Disambiguation of future, subjunctive, optative in Greek speech acts

Rosemarie Lühr
Humboldt University at Berlin
rosemarie.luehr@hu-berlin.de

Περίληψη

Η διαφορά ανάμεσα στην ομηρική και μετα-ομηρική χρήση του μέλλοντα, της υποτακτικής και της ευκτικής έγκειται στο ότι η προορατική υποτακτική δεν εμφανίζεται πλέον στην κύρια πρόταση. Για να εξηγήσουμε αυτό το φαινόμενο, οι προαναφερθείσες κατηγορίες εξετάζονται μέσα σε κύριες προτάσεις, ακολουθώντας μια ονομασιολογική προσέγγιση. Οι αντίστοιχες λεκτικές πράξεις (speech acts) αναδεικνύουν το σημαντικό ρόλο πρωτίστως του ομιλητή και στη συνέχεια του ακροατή κατά την επιλογή των μέσων έκφρασης. Το γεγονός ότι η προορατική υποτακτική δεν εμφανίζεται πλέον στην κύρια πρόταση αποτελεί ένα συντακτικό φαινόμενο της κύριας πρότασης. Δεδομένου ότι οι δευτερεύουσες προτάσεις είναι πιο συντηρητικές, η προορατική υποτακτική διατηρείται ως δείκτης υπόταξης.

Λέξεις-κλειδιά: μέλλοντας χρόνος, υποτακτική, ευκτική, λεκτικές πράξεις (speech acts), συντακτικά φαινόμενα κύριας πρότασης

1   Introduction

In Ancient Greek, the optative, the subjunctive and the future tense compete with each other when it comes to the expression of a will, and the subjunctive as well as the future tense can also be understood as prospective. Furthermore, the optative with ἄν is used to express a future possibility. While these varying expressions in Homer's Iliad and Odyssey apply to both the main clause and the subordinate clause, in post-Homeric time, the prospective subjunctive has been almost entirely displaced from the main clauses. The reasons are so far not very clear. In order to get on with this, main clauses and subordinate clauses are examined for their distribution of forms with future time and modal reference. Since the choice of one of the future reference expressions may depend on the grammatical person, especially the first person, relevant speech acts are dealt with. Finally, fundamental differences between main and subordinate clauses have to be discussed. The investigation covers the period from the 8th century BC to the 5th century AD. It is based on multi-layered annotated corpora. To distinguish the different functions of future tense, subjunctive and optative, we choose an onomasiological approach, because the aim is to show the variety of possibilities of expression. The semantic concepts for the main clause are intention – future, will, deliberation, imagined possibility, counterfacutal possibility, softening. We start with statistics (2), the study of main and subordinate clauses follows (3; 4). Finally, we discuss main clause vs. subordinate clause phenomena (5).

2   Statistics

Overall, future, optative and conjunctive are not very frequent versus the indicative; cf. the following numbers in text excerpts from Homer and Nonnos:

Homer, Iliad, Odyssey: tokens 2752			
indicative	subjunctive	optative	future
231 (with future)	44	16 (with future)	30
			indicative 23
			optative 1
			infinitive 6
Nonnos, Dionysiaca: tokens 4543			
indicative	subjunctive	optative	future
314 (with future)	12	20	16
			indicative 16

Table 1 | Distribution of indicative, subjunctive, optative, future

Compared to Homer, in Nonnos's Dionysiaca future, conjunctive and optative appear relatively rare.

3   Main clause

Since we want to find out why the prospective subjunctive is no longer present in the main clause in post-Homeric time, mainly uses that can relate to the future are treated. Only synthetic forms will be discussed below.[1]

3.1 Intention-future time reference

In the following, a distinction is made between intention and will. Intention is understood as a purpose and will as desire (cf. Tichy 2002; Tichy 2006: 320f.).

3.1.1   Desiderative-future tense

Because the future is formed sigmatically, a formation that goes back to a desiderative (cf. Vedic *dítsasi* ‚you will give'; Rix 1976: 224f.; Sampanis 2017), the denotation of the speaker's intention is probably the original one. The speaker expresses with the 1st singular that he intends to perform the action in question in the future. The diachronic path intention > future is well attested cross-linguistically (Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca 1994: 263; Allan 2013: 38).

