.

<sup>23</sup>A slightly different explanation was given by Hinze (1887, especially pages i-ii), who argued that Latin *an* originated from *anne* and had adversative meaning as well (but he did not explicitly state that *anne* came from *atne*).

the single-consonant-scansion before consonants from which the consonantic variant (i.e. the single scansion) was generalised.<sup>24</sup>

While the suggestion by Forbes and L. Palmer seems to be the most economic one, the connection between Latin and Gothic *an* and *ǣv* is too clear-cut to be simply discarded. In my opinion none of the objections raised by Skutsch is fatal for the connection between the Greek, Latin and Gothic word, not even the enclitic nature of *ǣv* versus the orthotonic nature in Gothic and Latin. As Greek had both an orthotonic *v̄v* and an enclitic *v̄v/vv̄v/vv̄*, one could argue that *ǣv* might have become enclitic under the influence of *κεν* (as Wackernagel [1892: 377-378] had already done), although the absence of an orthotonic *ǣv* remains problematic. The semantic objections against the connection can also be addressed by assuming an original dubitative meaning, which evolved differently in the different languages (and that would explain why this particle is never used with a realis-indicative). This can only be solved by investigating the oldest attestations of Latin *an* and Gothic *an* and by comparing them to Greek *ǣv*, but this has to remain outside the scope of this article. Having said this, there are still problems with the assumption that there would never have been a modal particle *κεν* or *κε*. Colvin's explanation for the creation of *κε* and *κεν*, and of Doric *κᾶ*, requires first a sort of resegmentation and generalisation of a phonologically determined variant, and second, also supposes that this newly created particle that had no modal meaning in origin acquired a specific modal meaning, although another modal particle already existed. The reason why that would have happened (especially if Greek already had a modal particle), remains unclear to me and it is also difficult to prove or disprove.

(6) A final explanation was that of Dunkel (1990, 2014b: 33-35, 397, 430), who reconstructed three different particles. As three particles (*ǣv*, *κεν* and *κε*) were attested in epic Greek, he argued that three particles had to be reconstructed for PIE,

---

<sup>24</sup>Both metrical explanations and etymologies were mentioned in Thurneysen (1904: 21, an etymological summary of the etymologies available in the *ThLL* at that moment) and in Vollmer 1901 (the *ThLL* article on *an*).

This criticism was voiced by (among others) Thurneysen (1904: 21), and later also by Ernout and Meillet (1967: 31) and De Vaan (2008: 41).

namely \**án* (without initial laryngeal, as particles would not necessarily follow the CVC structure and since there was no independent evidence for the laryngeal in this form), \**kem* and \**ke*,<sup>25</sup> *án* would have been orthotonic and would have been used with the indicative to convey the counterfactual, *kem* would have been emphatic and *ke* deictic. In Greek all three would have merged and acquired both the limiting value (*beschränkend*) and the counterfactual nuance, *ǎv* would have become enclitic under influence of *κεν* (as Wackernagel had already argued, cf. *supra*) and the Greek construction of the counterfactual indicative with *ǎv* would be an archaism and could be compared to the Hittite use of the indicative with *man* which Dunkel (1990: 128) reconstructed as *ma an*, *ma* and the counterfactual particle *an*, a suggestion already made *dubitanter* by Götze & Pedersen 1934: 58-59). In Dunkel's scenario the Greek use of the indicative in the counterfactuals would be a syntactic archaism shared with Hittite. There are some problems with it, however. First, the reconstruction of Hittite *man* as *ma an* is unlikely at best,<sup>26</sup> and seems to be contradicted by the fact that *man* has a short *a*.<sup>27</sup> Second, the assumption that there were in origin three different particles with three different meanings, which evolved into three particles used interchangeably, each having only two meanings, is unfalsifiable because any difference in meaning between these three can be countered by saying that the meanings were different in origin, but eventually merged. The third problem is that Dunkel needs to distinguish sharply between present and past potential and present and past counterfactual, and between counterfactual and (past) potential. The fourth problem is that he needs to assume that the counterfactual had always been

---

<sup>25</sup>For the co-existence of \**ke* and \**kem* see already Brugmann (1900: 543-544, 1916: 1000).

<sup>26</sup>Hettrich (1998: 264): *Die vorgeschlagene Segmentierung von man in ma plus an ist bestenfalls eine sehr hypothetische Möglichkeit.* (my underlining – 'a very hypothetical possibility at best')

<sup>27</sup>Hittite had two different particles, *man* and *mān*, only the former being the modal particle under discussion (cf. Kloekhorst 2008: 551-552 and Melchert and Hoffner 2008: 314-316); Sturtevant (1933: 88, 132, 135) considered them to be one and the same particle, but was already criticised for this by Götze & Pedersen (1934: 59). I thank Federico Giusfredi, Valerio Pisaniello and Paola Cotticelli-Kurras for their input on this issue.

expressed by the indicative, which seems to be contradicted by the evidence of the other Indo-European languages.<sup>28</sup> I address these two elements about the counterfactual constructions together. Although I cannot discuss the issue at length here, there are many instances that show that the distinction between counterfactual and potential was very thin in Homer, as was the distinction between present and past potential, and past and present counterfactual (I refer to Hettrich 1998 and De Decker 2015: 221-240). It is my personal opinion that the difference in tense usage in these constructions is not motivated by present or past reference, but by aspectual distinctions, as can be discerned from the following examples, which show that the optative was used in all tenses (present, aorist and perfect) to show all degrees of (un)likelihood (the verb forms are put in bold face):<sup>29</sup>

- (EX.01) (255) ἦ κεν **γῆθήσαι** Πριάμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες  
 (256) ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν **κεχαροῖατο** θυμῷ  
 (257) εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα **πυθοῖατο** μαρναμένοϊιν (*Iliad*  
 1, 255-257)

<sup>28</sup>Hettrich (1998: 264), De Decker (2015: 221-240), both with references for the other Indo-European languages and a discussion of the alternative scenarios. For a recent study, see Polsley (2019), but she does not discuss the transition from optative to indicative in Homeric Greek, nor the fact that the other old Indo-European languages use the optative to express contrafactivity (neither Ruijgh 1992 nor Hettrich 1998 are discussed by Polsley). Personally, I agree with the explanation by Koppin (1878b: 126-131) and Brugmann (1890: 191-194) that the optative initially expressed the potential and counterfactual nuance, but I believe that it was replaced by the indicative of the past in those instances that referred to a past event. See also Brugmann and Thumb (1913: 590-591), Debrunner (1921), Chantraine (1953: 226-228 - *Mais, pour marquer plus nettement le passé, on a commencé à se servir de l'imparfait ou de l'aoriste de l'indicatif, à qui la particule conférait une valeur modale* (underlining is mine - 'to indicate the past more distinctly'), Brunel (1980: 236). This suggestion was not addressed in Krisch (1986), Ruijgh (1992) nor in Hettrich (1998). Willmott (2007: 48-52) only mentioned and discussed the scenario proposed by Ruijgh (1992), but did not address the suggestions made by the Krisch or Hettrich.

<sup>29</sup>Taylor (2020) argued only the optative present was used in present counterfactual constructions and ruled out that the other tenses of the optative were used in counterfactuals, but she did not discuss any of the examples quoted here.

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

In this instance, Nestor laments that the current rift between Agamemnon and Akhilleus would create great joy among the Trojans, if they knew about it. As it is unclear how (un)likely Nestor considered this to be, the optatives could have potential or contrafactual meaning. Moreover, all verbs are in the aorist, but they do not refer to the past alone. In these verses I believe that the choice of the aorist stem was based on the aspect (the single notion of hearing and starting to rejoice) and not on the notion of present or past potential or counterfactual.

