



You have downloaded a document from  
**RE-BUŚ**  
repository of the University of Silesia in Katowice

**Title:** On studies in some systematic and interpretational aspects of Greek syntax : "Modus potentialis"

**Author:** Łukasz Tofilski

**Citation style:** Tofilski Łukasz. (2005). On studies in some systematic and interpretational aspects of Greek syntax : "Modus potentialis". "Scripta Classica" (Vol. 2 (2005), s. 83-95).



Uznanie autorstwa - Użycie niekomercyjne - Bez utworów zależnych Polska - Licencja ta zezwala na rozpowszechnianie, przedstawianie i wykonywanie utworu jedynie w celach niekomercyjnych oraz pod warunkiem zachowania go w oryginalnej postaci (nie tworzenia utworów zależnych).



UNIwersYTET ŚLĄSKI  
W KATOWICACH



Biblioteka  
Uniwersytetu Śląskiego



Ministerstwo Nauki  
i Szkolnictwa Wyższego

---

Lukasz Tofilski

University of Silesia, Katowice

## On Studies in Some Systematic and Interpretational Aspects of Greek Syntax – *Modus Potentialis*

System frame of the function of the construction discussed in the article is based on the fundamental works connected with Greek syntax. The most important, not to say, basic descriptive grammar is H.W. Smythe's<sup>1</sup> *Greek Grammar*. It is as much detailed as extensive, that it may be the reference point for any discussion, as well as other grammar books such as: R. Kühner's & Gerth's<sup>2</sup>, W.W. Goodwin's<sup>3</sup> or E. Schwytzer's & A. Debrunner's<sup>4</sup> *Greek Grammars*. The question of moods and their usage in ancient Greek has been widely discussed in many works, but the lack of a book that refers only to the main area of our interest here, which is the use of the optative mood with ἄν/κε(ν) particle is quite surprising. There is still a need for more detailed studies of the syntax and, generally, the language of the ancient texts than it has been provided so far, as many scholars noticed it. More than one hundred years ago W.W. Goodwin said: "The vague notions so often expressed on the Greek Moods, even by scholars of otherwise high attainments, are in strange contrast with the accuracy demanded by scientific scholarship of other departments. If the study of language is to retain its present place

---

<sup>1</sup> H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge 1920–1984.

<sup>2</sup> R. Kühner, B. Gerth: *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Leverkusen 1890–1955.

<sup>3</sup> W.W. Goodwin: *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. London 1900–1929.

<sup>4</sup> E. Schwytzer, A. Debrunner: *Griechische Grammatik*. Bd. 2. *Syntax und Griechische Grammatik, Syntaktische Stylistik*. Munich 1940.

(or indeed any prominent place), it must be conducted on strictly scientific principles, and above all with the scientific accuracy”<sup>5</sup>.

There are also few papers concerning functions of the particle itself in general or referring to it partially. The most important and outstanding one is F. Slotty’s<sup>6</sup> work from the beginning of the previous century. His innovative approach to divisions in grammar moods consists in finding them artificial and inappropriate. He tries to show similarities rather than differences between the mood functions, claiming that “die Grenzen Fliessen sind”<sup>7</sup>. He does not follow his predecessors’ researches in order to present “Grundbegriff der Modi”, but focuses on the usage of the constructions in particular dialects, i.e. in the works of the writers using them. As a result, he succeeds in giving division comprising in a great part a functional dimension. This in turn results in stressing the role of the particle in the act of communication, which is shown in the structure of the contents. He discusses separately “der blosser Konjunktiv” and “mit Modalpartikel” in prospective and voluntative function (*Sinne*). Further on, he deals the same way with the optative in the voluntative and potential function.

Each of the paragraphs presents narrow usage of the optative within each function, and so the optative with the ᾠ particle was discussed accordingly to how the author perceives its usage<sup>8</sup>. He discerns potential usage of the construction in questions and in voluntative function “als Willensbezeichnung, als Wunschbezeichnung, als Befehl oder Gebot, in deliberativen Sinne, in wünschenden Fragen, in konzessiver Bedeutung”. On the grounds of *koine* he formulates the view<sup>9</sup> that the usage of potential optative without the particle was a colloquial equivalent of not so frequent *potentialis* with ᾠ, used by more educated authors. The thesis has not been proved as far as classical period is concerned. Then, the form must have been introduced by Aristophanes, proportionally to its occurrence in everyday speech. This argument is vital as then the particle in *potentialis* could not be totally redundant element, semantically unmotivated.