From Homer to Nonnos, the indicative of the future tense signifies a future process or state. Cf. the desiderative in the 1st singular (1). The clause is an assertion. In order to perform such a speech act, the speaker must be in a position to do so.

(1)(a) Homer, Iliad 1.29f.	τὴν this: ACC.F.SG	δ' but	ἐγὼ I: NOM.SG	οὐ not	λύσω set free: FUT. IND.ACT1SG
πρίν before	μιν she: ACC.F.SG	καὶ and	γῆρας old age(N): NOM.SG	ἔπεισιν come over: PRS. IND.ACT3SG	ἡμετέρῳ our: DAT.M.SG
ἐνὶ in	οἴκῳ	ἐν in	Ἄργεϊ		

---

[1] Besides synthetic forms with future reference, periphrases occur. The oldest is μέλλω + infinitive, being about to'. It appears from Homeric Greek until Early Bycantine Greek (Joseph 1983; Markopoulos 2009; Joseph and Pappas 2002; Lucas 2014; Allan 2017).

	house(M): DAT.SG	Argos(N): DAT.SG

τὴν δ' ἐγὼ οὐ λύσω: πρίν μιν καὶ γῆρας ἔπεισιν / ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ ἐν Ἄργεϊ
'But I will not release her until she reaches old age, in our house in Argos'

Similar:

Typhoeus wants to compete with Cadmon for a musical contest:

(1)(b) Nonnos, Dionysiaka 1.439	στήσω face up to: FUT.IND. ACT1SG	δ' but	ἢν if	ἐθέλῃς wish: PRS.SUBJ. ACT2SG	Φιλίην friendly: ACC.F.SG	ἔριν quarrel(F): ACC.SG

στήσω δ', ἢν ἐθέλῃς, φιλίην ἔριν
'But I will, if you wish, face up to a friendly quarrel'

The proximity of future time reference and intention shows (1)(c): the futures ἀπειλήσω and πέμψω in the 1ˢᵗ person appear next to the voluntative subjunctive ἄγω.

(1)(c) Homer, Iliad 1.181-185	ἀπειλήσω threaten: FUT. IND.ACT1SG	δέ but	τοι you: DAT.SG	ὧδε this: DAT. N.SG
…	τὴν the: ACC.F.SG	μὲν but	ἐγὼ I: NOM.SG	σὺν with
νηΐ ship(F): DAT.SG	τ' as well	ἐμῇ my: DAT. F.SG	καὶ and	ἐμοῖς my: DAT. M.PL
ἑτάροισι compagnon (M): DAT.PL	πέμψω send: FUT.IND. ACT1SG	ἐγὼ I: NOM. SG	δέ but	κ' PART
ἄγω take: PRS.SUBJ. ACT1SG	Βρισηΐδα Briseis(F): ACC.SG			

ἀπειλήσω δέ τοι ὧδε … τὴν μὲν ἐγὼ σὺν νηΐ τ' ἐμῇ καὶ ἐμοῖς ἑτάροισι / πέμψω, ἐγὼ δέ κ' ἄγω Βρισηΐδα …
'But I will threaten you thus … I will send back her [Briseis] with my ship and my companions, but I will myself take Briseis …'

Sometimes the speaker himself uses special means to give his assertion a clear future time reference as in (2). The expressions ὑπερβὰς, 'passing over', τότε, 'then', τῷ νῦν 'into the now' provide a time frame with a transition from the present to the future:

(2) Gorgias, Encomium of Helen 5	τὸν the: ACC. M.SG	χρόνον time(M): ACC.SG	δὲ but	τῷ the: DAT. M.SG
λόγῳ	τὸν the: ACC.	τότε then	τῷ the: DAT.	νῦν now