(EX.02) (71) ἐγγύθι λαμπομένης τάχα κεν φεύγοντες  
ἐνάυλους

(72) πλήσειαν νεκύων, εἴ μοι κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων

(73) ἦπια εἶδείη: νῦν δὲ στρατὸν ἀμφιμάχονται (*Iliad* 16, 71-73)

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

This is probably one of the most important examples in this discussion because it illustrates the original use of the optative in counterfactual constructions and also shows that the distinction between the tense forms is aspectual rather than temporal. In these verses, Akhilleus complained here that he was mistreated by Agamemnon; if he had received respect, the Trojans would have been dying in large numbers, but now they are attacking the Greeks and have already surrounded them. We note a very clear difference between the situation that could have been and that of reality, introduced by νῦν δέ. The perfect stem is used because the verb “know” in Greek is resultative (i.e. it describes a state, “having seen”, hence “know”), and the filling of the river is described in the aorist because one can only fill a river with one's corpse once.

(EX.03) (565) οὐ γάρ κε **τλαίη** βροτὸς ἐλθέμεν, οὐδὲ μάλ' ἦβῶν,

(566) ἐς στρατόν: οὐδὲ γάρ ἄν φυλάκους **λάθοι**, οὐδέ κ' ὄχῆας

(567) ῥεῖα **μετοχλίσσειε** θυράων ἡμετεράων. (*Iliad* 24, 565-567)

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

Akhilleus pronounces these verses in response to 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 (not even a young and powerful warrior) would have been able to remain unseen by the Greeks and to open the doors. The optatives could be potential or unreal, but they clearly refer to the past. The use of the aorist is not due to the past reference, but to the aspectual value: the opening of the doors, the entering of the camp and the misleading of the guards happened only once.

There are also examples that show that there is no real difference between indicative and optative in the (past) potential and counterfactual constructions, as can be seen below:

(EX.04) (85) Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ἄν **γνοίης** ποτέροισι μετείη

(86) ἢ ἐ μετὰ Τρώεσσιν ὀμιλέοι ἢ μετ' Ἀχαιοῖς. (*Iliad* 5, 85-86).

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

In this instance the potential optative γνοίης could refer to the past “you would not have known”, but could also be interpreted as a present potential “you would not be able to know”.

(EX.05) (638) οὐδ' ἂν ἔτι φράδμων περ ἄνηρ Σαρπηδόνα  
 δῖον

(639) ἔγνω, ἐπεὶ βελέεσσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κόνιησιν (*Iliad*  
 16, 638-639)

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

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

These examples show that one cannot assume that there was a distinction between indicative and optative in these contexts (see especially Ruijgh 1992, Hettrich 1998 and De Decker 2015: 221-240). This raises the question of which mood was the original one, and in my opinion, it must have been optative, as several modal indicatives can be reconstructed as older optatives, but there are no optatives in counterfactual/past potential contexts that can be reconstructed as indicatives. I discuss two examples:

(EX.06) Μηριόνη τάχα κέν σε καὶ ὄρχηστίην περ ἔόντα  
 ἔγχος ἐμὸν κατέπαυσε διαμπερές, εἴ σ' ἔβαλόν περ. (*Iliad*  
 16, 617-618)

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

This seems to be a textbook counterfactual construction with the indicative in both the main clause and the subordinate conditional clause (as would be the case in Attic Greek). In these verses Aineias complains that he missed Meriones and that he survived the attack. Willmott (2007: 49) argued that in this instance the indicative had positive epistemic stance and Aineias genuinely believed that he could have killed Meriones, for otherwise the taunt would not have made sense.

(EX.07) (623) εἰ καὶ ἐγὼ σε βάλομι τυχῶν μέσον ὀξεί  
 χαλκῶ,

(624) αἰψά κε καὶ κρατερός περ ἔων καὶ χερσὶ πεποιθώς

(625) εὔχος ἐμοὶ **δοίης**, ψυχὴν δ' Ἄϊδι κλυτοπόλωφ.' (*Iliad* 16, 623-625)

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

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

To conclude, I can only state that none of the suggested etymologies solves all the problems. It is true that the one by Forbes would be the most economic, but that would deny the link with Gothic and Latin *an*, and from a semantic point of view that connection is less problematic than it may seem. L. Palmer's adaptation of Forbes' theory has the advantage that it provides a common origin for *κε* and *τε-épique* and would explain why the two never co-occur, but on the other hand, it renders the connection with Hittite *kan* and Vedic *kam* less likely and is therefore less preferable. Dunkel's (and Brugmann's) suggestion that there were three particles, cannot be ruled out, but the conflation of meanings in the earliest Greek texts makes it more difficult to prove or disprove this explanation. Dunkel's assumption of three different meanings is contradicted by the Greek data. In short, the etymology remains a *non liquet*.



## 2.3. The issue of the Aiolic phase: Has ἄν replaced κεν?

In addition to the problem of the etymology, there is the issue of the co-existence of ἄν and κεν. Since Hinrichs (1875: 147-152, with a list of all attestations) it has been noted that the epic language uses both the Aiolic κεν and the Ionic ἄν, but opinions differ as to why they coexist. This issue is related to the discussion of the different phases of Greek epic diction, namely whether it had an Akhaian, Aiolic and Ionic linguistic phase or whether it always had an Ionic core, but this is a thorny issue and could not be adequately discussed here.<sup>30</sup> Hinrichs himself argued that the metre was the deciding factor, but others suspected that κεν was ousted during the transmission in favour of the Ionic ἄν,<sup>31</sup> and thought that it had to be restored, whenever possible;<sup>32</sup> it is indeed possible to substitute ἄν by κε or κεν in most, but not all instances (as pointed out by Monro 1891: 330, Chantraine 1953: 347 and Dunkel 1990: 122), and it is one thing to assume that κεν is older than ἄν, but it is quite another to decide to remove all the instances of the latter, as Monro (1891: 330) and Chantraine (1953: 347) rightly observed. It thus seems that ἄν was also part of the epic diction, which is confirmed by the two oldest metrical inscriptions, that of the Nestor Cup from the 8<sup>th</sup> century BC and the Cup from Kyme, 650 BC (each quoted below), both of which use ἄν in a relative clause.

---

<sup>30</sup>This was first suggested by Giese (1837: 72) and elaborated by Hinrichs (1875). Since then, there have been *believers* and *non-believers*. In one extreme it has led to attempts to rewrite the epic poems in their original Aiolic form, such as Fick (1883, 1885, 1887) and most recently Tichy (2010), and in the other extreme, there have been attempts to deny the Aiolic influence altogether (I name only Strunk 1957 and Miller 1982, the list of scholars denying an Aiolic phase is much longer). While I admit that almost all individual Aiolisms allow for alternative explanations, other than being an example of an Aiolic phase, I still believe that the cumulative evidence points towards the existence of the different phases (see especially Ruijgh 2011 and also Strunk 1997: 149, who recanted his earlier statement that there were no Aiolic elements in Greek epic diction; for recent discussions see Jones 2012, arguing against it and Janko 2012, arguing in favour).

<sup>31</sup>One of the first to state this was von Herzog (1871: 121), who claimed that κε was originally also the Ionic form.

<sup>32</sup>See Fick (1887: xxii-xxxi) and Van Leeuwen (1890).

(EX.08) Νέστορος : ἐ[μί] : εὔποτ[ον] : ποτέριον·  
 ἡὸς δ' ἄν' τὸδε πί[εσ]ι : ποτερί[ο] : αὐτίκα κῆνον  
 ἡίμερος χαιρέσει : καλλιστε[φά]γο : Ἄφροδίτες.  
 I am Nestor's cup from which you can drink well, who  
 drinks from this cup, him will immediately seize longing  
 for lovely-crowned Aphrodite. (Nestor's Cup,  
 Pithekoussai, VIII BC)

(EX.09) Ταταίης ἐμὶ λέρουθος · ἡὸς δ' ἄν με κλέφσει,  
 θυφλὸς ἔσται.  
 I am the drinking-cup of Tataie; who steals me, will be  
 blind. (Kyme, 650 BC)

More generally, one could ask if it is sound scientific practice to remove all the instances of ἄν. Chantraine (1953: 348) added that ἄν was attested in Arkadian and could thus have belonged to the Akhaian stage of epic diction. If that is the case, there is nothing against accepting it for Greek epic and it would make no sense to substitute it for κεν. Janko (1992: 83, also quoted in Colvin 2012: 80) added that euphonic reasons might have played a role as well, namely κεν being used when a vowel with an α- followed, while ἄν was preferred when the next word started with an ε-. The question is how original this distinction is: is it properly Homeric or only a later rule, introduced by the Alexandrians or even later copyists?