The great value of the research is the fact that the examples included in the description of the function were enlarged by an additional chapter devoted to exemplification of the function, and moreover the author discusses the poetry written in Doric dialect with Pindar’s epinikia as well. Of course, the method rooted in the nineteenth century type of research together with the vast amount of text did not allow the author to examine precisely and meticulously the meanings in particular places. Therefore, the book is mostly of classifying character, where the instances,

<sup>5</sup> W.W. Goodwin: *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge 1865, p. 1.

<sup>6</sup> F. Slotty: *Der Gebrauch des Konjunktivs und Optativs in der griechischen Dialekten*. Bd. 1. *Der Hauptsatz*. Göttingen 1915.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 253.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 190–239.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 85–86, 88–89.

limited in number are selected so as to prove the theses. Nevertheless, F. Slotty succeeds in avoiding arbitrary and categorical opinions, which indicates that he was aware of the limits and complexity of the problem.

Another book that is definitely worth mentioning is E.A. Hahn's<sup>10</sup> work discussing the origin of moods. She continues researches started by B. Delbrück<sup>11</sup> and followed by such scholars as: K. Brugmann<sup>12</sup>, D.B. Monroe<sup>13</sup>, K. Hammersmidt<sup>14</sup>, W.W. Goodwin, W.D. Whitney<sup>15</sup>, J. Wackernagel<sup>16</sup>, A. Meillet and J. Vendryes<sup>17</sup>, Schwyzer and J. Humbert<sup>18</sup>. Delbrück established theory that the two distinctively different Indo-European moods, i.e. subjunctive and optative respectively, in primary and secondary function originated from the distinction between willing and wishing. For the subjunctive in the primary one it was the opposition – will versus future; for the optative – wish versus possibility. In the latter, in a broader sense, subjunctive was attributed with voluntative and prospective function whereas optative was attributed with the prescriptive (meaning iussive) and potential function<sup>19</sup>.

When considering the primary function of the moods E.A. Hahn refers particularly to the particle<sup>20</sup>. She maintains that “in the parent-speech” (Indo-Hittite) it marked modal distinctions. She stresses the unconditioned constitutive role of the particle in predication expressed by secondary infinitive. The particle that was used with moods as future forms could be redundant in its character and, in this case, it is difficult to formulate the relevant and accurate system rules in order to make the usage of the  $\check{\alpha}v/\kappa\epsilon(v)$  particle more precise or predictable.

It is also impossible to indicate the vital change of the meaning, which could result from introduction of the particle. Despite many critical observations including the one that points at the fact that modal notions could be expressed by means of the particle in early historical times and the remark about redundancy, which is a common language phenomenon, E.A. Hahn's arguments are not convin-

<sup>10</sup> E.A. Hahn: *Subjunctive and optative. Their origin as futures*. New York 1953.

<sup>11</sup> B. Delbrück: *Der Gebrauch der Coniunctivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*. Halle 1871.

<sup>12</sup> K. Brugmann: *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprache*. Strassburg 1886–1892.

<sup>13</sup> D.B. Monroe: *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*. Oxford 1891.

<sup>14</sup> K. Hammerschmid: *Über die Grundbedeutung von Konjunktiv und Optativ*. Erlangen 1892.

<sup>15</sup> W.D. Whitney: *Sanskritgrammar*. Cambridge 1923.

<sup>16</sup> J. Wackernagel: *Vorlesungen über Syntax, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Basel 1926–1928.

<sup>17</sup> A. Meillet & J. Vendryes: *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. Paris 1927.

<sup>18</sup> J. Humbert: *Syntaxe Grecque*. Paris 1945.

<sup>19</sup> B. Delbrück: *Vergleichende Syntax der Indogermanischen Sprachen*. Straßburg 1893–1900.

<sup>20</sup> E.A. Hahn: *Subjunctive and optative...*, p. 56.

cing. They do not indicate clearly inadequacy of the function of a particular construction, which could in turn lead to decay of the usage of the particle. Moreover, if the particle was accompanied frequently and widely by *irrealis* and optative, there must have been either a common meaning concept that could motivate the usage of ᾠν in both constructions or there was not because of difference or because of the neutralization of the particle in its function with optative (both theses would need proving).