706

speech(M): DAT.SG	M.SG		N.SG	
ὑπερβὰς passing over: AOR.PRT.ACT. NOM.M.SG	ἐπὶ to	τὴν the: ACC. F.SG	ἀρχὴν begin(F): ACC.SG	τοῦ the: GEN. M.SG
μέλλοντος upcoming: GEN.M.SG	λόγου speech(M): GEN.SG	προβήσομαι proceed: FUT.IND. MED1SG	καὶ and	προθήσομαι predicate: FUT.IND. MED1SG
τὰς the: ACC.F.PL	αἰτίας reason(F): ACC.PL			

τὸν χρόνον δὲ τῷ λόγῳ τὸν τότε τῷ νῦν ὑπερβὰς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος λόγου προβήσομαι, καὶ προθήσομαι τὰς αἰτίας …
'Passing over in my present discourse from the time past into the now, I will proceed to the beginning of my intended discussion and will predicate the causes …'

However, if hearers take future forms as a report about future events rather than about intentions, a reanalysis takes place (Eckardt 2006). Thus, the form becomes a designation of the future time reference and functions as prospective future.

In (3) a directive and a prediction in the 3rd person are combined. The speaker locates a particular state of affairs in the projected reality (Allan 2017: 50f.):

(3)(a) Nonnos, Dionysiaka 1.378	σύριζε flute: PRS.IMP. ACT2SG	καὶ and	οὐρανὸς sky(M): NOM.SG	εὔδιος clear: NOM.M.SG	ἔσται: sein: FUT.IND. MED3SG

σύριζε, καὶ οὐρανὸς εὔδιος ἔσται
'Flute and the sky will be clear'

A prediction can be used as prophecy; cf. with the 2nd person:

(3)(b) Nonnos, Dionysiaka 32.6f.	θέλξεις enchant: FUT.IND.ACT2SG	δ' but	εἰν with	ἑνὶ one: DAT.M.SG	πάντα everyone: ACC.M.SG
πόθων longing(M): GEN.PL	ἰθύντορι driver(M): DAT.SG	κεστῷ belt(M): DAT.SG			

θέλξεις δ' εἰν ἑνὶ πάντα πόθων ἰθύντορι κεστῷ …
'But you will enchant everyone with the one belt as the driver of the longings …'

3.1.2 Prospective Subjunctive

Like the future tense, the prospective subjunctive goes back to the desiderative (cf. Allan 2013: 37f.). The reinterpretation of the content-related future is then based on parallel individual language innovation; cf.:

Latin future: *erō*, *eris*, *erit* ... < *h_1esoH, *$h_1eses(i)$, *$h_1eset(i)$ ... Vedic subjunctive.: *ás-ā(ni)*, *ás-as(i)*, *ás-at(i)* ... Homeric subjunctive: ἔω, ἐῇις, ἐῇι … (Rix 1976: 225). According to Sampanis (2017), the Indo-European language made no clear-cut distinction between the voluntative and prospective subjunctive.

As mentioned, in our corpus we found the prospective subjunctive in main clauses only in Homer:

(4) Homer, Iliad 1.262f.	οὐ not	γάρ for	πω up to this time	τοίους such: ACC.M.PL
ἴδον see: AOR. IND.ACT1SG	ἀνέρας man(M): ACC.PL	οὐδὲ but not	ἴδωμαι see: AOR.SUBJ. ACT1SG	

οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον ἀνέρας οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι …
'Such warriors have I never since seen, nor shall I see …' (Allan 2013: 37f.; Willmott 2007: 54-281)

The use is epistemic, the negation is οὐδε. As Willmott (2008) has shown, the choice between οὐκ and μή does not match deontic and epistemic modality (for using the negation μή deontically cf. Allan 2013: 36 with fn. 46, 40).

3.2 Will

The following expressions exhibit deontic modality, they imply the will of the speaker that the event be realized.

