The use of the optative in Iliad 2,1-493

Filip De Decker

filipdedecker9@gmail.com
Marie Skłokowska Curie Action, Individual Fellow & Università di Verona
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2863-5801

Abstract

In this article I address the use of the optative (appearing alone or in in contrast with the subjunctive or indicative) in *Iliad* 2,1-493 (the part before the *Catalogue of Ships* starts). This part of the book describes Agamemnon's (failed) attempts to rouse the army and Odysseus' intervention to restore the damage caused by Agamemnon's blunder(s). In these lines there are about 110 subjunctive and optative forms, and they provide a small but reliable corpus of instances in different constructions and are therefore sufficient to serve as basis for an investigation and can be used to check if results acquired in other investigations can be confirmed or refuted. As the optative is the mood with the widest array of uses (from the unreal to the almost-certain-future), I focus on the passages in which the optative is used, either alone or in contrast with the subjunctive or indicative. I start by briefly discussing earlier scholarship on the issue, then I outline how I catalogue the forms, paying particular attention to the (metrical and palaeographical) overlap between subjunctive and future forms and finally I proceed to the actual analysis, addressing also textual and philological issues. My research hypothesis is that the subjunctive is used to describe events that the speakers and/or narrators considered to be more likely to happen, while the optative refers to what is (remotely) possible or wished for, but thought to be less probable. I also argue that while the optative is often used in iterative contexts and after past tense verbs, this does not mean

that the *optativus iterativus* and *optativus obliquus* were distinct categories as the former obtained its iterative meaning from the context and the latter was more often than not only due to the lower degree of probability (in other words there is no strict *consecutio modorum* nor *attractio modorum*).[1]

Keywords: optative, modal uses, Homeric syntax, subjunctive, verbal morpho-syntax, mood and modality.

1. The use of the moods in Homer

The literature on the moods in Homer is large,[2] and in general there seems to be agreement that the subjunctive conveys "will" and "expectation" and the optative "wish" and "possibility" (in Delbrück's words *Wille*, *Erwartung*, *Wunsch* and *Möglichkeit*), but many scholars differ in their analyses of the *Grundbedeutungen* and the origins of the moods: which meaning of the subjunctive and optative was the original one, can probably never be answered with certainty and it is even possible that both meanings were original.[3] One

[2] I quote (the list is obviously not exhaustive) von Bäumlein (1846), Novotný (1857), Aken (1861, 1865), Delbrück (1871, 1879, 1902), Lange (1872, 1873), Weber (1884), Masius (1885), Chitil (1899), Hammerschmidt (1892), Vandaele (1897), Lattmann (1903), Mein (1903), Mutzbauer (1903a, 1903b, 1908), Methner (1908), Walter (1923), Gonda (1956), Brunel (1980), Willmott (2007, 2008) besides the discussions in the grammars of Buttmann (1810: 494-514), von Thiersch (1826: 519-538, 607-699), Krüger (1859: 96-110, 130-135, 137-150), Vogrinz (1889: 266-277, 341-383), Kühner & Gerth (1898: 217-289), Schwyzer & Debrunner (1950: 301-338, with a bibliography until 1950), Chantraine (1953: 205-364) and Chantraine & Casevitz (2015: 237-343, 389-415).

[3] This discussion goes back to Delbrück (1871: 14 and *passim* where it was argued that *will* was the original meaning of the subjunctive and *wish* that of the optative and that the other meanings originated from those two *Grundbedeutungen*, see also 1897: 365-373, 1902: 326-336) and Mutzbauer (1903a: the subjunctive as an original expectation, 1903b: the optative as an original wish, 1908) and also Walter 1923. Brugmann 1904: 579 considered the

of the constructions where the optative seems to have maintained its notion of wish is in the conditional clauses and the indirect questions introduced by εἰ, as they are believed to continue old wish clauses "if only".[4]

While there is no agreement about the origins of the moods, the traditional description of a *continuum* with the indicative being the most "realistic", the subjunctive referring to the "expected" and the optative to the least certain explains the data the best.[5] In that continuum,[6] the optative expressed a wish

original meaning of the subjunctive to be volitative, but thought that the optative had always possessed the meaning of wish and possibility (1904: 583, 1925: 197). See also the discussions in the traditional Homeric grammars, such as Monro 1891: 287-293 and Chantraine 1953: 206-212, who argued that the subjunctive had in origin two meanings, but that the wish was the original meaning of the optative (1953: 212-213, agreeing thus with Mutzbauer 1903b).

[4] Delbrück 1871: 238, Lange (1872: 386, 401-402 *passim* and 1873), Monro 1891: 285-291, Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 680-688, Chantraine (1953: 274-279). Traditionally, Lange (1872, 1873) is considered to be the first to state that the conditional clauses were original wishes, but this had already been stated at least as early as von Thiersch 1826: 603-604, 628. Delbrück 1871: 72-74 was agnostic about this explanation, noting that it was possible, but that he preferred not to make a judgement on it.

In addition, I also refer to the analyses of καλέσειε (*Iliad* 24,74) by von Thiersch 1826: 603-604, 628, Krüger 1859: 98, Delbrück 1871: 196, La Roche 1871: 102, Lange 1872: 326, Leaf 1888: 441, Ameis & Hentze 1888: 102, Monro 1891: 285, Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 320-324, Chantraine 1953: 216, Brügger 2017: 49.

[5] Tabachovitz 1951, followed by Hettrich 1992: 265-266, vehemently disagreed with this theory and argued that the conditional clauses had always been subordinated and were never independent paratactic wish clauses (see already Delbrück's agnostic stance).

For Homer, see Bernhardy 1829: 384-414, Krüger 1859: 96-110, Delbrück (1871 *passim*, but only on the subjunctive and optative), Vogrinz 1889: 266-278, Monro 1891: 251-298, Chantraine 1953: 204-299, Chantraine & Casevitz 2015: 237-268.

For Greek in general, I refer to Madvig 1847, Goodwin 1865, Kühner & Gerth 1898: 200-260, 1904: 347-558, Brugmann 1900: 498-514, 551-579, Stahl 1907: 220-596 and Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 301-354 and 619-689, and for Attic Greek, (besides the works already quoted above) Bernhardy 1829: 384-414, Gildersleeve 1900: 168-190, Smyth & Messing 1956: 491-527, Humbert 1960: 110-132, 182-246, Bizos 1961, Delaunois 1988: 76-134, Rijksbaron 2002: 39-94 and Van Emde Boas & De Bakker & Huitink & Rijksbaron 2019: 438-550.

[6] This is sometimes referred to as "Greenberg's irrealis continuum" (based on Greenberg 1986: 247-248 – such a continuum had been suggested before already, see e.g. Aken 1865: 21 or Seiler (1971, reiterated in 1993)), but in these continua, however, the modal indicative is at the outmost extreme and as will be shown, this is an innovation. Greenberg discussed Classical Greek and did not treat Homeric nor non-Attic Greek. For the optative being *irrealis* see Cristofaro 2012: 132-133, 142-143. For a continuum in Homeric Greek with the optative as the most unlikely, see Vogrinz 1889: 267-274.

and a possibility in all nuances (likely, possible, unlikely).[7] Recently, Tichy described the moods as follows: the realis indicated what was foreseen to happen and what had timeless truth, the subjunctive was used for what was expected, and the optative for what was possible, probable or desirable and a negated realis is something that is not foreseen nor has it happened, a negated subjunctive is something that is not expected and a negated optative is something that is improbable or is desired not to happen.[8] Similarly, Fritz described the subjunctive as having future meaning, with two uses, future / prospective and will / voluntative,[9] and considered the optative to be potential, with two uses, namely wish / cupitive and possibility / potential.[10]

The continuum mentioned above also provides an explanation for two somewhat more unexpected uses of the optative, namely (first) that there are several examples where the optative (mostly with a modal particle) is used besides a future form and seems to be synonymous with it (although several scholars still think to note a modal difference),[11] and (second) that the optative (mostly with modal particle) could be used as quasi-synonym for an imperative.[12] These two uses pose only an apparent problem, as they

---

[7] As had already been noted by Delbrück 1871: 28-29, 1897: 371. For Homer, see also Gerth 1878, Van Pottelbergh 1939: 8, Chantraine 1953: 218, Brunel 1980: 240, Strunk 1997: 148, and Willmott 2008. Surprisingly enough, Monro 1891: 275 claimed that there was no difference between the Homeric optative in the main clause and that of later Greek (this had been argued for by Wilhelmi 1881 as well), but he nevertheless noted that the indicative intruded into the field of the other moods (1891: 293-296).

[8] Tichy 2006: 304-306.

[9] Fritz 2010: 393.

[10] Fritz 2010: 394-395.

[11] Buttmann 1810: 500, 503, von Thiersch 1826: 641, Rost 1826: 453-454, Kühner 1835: 110, 1870: 199-200, Kühner & Gerth 1898: 233, 235 considered the forms to be near-synonyms, but still noted a difference of modal nature, while Aken 1861: 42, Vogrinz 1889: 274, Ameis & Hentze 1900: 124 considered them to be synonymous.

Willmott 2008 did not see any differences per se, approached the optative on different modal axes and argued that the optative had many different meanings related to the abilities of the actor.