Yet, stating the problem does not seem to confirm the thesis about lack of consequence in using the particle that would prove that in Homer times, or rather in the times when moods came into being, it was an additional, semantically neutralised element of constructions. The authoress stresses the fact that the particle tends to appear together with future tense and it is used rather in potential than desiderative-volitive utterances. E.A. Hahn refutes K. Brugmann's, A. Meillet's and J. Vendryes' views regarding the particle as a secondary element and makes comments that "the idea of futurity or contingency is in the verb and ᾠν/κε(ν) simply adds to it". She claims that it is true only when referred to Homer and agrees in it with D.B. Monroe, whose opinion was that "the force originally in the particle independent of the mood was eventually lost by it"<sup>21</sup>.

E.A. Hahn wants to see the particle with optative as modification of the optative among six different ways of expressing futurity. They differ only slightly in meaning, i.e. there is pure and modified future, pure and modified subjunctive, pure and modified optative. Each of the instances presented in the book is chosen carefully so that it fitted perfectly the main thesis of the book as stated in its title. In each of the instances, no matter whether the particle is present or absent, the higher probability of events is understood as bigger vividness or reality, in which optative is different from subjunctive. The term vividness<sup>22</sup> was used very commonly by the authors of several grammar books and monographs in order to describe both the differences between the two moods and between the functions of the optative itself. The view that in the beginning there were no moods resulted in opinion that the particle was the prevailing factor in modalizing utterances.

The particle is for E.A. Hahn the appropriate, strictly modal element of utterance which, similarly to Hittite *irrealis*<sup>23</sup>, is responsible for modal values of verbal forms. The later status (Homeric times), when the usage of the particle is differentiated depending on the moods it goes with, is called "redundancy resulting from contamination of the two forms of expression"<sup>24</sup>. The difference between so wide usage and limited usage of the particle in Attic dialect was to prove a tendency to introduce system order into its usage yet not adequate to actual requirements of language at this stage of its development.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 55.

<sup>22</sup> H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar...*, pp. 2321–2329.

<sup>23</sup> Hahn refutes Wackernagel's view about innovatory usage of the particle by the Greeks.

<sup>24</sup> E.A. Hahn: *Subjunctive and optative...*, p. 55.

The book *Subjunctive and optative...*, like other books of the same author<sup>25</sup>, have provoked vivid reaction of linguists sharing the same interests. It has given an inspiration to J. Gonda<sup>26</sup> whose book, a deep study on moods, seems to have been born as the urge to fight E.A. Hahn's thesis and views. J. Gonda appears to be flexible and open-minded in opinions he presents, which is proved by a multitude of references to non-Indo-European languages made in his book. As far as the particle is concerned, he thinks that even if it originally could serve as a marker of modal notions in verbal constructions, it does not necessarily mean that it must have lost this value when the moods appeared. J. Gonda is in favour of opinion that the particle served notionally and emotionally as an element that expressed "indications of the speaker's attitude of disposition with regard to the utterance, intimating the general sense in which it should be taken"<sup>27</sup>.

He stresses the stylistic function of particles and their catalytic influence on mutual relations of separate components of the utterance. The  $\check{\alpha}\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  particle conveys some kind of vagueness as for validity of the utterance and, thus, weakens the assertion of the verb form by restricting it with a condition expressed explicitly or implicitly or by pointing at certain circumstances. Moods show the attitude of a sender in relation to the process and a situation it takes place in, whereas the particles influence understanding of the process itself on one hand and, on the other hand, they are connected with communicative function of the utterance, frequently introducing certain limiting modifications.

The potential function of the particle accompanying the optative in Indo-European parent-speech is interpreted by J. Gonda as the sign that the speaker lacks "the limiting condition or circumstances involved in the phrase opt. +  $\check{\alpha}\nu$ "<sup>28</sup>, saying that this function became then a fixed element with a strictly defined system function. The particle came into phraseology and began to constitute phrases like  $\omicron\upsilon\kappa \check{\alpha}\nu$  + opt. to express kind requests or together with  $\epsilon\iota$  + opt. to express supposition etc. When talking about non-potential functions of optative with  $\check{\alpha}\nu$ , the author considers the problem that is of utmost importance, discussed several times in this paper, i.e. maintaining or losing the potential meaning of the particle in iussive, desiderative, voluntative utterances and others.