3.2.1 Imperatival future

The imperatival future is similar to the imperative:

(5) Homer, Odyssey 12. 23-25	ἀλλ᾽ but	ἄγετ᾽ come on: PRS. IMP.ACT2PL	ἐσθίετε eat: PRS.IMP. ACT2PL	βρώμην food(F): ACC.SG
καὶ and	πίνετε drink: PRS.IMP. ACT2PL	οἶνον wine(M): ACC.SG	αὖθι here	πανημέριοι all day long
ἅμα at the same time	δ᾽ but	ἠοῖ dawn(F): DAT.SG	φαινομένηφι appear: PRS.PRT. MED.DAT.F.PL	πλεύσεσθ᾽ sail: FUT. IND.MED2PL

ἀλλ᾽ ἄγετ᾽ ἐσθίετε βρώμην καὶ πίνετε οἶνον / αὖθι πανημέριοι· ἅμα δ᾽ ἠοῖ φαινομένηφι / πλεύσεσθ᾽

[Circe:] 'But come on, eat food and drink wine here all day. When dawn appears you will sail.' (Denizot 2011: 438; Allan 2017: 53f.)

3.2.2   Voluntative future

The future tense can also be used to denote voluntativity:

(6) Plato, Protagoras 338a	ὣς so	οὖν in fact	ποιήσετε do: FUT.IND.ACT2PL

ὣς οὖν ποιήσετε
'So you shall do'

3.2.3   Voluntative subjunctive

The same applies to the voluntative subjcuntive (Allan 2013: 38). Cf. the following hortatives:

(7)(a) Homer, Iliad 1.62f.	ἀλλ' hence	ἄγε come on	δή therefore	τινα some: ACC.M.SG
μάντιν seer(M): ACC.SG	ἐρείομεν ask: PRS. SUBJ.ACT1PL	ἢ or	ἱερῆα priest(M): ACC.SG	

ἀλλ'ἄγε δή τινα μάντιν ἐρείομεν ἢ ἱερῆα …
'But come, let us ask some seer or priest …'

(7)(b) Aristophanes, Lysistrata 266	ἀλλ' otherwise	ὡς so	τάχιστα swift: SUPERL	πρὸς to
πόλιν city(F): ACC.SG	σπεύσωμεν hasten: AOR.SUBJ. ACT1PL			

ἀλλ᾽ ὡς τάχιστα πρὸς πόλιν σπεύσωμεν
'Otherwise let's hurry to the city as soon as possible'

3.2.4   Cupitive optative

The cupitive optative expresses wishes for the future: "may it happen!".

After jealous Hera asked Appollo to help his father, she calls out:

(8) Nonnos, Dionysiaka 1.328	αἴθε oh that	λαβὼν grabbing: NOM.M.SG	ἐρύσειεν drag: AOR.OPT.ACT3SG	ὅπως so that
Διὶ Zeus(M): DAT.SG	τοῦτο this: ACC.N.SG	βοήσω call: FUT.IND.ACT1SG		

αἴθε λαβὼν ἐρύσειεν ὅπως Διὶ τοῦτο βοήσω
'Oh, if only one would catch and drag him (to the plow), so that I could call this to Zeus'

3.3 Derliberative question

Following Faure (2012), we regard the deliberative question as a speech act. The deliberative subjunctive signals a desire of the speaker, whereby the speaker's will is questioned (Ruijgh 1971, 275). This usage is deontic.

3.3.1 Deliberative subjunctive

(9)(a) Euripides, Ion 758	εἴπωμεν talk: AOR. SUBJ.ACT1PL	ἢ or	σιγῶμεν keep silence: PRS.SUBJ. ACT1PL	ἢ or	τί what: ACC.N.SG	δράσομεν do: PRS. FUT.ACT1PL

[chorus leader] εἴπωμεν ἢ σιγῶμεν; ἢ τί δράσομεν;
'Shall we speak or be silent? Or what shall we do?'

(9)(b) Nonnos, Dionysiaka 1.400	ἀλλὰ but	τί what: ACC.N.SG	ῥέξω do: AOR.SUBJ.ACT1SG

ἀλλὰ τί ῥέξω
'But what can I do?'

3.3.2 Deliberative optative

The deliberative optative is rare. This use is called "remote optative".