#### 2.4. A difference in meaning?

The last issue is if there is a difference in meaning between the two particles. That both particles might have had the same etymology is not a problem per se, since it is possible that they acquired a different meaning later. Nevertheless, this cannot easily be answered, as many instances of ἄν are metrically insecure (meaning that one could change ἄν into κεν). In order to determine a difference, we would need to check the metrically secure instances, but the data are clearly skewed in favour of κεν (it is much easier to substitute ἄν by κεν than vice versa). While most scholars do not discern a difference, some have observed the following:<sup>33</sup>

<sup>33</sup>Kühner (1835: 92), pointing out the more emphatic nature, Delbrück (1871: 84-90), Seiler & Capelle (1889: 320 *im Gebrauch nah verwandt, aber schwerlich*

- ἄν is used much more often than κεν in negative sentences
- κεν is more common in relative clauses
- when the particles are used in more than one consecutive sentence (e.g. conditional protasis and apodosis), κεν is preferred
- ἄν is used in adversative contexts and is more emphatic

The relative predominance of ἄν with a negation is remarkable, but as most instances occur in the sequence οὐκ ἄν, the probative value is limited, as ἄν is insecure in that combination (one could easily read οὐ κεν, cf. supra). The alleged use of ἄν in more emphatic contexts also needs a more in-depth analysis. In *Iliad* 24 we have 27 secure instances of κεν, but only two of ἄν. The figures are too small to allow for a distinction. This issue will have to be addressed on another occasion, but the only example where both particles are used beside each other does not show a more emphatic value of ἄν:

(EX.10) (565) οὐ γὰρ κε τλαίη βροτὸς ἐλθέμεν, οὐδὲ μάλ'  
 ἠβῶν,  
 (566) ἐς στρατόν: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄν φυλάκουσ λάθοι, οὐδέ κ'  
 ὀχῆας  
 (567) ῥεῖα μετοχλίσσειε θυράων ἡμετεράων. (*Iliad* 24, 565-567)

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

In these verses, discussed above already, Akhilleus replies to 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 have reached his tent alive and entered it, because no other man (not

---

*identisch*), Monro (1891: 332-335), Chantraine (1953: 345-350), Neuberger-Donath (1977), and De Mol (2015: 59), mentioning only the more emphatic meaning. Delbrück did not see any differences in meaning, only in use. Neuberger-Donath showed that all explanations could be reduced to the fact that ἄν was the stronger variant of the two (and had its own accent).

even a young and powerful warrior) would have been able to remain unseen by the Greeks and to open the doors. The most important element in this statement is that no mortal being would ever have dared to come to the camp of the Greeks, and yet this verb is used with  $\kappa\epsilon$  and not with  $\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$ ; the verb used with  $\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$  describes the misleading of the guards, which is not the most salient element in the description.

An additional example can be found below.

(EX.11) (653) τῶν εἴ τις σε ἴδοιτο θοῆν διὰ νύκτα  
 μέλαιναν,  
 (654) αὐτίκ'  $\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$  ἐξείποι Ἀγαμέμνονι ποιμένι λαῶν,  
 (655) καὶ  $\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$  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 as warning for Priam that he should go. Remaining longer in the camp might lead to him being discovered by a soldier, who might tell Agamemnon about his presence, and if Agamemnon learns about this, the return of the body will probably no longer take place. In this specific instance the fact that the return of the body might fail is more important than the possibility that Agamemnon might become aware of his presence, as the return of the body is Priam's main goal. In spite of this, the particle  $\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$  is used to describe the possible failure, while  $\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$  is used for Agamemnon's possible finding out (it has to be said that  $\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$  is insecure here, as one could read αὐτίκα κ' ἐξείποι, but the multiple  $\kappa$ -sounds make this assumption less likely, cf. the euphonic reasons adduced by Janko above). If  $\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$  were indeed more emphatic, would we not have expected it to occur here with γένηται?

### 3. Overview of the previous scholarship on the meaning and uses

In this subchapter I discuss the previous scholarship on the use of the MP in Homer.<sup>34</sup>

1. One of the first suggestions was that the particle could be used to add some doubts to the statement.<sup>35</sup>
2. The second explanation was that it described the conditions under which the action occurred and that it was used in sentences with a conditional meaning.<sup>36</sup>  
The problem with this assumption (and the previous one) is that it does not explain why the particle is missing in some conditional clauses and relative clauses with a (quasi-conditional) meaning.
3. The third explanation was that the particle was used in sentences that referred to a specific instance and that it remained absent in generic statements. This explanation, first made by Hartung (1832: 294-297) and von Bäumlein (1846: 208-245, especially 219-220), was reiterated by Delbrück (who added that the prospective subjunctive could be used with an MP, but the voluntative one - i.e. the one used in wishes and exhortations - could not)<sup>37</sup> and accepted by the standard Homeric grammars of Monro and Chantraine and scholars after them.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>The most recent surveys are Gerö (2000), Colvin (2012) and De Mol (2015). It was not addressed in the Oxford or Cambridge Commentaries. In the new *Basel Kommentar*, instances with MP are discussed (as e.g. *Iliad* 1,60 and 1,64), but the absence is not (see following note).

<sup>35</sup>This had been noted in the very early treatises by Devarius (1587: 45, edited 1835: 26) and Hoogeveen (1769, edited 1813: 30-34) and in Buttman (1810: 496-497, 1819: 323). It has been reiterated by Latacz, Nünlist & Stoevesandt (2002: 51 *betont die Potentialität noch stärker als ohne*).

<sup>36</sup>See already von Thiersch (1818: 533-538), Matthiä (1827: 981, 1195), Bernhardt (1829: 397), G. Hermann (1831), an author identified only by the initials H. M. (1832 Vol I: 102), Ahrens (1852: 194-195), Aken (1865: 27-30) and Seiler & Capelle (1889: 320-322).

<sup>37</sup>Delbrück (1871: 83-86), but his explanation was somewhat unclear as he also spoke about *das Eintreten der Handlung*. However, on page 86 he stated that the particle was much more absent in generic statements than in specific ones. See also Gildersleeve (1882), who applied it to Pindar.

<sup>38</sup>Monro (1891: 250, 259, 266, 327-335), Kühner & Gerth (1898: 208), Leaf (1900: 17), Brugmann (1900: 499), Chantraine (1948: 279, 1953: 210-211), Schwyzer &

This explanation seems convincing, but the number of exceptions is considerable and they cannot all be emended away by changing  $\tau\epsilon$  into  $\kappa\epsilon$  and vice versa (as Monro tried to do [1891: 259, 266-267]). Ruijgh (1971: 286-288) showed that many instances Monro considered to be generic and to be in need of correction, were not (but this does not explain all the exceptions). Assuming a common origin for  $\tau\epsilon$  and  $\kappa\epsilon$  (cf. supra) does not resolve this issue either and would only account for the fact that these two particles never co-occur.

4. Very early on, there were doubts as to the exact meaning and use. Already von Bäumlein (1846: 216-217), who argued that there was a distinction between generic and specific instances, stated that there were many contexts in which one could not distinguish between the forms with and without MP. The validity of this “particularising theory” was doubted because there were too many exceptions to the rule,<sup>39</sup> and therefore the use of the MP was considered to be “poetic” or “metrically motivated”.<sup>40</sup> The metrical explanation can always be invoked in Homer<sup>41</sup> and there are several instances in which the particle is not metrically secure; yet, this theory does not explain why in some instances  $\kappa(\epsilon)$  was used and in others  $\tau(\epsilon)$ , both being metrically equivalent. Many commentaries and lexica mention “wohl, zwar” as a

---

Debrunner (1950: 305-306), Valgiglio (1955: 50), Ruijgh (1971 *passim* but especially page 275 and pages 286-302, 1992: 80-82), Dunkel (1990, 2014b: 33-35, 397, 430), Wakker (1994: 207-209 with reference to Monro, Basset and Ruijgh).