The main idea of J. Gonda's dissertation is as follows: no matter what functions of  $\check{\alpha}\nu$  have been accepted by the system (it refers to other particles as well), the particle served as index of primary functions that were certain semantic component of the utterance. They expressed "surprise, incredulity, remonstrance, restriction or limitation"<sup>29</sup>. It could be seen as depriving or weakening the objective

<sup>25</sup> E.g.: E.A. Hahn: "Apollonios Dyscolus on Mood". *TAPA* 1951, Vol. 82, pp. 29–48.

<sup>26</sup> J. Gonda: *The Character of the Indo-European Moods*. Wiesbaden 1956.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 133.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 138.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 147.

certainty of the utterance. Studies on moods in confrontation with E.A. Hahn's book fortified J. Gonda in his view that although he is not totally in favour of *Grundbegriff* he definitely does not find E.A. Hahn's arguments any more convincing.

Moreover, he thinks that the "orthodox opinions are, in substance, nearer to the truth than the new theory advocated by her. In linguistics one should not either base their opinion on philosophical concepts or inadequate analysis of classical languages"<sup>30</sup>. It is impossible to ascribe certain values to the particle and, hence, it seems inappropriate to make clear-cut distinction and classifications that may have many exceptions. For J. Gonda the subjunctive indicates that the speaker "views the process denoted by the verb as existing in his mind"<sup>31</sup> and he calls it "visualisation". The optative enabled the speaker to "introduce elements of visualisation and contingency", i.e. possibility of non-occurrence. Moreover, even a primary indicative could serve to express statements but also feelings, emotions and things that were not actual or as if they existed in the moment of speaking. J. Gonda understands moods as means by which men can not only express states and events as they are but also as mental process<sup>32</sup>.

Another important monograph, a study of the Greek particle  $\tau\epsilon$  must not be omitted. The author – C.J. Ruijgh<sup>33</sup> discusses the usage of moods and the  $\alpha\upsilon$  particle<sup>34</sup> and inclines to views that it possessed a distinctive semantic function. He maintains that the particle indicates that an event depends on fulfilling certain conditions. Like most scholars C.J. Ruijgh stresses difficulty in defining the meaning that he calls "d'un faible 'le cas échéant' ou 'éventuellement'". Nevertheless, he makes clear functional distinction between moods, which takes the particle into accounts.

The distinction goes as follows:

- with the particle: optative – potential usage, subjunctive – prospective;
- without the particle: optative – cupiditive, subjunctive – volitive.

It allows to juxtapose further functions of the moods that are similar, i.e. cupiditive with volitive correspondingly – wishes (*souhait*) with prompting (*exhortation*) and potentiality with prospectiveness, i.e. an event that is likely to occur with an event expected (*attendu*). The former denotes a mental process of emotional character (*dans le désir*), the latter an intellectual one (*dans la pensée*). The particle there definitely conveys an external modalizing regulation, whereas the moods according to Ruijgh are related to the subject's point of view. Both express process or state but the subjunctive expresses a thought about something, a desire for something that is likely to happen, expected in the future, while the optative not likely and not fully expected.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., p. 48.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 51.

<sup>33</sup> C.J. Ruijgh: *Autour de "τῆ ἐπική"*. Amsterdam 1971.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., pp. 223, 242, 252.

When we juxtapose them it is clear enough that the particle is a modal operator which unavoidably needs referring to deep structure of the sentence expressing what might or could have occurred if certain, specified conditions were fulfilled. Semantic value of the particle allows to move further in defining precisely the functions when the construction is embedded in a certain context. This function is open and depends on the context it refers to directly and indirectly within the predicate. It becomes its co-element but, at the same time, it modifies the relation between the verbal form and the context. The final conclusion drawn on the basis of the juxtaposition that C.J. Ruijgh presented is the same as the one for which the starting point is the secondary, in relation to the verb form, more stylistic function of  $\alpha\nu$  particle. The author does not limit, understandably, his explanation to the scheme and explains more precisely the specifics of particular functions, admitting that the description is far from being perfect as far as the parallels for a starting point are concerned.