(10) Plato, Gorg. 492b	<τί what: NOM. N.SG	ἂν> PART	τῇ the: DAT.F.SG	ἀληθείᾳ truth(F): DAT.SG
αἴσχιον dishonouring: COMP.NOM.N.SG	καὶ and	κάκιον bad: COMP. NOM.N.SG	εἴη be: PRS. OPT.ACT 3SG	σωφροσύνης prudence(F): GEN.SG
καὶ and	δικαιοσύνης justice(F): GEN.SG	τούτοις this: DAT. M.PL	τούτοις this: DAT. M.PL	ἀνθρώποις man(M) DAT.PL

<τί ἂν> τῇ ἀληθείᾳ αἴσχιον καὶ κάκιον εἴη σωφροσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης σωφροσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης τούτοις τοῖς ἀνθρώποις
'what in truth could be fouler or worse than temperance and justice in such cases?'

3.4 Imagined possibility
3.4.1 Potential optative

The potential optative indicates that the state of affairs is merely imagined, that is, not expected. The modality is epistemic; cf. with particle ἄν (Allan 2013: 40).

(11)(a) Antiphon, On the murder of Herodes 5.48f	ὥστε so as	πολλῷ far rather	ἄν PART	ὑμεῖς you: NOM.PL
δικαιότερον more deserved	κρίνοισθε accuse: PRS. OPT.PASS2PL	ἤ than	ἐγὼ I: NOM.SG	

ὥστε πολλῷ ἂν ὑμεῖς δικαιότερον κρίνοισθε ἢ ἐγὼ νῦν …
'Thus it is you who deserve to be on trial far rather than I …'

The optative with ἄν can also be used to express a future possibility:

Xenophon, Cyropaedia 1.6.21	γνοίης come to know: PRS.OPT.ACT2SG	δ' but	ἄν PART	ὅτι that
τοῦθ' this: NOM.N. SG	οὕτως so	ἔχει occur: PRS. IND.ACT3SG		

γνοίης δ' ἂν ὅτι τοῦθ' οὕτως ἔχει
'you may see that this is so'

3.4.2   *"Futur de raisonnement »*

Also the so-called "futur de raisonnement" has an epistemic meaning.[2] It is especially frequent in the dialogues of Plato.

For (12) the preceding premise is, that the soul's excellence is justice and its vice is injustice.

(12) Plato, Republic 353e	ἡ PART	μὲν PART	ἄρα PART	δικαία just: NOM.F.SG
ψυχὴ soul(F): NOM.SG	καὶ and	ὁ the: NOM. M.SG	δίκαιος just: NOM. M.SG	ἀνὴρ man(M) NOM.SG
εὖ well	βιώσεται live: FUT.IND. MED3SG	κακῶς ill	δὲ but	ὁ the: NOM.M.SG
ἄδικος unjust: NOM. M.SG				

ἡ μὲν ἄρα δικαία ψυχὴ καὶ ὁ δίκαιος ἀνὴρ εὖ βιώσεται, κακῶς δὲ ὁ ἄδικος.

---

[2] Allan (2017: 57) considers the emergence of the epistemic meaning of the future tense as a form of "extreme subjectification" (Langacker 2003: 13).

[Socrates] 'Indeed, the just soul and the just man then will live well and the unjust ill.'

3.5 Counterfactual possibility

Only in Homer, the potential optative can be used with counterfactual meaning (mostly referring to the present). With this kind of modality, the speaker refers to propositions which the speakers knows to be not true, i.e. events that have not been/are not being realized (Allan 2013: 5, 39f.).

(13) Homer, Iliad 12, 322-325	…	εἰ if	μὲν indeed	γὰρ for
…	αἰεὶ ever	δὴ now	μέλλοιμεν be destined: PRS. OPT.ACT1PL	ἀγήρω ageless: NOM.M.DU
τ᾽ both	ἀθανάτω immortal	τε and	ἔσσεσθ᾽ be: FUT.MED.INF	οὔτέ and not
κεν PART	αὐτὸς self: NOM.M.SG	ἐνὶ in	πρώτοισι first: DAT.M.PL	μαχοίμην fight: PRS. OPT.MED3PL
οὔτέ and not	κε PART	σὲ you: ACC.SG	στέλλοιμι send: PRS.OPT. ACT1SG	μάχην battle(F): ACC.SG
ἐς into	κυδιάνειραν bringing men glory: ACC.F.SG			

… εἰ μὲν γὰρ … / αἰεὶ δὴ μέλλοιμεν ἀγήρω τ᾽ ἀθανάτω τε / ἔσσεσθ᾽, οὔτέ κεν αὐτὸς ἐνὶ πρώτοισι μαχοίμην / οὔτέ κε σὲ στέλλοιμι μάχην ἐς κυδιάνειραν
,… if we had the perspective to be forever ageless and immortal, neither should I myself fight amid the foremost, nor should I send you into battle.'[3]

The negation of the main clause is οὔτε.