<sup>39</sup>Howorth (1955), Basset (1988: 29, 1989: 205); Willmott (2007: 199-210). See also explanation 3. Many exceptions involve the use of the so-called  *$\tau\epsilon$ -épique*. Chantraine (1953: 349) had some reservations on the “particularising” meaning (in spite of his own analyses), as did Gonda (1956: 147-148), but he did not ascribe his doubts to the number of exceptions.

<sup>40</sup>Already Devarius (1587: 46, 1835: 27), G. Hermann (1831: 143) and later Ebeling (1885a: 692) had observed this. Wakker (1994: 207) admitted that the metre played a role, but did not consider it to be the sole factor.

<sup>41</sup>The metre has been proposed as an explanation for the augment use, the use of the tenses and the use of the dual. In all of these instances, the metre played - in my opinion - only a limited role.

meaning, but do not discuss when it was present and when it remained absent.<sup>42</sup>

5. Other scholars assumed the MP (especially ἄν, cf. supra) had an emphatic value.<sup>43</sup> Camerer (1968) ascribed an *emphatischen Grundwert* to ἄν and Gerö (2000) analysed it as “intensional” (*sic*). This was also assumed for non-Homeric Greek: in her study on the ὅπως clauses in Attic, Amigues (1977: 142-169) argued that ὅπως ἄν with the subjunctive was more emphatic and outspoken than the simple ὅπως with the subjunctive.

There is one important shortcoming, however: if the meaning were indeed intensive or emphatic, one would expect the particle to occur with exhortative subjunctives and in wishes, but these subjunctives are almost never constructed with an MP. Moreover, Amigues’s explanation of ὅπως ἄν as being the more emphatic form is not necessarily correct: as many instances occur in legal texts (inscriptions) and in oratory, an explanation of the MP as particularising is also possible.<sup>44</sup>

6. Howorth (1955) observed that the “specific instance theory” had too many exceptions and could therefore not be correct, and suggested that the MP was originally only used in main clauses with verbs referring to a future action; then it could appear in a subordinate clause, but

---

<sup>42</sup> A good example is Ebeling (1885a: 691-735), who described all the uses but did not discuss the absence. Similarly, Ameis (1868a: 13) translated the particle as “wohl”, but neither in his further commentaries nor in that by Ameis and Hentze was the difference between forms with and without particle discussed. The same applies to the commentaries by Faesi (1858a, 1858b, 1860): although he ascribed emphatic value to the MP (1858a: 50 - see footnote below), he did not discuss the presence and absence of the MP and the possible distinctions in meaning.

<sup>43</sup> As can be seen in Faesi’s explanation of *Iliad* 1, 137: *die kecke doch gemessene Zuversicht des Sprechenden* (Faesi 1858a: 50); see also Camerer (1968). The emphatic value seems also accepted in Buttman (1810: 496-497, 1819: 323) and Latacz, Nünlist & Stoevesandt (2002: 50,52) where they stated that the MP strengthened the potential value of the optative when used in a protasis and emphasises the expected outcome when used in a relative clause with final nuance (cf. footnote 62).

<sup>44</sup> See already Kühner and Gerth (1904: 385-386) and Ruijgh (1971: 276). For the use of ὅπως ἄν in inscriptions, see Meisterhans (1885: 109). For criticism of Amigues’s theory, see also Bers (1984: 164-165).

still refer to the verbal action of the main clause. Finally, it would have spread to the subordinate clauses that did not depend on future actions anymore and it became generalised. In Attic, certain clauses generalised the use, while in others the absence became the rule.

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

7. Confronted with the exceptions of the particularising theory (as had been done before him already, cf. *supra*), Basset (1988, 1989: 204-205) adapted the explanation to state that the MP was only used when an action near to the speaker was related (*actualité du locuteur*), but not when actions in a remote past or future were described.
8. Finally, Willmott argued that the particles did not contain any additional meaning and were in the process of being grammaticalised as part of the eventual and potential constructions.<sup>45</sup> This is only partly true; as she stated herself, the MP was used much less in the relative clauses with a generic meaning than in those with a specific meaning and in the purpose clauses of the *Odyssey* the MP was more often absent than present.<sup>46</sup>
9. Independent from the exact meaning, it was also noted that in a sequence of optatives and subjunctives the MP usually only appeared with the first form.<sup>47</sup> This is a sort of *conjunction reduction*: if one verb is already marked for

---

<sup>45</sup>Willmott (2007: 199-210). Probert (2015: 85) referred to Willmott to state that the presence or absence of the MP did not change the meaning of the relative clause.

<sup>46</sup>Willmott (2007: 202-204); the data of the purpose clauses could be found in P. Weber (1884) already, but she did not quote that book.

<sup>47</sup>Madvig (1847: 152), Buttman (1854: 401), Krüger (1859: 181), Frohberger (1863), Kühner & Gerth (1898: 248-249), Goodwin (1890: 63-64), Smyth & Messing (1956: 400), Ruijgh (1971: 767), Rodríguez-Adrados et al. (1986: 26), Gerö (2001: 193).



particularity, it is not necessary to mark it with the following verb forms.<sup>48</sup>

#### 4. Determining the instances of the MP in *Iliad* 24

Before proceeding to the actual analysis, I first have to determine my corpus, by tagging the forms for tense, mood and use/absence of the MP. In doing so, I need to take into account metrical, textual-critical and formal factors. First, I need to determine if the presence of the MP is guaranteed by the metre.

##### 4.1. Are the forms metrically secure?

I will first address the question as to when the (absence of) MP is secure. In my analysis, I will start from the transmitted text, but it is necessary to discuss the instances where the metre does not guarantee the use of the MP (as was stated above, especially Monro suggested to change the text and add/remove the particle when needed). One can always change  $\tau\epsilon$  into  $\kappa\epsilon$  and vice versa,  $\tau'$  into  $\kappa'$  and vice versa,  $(\omicron\zeta/\eta)$   $\tau\iota\zeta$  into  $(\omicron\zeta/\eta)$   $\kappa\epsilon\nu$  and vice versa,  $\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\kappa\epsilon$  into  $\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\theta\epsilon$ ,  $\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\kappa'$  into  $\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\theta'$  and (sometimes)  $\kappa\epsilon\nu$  in  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$  and vice versa. Moreover, instances with  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\eta}\nu$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\nu$  or  $\eta\nu$  are insecure when a word starting with a consonant follows because in that case  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\eta}$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  or  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  (without particle) could also have been used; in case a word with a vowel follows, the MP is secure because otherwise we would have a hiatus and the “Attic” forms with  $-\eta\nu$  could contain an older  $-\epsilon\acute{\iota}$   $\kappa'$  or  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$   $\kappa'$ .<sup>49</sup> In those latter instances the MP is metrically secure (albeit the exact form is not).<sup>50</sup> Wackernagel argued that  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\nu$   $\delta\acute{\eta}$  was only found in the *Odyssey* and would be the normal order, since  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  takes precedence over  $\delta\acute{\eta}$ ;  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu$  would have been Attic and would have replaced the Homeric

<sup>48</sup>This principle was first noted for Greek by Kiparsky (1968), but he did not discuss the MP among the instances of possible reductions.

<sup>49</sup>See Van Leeuwen (1890 *passim*) for a detailed study of the oldest forms of the MP (but see following note).

<sup>50</sup>I am very skeptical about reconstructing the *Urform* of the poems, as has been attempted by Fick (1883, 1885, 1887) and Tichy (2010). In my opinion the transmitted text should serve as the basis, with the metre as a confirming factor, whenever possible, but I do not think that one should start changing the text or rewriting it into an older form (as has been done in M. West's editions as well).

ἐπεὶ κεν.<sup>51</sup> I will discuss several instances (the MP / words under discussion are italicised).

(EX.12) (225) τεθνάμεναι παρὰ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν  
χαλκοχιτώνων

(226) βούλομαι: αὐτίκα γάρ με κατακτείνειεν Ἀχιλλεύς

(227) ἀγκᾶς ἐλόντ' ἐμὸν υἱόν, ἐπήν γόου ἔξ 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 verses the use of the MP in ἐπήν is insecure, as ἐπεὶ would be metrically correct as well. This instance is therefore not included in my corpus.