Monro 1891: 273 argued that the optative could occur together with future, but did not state that it was synonymous, while Chantraine 1953: 221 mentioned that the optative and modal particle could be used as a synonym for an imperative, but did not postulate that it could be used for a future.

[12] Buttmann 1810: 500, 503, von Thiersch 1826: 641, Bernhardy 1829: 410, Kühner 1835: 108-109, 1870: 198-199, Aken 1861: 44, Kühner & Gerth 1898: 233-234, Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 322-323, Chantraine 1953: 221.

could be interpreted as an extension of the aspect "likely (to occur)" described above. A final problem is that the optative can also be used in contexts in which reference is made to the past (both in cases of wish and potentiality) and/or the degree of possibility is almost that of impossibility (making the wish unfulfillable and the potential a counterfactual).[13] While this is not a problem for the irrealis-continuum (these uses of the optative would then be placed at the most unlikely end of the scala), the expansion of the indicative at the expense of the optative, followed by an almost complete substitution of the optative by the indicative (Attic Greek (almost) exclusively uses the indicative in these contexts), raises some questions, however (they are all somehow intertwined).[14] First, it is often difficult to distinguish between something that is possible, remotely possible or impossible and also whether an action belongs to the past or present is not always clear either, especially when we are dealing with an event that has not happened or that cannot occur (anymore). Second, many scholars assumed that the distinctions valid for Classical Greek applied to Homeric Greek as well and did not believe that the epic examples in the optative could refer to the past,[15] while other assumed that there were indeed differences between the constructions with the optative and with the indicative.[16] Third, if there is no difference and the optative is indeed the oldest form, which seems to be confirmed by the fact that the use of the optative in these contexts (*potentialis* of the past and *irealis*) has parallels in other old Indo-European languages,[17] how and why did the indicative intrude and eventually substitute the optative entirely? These three questions would require a study on their own, which I cannot

---

[13] Krüger 1859: 100, 103-104, 138, Düntzer 1864: 132, Ameis & Hentze 1871: 72, Gerth 1878, Vogrinz 1887: 267-274, Monro 1891: 273-274, Kühner & Gerth 1898: 232, Brugmann 1900: 505, 512-514, Mutzbauer 1902, 1903b, Van Pottelbergh 1939: 8, Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 324, 328-329, 344-345) Chantraine 1953: 218, Brunel 1980: 240, Strunk 1997: 148, Hettrich 1998, Chantraine & Casevitz 2015: 252-254, De Decker 2015: 221-240, 2021: 138-170.

This use of the optative was not discussed in Willmott 2008, although she treated some examples of this category.

[14] The most recent treatment of this problem is De Decker 2021: 138-170.

[15] Buttmann 1810: 498-499, von Thiersch 1826: 611-613, 638, von Naegelsbach 1834: 49, 98-99.

[16] Basset 1989: 220-230, Willmott (2007: 48-52 - in her 2008 article she seemed to have abandoned this viewpoint already), Polsley 2019: *passim* but especially page 8.

[17] The references can be found in Hettrich 1998: 264, De Decker 2015: 222-223.

perform here,[18] but in my opinion Homeric Greek used the optative for what was (remotely) possible and the tense usage did not refer to present or past, but described the aspectual value of the action. Later on, as it became more and more necessary to distinguish between past, present and future reference, Greek started to use the indicative to refer to the past (as it also did in the wishes, purpose clauses, and with the *verba timendi* and *verba curandi*, replacing the subjunctive by the indicative when reference to the past was made and in post-Classical Greek also with the iterative actions in the subordinate clauses, where the optative was substituted by the indicative to express the pastness).[19]

An entirely different analysis of the moods was made by Hahn, who argued that both the subjunctive and the optative were in origin future forms.[20] Along similar lines, Willmott argued that the subjunctive was a future form,[21] and that the optative conveyed *negative epistemic stance*,[22] and Fritz posited that there was an *inhaltliche Nähe* between subjunctive and optative.[23] Two observations have to be made. First, the analysis of the "future-origin" poses some problems, because if correct, it would mean that Proto-Indo-European had three different methods to forms the future, namely the subjunctive, the optative and also the desiderative suffix *-(h_p) s-*. While this is not impossible, it seems nevertheless rather uneconomical. Second, the interpretation of the optative as *negative epistemic stance* might

---

[18] The issue was discussed in detail in De Decker (2015: 221-240, 2021: 150-162, with more references).

[19] Koppin 1878: 126-131, Brugmann 1890: 191-194, 1900: 590-591, 1904: 584, 586, Mutzbauer 1902, Stahl 1907: 280-290, Debrunner (1921 focusing on the iterative forms in subordinate clauses in post-Classical Greek), 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*), Brunel 1980: 236, De Decker 2021: 152-153.

Brunel 1980: 236 agreed, but did not mention any of these scholars. This suggestion was not addressed in Krisch 1986, Ruijgh 1992 nor in Hettrich 1998. Willmott 2007: 48-52 only discussed Ruijgh, but did not mention the others. Jacquinod 2017: 692 notes that the indicative is already being used for the counterfactual in Homer ("makes its first appearance in Homer"), but does not address the issue in detail.

For an in-depth discussion of this problem, the reader is referred to De Decker 2015: 241-260, 2021: 150-162.

[20] Hahn 1953.

[21] Willmott 2007: 53-111, especially 111.

[22] Willmott 2007: 113-152.

[23] Fritz 2010: 395, this had been suggested already by Aken 1861: 42-43.

seem radically different from what had been argued before, but in spite of what Willmott herself argued, there is not so much difference between her analysis of the optative and that of the more traditional or earlier scholars, such as Delbrück, Kühner & Gerth, Schwyzer & Debrunner or Chantraine (one could in fact label the optative as having *uncertain epistemic stance*).

2. The future-subjunctive and future-desiderative forms

The first problem is the distinction between the future indicative and the subjunctive aorist. As is known, the subjunctive aorist of the sigmatic aorist is metrically equivalent to the future indicative (unless the verb is a semi-deponent or belongs to the *verba liquida*) and those forms would have been written the same in the most alphabets anyway: λύσω can be either future indicative or subjunctive aorist, and λύσωσι and λύσουσι are metrically equivalent and would have written ΛΥΣΟΣΙ in the oldest Greek alphabet and in that of Athens from before 403 BC.[24] Chantraine argued that one should make a difference between the two forms based on the transmission (thus distinguishing λύσωσι from λύσουσι),[25] and consider the form a subjunctive, when an MP is used,[26] but in my opinion this fails to take into account the transmission problems (as in several cases both forms are found in the codices) and the fact that in Homer's time one could not have differentiated between the forms (at least in writing). The verbs without an aorist or with a non-sigmatic aorist build their future on the Indo-European desiderative *-$(h_1)s$-:[27] the verb ἄγω has a reduplicated aorist ἤγαγον with a subjunctive aorist ἀγάγω, but has a future form ἄξω which is built on *$h_2eĝ$-s-. The same applies to the semi-deponent future forms.[28] For that reason I catalogue the forms of the type λύσω as a special category "future-subjunctives".

---

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

[25] Chantraine 1953: 225.

[26] Chantraine 1953: 206-211.

[27] For the present investigation it is irrelevant whether the suffix was *-s- or *-h_1s- or whether or not both suffixes existed.

[28] 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

An additional problem in this discussion is the third person singular ending in -(σ)ει. When a verb form with this ending appears in a main clause (mostly with a modal particle) or in a subordinate clause and is followed by a word that starts with a vowel, -ει is often corrected into -ει',[29] but there are several problems with that specific ending. First, we cannot distinguish between the subjunctive ending -η and the "genuine" future ending -ει (as in later Attic), which is the reason why these forms are called "future-subjunctives" here. Second, in West-Ionic the ending -ει was used as subjunctive ending (and even in Doric and Lesbian dialects),[30] but whether this means that this ending was a subjunctive in Homer as well, is debated.[31] As I noted above, the forms in -ει and -η are metrically equivalent, but the fact that Ionic dialects (Ionic being the main component of the epic language) use the "short" vowel variants as genuine subjunctives, adds to the uncertainty. Third, it has been argued that the ending -ει could be an optative ending as well. Building on Savelsberg,[32] Ameis and Ameis & Hentze argued that this ending was an apokopated variant of the optative ending in -ειε and could occur even before a word starting with a

---

future originated in the subjunctive were Buttmann 1830: 398, 1854: 396 and also Aken 1865: 13, whereas Franke 1861 stated that all future forms were in origin present forms. I cannot address that issue in detail here (already Brugmann 1880: 58-64 stated that the issue could not be solved), nor the question whether there is a difference in meaning between the future and the subjunctive aorist forms.

[29] This was the case for ἀτιμήσει in *Iliad* 9,62, corrected into ἀτιμήσει' by Bentley and for πείσει in *Iliad* 9,386 which was changed into πείσει' by Barnes 1711: 346; in our corpus we have for τιμήσει and τιμήσει' (in the skholia) which were transmitted besides τιμήσῃ in *Iliad* 2,3. There are more examples of this change in the different editions: in the *Iliad* we have 2,4, 4,178, 9,62, 9,386 14,240, 20,102 and 24,672.