3.6 Softened statements

Softened statements with potential optative and particle ἄν display an epistemic use (Allan 2013: 39). Examples for mitigated requests are:

(14)(a) Sophocles, Antigone 1339	ἄγοιτ᾽ lead: PRS. OPT.ACT2PL	ἂν PART	μάταιον useless: ACC. M.SG	ἄνδρ᾽ man(M): ACC.SG
ἐκποδών away from the feet				

---

[3] Cf. Wakker 1994: 211, 212 n. 171. According to Allan (2013: 41), "the domain of possible reality and the domain of counterfactuality constitute a semantic continuum."

ἄγοιτ᾽ ἂν μάταιον ἄνδρ᾽ ἐκποδών
[Kreon] 'Lead me out of the way, useless man that I am' (Drummen 2013: 51)

(14)(b) Sophocles, Electra 1491	χωροῖς give way: PRS. OPT.ACT2SG	ἂν PART	εἴσω into	σὺν with	τάχει swiftness(N): DAT.SG

χωροῖς ἂν εἴσω σὺν τάχει
'You could go in fast' (instead of:, Go in, and quickly')[4]

Presenting the state of affairs as possible is less disturbing for the addressee than an imperative and leaves more room for refusal (Drummen 2013: 90 n. 40).

All in all, concepts that are somehow related to futurity or modality provide a great deal of means of expression in the main clause.

future tense	**subjunctive**	**optative**
future time reference	prospective	potential
desiderative/voluntative	voluntative	cupitive
prediction/prophecy	deliberative	deliberative
imperative		counterfactual possibility
future de raisonnnement		softened statement

Table 2 | Functions of future tense, subjunctive, optative in main clauses

4   Subordinate clause

For subordinate clauses we only consider the subjunctive. It's about relative clauses, deliberative indirect questions, complement clauses with verbs of fearing, purpose and conditional clauses.

4.1 Deliberative indirect question

In deliberative indirect questions the deliberative subjunctive appears. The use corresponds to that in the main clause.

(15) Xenophon, Anabasis 1.3.5	εἰ whether	μὲν indeed	δὴ PART	δίκαια right: ACC.N.PL
ποιήσω do: AOR.SUBJ. ACT3SG	οὐκ not	οἶδα know: PF.IND. ACT1SG		

εἰ μὲν δὴ δίκαια ποιήσω, οὐκ οἶδα
'I don't know whether I shall do what is right'

---

[4] Bornemann and Risch 1973: § 228. 3 fn. 2.

4.2 Complement clause with verbs of fear

In the case of complement clauses depending on verbs of fear, there was an original voluntative subjunctive. The negation μή expresses the wish to avert something (negative desire).

(16) Xenophon Hellenica 4.8.4	εἰ if	δέ but	τις anyone: NOM.M.SG	τοῦτο this: ACC.N.SG
φοβεῖται fear: PRS. IND.MED3SG	μὴ that not	καὶ and	κατὰ downwards	γῆν land(F): GEN.SG
καὶ and	κατὰ downwards	θάλατταν sea(F): ACC.SG	ἐνθάδε thither	πολιορκώμεθα besiege: PRS.SUBJ. PASS1PL

εἰ δέ τις τοῦτο φοβεῖται, μὴ καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν ἐνθάδε πολιορκώμεθα …
'But if anyone is afraid that we may be besieged here both by land and by sea…'

4.3 Relative clause

The prospective subjunctive with clear future time reference can be found in relative clauses. In (17), there is a restrictive one:

(17) Homer, Iliad 21, 104	νῦν now	δ᾽ but	οὐκ not	ἔσθ᾽ be: PRS.IND. ACT3SG
ὅς who: NOM.M.SG	τις any one: NOM.M.SG	θάνατον death(M): ACC.SG	φύγῃ escape: AOR.SUBJ. ACT3SG	

νῦν δ᾽ οὐκ ἔσθ᾽ ὅς τις θάνατον φύγῃ
'but now is there not one that shall escape death'

The subjunctive is used here deontically, it is a prophecy.