A book of great importance for the scholars interested in Greek syntax is V. Bers' *Greek poetic syntax in the classical age*<sup>35</sup>. The author presents his opinion as to the meaning of the term "modal particle"<sup>36</sup> in the chapter discussing the subjunctive, optative and the  $\alpha\nu$  particle. He concludes that one can define the function and the value of the particle only when all the structural and lexical features of a single construction are concerned. He is convinced that "we cannot learn anything useful from a general classification of the term". This particle can be an element accompanying the mood and, on other occasion, it influences speaker's attitude to what he regards a fact or possibility. When considering the particle as a modal one, V. Bers indicates the problem external to the matter itself but extremely important for interpretation of the function of the particle and the construction it is applied in.

He stresses the fact that this small particle can be easily interpolated or omitted as its usage does not possess clear system criteria, which are often formed on the basis of its appearance and the place of order in sentences. As its function in most cases is inexplicable, one can form not more than hypotheses. The theoretical questions are not the matter of author's interest and so he does not try to examine them but focuses his research on classification of the functions of the constructions and compares their usage in Homer and Attic dialect. Applying grammar criteria used by his predecessors, he makes numerous critical remarks yet without giving his own solution to the problem<sup>37</sup>. When referring to the usage of the optative in potential function without the particle, he gives several instances taken from ancient tragedies and poetry, especially Pindar's odes with his "high style". He agrees in his opinion with F. Slotty as to the non-colloquial character of this construction in the fifth century. This results in suggestion that we should accept the

---

<sup>35</sup> V. Bers: *Greek poetic syntax in the classical age*. New Haven & London 1984.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 117–165.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 131, 134.

opposition of the two constructions representing the potential function: optative versus optative +  $\check{\alpha}\nu$ . V. Bers seems to be in favour of the view that the function of the particle is secondary as far as structure is concerned: “the particle (...) is not primarily a marker of verbal mood. However, it would be incautious to deny the particle any power to contribute nuance by its presence or absence”<sup>38</sup>.

The relevant literature reviewed briefly above shows clearly that there was some difficulty in defining the function of *potentialis* represented by optative with or without the  $\check{\alpha}\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  particle and that even the most excellent and experienced scholars working on the problem over more than a century have not succeeded in finding satisfactory answers to most problems that arose. A summary of the attempts to give clear classification allows us to put certain criteria that could be an indispensable reference point for every interpretation concerning the usage of the construction. As modal or modalizing values of the particle are indisputable and, hence, we accept it as an axiom, there are two main questions that the scholars try to answer. The first question refers to the status of the modal particle in the system. The second is connected with the rank of the particle in semantic-syntax structure of the text. The former includes the latter. The primary modal function of  $\check{\alpha}\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  means that the particle is asemantic and that the particle is ascribed to the verb form it modalizes. The secondary function means that the modal values it conveys result from its weak semantic value and, thus, they are obtained secondarily. Hence, the real problem to consider refers to arguing modal values with reference to two options: either semantic or syntactic function.

If we assume that the particle adds semantic value to the utterance, then it possesses it independently from its presence or absence in the utterance and so lexically, outside the (con)text. Ascribing such a value that is comparable with such English (as well as in other European languages) equivalents as *probably*, *maybe*, *providing*, *supposing* would mean that it modalizes the predicate through the deep, semantic structure. We could say then that the modal value of the predicate would be, without taking proportions into account, the sum of the modal value of the mood and the  $\check{\alpha}\nu$  particle. The relation would equal the relation between a verbal form and an adverb, its circumstantial marker. This sort of classification has also been presented in the literature<sup>39</sup>.

The consequences of such assumption are the following:  $\check{\alpha}\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  is not the form that constitutes directly the modal value of the predicate and the usage of such a form is connected with its direct stylistic function. It would explain the fact that in certain circumstances, like in the optative in a iussive-desiderative function, its presence is close to redundancy. On the other hand, it is extremely difficult to interpret its function in utterances where it is indispensable, like in the *irrealis* with secondary indicative.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., p. 126.

<sup>39</sup> R. Kühner: *Ausführliche Grammatik...*, p. 398, defines the particle as *Modaladverbien*.