When replacing ἐπήν by ἐπεὶ would cause a hiatus to occur, the MP is secure, as in the following instances:

(EX.13) αὐτὰρ ἐπήν ἀγάγησιν ἔσω κλισίην Ἀχιλλῆος, (*Iliad*  
24, 155)

But when he had brought him inside the tent of Akhilleus,

...

(EX.14) ἄσεσθε κλαυθμοῖο, ἐπήν ἀγάγωμι δόμονδε (*Iliad*  
24, 717)

Satiate your wailing, when I have brought him home

In both instances replacing ἐπήν by ἐπεὶ would put ἐπεὶ in hiatus and we need a long scansion of the second syllable (sc. of the -εῖ). As short diphthongs are mostly shortened in hiatus,<sup>52</sup> the MP is secure here, as ἐπήν probably “replaced” an older ἐπεὶ κ'.

In the following instance the MP seems to be inserted as a *Hiatustilger*.

<sup>51</sup>Wackernagel (1916: 191-195), but see preceding note.

<sup>52</sup>Von Hartel (1874a, especially 48, 1874b: 1-13 - quoted after the *separatum*-edition), Sjölund (1938: 43-70).

(EX.15) ἀνδρὶ ἑταιρίσσαι, καὶ τ' ἔκλυες ᾧ κ' ἐθέλησθα  
(*Iliad* 24, 335)

to become friends with a man and you listed to whom you  
want

In this instance the use of κ' is not metrically secure, since it could have been used to prevent the hiatus in ᾧ ἐθέλησθα; as long diphthongs are shortened much less in hiatus than short diphthongs, the absence of κ' would not have affected the metre. Alternatively, one could state that the reading should not be ᾧ κ' ἐθέλησθα but ᾧ κε θέλησθα, in which case the MP would be secure, but since we have no absolute metrical guarantee, I do not include this instance in the data.

(EX.16) οὐδέ μιν ἀνστήσεις, πρὶν καὶ κακὸν ἄλλο  
πάθῃσθα. (*Iliad* 24, 551)

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

In this verse Akhilleus describes to Priam that no matter what he does, he will not be able to resuscitate Hektor; very much to the contrary, he himself will have to endure more adversities. In this instance one could add the MP by changing καὶ into κεν, but the question is whether one should do this to make the text conform to the rules one has established and wants to prove.

#### 4.2. Textual problems in determining the presence of the MP

Related to the metrical problem are the instances in which both variants are transmitted. Below I discuss the instances in *Iliad* 24 where both a variant with and without MP has been found in the codices.

(EX.17) (149) κῆρύξ τις οἱ ἔπειτο γεραίτερος, ὅς κ' ἰθύνει  
(150) ἡμίονους καὶ ἄμαξαν εὐτροχόν, ἥδ' ἐκαὶ αὐτίς  
(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 some codices have ἢ κε (instead of ἡδέ) and this was printed by M. West (2000: 340). That reading would mean that Homer stated that the chariot was carrying the body and that the subject of ἄγοι was the chariot. It is in my opinion much more likely that Homer is still referring to the herald who needs to guide and help Priam: by reading ἡδέ the subject of ἄγοι is the herald. That also means that ἄγοι is an optative without MP. M. West (2001: 277, followed by Brügger 2017: 49 in the *Basel Kommentar*), argued that it is not the task of the herald to carry the body, but that the waggon will be used for it. As support for this manuscript reading, they point to *Odyssey* 6, 37 where - in their opinion - a similar construction could be found:

(EX.18) (36) ἀλλ' ἄγ' ἐπότρυνον πατέρα κλυτὸν ἠῶθι πρὸ  
 (37) ἡμίονους καὶ ἄμαξαν ἐφοπλίσαι, ἢ κεν ἄγησι  
 (38) ζῶστρά τε καὶ πέπλους καὶ ῥήγεα σιγαλόεντα.  
 (*Odyssey* 6, 36-38)

But go, ask your father to prepare mules and a waggon, to carry girdles, robes and glittering fabrics.

I do not believe that the two passages can be compared. To begin with, the constructions are different: here we have ἡδέ καὶ αὐτίς // νεκρὸν ἄγοι in the optative and in the *Odyssey* ἢ κεν ἄγησι in the subjunctive; second, in the *Odyssey* there is no other animate subject in the sentence, so the verb can only refer to the waggon. Third, the context is entirely different: Nausikaa and her friend, the daughter of Dymas, are going to wash clothes, not take back the dead body of a fallen hero. In addition, the presence of the herald in the *Iliad* is necessary to convince Priam (and his family) to undertake the mission, whereas there is no such pressure in Nausikaa's case.

Moreover, it is possible to explain the reading ἢ κε καὶ αὐτίς out of ἡδέ καὶ αὐτίς, but not vice versa: it is possible that a connection ἄμαξαν and ἄγησι was made during the tradition, but it is much more difficult to see why the original reading ἢ κε καὶ αὐτίς would have been changed into ἡδέ καὶ αὐτίς. The latter is in my opinion the *lectio difficilior*.

(EX.19) σοὶ δ' αὖ ἐγὼ καὶ τῶνδ' ἀποδάσσομαι ὅσ' ἐπέοικεν. (*Iliad* 24, 595).

For you I will divide from these (gifts) what is fitting (for you).

In this verse some codices have ἄν instead of αὖ and in that case we would have an MP with a future-subjunctive (for this term and the difficulty in distinguishing between future indicative and aorist subjunctive, cf. *infra*). On the other hand, the form ἀποδάσσομαι can also be interpreted as exhortative “let me give you”. Most forms of the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular and plural can be interpreted as either exhortative or specific. As this instance is insecure, I do not include it in the data.

(EX.20) (635) λέξον νῦν με τάχιστα διοτροφές, ὄφρα καὶ / ὄφρα κεν ἦδη

(636) ὑπνω ὕπο γλυκερῷ ταρπώμεθα κοιμηθέντες: (*Iliad* 24, 635-636).

Let me now sleep as soon as possible, so that we can both enjoy lying down in sweet sleep.

Here, some codices have ὄφρα καὶ ἦδη while other read ὄφρα κεν ἦδη. As it occurs there in a purpose clause, it is less likely that the MP is correct (cf. *infra*), but on the other hand, ὄφρα κεν is the *lectio difficilior*. Since this instance is insecure, it is not included in the analysis.

There is one additional instance where both readings are possible:

(EX.21) (212) ἀνδρὶ πάρα κρατερῷ, τοῦ ἐγὼ μέσον ἦπαρ ἔχομι

(213) ἐσθέμεναι προσφῦσα: τότε ἄντιτα ἔργα γένοιτο (*Iliad* 24, 212-213)

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

In this instance the codices have either ἄντιτα or ἄν τιτά. If the former is correct, then the optative γένοιτο is either a wish “may that be ...” or a modal optative without MP (with either potential or counterfactual meaning) “that would be/would have been”; if the latter is correct, it is a modal optative with

MP. Both explanations are possible, but given the fact that ἔχομι in the preceding line is a wish (cf. *infra*), it is more likely that γένοιτο is a wish as well.

In some instances, it cannot be ruled out that the MP was inserted either to lengthen a syllable or to avoid a hiatus (sometimes after the disappearance of the digamma)<sup>53</sup>, but I personally do not believe that the metre alone would have guided the use of the MP. One such example is –

(EX.22) κῆρύξ τις οἱ ἔπειτο γεραίτερος, ὃς κ' ἰθύνοι (*Iliad* 24,149)

Let one elder herald follow him, who should lead (the mules)

In this specific verse (already discussed above as well) the optative ἰθύνοι appears in a relative clause with an MP, but one could say that the poet only used κ' to lengthen the first syllable in ὃς. Similar instances occur in 178, 184, 335 (although in this instance there is a hiatus of a long vowel and long vowels tend to be shortened less anyway), 529, 664 (although in the last two instances the lengthening itself cannot have been the reason, as μὲν ἄν would have scanned as well), 717. That the poet(s) chose κ' and not τ' or δ' must have had a reason and that is why I include these instances in my investigation.