In his *Iliad* edition West rejected Bentley's correction (1998: 254) for 9,62, but adopted Barnes' (West 1998: 269) for 9,386 and referred in both instances to the other instance, although he did not state why he now adopted and then rejected the correction, while Van Thiel (2011: 156 and 166) was more consistent and preserved the transmitted readings in both instances of *Iliad* 9.

[30] Westphal (1868: 69-70, discussing the short vowel subjunctives in general), Schulze (1885, with reference to Westphal), Smyth (1894: 217-218, with reference to Schulze 1885), Buck 1910: 111, Brugmann (1900: 333, 1916: 527-528, doubting however whether this meant that one could restore the short endings in Homer), Bechtel (1924: 217, with reference to Schulze 1885), Schwyzer 1939: 790-791, Chantraine 1964: 259, Rix 1992: 230.

[31] La Roche 1869: 239-242 emphatically denied this, Brugmann 1916: 527-528 remained skeptical as well and later grammarians did not address these forms

[32] Savelsberg 1867a: 413-416, 1867b: 507-513.

consonant.[33] This explanation is problematic, as an apokope at the end of a line seems highly unlikely. Von Thiersch already stated that the ending -ειε was never elided into -ει, so that all the endings -ει had to be changed into -αι,[34] which is in my opinion at least as unlikely, because it involves changing many transmitted forms. While Savelberg's, Ameis' and Ameis & Hentze's explanations can no longer be sustained, the question remains whether or not the ending -ει could have been used for the optative.[35] La Roche emphatically denied the existence of this ending in epic Greek,[36] but in the Arkadian dialect we find the form διακωλύσει which is often interpreted as an optative.[37] If that form is indeed an optative, the optative ending -ει could be accepted for Homer as well,[38] especially since Arkadian is a dialect of the Aiolic branch and the epic language has a strong Aiolic layer. It would then render it unnecessary to interpret the ending -ει as an elided -ειε when it appears before a caesura (reason why it is often printed as -ει᾽ by editors). Others, however, have tried to explain διακωλύσει as a future,[39] or as subjunctive,[40] and it remains therefore uncertain if it is indeed an optative.[41] Blümel interpreted the forms in -ει (where no elision was possible) as subjunctives and did not discuss the possibility that they might have been optatives after all.[42] In favour of interpreting διακωλύσει as an optative, is the fact that subjunctive was not used regularly anymore in Arkadian at the time of that inscription, that the form following διακωλύσει was an optative as well (namely φθέραι),[43] and that the combination of

---

[33] Ameis 1868b: 52 and Ameis & Hentze 1871: 90.

[34] Von Thiersch 1818: 207.

[35] Surprisingly enough, this issue is not addressed in Rix 1992.

[36] La Roche 1869: 242-243.

[37] Brugmann 1880: 66-67, Spitzer (1883: 60, but he interpreted the forms as apokope from διακωλύσειε, thus returning to what Ameis and Ameis & Hentze had already argued for), Wackernagel 1897: 46, Bechtel (1921: 287, a suggestion he already made in Bechtel 1884), Schwyzer (1939: 660 (not 656 as Chantraine 1964: 266 stated), 797), Chantraine (1964: 266, with reference to Schwyzer).

[38] As was cautiously and hesitatingly suggested by Wackernagel 1897: 46.

[39] Hoffmann 1891: 260-261, Dubois 1986: 226.

[40] Slotty 1915: 128, Blümel 1982: 146-151, who did not even discuss the possibility that the forms in -ει might have been an optative.

[41] As Chantraine 1964: 266 added cautiously; Blümel 1982: 150 noted that the context for this form was missing, so that no analysis could be made.

[42] Blümel (1982: 146-151).

[43] This form was quoted in Brugmann 1880: 67 and Schwyzer 1939: 660.

a future indicative and an optative was not common at all (as was also admitted by Dubois himself).[44] Given the fact that an optative in -ει could have existed in a dialect of the Aiolic group and that the epic language has a strong Aiolic component, it cannot be excluded either that the ending -ει would in fact be a relic of such an old optative form (although this remains highly controversial). This, combined with the fact that the ending -ει could also be a subjunctive or future-subjunctive ending, makes correcting -ει into -ει' unnecessary, but at the same time it makes it nearly impossible to correctly assess these forms as to mood and tense.

There is only one such instance where -ει appears before a vowel (*Iliad* 2,3), but in that instance other variants are attested as well. This instance will be discussed below in more detail.

3. The individual instances of the optative

We have 32 optative forms and 2 debated instances (one where the optative is possible and one where the optative was restored by some). We will start with the "secure" forms and will discuss the debated instances at the end. The uncontested optative forms can be catalogued into the following categories: wish or wish nuance, "near-future", "near-imperative", *optativus obliquus*, *optativus iterativus*, counterfactual / remotely possible and one single instance where the exact interpretation can be debated (probably intended by the poet). I will try to show that (a) each of these instances fits into the schema of the differing degrees of wish and possibility, (b) that this also applies to the so-called oblique and iterative optative and that they cannot be considered special uses of the optative (i.e. they are either a wish or *potentialis* or even both), (c) that several old subordinate clauses can be reconstructed as old wish clauses (especially the purpose and conditional clauses) and that conditional constructions in the optative can be "rewritten" into or reconstructed as an optative of a wish followed by a potential optative (with all degrees of (im)possibility). I will start with the unequivocal wish clauses.

3.1. The wishes

(EX.01) (340) ἐν πυρὶ δὴ βουλαί τε γενοίατο μήδεά τ' ἀνδρῶν

---

[44] Dubois 1986: 226

(341) σπονδαί τ' ἄκρητοι καὶ δεξιαί, ᾗς ἐπέπιθμεν: (Iliad 2,340-341).[45]
"May the councils and plans of men be given to the fire, and also the unmixed offerings and our rights hand, in which we trusted."[46]

In this instance the optative γενοίατο is a clear wish. Similar instances can be found in 372 (which will be discussed below) and 418. A special instance of the wish clauses are the optatives in the conditional and purpose clauses, which will be treated later on.

3.2. Near-future meaning

As was mentioned above already, there are instances in which the optative (mostly with modal particle) is used besides a future form or almost as a synonym of a plain future form. In our corpus there are two such instances.

(EX.02) (158) οὕτω δὴ οἶκόνδε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν
(159) Ἀργεῖοι φεύξονται ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης,
(160) κὰδ δέ κεν εὐχωλὴν Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ λίποιεν
(161) Ἀργείην Ἑλένην, ἧς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν
(162) ἐν Τροίῃ ἀπόλοντο φίλης ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἴης: (*Iliad* 2,158-162).
"Now they want to flee home to their beloved fatherland over the wide ridges of the sea and would leave Argive Helen, for whom many of the Akhaians have died in Troy far away from their beloved land, as object of glory to Priam and the Trojans."

In this instance Here expresses her discomfort and fear that the Greeks want to flee and will leave Troy without having destroyed it. She suggests to Athene to try to stop this flight. The future-desiderative φεύξονται is used besides the optative λίποιεν. Athene will rush to Odysseus and incite him to convince the Greeks to remain in Troy. In doing so, she will reuse Here's words (2,174-178).

There are two other instances, but they are a rework of a more ambiguous passage that will be discussed later on.

---

[45] In general the text by Van Thiel 2011 is followed.
Optatives are underlined, (future-)subjunctive forms are put in bold face and future--desiderative forms are italicised and put in bold.
[46] Unless noted otherwise, the translations are my own.

3.3. Near-imperative meaning

In our corpus there is one instance where the optative forms (again with modal particle) are used as an imperative (cf. the references above).

(EX.03) (248) οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ σέο φημὶ χερειότερον βροτὸν ἄλλον
(249) ἔμμεναι, ὅσσοι ἅμ' Ἀτρεΐδης ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον.
(250) τὼ οὐκ ἂν βασιλῆας ἀνὰ στόμ' ἔχων <u>ἀγορεύοις</u>,
(251) καί σφιν ὀνείδεά τε <u>προφέροις</u>, νόστόν τε <u>φυλάσσοις</u>. (*Iliad* 2,248-251).
"I state that no other human being belonging to the many ones that came with the Atreids to Troy, is inferior to you. Therefore you should not open your mouth and speak to the kings, nor put forwards hateful words to them and keep the homecoming safe."

In this passage Odysseus attacks Thersites for his arrogant and disruptive behaviour and tells him that since he is the ugliest man in the army, he has no right to speak on such a tone to the Greek commanders and that he should refrain from challenging their leadership. The optatives ἀγορεύοις, προφέροις and φυλάσσοις are used as imperatives here.