To explain this phenomenon we should accept the following explanation: first of all, the interpretation of the *irrealis* in the construction where the  $\acute{\alpha}\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  particle that expresses future and present possibility is confronted with the form of a historic tense, an element that excludes such a possibility, leads to a particular paradox. We confront the possible with irreversible, past with present. We can compare it with similar constructions in modern languages like the second conditional in English or *irrealis* in modern Greek, the construction where Greek indicative imperfecti with  $\acute{\alpha}\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  has been replaced with its equivalent with the particle  $\theta\alpha$  denoting futurity. Greek  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  ἔγραφε corresponds to  $\theta\alpha$  ἔγραφα in modern Greek – I would write (I will write is  $\theta\alpha$  γράφω).

There are many more ways to express something that is impossible or unreal. When we compare some of them in English, e.g.: *supposing I had written, Imagine I wrote* (and Polish, like: *dajmy na to, wyobraźmy sobie, że*), we could assume that the problem maintains on semantic level. The second problem connected with meaning of the  $\acute{\alpha}\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  particle is its ability to join other elements of the context with predicate on the semantic level. Particularity of context determination makes this relation more or less intense and more or less motivated in various ways. It remains independent from the proper modal function of the system and is unique as much as unique is the text with its context which can have its own wider context. These semantic links decide considerably about other functional components of the text like: senders attitude, illocutionary force, etc. All of them must be included in interpretation of such stylistic value of the modal particle.

An assumption that the  $\acute{\alpha}\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  particle is not the form that is an independent semantic marker needs to be proved by showing that there are not such relations or, at least, that they are impossible to prove. The good example is troublesome *irrealis* where the  $\acute{\alpha}\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  particle evidently is limited to modalizing the verb form and semantically “belongs” to the verb form of the predicate.

The last remark is a starting point for another assumption: asemantic value – the strictly structural function of the particle. That being so the modal particle would have to be considered the same way it is considered when we analyse *irrealis*. It means excluding its direct connection with other components of utterance and its context. It only determines the verb form without possessing a lexical value. It is an analytical indicator of modality. Its function is similar to the function of particles, conjunctions and other elements influencing arrangement of the text by means of setting relations between its semantic elements. There is no such literal equivalent in other European languages, but it seems justified to make reference to any purely syntactical element, or a modal one, like *whether, non, would* etc. (accordingly in Polish – interrogative particle *czy* or negative *nie*, or the closest possible to  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  indicator of the conditional – agglutinate *-by*).

The modal function of the predicate is not a sum of modal value of the mood and the  $\acute{\alpha}\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  particle but a result of its modalizing impact. The stylistic function

refers to the whole predicate and, indirectly, is a result of presence of the  $\check{\alpha}V/\kappa E(V)$  particle, as the range and the character of the modal function of this particle is stable and does not influence directly the unique semantic variant of the utterance. It is in accordance then with the constitutive function of this form in *irrealis*. However, the explanation of redundancy in iussive-desiderative utterances is still a problem unless we assume that these constructions are somehow featured in comparison with their equivalents without the particle. This explanation, however, can not go any further.

When remaining at the same level of analysis of signalling the modal value, we can perceive the role of the particle in two ways. It either adds meaning to the optative, which in its primary function – so without the particle – denotes a wish. The meaning of potentialis, gained thanks to the use of the particle, is for this mood the secondary function, whereas the primary one is for the whole expression, i.e. the optative with the particle. It can, in turn, communicate another modal content within the secondary function, for example an order, a prompt, or a wish as well.

If we consider a wish, we have to bear in mind that the function of the particle does not add the primary meaning to optative but, rather, it does not deprive it. Its function then is neutralized. Further analysis that aims at reasoning its usage exceeds the frames of the system entering the zone of stylistic values, especially in poetry, where the particle appears much more frequently<sup>40</sup>. As a result, we should juxtapose the following function of the optative without and with the particle, which takes into account the modally featured (+) or neutralized (-) mood  $m$  and the particle  $\rho$  in a given context  $c$ :

- primary function, cupiditive (optative)  $m^+, c^-$
- secondary function, potential  $m^+, c^+$
- primary function, potentialis,  $m^+, p^+, c^-$ ; or  $(m^+, p^+) c^-$
- secondary function, voluntative, postulative, iussive etc.  $m^+, p^+, c^+$  or  $(m^+, p^+) c^+$
- secondary function, cupiditive (optative)  $m^+, p^-, c^+$  or  $(m^+, p^-) c^+$