#### 4.3. Determining the mood

What applies to determining the presence of the MP, applies *mutatis mutandis* also to the moods: they are subject to metrical and textual problems. There are many instances where the optative and the subjunctive are metrically equivalent. This is the case for the paradigms of the verbs in -μι, and for the active optative forms in -ειε and the subjunctives in -ησι, the optatives in -οι- and the subjunctives in -η/ω-, and, especially at the end of the verse, the optative in -οιτο and the subjunctive in

<sup>53</sup>There are no such examples in *Iliad* 24, but one example is ὃς κ' εἴποι in *Iliad* 1,64. Bentley suggested to remove the particle and read ὃς εἴποι; his conjecture was quoted in Maehly (1868: 163) and Wright (1884: 124 - Wright was the librarian of Trinity Library in Cambridge and published in *Bentleiana* all of Bentley's remarks on Homer). Bekker (1858a: 8, 406) read ὃς εἴπη (in the subjunctive).

-ηται. I always use the transmitted form as basis, but sometimes, both forms are transmitted. I give two examples:

(EX.23) (580) καὶ δ' ἔλιπον δύο φάρε' ἑύνητον τε χιτῶνα,  
(581) ὄφρα νέκυν πυκάσας δοίη οἶκον δὲ φέρεσθαι. (*Iliad*  
24, 580-581)

They left him two cloths and a well-woven tunic, so that he might wrap the body in it and give it to be carried home.

In this passage both the optative δοίη and the subjunctive δώ(ι)η (with or without iota) are transmitted.

(EX.24) (653) τῶν εἴ τις σε ἴδοιτο θοῆν διὰ νύκτα  
μέλαιναν,  
(654) αὐτίκ' ἂν ἐξείποι Ἀγαμέμνονι ποιμένι λαῶν,  
(655) καὶ κεν ἀνάβλησις λύσιος νεκροῖο γένηται / γένοιτο.  
(*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.

In this passage both the subjunctive γένηται (printed in the commentaries by La Roche 1871: 131, and Ameis & Hentze 1906: 142, and in the editions by Monro & Allen 1902b *on this passage* and Van Thiel 2011: 487) and the optative γένοιτο (printed in the edition by M. West 2000: 363) are transmitted.<sup>54</sup> Leaf (1888: 475) argued that the change in construction might not have been impossible, but he considered it nevertheless very unlikely and pointed out that the regular construction with the same moods was much more common. Although I am not discussing this extensive issue in detail here, I follow Monro in his analysis that the subjunctive is used here to put emphasis on the most important element of the discussion: the optatives describe what would happen and the subjunctive indicates what this will mean, namely that Priam might not be able to take Hektor's body with him.<sup>55</sup> Moreover, the change in

<sup>54</sup>The optative is not mentioned in Monro and Allen's apparatus (1902b).

<sup>55</sup>Monro (1891: 252-253), Chantraine (1953: 211-212). See also Faesi (1858b: 426, 430), Lange (1872: 307), Peppmüller (1876: 281, 37), MacLeod (1982: 143),

construction (optative and subjunctive beside each other) is not so uncommon as Leaf claimed it to be either (for this co-occurrence, see La Roche 1871: 127,131, Monro 1891: 252-253, Ameis & Hentze 1906: 142, Chantraine 1953: 211-212), so that the subjunctive has preference. One codex has καί κεν ἀνάβλησις νεκροῖο λύσιος ἐσεῖται, but this is less likely to be correct, because it requires the ι of λύσιος to be read as long and because of the form ἐσεῖται, which is comparably rare. If it were correct, it would mean that this instance was an example of a future-desiderative with an MP.

(EX.25) (664) ἐννήμαρ μὲν κ' αὐτὸν ἐνὶ μεγάροις γοάοιμεν,  
 (665) τῇ δεκάτῃ δέ κε θάπτοιμεν δαινυτό τε λαός,  
 (666) ἐνδεκάτῃ δέ κε τύμβον ἐπ' αὐτῷ ποιήσοιμεν,  
 (667) τῇ δὲ δωδεκάτῃ πολεμίζοιμεν / πολεμίζοιμεν 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.

Asked by Akhilleus for how many days Priam and the Trojans would need to mourn for Hektor and bury him, Priam explains to Akhilleus that they would need eleven days for the mourning and funeral, and that on the twelfth day the hostilities could resume. In this instance both πολεμίζοιμεν and πολεμίζοιμεν are transmitted. The former is a future-subjunctive (for the term, cf. *infra*), while the latter can either be an indicative present or a subjunctive present with a short vowel. In my opinion, πολεμίζοιμεν is the *lectio difficilior*, as the change from πολεμίζοιμεν into πολεμίζοιμεν can be explained; it would

---

Richardson (1993: 345), who stated that the subjunctive was the *lectio difficilior* and that the subjunctive made the action more likely to occur.

La Roche (1871: 127,131) noted the difference but did not comment on it, and Ameis and Hentze (1906: 142) only stated that the subjunctive made the action *eventuell zu erwarten*.

Brügger (2017: 241) quoted the reading in the optative, but on page 218 he stated that deciding whether there was a difference in meaning between optative and subjunctive when both were used beside each other in the same construction, was still a matter of debate, but he tended to accept a difference.



not in the opposite direction. The form is used without an MP, which would be normal if the form is an indicative present, but would require an explanation if it were a subjunctive (a possible explanation would be that it was an exhortative subjunctive).

#### 4.4. Determining the tense

In this subchapter I catalogue the instances for tense. In doing so, there are three issues.

1. In two instances it is impossible to decide which tense they have: κατακτείνειεν and ὀρίνης can be aorist and present, and therefore I tagged them only for mood but not for tense.
2. An important formal and grammatical problem is the distinction between the future indicative and the subjunctive aorist. As is known, the subjunctive aorist of the sigmatic aorist is metrically equivalent to the future indicative (unless the verb is a semi-deponent or belongs to the *verba liquida*) and those forms would have been written in the same manner in most alphabets anyway: λύσω can be either future indicative or subjunctive aorist, and λύσωσι and λύσουσι are metrically equivalent and would appear as ΛΥΣΟΣΙ in the oldest Greek alphabet (and in that of Athens from before 403 BC). Chantraine (1953: 225) argued that we should distinguish between the two forms based on the transmission (thus distinguishing λύσωσι from λύσουσι), and consider the form a subjunctive, when an MP is used (1953: 206-212), but in my opinion this fails to take into account the transmission problems (as in several cases both forms are found in the codices) and the fact that at the time when the epic poems were composed one could not distinguish between the forms (at least in writing). The verbs without an aorist or with a non-sigmatic aorist build their future on the Indo-European desiderative \*-(h<sub>1</sub>)s-: the verb ἄγω has a reduplicated aorist ἤγαγον with a subjunctive aorist ἀγάγω, but has a future form ἄξω which is built on \*h<sub>2</sub>éǵ-s-. The same applies to the semi-

deponent future forms.<sup>56</sup> I catalogue the forms as subjunctives (present, aorist, perfect), future-subjunctives (those subjunctive aorist and future indicative forms that have the same metrical form, type  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omega$  and  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omega\sigma\iota$  and  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ ), future-desiderative forms (type  $\check{\alpha}\xi\omega$ ) optatives (present, aorist, perfect) and rarely, in the case of counterfactuals, indicatives (imperfect, aorist, pluperfect).

3. In this respect, the root  $*h_3ek^w$  poses a special problem because one could interpret the form  $\delta\psi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  as a desiderative form (as is done in the LIV<sup>2</sup> [Rix et al.: 297]), but given the fact that there is a present  $\delta\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  (from  $*h_3ek^w$  -  $ye/o$  -), one cannot exclude that the form was in origin a subjunctive aorist (although the aorist is only attested in a fragment of Pindar and in Sophokles, but not in epic Greek).<sup>57</sup> For that reason I classified the form as a special category.