3.4. The so-called *optativus obliquus*

In Classical Greek the rule is that a subjunctive (and sometimes an indicative as well) in a subordinate clause can be substituted by an optative when the verb in the main clause or in the clause of which the subjunctive depends, is in the past. This substitution was not an absolute rule in Homeric Greek (and not even in Classical Greek, but that issue that cannot be addressed here). In general it is argued that the subjunctive is used after secondary tenses when there is still a connection with the present and/or when the speaker (or narrator) believes that the action can still be accomplished. This use is not limited to purpose clauses, but given the voluntative and/or expectative nature of the final clauses, the issue occurs very often in these clauses.[47] This means that after a past tense form the

---

[47] Most scholars seem to accept this distinction, as in Buttmann 1810: 485-486, von Thiersch 1826: 657-659, 681, Rost 1826: 476-477, 481-482, Matthiae 1827: 992-1002 for the purpose clauses, Bernhardy 1829: 401-402, Kühner 1835: 487-488, Krüger 1859: 102, 147, Delbrück 1871: 83, Monro (1891: 279-280, describing that the optative is used when immediate fulfilment is not envisaged), Ameis & Hentze 1898: 21, Chitil (1899, who called the subjunctive the *modus energeticus*), Mutzbauer 1903b: 632, Kühner & Gerth 1904: 380-381. Chantraine 1953: 269 pointed out that the subjunctive was more common

difference between subjunctive and optative is a semantic one and not mechanically regulated. In our corpus there are 8 optatives depending on a past tense (98, 98, 188, 198, 198, 215, 282 and 282, of which four have been called "iterative" as well, cf. infra).

> (EX.04) (95) τετρήχει δ' ἀγορή, ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα
> (96) λαῶν ἱζόντων, ὅμαδος δ' ἦν: ἐννέα δέ σφεας
> (97) κήρυκες βοόωντες ἐρήτυον, εἴ ποτ' ἀϋτῆς
> (98) <u>σχοίατ</u>', <u>ἀκούσειαν</u> δὲ διοτρεφέων βασιλήων. (*Iliad* 2,95-98).
> "The assembly was in turmoil, the earth groaned beneath it by the people who were sitting on it, there was noise (everywhere), nine heralds were shouting and trying to restrain (the soldiers) so that they would stop their cries and would listen to the kings who are nurtured by Zeus".

These lines describe the turmoil in the assembly and how nine heralds (vainly) try to restore calm and order in it to allow the leaders to speak. The optatives appear in a conditional clause, depending on a past tense, the imperfect ἐρήτυον. The choice of the optative in σχοίατ', ἀκούσειαν is deliberate and not metrically motived, as σχῶνται, ἀκούσωσιν would fit the metre as well. The reason why the optative was chosen is that the poet wanted to convey the message that it was by no means certain that the heralds would succeed in restoring order in the army. The optative expresses at the same time the possible and wish. The conditional clause here can be translated as "to see if, to make that" or "if only they … ".[48] It has the old notion of wish (and also purpose) still in it. As such, the optative use is not due to the fact that the verb of the main clause is in

---

in purpose clauses than the optative, even after verbs of the past and that the optative was used when there was a link with the past and the fulfilment was less certain (1953: 223, Chantraine & Casevitz 2015: 256).

Other scholars, such as Novotný 1857: 1 and Curtius (1864: 242, mentioning that the use of the subjunctive after secondary tenses was very rare), have also argued, however, that the traditional distinction was correct after all (subjunctive after primary tense and optative after secondary tense).

The issue was not addressed in Faesi 1862: 18-19, Düntzer 1863: 133-134 or in Hoekstra 1989: 182.

The distinctions between subjunctive and optative as described in Willmott (2007) can account for the different uses of the moods as well (I argued earlier that her analysis differs much less from earlier scholarship than she claimed it did).

[48] Lange 1872: 399.

the past, but because the speaker or narrator is uncertain about the actions and wishes them to come true.

> (EX.05) (278) ὣς φάσαν ἡ πληθύς: ἀνὰ δ' ὃ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεὺς
> (279) ἔστη σκῆπτρον ἔχων: παρὰ δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη
> (280) εἰδομένη κήρυκι σιωπᾶν λαὸν ἀνώγει,
> (281) ὡς ἅμα θ' οἳ πρῶτοί τε καὶ ὕστατοι υἷες Ἀχαιῶν
> (282) μῦθον <u>ἀκούσειαν</u> καὶ <u>ἐπιφρασσαίατο</u> βουλήν: (*Iliad* 2,278-282).
> "So the masses spoke. Citysacker Odysseus stood up, holding his sceptre. Owleyed Athene took the form of herald, (stood) next to him and ordered the army to keep quiet, so that the first and last sons of the Akhaians could hear his word and discuss his plan."

In this instance the optatives ἀκούσειαν and ἐπιφρασσαίατο appear in a purpose clause, depending on the pluperfect ἀνώγει. At first sight one could think that the optative is due to the fact that the verb is in the past, but in purpose clauses the subjunctive is more common than the optative, even after a past tense (see footnote 46), so that the mechanical substitution cannot be the explanation for the use of the mood. In this case the optative forms contain both the potential and wish nuance, and in my opinion the optative was chosen here, because the poet wanted to highlight that it was not certain at all that Odysseus and Athene would succeed in calming down the army and debating the proposals (as was the case in the previous example).

3.5. The *optativus iterativus*

The *optativus iterativus* refers to a repeated action in a subordinated clause that is dependent on a verb form in the past and could therefore be considered a special case of the previous instance. The question is whether or not the iterative notion is expressed by the optative. Many earlier scholars assumed that, as in later Attic, the optative in Homer could express iterativity,[49] while others assumed that this use did not yet exist in the conditional clauses.[50] As was the case with the category discussed

---

[49] Earlier scholars believed that the optative could in fact convey the iterative notion: Buttmann 1810: 502, Rost 1826: 464, Matthiae 1827: 1005-1008, Bernhardy 1829: 406-407, von Naegelsbach 1834: 91-92, Curtius 1864: 247, 250-251, Monro 1891: 279. See most recently also Jacquinod 2017: 692.

[50] Krüger 1859: 148, Lange 1872: 372-373, 401, Monro 1891: 284.

above, the optative itself might have expressed the possibility (in this case in the past) and the iterative notion might have come from the context.[51] We have four examples of such "iterative" optatives, and three of them occur in combination with the so-called Ionic-epic iteratives.[52] There are two examples of this in our corpus:

(EX.06) (188) ὅν τινα μὲν βασιλῆα καὶ ἔξοχον ἄνδρα κιχείη
(189) τὸν δ' ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσσιν ἐρητύσασκε παραστάς: (*Iliad* 2,188-189).
"Whichever king or virtuous man he could / would encounter, he would restrain with sweet words, standing next to him:"
(EX.07) (198) ὃν δ' αὖ δήμου τ' ἄνδρα ἴδοι βοόωντά τ' ἐφεύροι,
(199) τὸν σκήπτρῳ ἐλάσασκεν ὁμοκλήσασκέ τε μύθῳ: (*Iliad* 2,198-199)
"Whomever from the people he saw and noted to be shouting, he would drive forward with the sceptre and call him out with (this) word:"

In this instance Homer describes how Odysseus walks through the Greek army trying to restore order and stop the unforeseen and unplanned homecoming from taking place. When he encounters a high ranked official, he addresses him with respect and tries to convince him to stay. When he meets a common soldier, he chastises him and forcefully obliges him to remain silent and do what he is told. These lines are often quoted when the iterative optative is discussed,[53] but there is yet another example in our corpus, where an optative seems to have iterative meaning, but in this instance it is not combined with an Ionic-epic iterative form.

(EX.08) (211) ἄλλοι μέν ῥ' ἕζοντο, ἐρήτυθεν δὲ καθ' ἕδρας:
(212) Θερσίτης δ' ἔτι μοῦνος ἀμετροεπὴς ἐκολῴα,
(213) ὅς ῥ' ἔπεα φρεσὶν ᾗσιν ἄκοσμά τε πολλά τε ᾔδη
(214) μάψ, ἀτὰρ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, ἐριζέμεναι βασιλεῦσιν,
(215) ἀλλ' ὅ τι οἱ εἴσαιτο γελοίϊον Ἀργείοισιν

---

[51] Delbrück 1871: 223-227, Lange 1872: 372-373, 401, Kühner & Gerth 1898: 252-257, 1904: 427, Brugmann 1900: 508-509, Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 335-336, Chantraine 1953: 224-226, Pagniello 2007, Chantraine & Casevitz 2015: 257-258.

[52] For this combination see especially Stolpe 1849: 36-39, Týn 1860: 677-681, 685-686, Delbrück 1871: 223-227, 1897: 62-63, Kluge 1911: 56-57, Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 335-336, Zerdin 2002: 117-118, Pagniello 2007.

[53] Most of the scholars quoted in the previous footnotes use this example to prove that the optative has in fact iterative notion.

(216) ἔμμεναι: αἴσχιστος δὲ ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε: (*Iliad* 2,211-216).
"The others sat down and restrained themselves in their seats. Only Thersites, a man of endless speech, was still scolding. He knew many unfitting words in his mind to quarrel with the kings, in vain and inappropriately, with anything that appeared / could appear amusing to the Argives. He was the ugliest man that had come to Troy."

In these lines Homer describes Thersites and his predilection to quarrel with the leaders and to insult them, and to try to please the soldiers by saying anything that could please them.