The last option is purely theoretical and can be explained only by the logic of the system. The secondary function of the utterance is here identical with the primary function of the mood. There is no difference between the two functions as far as the communication is concerned. Neutralized  $\check{\alpha}V/\kappa E(V)$  becomes an additional element and in a certain way redundant. Yet superficially this expression is the same as the scheme of the mood with the particle ( $m, p$ ) and thus the change of the function is due to the context. We can explain the presence of the particle in each particular construction in the following way:

- the particle has its own meaning; its modalization is secondary and the function stylistic. It is necessary to prove its particular direct relationships with various elements of the utterance and its context.

---

<sup>40</sup> R. Kühner, B. Gerth: *Ausführliche Grammatik...*, pp. 482–483.

– the particle does not have meaning; it is a structural modal element. The stylistic function depends on the whole predicate and the impact of the modal of the particle is limited to it. It is necessary to prove its stable, predictable role restricted to the system functions, which excludes particular direct relationships between various elements of the utterance and its context.

Finally, it is important to stress the fact that it is possible to distinguish terminologically the two options. According to classifying criteria in Polish grammar books that discern distinctively the functions of the words known as *dodatkowe wyznaczniki*<sup>41</sup> [additional indices] – the words that can not be classified as traditional notions of subject, predicate and its circumstantials – both options fulfil requirements of the category of the particle as a non-declining lexem, used separately, unlike exclamations and as non-conjunctive unlike the prepositions and conjunctives<sup>42</sup>.

To be more accurate, in this classification we use the term “particle-adverbs”, excluding from them adverbs being derivatives of adjectives. They fulfil also the requirement of this kind when we apply the generalisation presented in grammar books of Greek language written in English<sup>43</sup> or other western Europe languages. It results in calling all these words **particles**.

The division in Polish language presented above is based on sound grounds that confine the function of these words to organising so-called sending-receiving strategy of the text<sup>44</sup>. It comprises the word order, intonation, which, obviously, are not the matter of our interest, and the character of the regulations they introduce to utterances. Then, conjunctives and auxiliaries, i.e. modulators are included as well. This classification, in turn, implies distinction between auxiliaries of discourse reference modification and text modification, depending on whether they refer to elements within the context or on disposition of the sender towards the communicated matter. Further division of the auxiliaries of text-content modification introduces auxiliaries of presupposition which convey lexically non-expressed communicates in different way, and also very important modal auxiliaries like for example: *for certain, perhaps, probably* etc.; ἄν/κε(ν) in its first function undoubtedly belongs to the category of the words that are classified as modal auxiliaries. It refers also to the analogical structures in Greek with the declining and non-declining lexems like *χρή, δυνατόν, οἶον τε* or *έθέλω*, which are different, at the same time, because of their predicative features. The latter verb, which is quite symptomatic and significant, in the course of changes was reduced in modern Greek language to *θα* and is classified as a particle. Accordingly, ἄν/κε(ν) particle should be classified as a non-verbal modal auxiliary.

<sup>41</sup> Z. Klemensiewicz: *Zarys składni polskiej*. Warszawa 1969, pp. 26 f.

<sup>42</sup> Z. Saloni: “Klasyfikacja gramatyczna leksemów polskich”. *Język Polski* 1974, z. 54, pp. 3–13, 93–101.

<sup>43</sup> J.D. Denniston: *The Greek Particles*. Oxford 1934.

<sup>44</sup> J. Strutyński: *Zarys gramatyki polskiej*. T. 2. *Morfologia*. Kraków 1992, pp. 32–33.