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

Based on the investigations of §4 we obtain these figures for *Iliad* 24 (Van Thiel's text):

---

<sup>56</sup>Contrary to e.g. Willi (2011, 2018: 441-447) I believe that the Greek future continues both the subjunctive and the desiderative, or, better said, that the old desiderative and the subjunctive of the sigmatic aorist merged in the Greek future. The first one to state that the future originated in the subjunctive were G. Hermann (quoted *apud* Buttmann 1810: 503), Buttmann (1810: 503, 1854: 396), von Naegelsbach (1834: 7-8), and also Aken (1861: 17, 1865: 13), whereas Franke (1861) stated that all future forms were in origin present forms. I cannot address that issue in detail here (already Brugmann 1880: 58-64 stated that the issue could not be solved), nor the question whether there is a difference in meaning between the future and the subjunctive aorist forms. For a recent discussion see Markopoulos (2009) and Sampanis (2014, 2017: 237-242 - I owe the reference to these works to an anonymous reviewer of the journal).

<sup>57</sup>As was suggested by Ruijgh (1992: 76) and Kölligan (2007: 256) with a detailed argumentation as to why this is better interpreted as a subjunctive aorist. For the aorist form in Pindar and Sophokles, see Veitch (1873: 495, 504), Kühner and Blass (1892: 503-504), Kölligan (2007: 256); the sigmatic aorist forms are not mentioned in Chantraine (1968: 812, 832) nor in LIV<sup>2</sup> (Rix et al.: 297. Ebeling (1885b: 91), following Bekker (1872: 3), Frisk (1970: 407-408) and Beekes and Van Beek (2010: 1094) considered the form to be the future of  $\delta\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ , but did not discuss the exact form nor the aorists in later Greek.

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</i> <sup>w</sup>	0	2
Aorist indicative	0	0
Imperfect indicative	1	2
Pluperfect indicative	0	0
Total	49	110

## 6. (Preliminary) conclusion

In part 1 of the article I have discussed the etymology and the origin of the Greek modal particle (MP)s ἄν and κε and the previous scholarship on their use and absence. Then I determined with which moods and tenses the MP was used in *Iliad* 24, distinguishing forms that originated in Indo-European desideratives (called “future-desideratives” here), forms that could have been a desiderative and/or a subjunctive aorist (called “future-subjunctives” here), the “genuine” subjunctives and optatives and the “modal indicatives”. It was noted that the future-desiderative and future-subjunctive forms were used much less frequently with an MP than the normal subjunctives and optatives. This fact will be addressed in part 2 of the article, where I will provide an in-depth analysis of the meaning and use of the MP in epic Greek in general and *Iliad* 24 in particular.

## 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 Moduleher, historisch und vergleichend.* Berlin: Enslin.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 1900 *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang 1-6.* Leipzig: Teubner.
- 1900 *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 subordonnées 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*. Amsterdam. 27-37.
- 1989 *La syntaxe de l'imaginaire: études des modes et des négations dans l'Illiade et l'Odyssée*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée.
- 2000 L'opposition aspectuelle présent/aoriste chez Platon: une paire minimale "peux-tu le dire?". In: B. Jacquino (ed.), *Études sur l'aspect chez Platon*. Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne. (Reprinted in Basset 2004)
- 2003 Le prévisible et l'imprévu : Oppositions de l'imparfait et de l'aoriste indicatif dans Thucydide VI, 50-52. *Syntaktika* 26 (Reprinted in Basset 2004)
- 2004 *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora* (Collection de la Maison de l'Orient méditerranéen ancien. Série philologique, 32). Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux.

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.
- 1923 *Die griechischen Dialekte. Zweiter Band. Die westgriechischen Dialekte*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Beck, Jana, Sophia Malamud & Iryna Osadcha

- 2012 A semantics for the particle *äv* in and outside conditionals in classical Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12: 51-83.

Beekes, Robert & Lucien Van Beek

- 2010 *Greek Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.

Bekker, Immanuel

- 1843 *Ilias ex recognitione Immanuelis Bekkeri*. Berlin: Nicolai.
- 1843 *Odysssea ex recognitione Immanuelis Bekkeri*. Berlin: Nicolai.
- 1858a *Carmina Homerica. Volumen Prius. Ilias*. Bonn: Marcus.
- 1858b *Carmina Homerica. Volumen Alterum. Odysssea*. 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.
- Bopp, Franz  
1833 *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litthausische, Gothischen und Deutschen.* Berlin: Dümmler.
- Brügger, Claude  
2017 *Homer Iliad. The Basel Commentary. Book XXIV.* Translated by S. Douglas Olson. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Brugmann, Karl  
1880 Beiträge zur Conjugationslehre. In: Herman 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 & 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.
- 1825 *Lexilogus oder Beiträge zur griechischen Wort- Erklärung, hauptsächlich für Homer und Hesiod*. Berlin: Dümmler.
- 1825 *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

- 1877 Beiträge zur homerischen syntax: I. ὄ, ὄτ', ὄτι, ὄτε. *Philologus* 36: 193-209.
- 1877 Die neueren arbeiten 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 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.

## Colvin, Stephen

- 2012 The modal particle in Greek. *Cambridge 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 ἄν. *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

- 1987 The voice of anonymity: *Tis* Speeches in the *Iliad*. *Eranos* 85: 69-84.
- 1987 *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.

Delaunoy, 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.



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.

De Vaan, Michiel

- 2008 *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages.* Leiden: Brill.

Devarius, Matthaeus (= Matthaios Devaris)

- 1587 *De Graecae Linguae Particulis.* Rome: Zanetti.  
1835 *Liber de Graecae linguae particulis.* Edited by Reinholdus Klotz. Leipzig: Baumgärtner.

Döhring, A.

- 1900 Miscellen. Lat. at = atne. *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 11: 125-127.

Dunkel, George

- 1990 Jakob Wackernagel und die idg. Partikeln \*só, \*ke, \*kem und \*an. In: Helmut Rix & Heiner Eichner (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, 110-130. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.  
2014a *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme. Band 1: Einleitung.* Heidelberg: Winter.  
2014b *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme. Band 2: Lexikon.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Ebel, Hermann

- 1856 Etymologische streifzüge. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 6: 201-219.

Ebeling, Heinrich

- 1885a *Lexicon Homericum.* I. Α-Ξ. Leipzig: Teubner.  
1885b *Lexicon Homericum.* I. Ο-Ω. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ernout, Alfred & Antoine Meillet

- 1967 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots.* 4e édition, 2e tirage augmenté de corrections nouvelle. Paris: Klincksieck.

## 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.

## Feist, Sigmund

- 1939 *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der gotischen Sprache. Mit Einschluss des Krimgotischen und sonstiger zerstreuter Überreste des Gotischen.* Leiden: Brill.

## Fernández Galiano, Manuel

- 1992 Books XXI-XXII. In: Joseph Russo, Manuel Fernández Galiano & Albert Heubeck (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Vol. III: Books XVII – XXIV*, 131-311. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

## Fick, August

- 1876 *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen. Zweiter Band.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.  
 1883 *Die Homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt.* Göttingen: Peppmüller.  
 1885 *Die Homerische Ilias nach ihrer entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen sprachform wiederhergestellt.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.  
 1887 *Hesiods Gedichte in ihrer ursprünglichen fassung und sprachform wiederhergestellt.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.  
 1890 *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

## Fingerle, Anton

- 1939 *Typik der homerischen Reden.* Unpublished PhD thesis: LMU München.

## Forbes, Kathleen

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

## Fournier, Henri

- 1946 *Les verbes "dire" en grec ancien.* Paris: Klincksieck.  
 1946 *Formules homériques de références.* *Revue de Philologie* 20: 29-68.

## Fraenkel, Ernst

- 1913 *Graeca-Latina.* *Glotta* 4: 22-49.

## Franke, August

- 1861 *Über die Bildung der Futura im Griechischen.* Lingen: Sattler.

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.

Frohberger, H.

- 1863 Ueber die unterordnung mehrerer verba unter *ein ἀπό κοινοῦ* stehendes ᾶν. *Philologus* 19: 599-613.

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.