We find the optatives in a relative clause, but the question is whether the optatives κιχείη, ἴδοι, ἐφεύροι and εἴσαιτο contain the iterative meaning or they have past potential meaning "was able to find, to see, what could appear" and obtain their iterative meaning from the context and the presence of the iterative forms in the main clause. The fact that also subjunctive forms can have the iterative nuance,[54] seems to argue that the iterative meaning is taken from the context and not from the form. An example of such an iterative subjunctive (not from our corpus) is

(EX.09) (416) ἦ μέν μιν περὶ σῆμα ἑοῦ ἑτάροιο φίλοιο
(417) ἕλκει ἀκηδέστως ἠὼς ὅτε δῖα φανήη (*Iliad* 24,416-417).
"Truly, he (repeatedly) drags him without respect around the grave of his beloved friend, until the daylight appears."
In this passage Hermes tells Priam that Akhilleus is in fact repeatedly mistreating Hektor's body, but that the gods are protecting him. It describes how whenever the sun rises, Akhilleus goes outside his tent and starts the "process" of mutilation again: binding the body to the chariot and dragging it around the city. This passage appears in a speech, whereas the passages quoted above are taken from narrative parts. Below I give the figures for the *Iliad* (without Books 2 and 10), and it becomes clear that the optative is proportionally used much more often in narrative than in speech.[55]

---

[54] This was already observed at least as early by Matthiae 1827: 1005-1008.
[55] This observation was already made by Leaf 1886: 38.

	Optative	Subjunctive	Future-subjunctive	% optative on optative and subjunctives	% optative on optative, subjunctive and future-subjunctives
Narrative					
Main clause	15	0	0		
Subordinate clause	131	84	25	61	55
Negative purpose clauses / negative wishes[56]	27	2	0	93	93
Overall	173	86	25	67	61

	Optative	Subjunctive	Future-subjunctive	% optative on optative and subjunctives	% optative on optative, subjunctive and future-subjunctives
Speeches					
Main clause	256	125	222	67	42
Subordinate clause	159	567	167	22	18
Negative purpose clauses / negative wishes	15	56	33	21	14
Overall	430	748	422	37	27

From the data quoted above it is clear that there is a preference for the optative (the mood of the lower / lowest probability when compared to the subjunctive) to appear in narrative. These two facts make it in my opinion more likely that the choice of the mood is decided upon by the likelihood of the occurrence, the closeness to the speaker, narrator, audience and their present situation, and not that the optative in itself contained the iterative notion.

---

[56] By this category I mean sentences that are introduced by μή (or a compound of it) and indicate a negative wish or a negative purpose clause (I included the figures of the *verba curandi* and *verba timendi* when the complement clause was introduced by μή, as these clauses were in origin paratactic).

3.6. The (past) potentialis and the counterfactual constructions

The next category where the optative is used, are the instances that seem to refer to a remote possibility or an unreal situation. In our corpus there are four passages where the optative is still used in this old meaning: 80-81, 123-128, 242, 372-373 (which combines the irrealis with an old wish) and 488-493 (which will be discussed later on in §5). I now discuss the examples in our corpus.

> (EX.10) (80) εἰ μέν τις τὸν ὄνειρον Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἔνισπε
> (81) ψεῦδός κεν <u>φαῖμεν</u> καὶ <u>νοσφιζοίμεθα</u> μᾶλλον: (*Iliad* 2,80-81).
> "If someone else of the Akhaians had told this dream, we would have called it a lie and would have rejected the idea."

In these lines Nestor reacts to Agamemnon's description of his dream and tells him that if someone else had told the story, no-one would have believed him. The reference is clearly to the past and to something that has not happened and the optatives φαῖμεν and νοσφιζοίμεθα are thus counterfactual. What is remarkable in this passage is that ἔνισπε is in the indicative and not in the optative, although one could argue that ἔνισπε could still contain an older optative ἐνίσποι (the optatives in the counterfactual and past potential constructions and in the unfulfillable wishes were only preserved in the epic language when they were guaranteed by the metre and have been "replaced" by indicatives when the metre allowed the substitution).

> (EX.11) (123) εἴ περ γάρ κ' <u>ἐθέλοιμεν</u> Ἀχαιοί τε Τρῶές τε
> (124) ὅρκια πιστὰ ταμόντες ἀριθμηθήμεναι ἄμφω,
> (125) Τρῶας μὲν λέξασθαι ἐφέστιοι ὅσσοι ἔασιν,
> (126) ἡμεῖς δ' ἐς δεκάδας <u>διακοσμηθεῖμεν</u> Ἀχαιοί,
> (127) Τρώων δ' ἄνδρα ἕκαστον <u>ἑλοίμεθα</u> οἰνοχοεύειν,
> (128) πολλαί κεν δεκάδες <u>δευοίατο</u> οἰνοχόοιο. (*Iliad* 2,123-128).
> "For if we, both Akhaians and Trojans, were willing, to swear a faithful oath and to have ourselves counted, and if the Trojans should gather themselves, all those who have their homes in the city, and we, Akhaians, should be grouped by tens, and we should choose each man of the Trojans to pour wine, then many divisions of ten would lack a wine pourer."

In these lines Agamemnon tries to convince the soldiers that they should win the war easily since they vastly outnumber the Trojans. To do

this he uses a fictitious comparison with verbs in the optative of the number of Trojans that could serve as wine pourer to groups of ten Greeks.

(EX.12) ἦ γὰρ ἂν Ἀτρεΐδη νῦν ὕστατα λωβήσαιο. (*Iliad* 2,242).
"Indeed, son of Atreus, you would then have committed your last outrage."

In this instance Thersites attacks Agamemnon by saying that if Akhilleus had not been so restrained, he (Ag) would have abused his power for the last time. The optative λωβήσαιο clearly refers to the past and to something that has not taken place.

(EX.13) (371) αἲ γὰρ Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον
(372) τοιοῦτοι δέκα μοι συμφράδμονες εἶεν Ἀχαιῶν:
(373) τῶ κε τάχ' ἠμύσειε πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος
(374) χερσὶν ὑφ' ἡμετέρησιν ἁλοῦσά τε περθομένη τε (*Iliad* 2,371-374).
"If only, oh Father Zeus, Athene and Apollon, there were ten such men among the Akhaians with the same thinking, then soon the city of ruler Priam would have gone down, taken and destroyed by our hands."

In these lines Agamemnon states that if only he had ten men with Nestor's intelligence in the army, he would have been able to take Troy very rapidly. In this specific example the conditional clause αἲ γὰρ … εἶεν is still used in its wish-meaning "if only there were … ",[57] but one can see how from this wish-construction, the conditional constructions might have arisen. Noteworthy is that an optative is used in both the wish and the "main" clause, and that they refer to unrealised and unrealisable events.

3.7. A (deliberately?) ambiguous example

(EX.14) (11) θωρῆξαί ἑ κέλευε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιοὺς
(12) πανσυδίῃ: νῦν γάρ κεν ἕλοι πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν (*Iliad* 2,11-12).
"Order him to gear up the longhaired Akhaians with all speed, since now he might / could / will take the city (of the Trojans) with its wide streets."

In this instance the use of the optative is less obvious than it seems. In these lines Zeus tells Oneiros ("Dream") to go to Agamemnon and tell him to prepare the army for an attack on Troy, as the hour to take the city might have come / has come. At first sight one could think that the optative

---

[57] Lange 1872: 347-348.

ἕλοι is used here with the meaning of a future "he will take, he is able to take the city" (as was discussed in §4.2), but I suspect that by using the optative and not the subjunctive or future-desiderative Zeus (or Homer himself) wanted to cast some doubt on this (or already foreshadow the failure), as ἕλοι could also mean "he could have taken".[58] When the dream went to Agamemnon, it used the same verb to address him (2,28-29) and when he related his dream to the leaders of the army, he again used the same optative form (2,65-66). This ambiguity is missing in the discourse of the Dream to Agamemnon and in Agamemnon's description of the dream to the leaders of the army, not because it is grammatically excluded, but because Agamemnon is unaware of it (or is unwilling to see it). Because of this intended ambiguity, I the reading ἕλοι is to be preferred over ἕλοις, which is also attested, but would require an abrupt transition into direct speech and would remove the deliberately ambivalent message.

(EX.15) (28) θωρῆξαί σ' ἐκέλευε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιοὺς
(29) πανσυδίῃ· νῦν γάρ κεν ἕλοις πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν (*Iliad* 2,28-29 = 65-66).[59]
"He ordered you to gear up the longhaired Akhaians with all speed, since now you might take the city (of the Trojans) with its wide streets."

In this instance an interpretation of a remote possibility makes no sense, as it would undermine. This passage will be resumed later on again when Athene addresses Odysseus and orders him to convince the Greeks to remain in Troy and to prevent their return home (2,175-180).

4. Subjunctive and optative besides each other

In two passages an optative appears besides a subjunctive. As was briefly touched upon earlier, the subjunctives (future-subjunctives and the "genuine" ones) all indicate that the action is likely to occur (in the mind of the narrator or speaker). We will now discuss them and see how/if the

---

[58] This ambiguity was not addressed in the commentaries of this passage. Willmott 2008: 246-247 notes a difference in meaning between the passages, but does not ascribe to the different degrees of possibility.