4.4 Purpose clause

In purpose clauses, also the prospective subjunctive appears. The speaker views the future realization of the state of affairs as probable or, at least, very well possible. Thus the subjunctive has an epistemic meaning.

(18)(a) Nonnos, Dionysiaka 1.136	ἴσχεο stay: PRS. IMP.MED2SG	φωνή voice(F): VOC.SG	μὴ not	Βορέην Boreas(M): ACC.SG
μετὰ after	ταῦρον bull(M): ACC.SG	ἐρωμανέοντα crazy with love: PRS. PRT.ACT. ACC.M.SG	νοήσω perceive: AOR.SUBJ. ACT1SG	

ἴσχεο, φωνή, / μὴ Βορέην μετὰ ταῦρον ἐρωμανέοντα νοήσω.'
'Stay, my voice, so that I will not see Boreas crazy with love, after the bull'

(18)(b) Plato, Euthyphro 9a1-2	δίδαξον teach: AOR.IMP.ACT2SG	καὶ also	ἐμέ I: ACC.M.SG	ἵνα so that
σοφώτερος wise: COMP. NOM.M.SG	γένωμαι become: AOR.SUBJ. MED1SG			

δίδαξον καὶ ἐμέ, ἵνα σοφώτερος γένωμαι.
'Teach me too, so that I can become wiser.'

4.5 Conditional clause

In the following conditional clause, the meaning if (in future) of ἤν appears together with the negation μή[5]. Something that is conceived or imagined is expressed. The prospective subjunctive is again used epistemically:

(19) Isocrates, Euagoras 9.48	καίτοι and indeed	τηλικαύτας such as this: ACC. F.PL	ἐπιδόσεις increase (F): ACC. PL	τὰς the: ACC.F. PL
πόλεις city(F): ACC.PL	λαμβάνειν take: PRS. INF.ACT	οὐχ not	οἷόν such as: NOM.N.SG	τ᾽ and
ἐστίν be: PRS.IND. ACT3SG	ἤν if	μὴ not	τις anyone: NOM.M.SG	αὐτὰς this: ACC. F.PL
διοικῇ keep house: PRS. SUBJ.MED.3SG	τοιούτοις such as this: DAT.N.PL	ἤθεσιν character (N): DAT.PL	οἵοις such as: DAT.N.PL	Εὐαγόρας Evagoras (M): NOM. SG
μὲν but	εἶχεν have: IPF. IND.ACT 3SG			

καίτοι τηλικαύτας ἐπιδόσεις τὰς πόλεις λαμβάνειν οὐχ οἷόν τ᾽ ἐστίν, ἢν μὴ τις αὐτὰς διοικῇ τοιούτοις ἤθεσιν οἵοις Εὐαγόρας μὲν εἶχεν
'And yet it is not possible that cities should take on such increase unless there are those who govern them by such principles as Evagoras had'

Thus, in subordinate clauses with subjunctive future and modal meanings can still be inferred. But as soon as the prospective subjunctive had disappeared from the main clause, this mood was interpreted as a subordinate clause marker.

---

[5] Negative epistemic stance is also indicated by the potential optative (Drummer 2013: 70).