Gallavotti, Carlo

- 1991/1992 La congiunzione εικ da Empedocle a Callimaco e il nesso EIK AN in Arcadia. *Helikon* 31/32: v-xlii.

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 ᾶν 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

- 1890 *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge, MA: Sever and Francis.

Götze, Albrecht & Pedersen, Holger

- 1934 *Muršilis Sprachlähmung. Ein hethitischer Text. Mit philologischen und linguistischen Erörterungen von Albrecht Götze und Holger Pedersen*. Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard.

Grassmann, Hermann

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

Graziosi, Barbara & Johannes Haubold

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

Grimm, Jakob

- 1831 *Deutsche Grammatik. Dritter Theil*. Göttingen: Diederich.

H. M.

- 1832 On certain constructions of the subjunctive mood. In: Julius Charles Hare (ed.), *Philological Museum* Vol I, 96-106. Cambridge: J. Smith. <https://archive.org/details/philologicalmus00haregoog/page/96/mode/2up>

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 εἰ, εἶ κε und ἤν mit dem Konjunktiv. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 41: 356-378.  
 1909 Der homerische Gebrauch der εἰ 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 ᾧν 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 &amp; 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 Homericae Elocutionis Vestigiis Aeolicis Scripsit Gustavus Hinrichs.* Jena: Frommann.
- Hinze, Paul  
 1887 *De AN particularae 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. In: *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 873-904.
- Hoogeveen, Henricus  
 1769 *Doctrina Particularum Linguae Graecae.* Leiden: Damme.  
 1813 *Doctrina particularum linguae Graecae in Epitomen.* Edited by 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.
- 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. ögs, lat vel. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 45: 342-348.

## Jacquinod, 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 ἀείδειν*. 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. &amp; W. J. Pepicello

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

## Jones, Brandtly

- 2012 Relative chronology and an “Aeolic phase” of epic. In: Øvind Andersen & Dag Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, 44-64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Keydana, Götz

- 2018 The syntax of proto-Indo-European. In: Matthias Fritz, Brian Joseph & 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: Adrien 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 - Boston, Massachusetts: 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.  
<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b2596744&view=1up&seq=5>

## 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. *Vāgasaneya-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.



## Kvíčala, 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.
- 1870 *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang I-IV*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.
- 1870 *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang V-VIII*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.
- 1870 *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang IX-XII*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.
- 1870 *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XIII-XVI*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.
- 1870 *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

- 2000 1. Faszikel 1: Text: Gesang und Übersetzung. In: Joachim Latacz (ed.), *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar*. Band I. München: Beck

## Latacz, Joachim (ed.)

- 2000 *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*. 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.
- 1919 Negation, Indefinitum, Intensivum und gr. μή. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 49: 92-110.

## Lee, D. J. N.

- 1967 The Modal Particles ἄν, κε(v), κα. *American Journal of Philology* 88: 45-56.

## 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.

## 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.
- Magnien, Victor  
1922     L'alternance rythmique chez Homère. *Mémoires de la Société  
Linguistique (de Paris)* 22: 113-139.
- 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.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred  
1986     *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindiarischen*. Band I.  
Heidelberg: Winter.
- 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.

- Melchert, Craig & Harry Hoffner  
2008 *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lakes: Eisenbrauns.
- 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.
- Methner, Rudolph  
1908 *Die Grundbedeutungen und Gebrauchstypen der Modi im Griechischen*. Bromberg: Dittmann.
- Meyer, Leo  
1880 *An im Griechischen, Lateinischen und Gothischen: Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Syntax der indogermanischen Sprache*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- Miller, D. Gary  
1982 *Homer and the Ionian epic tradition: some phonic and phonological evidence against an Aeolic 'phase'*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.  
2014 *Ancient Greek Dialects and Early Authors. Introduction to the Dialect Mixture in Homer, with Notes on Lyric and Herodotus*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- 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.
- Monier-Williams, Monier  
1899 *A Sanskrit-English dictionary, Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Monro, David  
1884 *Homer Iliad I-XII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.  
1891 *Homeric Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Monro, David & 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.
- Murray, Robert W.  
2010 Language and space: the neogrammarian tradition. In: Peter Auer & Jürgen Eric Schmidt (eds.), *Language and Space: An International Handbook of Linguistic Variation / Sprache und Raum: ein internationales Handbuch der Sprachvariation*, 70-85. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Mutzbauer, Carl  
1903 Die Grundbedeutung des Conjunctivs und Optativs und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen. *Philologus* 62: 388-409.  
1903 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.
- Neuberger-Donath, Ruth  
1977 On the Synonymy of ᾄv and κε. *Classical Philology* 72: 116-125.
- 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.  
[https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/pagniello\\_frederick\\_j\\_200205\\_phd.pdf](https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/pagniello_frederick_j_200205_phd.pdf)  
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: Meyersche Hofbuchhandlung.
- 1859 *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen, insbesondere des Sanskrit, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litauischen und Gothischen*. Zweite Auflage in völlig neuer Umarbeitung. 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. Vol VI: 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 Primärstammbildungen*. 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, Hannas  
 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/ ᾶν. 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 (in Press. Wiesbaden: Reichert)
- 2013 A diachronic and typological approach to the Modern Greek subjunctive complementation. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 13(1): 165-169. doi.org/10.1163/15699846-13130112 (PhD thesis: Salzburg, 2011)
- 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.

## Schwyzer, Eduard

- 1939 *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München: Beck.

## Schwyzer, Eduard &amp; 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 Zur Wortzusammensetzung im Lateinischen. *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* Supplementband 27. Festschrift für C. J. W. Müller: 82-110. (Reprinted in Skutsch 1914: 152-182).  
1914 *Kleine Schriften.* Herausgegeben von Wilhelm Kroll. Leipzig: Teubner.  
<https://archive.org/details/kleineschriften00skutuoft/page/n5/mod/e/2up?ref=ol&view=theater>

Smyth, Herbert & Gordon Messing

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

Solmsen, Felix

- 1898 Etymologien. (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 35: 463-484.

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.
- Sturtevant, Edgar Howard  
 1933 *A Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language.* Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.
- Tabachovitz, David  
 1951 *Homerische ei Sätze. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung.* Lund: Gleerup.
- Taylor, Roxanne  
 2020 Present counterfactuals and verbal mood in the Homeric poems. In: Martii 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.
- Thurneysen, Rudolph  
 1904 Zu den etymologien in dem *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae.* *Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik* 13. 1-40.
- Tichy, Eva  
 2006 *Der Konjunktiv und seine Nachbarkategorien.* Bremen: Hempfen.  
 2010 *Alter als der Hexameter. Schiffskatalog, Troerkatalog und vier Einzelszenen der Ilias.* Bremen: Hempfen.
- 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  
1890 *Homericorum 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.
- Vollmer, Friedrich Karl  
1901 An. In: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* II. 1, line 1 - 12, line 29.
- 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, Wilhem

- 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  $-q^u$ e als alte Nebensatzeinleitende 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 and 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 and 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 QΛ EPEEI: An Homeric device in Greek literature? *Illinois Classical Studies* 4 1-15.
- Windisch, Ernst  
 1868 Untersuchungen über den Ursprung des Relativpronomens in den indogermanischen Sprachen. (*Curtius'*) *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik* 2: 201-420.
- Witte, Kurt  
 1913 Homeros. In: Wilhelm Kroll (ed.), *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung, begonnen von Georg Wissowa unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Fachgenossen. Achter Band: *Helikon bis Hyagnis*. Sechszehnter Halbband: *Hestiaia bis Hyagnis / Pauly's Realencyclopedia of classical antiquity*. New arrangement, begun by Georg Wissowa with the participation of numerous peers. Volume Eight: *Helicon to Hyagnis*. Sixteenth volume: *Hestiaia to Hyagnis*, 2213-2247. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Wright, W. A.  
 1884 Bentleiana I. Notes on Homer, *Iliad* I-VI. *Journal of Philology* 13: 122-145.  
 1885 Bentleiana 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.  
<https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:a605e950-4db8-4355-8a7f-2404056fcadb>

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