[59] Here I deviate slightly from Van Thiel's text: he (2011: 23) printed θωρῆξαί σε κέλευε in *Iliad* 2,65, but that reading violates a metrical law, that was called "Nikanor & Meyer" elsewhere and that states that a word starting in the first foot of the hexameter should not end at the trochee of the second foot (σε is an enclitic and belongs to the preceding word).

difference in moods can be explained (the (future-)subjunctives are put in bold face and the future-desideratives are put in bold and italic font, while the optatives are underlined).

(EX.16) (258) εἴ κ' ἔτι σ' ἀφραίνοντα κιχήσομαι ὥς νύ περ ὧδε,
(259) μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆϊ κάρη ὤμοισιν ἐπείη,
(260) μηδ' ἔτι Τηλεμάχοιο πατὴρ κεκλημένος εἴην,
(261) εἰ μὴ ἐγώ σε λαβὼν ἀπὸ μὲν φίλα εἵματα δύσω,
(262) χλαῖνάν τ' ἠδὲ χιτῶνα, τά τ' αἰδῶ ἀμφικαλύπτει,
(263) αὐτὸν δὲ κλαίοντα θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας ἀφήσω
(264) πεπληγὼς ἀγορῆθεν ἀεικέσσι πληγῇσιν. (*Iliad* 2,258-264).
"If I find you again as you do now, let the head of Odysseus no longer be on his shoulders nor let me be called the father of Telemakhos any longer, if I do not take your beloved garments, remove your cloak and mantle from you, that cover your private parts, and send you yourself crying away to the fast ships after I hit you away from the assembly with humiliating blows."

These lines are taken from Odysseus' attack on Thersites. He threatens him that if he (T) challenges the leaders of the army again, he will seriously beat him, remove his clothes and chase him towards the ships while he will be weeping. There is a clear distinction between the moods: the subjunctive and desiderative forms (the future-subjunctives κιχήσομαι and δύσω; and the future-desiderative ἀφήσω) refer to actions that Odysseus controls himself and thus considers to be very likely to happen (noticing that Thersites challenges the leaders, removing his clothes and chasing him towards the ships), while the optatives (ἐπείη and εἴην) refer to something that is outside his own power (namely that his head will fall from his shoulders and that he will no longer be called Telemakhos' father) and which he considers less likely to happen, because he knows that he will severely punish Thersites if he forces him to do so.

(EX.17) (488) πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
(489) οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ᾽ εἶεν,
(490) φωνὴ δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη,
(491) εἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
(492) θυγατέρες μνησαίαθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον:
(493) ἀρχοὺς αὖ νηῶν ἐρέω νῆάς τε προπάσας (*Iliad* 2,488-493).
"I will not be able to tell nor name the multitude (of men), not even if I had ten tongues and ten mouths, and an unbreakable voice and a bronze heart

were inside me, unless the Olympian Muses, daughters of Zeus, were to remember how many men had come to Troy. I will name the leaders of the ships and all the ships (as well).”

In these lines Homer announces that enumerating all the leaders and their contingents is an impossible task and that he will not do so, not even if he had ten mouths and tongues,

The distinction we observed in the previous example is valid here as well: the future-subjunctive μυθήσομαι and the subjunctive ὀνομήνω (and also the future-desiderative ἐρέω) refer to an action the narrator (in this specific case Homer himself) can(not) do, namely enumerate all soldiers and describe the leaders and their ships. The optatives εἶεν, ἐνείη and μνησαίαθ᾽ refer to actions that are outside the will and possibility of the narrator (he cannot have ten mouths and has no bronze tongue, nor has he power over the Muses), and even outside the possible altogether and could therefore even be considered unreal or counterfactual.

5. The debated instance: *Iliad* 2,3-4, optative or subjunctive?

Now I will address the passage where both subjunctive and optative were transmitted and/or where there is debate about the correct reading (the disputed forms are put in italics).

(EX.18) (1) ἄλλοι μέν ῥα θεοί τε καὶ ἀνέρες ἱπποκορυσταὶ
(2) εὗδον παννύχιοι, Δία δ' οὐκ ἔχε νήδυμος ὕπνος,
(3) ἀλλ' ὅ γε μερμήριζε κατὰ φρένα ὡς Ἀχιλῆα
(4) *τιμήσῃ / τιμήσει / τιμήσει' / τιμήσαι* , *ὀλέσῃ / ὀλέσει / ὀλέσαι* δὲ πολέας ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν. (*Iliad* 2,1-4).
“The other gods and the mortals who bear helmets on their horses were sleeping throughout the entire night, but sweet sleep did not take hold of Zeus. He on the other hand was thinking in his mind how to honour Akhilleus and destroy many Akhaians by their ships.”

In these lines Homer describes how all the gods and human soldiers are sleeping, but that Zeus is unable to fall asleep as he is pondering how he can grant honour to Akhilleus and destroy (at least temporarily) the Greek army. The verb μερμήριζε is a past tense, to which an indirect question (or purpose clause) is subordinated. All codices have the future- -subjunctive forms τιμήσῃ and ὀλέσῃ, but two skholia have the form

τιμήσει (which could be interpreted as the optative τιμήσει' with elided -ε) and one codex has ὀλέσει. As the verb of the main clause is a past tense, many scholars have argued that the (future-)subjunctive forms are wrong here and that the optative is the correct form. Voss (cf. supra) changed τιμήση and ὀλέση into τιμήσαι and ὀλέσαι, because τιμήσει' and ὀλέσαι would destroy the *Gleichklang* of these two forms. [60] Ameis adopted the change into ὀλέσαι and interpreted τιμήσει as an optative in -ει (cf. supra).[61] Voss' corrections have been adopted by Cauer,[62] while other have preferred to combine the reading of the skholia and that of Voss, printing τιμήσει' and ὀλέσαι.[63] There are two related questions, however: the first question is if the use of the optative is mandatory after a past tense verb and the second is whether or not the subjunctive can be defended. As was discussed in §.4.4 (cf. footnote 46), the subjunctive is not uncommon at all after verbs of the past. As was argued there the subjunctive is used when there is a link with the present and/or when (the speaker/narrator believes that) the action is likely to occur. In this specific instance it is clearly Zeus' intention to honour the request and as he is the most supreme god, he is certain that he will succeed in accomplishing this.[64] Some other, less likely, explanations of the subjunctive were also made, namely that the construction of the direct speech was transferred unchanged into the indirect speech,[65] or that the subjunctive was used here *in dubitativem Sinne*.[66] Leaf pointed out that while subjunctives after a secondary tense are mostly found in speech and not in narrative (cf. the figures quoted in §4.5), one could argue that the optatives were correct here, but he also assumed that this passage deliberately echoed *Iliad* 1,559 (a suggestion not only made by him).[67] The passage of *Iliad* 1 occurs in a speech:

---

[60] Voss 1828: 228-229, also quoted in Voss & Voss 1838: 30.

[61] Ameis 1868a: 42.

[62] Cauer 1890: lv, 28.

[63] Bekker (1858: 22, without mentioning Voss), Faesi 1858: 76, Düntzer (1866: 64 - ruling out the existence of an optative in -ει), Naber 1877: 99, Monro 1891: 281.

[64] La Roche (1869: 240-245, 1870: 36 "wie er ehren werde", 1873: 29), Ameis & Hentze 1896: 111.

[65] Von Thiersch (1826: 681, not excluding the correction into the optative), von Naegelsbach 1834: 90-92.

[66] Von Thiersch 1826: 681, Ameis & Hentze 1884: 45.

[67] Leaf 1886: 38.

(EX.19) (558) τῇ σ' ὀΐω κατανεῦσαι ἐτήτυμον ὡς Ἀχιλῆα
(559) τιμήσῃς / τιμήσεις / τιμήσαις , ὀλέσῃς / ὀλέσεις / ὀλέσαις δὲ πολέας
ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν. (*Iliad* 1,558-559)
"I think that you bowed (your head) in agreement to her that you will honour
Akhilleus and destroy many at the ships of the Akhaians."

In these lines Here fears that Thetis begged Zeus to avenge Akhilleus
and to bring death and destruction to the Akhaians until they rehabilitate
him. The future-subjunctives τιμήσῃς and ὀλέσῃς are used in a speech, but
also indicate that Here is certain that since Zeus has nodded his head, death
and destruction will come to the Greek army. These forms were debated as
well, as Naber argued that they should be optatives, because κατανεῦσαι
referred to the past,[68] while von Naegelsbach stated that the optative should
be used if Here described Thetis' standpoint and the future form (hence
τιμήσεις and ὀλέσεις) if Here described her own viewpoint.[69] In my opinion,
neither suggestion is necessary. First, the distinction between optative and
subjunctive is one of expectation and possibility. As Here has heard the
thunder on the Olympos and as she knows Zeus, she expects / fears that he
will accomplish the deeds. The actions are therefore much more than a wish
from the side of Thetis. In addition, as I argued above, the distinction between
future-indicative and subjunctive aorist of the verbs with a regular sigmatic
future and a sigmatic aorist is impossible to make (at least from a writing
perspective). As to Naber's suggestion, it is true that κατανεῦσαι refers to
the past, but the use of the aorist might also have been aspectual, namely
that Zeus nodded his head only once. Moreover, Naber's assumption that
all subjunctives would need to be changed into optatives after a secondary
verb form would require a substantial amount of corrections, which begs
the question why and how this "errors" would have occurred during the
transmission (assuming that the optative had become moribund and hence
unknown to the copyists is in my opinion insufficient).