5   Main clause vs. Subordinate clause phenomena

Now the question has to be answered, why in post-Homeric time, the prospective subjunctive no longer appears in main clauses while surviving in subordinate clauses. This has to be explained given that other types of the subjunctive survive in both main and subordinate clauses (i.e. deliberative and voluntative subjunctive). However, main and subordinate clauses differ fundamentally when it comes to language changes. Main clauses are pragmatically richer than subordinate clauses. They contain more information than subordinate clauses by separating old information from new information (Bybee 2002: 14). As our examples have shown, the speaker's and hearer's attitude are also expressed more clearly in main clauses. Especially the speaker is affected when intention, will, strong request or deliberation are expressed, while the addressee comes into play with the imperatival future or the voluntative future. But above all, the speaker is also the one who can trigger language changes. In main clauses he replaced the prospective subjunctive with the more objective future or with the optative, which is similar in its function but describes the mere possibility. In the subordinate clause, on the other hand, the prospective subjunctive was retained and became a subordinate clause marker[6]. Altogether, the preservation of the subjunctive agrees with the fact that subordinate clauses are conservative and main clauses are innovative.

References

Allan, Rutger J. 2013. "Exploring Modality's Semantic Space: Grammaticalisation, Subjectification and the Case of ὀφείλω." *Glotta* 89:1-46.

Allan, Rutger J. 2017. "The history of the future: grammaticalization and subjectification in Ancient Greek future expressions." In Lambert et. al., 43-72.

Bornemann, Eduard and Ernst Risch. 1973. *Griechische Grammatik*. Frankfurt a. M.: Diesterweg

Bybee, Joan L. 2002. "Main clauses are innovative, subordinate clauses are conservative." In *Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse: Essays in honor of Sandra A. Thompson*, edited by Joan L. Bybee and Michael Noonan, 1-17. University of New Mexico: John Benjamins.

Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca.1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Denizot, Camille. 2011. *Donner des ordres en grec ancien: étude linguistique des formes de l'injonction. Cahiers de l'ERIAC, n° 3 – Fonctionnements linguistiques*. Mont-Saint-Aignan: Presses universitaires de Rouen et du Havre.

Drummen, Annemieke. 2013. "A constructionist approach to the potential optative in classical Greek drama." *Glotta* 89:68-108.

Eckardt, Regine. 2006. *Meaning change in grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---

[6] As Allan (2013: 37) explains, in clauses with the original local conjunction ἵνα the subjunctive was used in its purely epistemic future-referring meaning. After the local meaning faded, the subjunctive became a grammaticalized marker for purpose clauses.

Faure, Richard. 2012. "La deliberation et le subjonctif deliberative dans la prose grecque classique." *Syntaktika* 43:5-62.

Joseph, Brian D. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive. A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Joseph, Brian D. and Panayiotis Pappas. 2002. "On some recent views concerning the development of the Greek future system." *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 26.247–273.

Lambert, Frédéric, Rutger J. Allan, and Theodore Markopoulos, eds. 2017. *The Greek future and its history/Le futur grec et son histoire*. Louvain-La-Neuve: Peeters.

Langacker, Roland W. 2003. "Extreme subjectification: English tense and modals." In *Motivation in Language: Studies in Honor of Günther Radden*, edited by Hubert Cuyckens, Thomas Berg, René Dirven and Klaus-Uwe Panther, 3-26. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 243.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Lucas, Sandra. 2014. "Aspect in Greek Future Forms." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 14:163-189.

Markopoulos, Theodore. 2009. *The Future in Greek: From Ancient to Medieval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rix, Helmut. 1976. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Sampanis, Konstantinos. 2017. "The Interplay between the Future and the Subjunctive Mood in the Diachrony of the Greek Language." In Lambert et. al., 237-251.

Tichy, Eva. 2002. „Zur Funktion und Vorgeschichte der indogermanischen Modi." In Ind*ogermanische Syntax. Fragen und Perspektiven*, edited by Heinrich Hettrich with the cooperation of Jeong-Soo Kim, 189-206. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

Tichy, Eva. 1992. „Wozu braucht das Altindische ein periphrastisches Futur?" *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 142/2: 334-342.

Tichy, Eva. 2006. *Der Konjunktiv und seine Nachbarkategorien Studien zum indogermanischen Verbum, ausgehend von der älteren vedischen Prosa*. Bremen: Hempen.

Wakker, Gerry. 1994. *Conditions and Conditionals. An investigation of Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

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

Willmott, Jo. 2008. „Not in the mood: modality and negation in the history of Greek." http://www.jowillmott.co.uk/downloads/papers/AMGLPaper.pdf.