For all these reasons the choice for the future-subjunctive forms τιμήσῃ
and ὀλέσῃ in *Iliad* 2,3-4 seems the most logical and there is therefore no
reason to change the transmitted forms.[70]

---

[68] Naber 1877: 99.
[69] Von Naegelsbach 1834: 83.
[70] The subjunctive has been adopted by Monro & Allen 1902 *on this passage*, West
1998: 39, Van Thiel 2011: 21. Kirk 1985: 115 agreed that the subjunctive was most likely
correct, but did not rule out that the optative of the skholia could not be excluded.

Conclusion

In this article I addressed the use of the optative in *Iliad* 2,1-493 in contrast with the subjunctive and indicative. I started by providing an overview into existing scholarship on the use of the moods in Homer. Then I described how I catalogued the forms and focused particularly on the distinction between subjunctive aorist and future indicative forms. While this distinction is clear in Attic Greek, many of these forms are metrically and also palaeographically equivalent (many dialects, including Attic until 403 BC, could not distinguish in writing between long and short vowels). Those equivalent forms were catalogued as "future-subjunctive" forms, the "real" futures were called "future-desideratives" and the aorist subjunctives that could not be sigmatic future forms were catalogued as aorist subjunctives. After finishing that formal analysis, I proceeded to the actual analysis, focusing on the optative, the mood that could span almost the entire spectrum of what was described as "wish" or "possible", from very likely and fulfillable over possible until unlikely and impossible and unfulfillable. In doing so I specifically addressed the issue of (a) the iterative and oblique optative, and argued that they do not constitute a grammatically defined category that is mandatory, but are a consequence from the context, (b) on those optative forms that seem to refer to the very unlikely and even unreal and (c) on the instances where the optative was used together with another mood, the indicative in 2,80-81 and the (future-) subjunctive in 2,258-264 and 2,488-493. Finally, I briefly discussed 2,1-4 where all codices have the subjunctive after a secondary tense verb form, but where some scholars wanted to change the subjunctive into an optative. In my opinion this change is unnecessary. This brief analysis has indeed shown that the optative can have a wide variety of meanings that can all be subsumed under the spectrum of the "possible" and "wish" in all varying degrees of likelihood.

Bibliography

Aken, A. F. (1861), *Die Grundzüge der Lehre von Tempus und Modus im Grie-chischen: historisch und vergleichend aufgestellt*. Rostock: Stiller.

Aken, A. F. (1865), *Die Hauptdata der griechischen Tempus- und Moduleher, historisch und vergleichend*. Berlin: Enslin.

Ameis, K. F. (1868a), *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Erster Band. Erstes Heft. Gesang 1-3*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K. F. (1868b), *Anhang zu Homers Odyssee Schulausgabe. Erläuterungen zu Gesang XIX - XXIV*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K. F. & Hentze, C. (1871), *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XIX-XXIV*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K. F. & Hentze, C. (1884), *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang I-III. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K. F. & Hentze, C. (1888), *Homers Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XXII-XXIV*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K. F. & Hentze, C. (1896), *Anhang zu Homers Ilias Schulausgabe. Erläuterungen zu Gesang I - III*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K. F. & Hentze, C. (1898), *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang XIII-XVIII. Leipzig: Teubner.

Ameis, K. F. & Hentze, C. (1900), *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang I - VI*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Barnes, J. (1711), *Homeri Ilias & Odyssea. Et in easdem* Scholia, sive Interpretatio, *Veterum*. Cambridge: Cornfield.

Basset, L. (1989), *La syntaxe de l'imaginaire*: *études des modes et des négations dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée.

Bechtel, F. (1884), "Die inschriftlichen denkmäler des arkadischen dialects", *BB* 8: 301-327.

Bechtel, F. (1921), *Die griechischen Dialekte. Erster Band. Der lesbische, thessalische, böotische, arkadische und kyprische Dialekt*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bechtel, F. (1924), *Die griechischen Dialekte. Dritter Band. Der ionische Dialekt*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bekker, I. (1858), *Carmina Homerica. Volumen Prius. Ilias*. Bonn: Marcus.

Bernhardy, G. (1829), *Wissenschaftliche Syntax der griechischen Sprache*. Berlin: Duncker und Humblot.

Bizos, M. (1961), *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris: Vuibert.

Blümel, W. (1982), *Die aiolischen Dialekte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Brügger, C. (2017), *Homer Iliad. The Basel Commentary. Book XXIV*. Translated by Benjamin W. Millis and Sara Strack. Edited by S. Douglas Olson. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Brugmann, K. (1880), "Beiträge zur conjugationslehre: Der sogenannte unechte conjunctiv.", in K. Brugmann & H. Osthoff (eds.), *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Volume 3). Leipzig: Hirzel, 1-16.

Brugmann, K. (1890), *Griechische Grammatik*. München: Beck.

Brugmann, K. (1900), *Griechische Grammatik*. München: Beck.

Brugmann, K. (1904), *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg.

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

Brugmann, K. (1925), *Die Syntax des einfachen Satzes im Indogermanischen*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Brunel, J. (1980), "Les périodes conditionnelles du grec et le problème de l'optatif.", *BSL* 75: 227-261.

Buck, C. D. (1910), *The Greek Dialects*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Buttmann, P. (1810), *Griechische Grammatik*. Fünfte, vermehrte und verbesserte Ausgabe. Berlin: in der Myliussischen Buchhandlung.

Buttmann, P. (1830), *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre*. Erster Band. Berlin: Dümmler.

Buttmann, P. (1854), *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin: Dümmler.

Cauer, P. (1890), *Homeri Ilias in Scholarum Usum edidit Paulus Cauer. Pars I: Carm. I - XII*. Leipzig: Freytag.

Chantraine, P. (1948), *Grammaire homérique*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Chantraine, P. (1953), *Grammaire homérique. Tome II. Syntaxe*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Chantraine, P. (1964), *Morphologie historique du grec*. Deuxième édition revue et augmentée. Paris: Klincksieck.

Chantraine, P. & Casevitz, M. (2015), *Grammaire homérique. Tome II : Syntaxe*. Nouvelle édition revue et corrigée par Michel Casevitz. Paris: Klincksieck.

Chitil, C. (1899), *Zur Konstruktion der Finalsätze im Griechischen*. Waidhausen an der Thaya: Verlag des Realgymnasiums.

Cristofaro, S. (2012), "Descriptive notions vs. grammatical categories: Unrealized states of affairs and 'irrealis' ", *LS* 34: 131-146.

Curtius, G. (1864), *Griechische Schulgrammatik. Zweite Auflage*. Prag: Tempsky.

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

De Decker, F. (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/

De Decker, F. (2021), "A look at some (alleged) morpho-syntactic isoglosses between Greek and Anatolian: the modal particle in epic Greek", in F.

Giusfredi & Z. Simon & E. Martínez Rodríguez (eds.), *Studies in the languages and language contact in Pre-Hellenistic Anatolia*. Barcelona: Institut del Pròxim Orient Antic (IPOA), Facultat de Filologia, Universitat de Barcelona, 101-189.

Delaunois, M. (1988), *Essai de syntaxe grecque classique*. Leuven: Peeters.

Delbrück, B. (1871), *Syntaktische Forschungen I. Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

Delbrück, B. (1879), *Syntaktische Forschungen IV. Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.

Delbrück, B. (1897), *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II. Strassburg: Karl Trübner.

Delbrück, B. (1902), "Die Grundbegriffe der Kasus und Modi", *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und Deutsche Literatur, und für Pädagogik* 5: 317-336.

De Mol, G. (2015), *Het modale partikel ἄν / κε(ν) / κα. Een bijdrage aan de Griekse Grammatica DyLEGRam*. MA thesis. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

Dubois, L. (1986), *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien 1. Grammaire*. Louvain--la-Neuve: Presses de l'université.

Düntzer, H. (1863), *Homers Odyssee. Erklärende Schulausgabe. Zweites Heft. Buch IX - XVI*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Düntzer, H. (1864), *Homers Odyssee. Erklärende Schulausgabe. Drittes Heft. Buch XVII - XXIV. Nebst Register*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Düntzer, H. (1866), *Homers Ilias. Erklärende Schulausgabe. Erstes Heft. Buch I - VIII*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Faesi, J. U. (1858), *Homers Iliade, erklärt von J. U. Faesi*. Erster Band. Berlin: Weidmann.

Faesi, J. U. (1862), *Homers Odyssee, erklärt von J. U. Faesi*. Zweiter Band. Berlin: Weidmann.

Franke, A. (1861), Über die Bildung der Futura im Griechischen. Lingen: Sattler.

Fritz, M. (2010), "Indogermanische Syntax", in M. Meier-Brügger, *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 374-412.

Gerth, B. (1878), *Grammatisch-Kritisches zur griechischen Moduslehre*. Dresden: Programm des Königlichen Gymnasiums zu Dresden-Neustadt.

Gildersleeve, B. L. (1900), *Syntax of Classical Greek*. New York & Cincinatti & Chicago: American Book Company.

Gonda, J. (1956), *The Character of the Indo-European Moods*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.

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

Greenberg, J. (1986), "The realis-irrealis continuum in the Classical Greek conditional", in E. Closs Traugott et al. (eds.), *On Conditionals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 247-264.

Hahn, A. (1953), *Subjunctive and Optative: Their Origins as Futures*. New York: American Philological Association.

Hammerschmidt, K. (1892), Über die Grundbedeutung von Koniunktiv und Optativ und ihr Verhältnis zu den Temporibus. Erlangen: Drück der Universitätsdrückerei von E. Th. Jacob.

Hettrich, H. (1992), "Lateinische Konditionalsätze in sprachvergleichender Sicht", in O. Panagl & T. Krisch (eds), *Latein und Indogermanisch*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 263-284.

Hettrich, H. (1998), "Die Entstehung des homerischen Irrealis der Vergangenheit", in J. Jasanoff, C. Melchert & O. Lisi (eds), *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 261-270.

Hoekstra, A. (1989), "Books XIII-XVI", in A. Heubeck & A. Hoekstra (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume II: Books IX-XVI*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 147-287.

Hoffmann, O. (1891), *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange. 1 Band: Der süd-achäische Dialekt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Humbert, J. (1960), *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Jacquinod, B. (2017), "The Syntax of Greek ", in M. Fritz, B. Joseph & J. Klein (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics I*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 682-695.

Kirk, G. (1985), *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kluge, H. (1911), *Syntaxis Graecae quaestiones selectae*. Inauguraldissertation Berlin.

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

Krisch, T. (1986), Überlegungen zur Herkunft und Entwicklung der irrealen Konditionalsätze des Altgriechischen. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.

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

Kühner, R. (1835), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Wissenschaftlich und mit Rücksicht auf dem Schulgebrauch*. Weiter Theil. Hannover: im Verlage der Hahnschen Hofbuchhandlung.

Kühner, R. (1870), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Zweite Auflage in durchaus neuer Bearbeitung. Zweiter Theil, erste Abtheilung. Hannover: Hahnsche Hofbuchhandlung.

Kühner, R. & Gerth, B. (1898), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre*. Erster Band. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Kühner, R. & Gerth, B. (1904), *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre*. Zweiter Band. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Lange, L. (1872), *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel EI*. Leipzig: Hirzel.

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

La Roche, J. (1869), *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: Teubner.

La Roche, J. (1870), *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang I-IV*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.

La Roche, J. (1871), *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XXI-XXIV*. Berlin: Ebeling & Plahn.

La Roche, J. (1873), *Homeri Ilias ad fidem librorum optimorum edidit J. La Roche. Pars prior*. Leipzig: Teubner.

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

Leaf, W. (1886), *Homer: The Iliad*. I: Books I-XII. London: Macmillan.

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

Madvig, J. (1847), *Syntax der griechischen Sprache, besonders der attischen Sprachform, für Schulen*. Braunschweig: Friedrich Dieweg und Sohn.

Masius, R. (1885), Über den Gebrauch des Konjunktiv in unabhängigen Sätzen bei Homer. Glogau: Flemming: Karl Gerhard.

Matthiae, A. (1826), *Ausführliche griechische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Friedrich Vogel.

Mein, A. (1903), *De optativi obliqui usu Homerico. Pars I. De sententiis obliquis aliunde pendentibus primariis*. Bonn: Karl Gerhard.

Methner, R. (1908), *Die Grundbedeutungen und Gebrauchstypen der Modi im Griechischen*. Bromberg: Dittmann.

Monro, D. (1891), *Homeric Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Monro, D. & Allen, T. (1902), *Homeri Opera: Iliadis libros I - XII continens*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

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

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

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

Naber, S. A. (1877), *Quaestiones Homericae*. Amsterdam. (Reprinted as separatum from *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde*, *deel* 11).

Novotný, E. (1857), *Beiträge zur Lehre vom Finalsatze in der homerischen Sprache*. Prag: Druck der königlich-kaiserlichen Schulbuchdruckerei.

Pagniello, F. (2007), "The past-iterative and the augment in Homer", *IF* 112: 105-123.

Polsley, C. C. (2019), *Contrafactual Structures in Ancient Greek Narrative*. PhD Thesis Yale. Published online.

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

Rix, H. (1992), *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. 2. erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage.

Rossbach, A. & Westphal, R. (1856), *Griechische Metrik nach den einzelnen Strophengattungen und metrischen Stilarten*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Rost, V. (1826), *Griechische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Ruijgh, C. J. (1992), "L'emploi le plus ancien et les emplois plus récents de la particule κε/ ἄν.", in F. Létoublon (ed.), *La langue et les textes en grec ancien. Actes du Colloque Pierre Chantraine*. Amsterdam: Gieben, 75-84.

Savelsberg, M. J. (1867a), "Lautwandel von σ in κ. II. Im Inlaut. *KZ* 16. 401-420.

Savelsberg, M. J. (1867b), "Die aoriste ἔδωκα, ἔθηκα, ἧκα.", in: (no editor) *Symbola philologorum bonnensium in honorem Friderici Ritschelii collecta*. Leipzig: Teubner, 505-528.

Schulze, W. (1885), "Zum Dialect der ältesten ionischen Inschriften", *Hermes* 20: 491-494.

Schwyzer, E. (1939), *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München: Beck.

Schwyzer, E. & Debrunner, A. (1950), *Griechische Grammatik. Teil II.Syntax*. München: Beck.

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

Seiler, H. (1993), "Satzverbindung in Konditionalgefüge (besonders im Altgriechischen)", *CFS* 47: 143-158.

Slotty, J. (1915), *Der Gebrauch des Konjunktivs und Optativs in den griechischen Dialekten. I. Der Hauptsatz*. Göttingen: Universitätsbuchdruckerei von F.A. Huth.

Smyth, H. (1894), *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects. I. Ionic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smyth, H. & Messing, G. (1956), *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Spitzer, J. (1883), *Lautlehre des arkadischen Dialektes*. Kiel: Schmidt & Klaunig.

Stahl, J. M. (1907), *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Stolpe, A. (1849), *Iterativorum Graecorum vis ac natura ex usu Homeri atque Herodoti demonstrata*. Bratislava: Klein.

Strunk, K. (1997), "Vom Mykenischen bis zum klassischen Griechisch", in H.-G. Nesselrath (ed.), *Einleitung in de griechische Philologie*. Leipzig: Teubner, 135-155.

Tabachovitz, D. (1951), *Homerische ei Sätze. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*. Lund: Gleerup.

Tichy, E. (2006), *Der Konjunktiv und seine Nachbarkategorien*. Bremen: Hempen.

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

Vandaele, H. (1897), *L'optatif grec*. Paris: Bouillon.

Van Emde Boas, E., De Bakker, M., Huitink, L. & Rijksbaron, A. (2019), *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Pottelbergh, R. (1939), *Over de Geschiedenis en de Beteekenis van den EI-zin in het Grieksch*. Gent Claeys-Verheughe.

Van Thiel, H. (2010), *Homeri Ilias*. Second edition. Hildesheim: Olms.

Veitch, W. (1879), *Greek Verbs. Defective and Irregular*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Vogrinz, G. (1889), *Grammatik des homerischen Dialektes*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Von Bäumlein, W. F. (1846), *Untersuchungen über die griechischen Modi und die Partikeln κέν und ἄν*. Heilbronn: Johann Ulrich Landherr.

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

von Thiersch, F. W. (1818), *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialects*. Leipzig: Gerhard Fleischer.

von Thiersch, F. W. (1826), *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialektes*. Leipzig: Gerhard Fleischer.

Voss, J. H. (1828), *Kritische Blätter, nebst geographischen Abhandlungen*. Erster Band. Stuttgart: in der J.B. Metzschler'schen Buchhandlung.

Voss, A. & Voss J. H. (1838), *Anmerkungen und Randglossen zu Griechen und Römern von J. H. Voss, herausgegeben von Adam Voss*. Leipzig: Müller.

Wackernagel, J. (1897), *Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde*. Basel: Fr. Reinhardt, Universitätsdruckerei.

Walter, A. (1923), *Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktivs im Griechischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Weber, P. (1884), *Entwickelungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze. I: Von Homer bis zur attischen Prosa*. Würzburg: A. Stuber's Verlagshandlung.

West, M. (1998), *Homerus Ilias. Volumen I: Rhapsodiae I - XII*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Westphal, R. (1868), *Griechische Metrik von A. Rossbach und R. Westphal, neu bearbeitet von R. Westphal*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Wilhelmi, W. (1881), *De modo irreali, qui dicitur*. Marburg: Robert Friedrich.

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

Willi, A. (2018), *Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willmott, J. (2007), *The Moods of Homeric Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willmott, J. (2008), "The 'Potential' Optative in Homeric Greek", *CCJ* 54: 237-251.

Zerdin, J. (2002), "The 'Iterative-Intensives' in -σκ", *Oxford Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 103-130.

Online resources:

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/inst/tsearch.jsp

Chicago Homer: https://homer.library.northwestern.edu/html/application.html

Perseus: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:collection:Greco-Roman

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)