To examine a particular construction that represents certain system type of modality in Greek, it is necessary to analyse all its instances in a given (con)text. The significance of each method applied can be assessed by its effectiveness and here it is description and defining, precise as it is possible, of all the functions of the examined predicates and their pragmatically conditioned meanings. Referring to the pragmatics of the text may appear a difficult not to say risky task. In books of theoretical linguistics, dealing with modern languages pragmatic dimension had been of less interest when examining semantic-syntax structures<sup>45</sup> up until about two decades ago when the new, cognitive approach began to prevail. Having accepted the synthesis of the examined language phenomenon as the aim, the final conclusions to be drawn, tend to omit constituents of unique and unrepeatable context of a particular communicate. At the same time, the exemplification, which is to prove the theses, chosen with the means of certain key accepted due to the assumption and the aim of the research, refers to readiness and correctness of utterances, which shall verify the theses and deductions. The method in fact implies as a base the intuition of a native speaker who discerns the right, correct structure of an utterance and is aware of any error and deviation of the structure. Moreover, in the mind of a receiver of a text there exists more than one hypothetical context of utterances, which is the first step to pragmatics – referring to wider contexts and background which is **reality**.

Receivers of an ancient text are in totally different situation. They lack possibility to use intuition and, as a result, the pragmatic level of the text needs tremendous effort in rebuilding it to such an extent that would allow to achieve the main goal for a receiver, i.e. understanding. There are two ways that enable to achieve the aim. One leads through the background – the reality context, where we assume the same importance of its each single element. These are not the statistic analyses that decide about the hierarchy but the condition of the text and so the lexical respects. Another one is the text itself. But the key to understanding it lies in the reaching the information constituting the background.

If we refer to the fact that the text being the produce of the mind, emanation of the mental process is organised due to certain logic and order that are somehow compatible with the order and logic present at the act of its coming into being, then there is hope that we can find the way to reach the lost meanings. The idea might seem impossible, if there was no connection between the texts and the culture constituting their background context. The possession of classical philology in the last century, particularly the critique of the text, where the problem of interaction – the text versus its background – is obvious, let us hope that this two-dimensional – in terms of time and space – intercultural communication does not have to remain in the sphere of delusion and imagination.

---

<sup>45</sup> E. Jędrzejko: *Semantyka i składnia polskich czasowników deontycznych*. Wrocław 1987, pp. 8, 42; E. Jędrzejko: *Problemy predykcji peryfrastycznej. Konstrukcje, znaki, pojęcia*. Katowice 2002, p. 7, et passim.

*Lukasz Tofiłski*

Z badań nad systemowymi i interpretacyjnymi aspektami składni greckiej  
– *modus potentialis*

Streszczenie

W artykule omówiono problem interpretacji funkcji greckiego potentialisu, którego powierzchowną reprezentacją jest optativus z partykułą  $\alpha\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$ . Kwestii tej nie została dotychczas poświęcona w całości żadna praca, mimo że badacze składni greckiej przyznają, iż to zagadnienie jest bardzo trudne. Część pierwsza jest prezentacją istotnych w dorobku światowym pozycji, których autorzy odnoszą się w ogóle do tego problemu. Następnie, w rozwinięciu przedstawiono możliwości interpretowania rozpoznanych funkcji systemowych badanej konstrukcji, z odniesieniem się do ich znaczeniowych i kategoryalnych odpowiedników w językach nowożytnych. Szczególną uwagę zwrócono na pragmatyczne aspekty funkcji potentialisu, których badanie stanowi zasadniczą trudność w interpretowaniu znaczenia tekstu starożytnego.

*Lukasz Tofiłski*

Zu Forschungen über System- und Interpretationsaspekte  
der griechischen Syntax – *modus potentialis*

Zusammenfassung

Im vorliegenden Artikel hat sein Verfasser mögliche Interpretationen der Funktion des griechischen Potenzialis besprochen, dessen äußere Vertretung der Optativ mit der Partikel  $\alpha\nu/\kappa\epsilon(\nu)$  ist. Dem Problem ist bisher noch keine Arbeit als Ganzes genommen gewidmet worden, obwohl die sich mit der griechischen Syntax befassenden Forscher zugeben, dass das Problem sehr kompliziert ist. Im ersten Teil werden die wichtigsten Publikationen genannt, deren Autoren das oben genannte Thema überhaupt angesprochen haben. Weiter zeigt der Verfasser mögliche Interpretationen von festgestellten Systemfunktionen der untersuchten Struktur in Bezug auf deren semantische und kategoriale Äquivalente in neueren Sprachen. Er schenkt die meiste Aufmerksamkeit den pragmatischen Aspekten der Funktion von Potenzialis, die bei Ausdeutung der altentworflichen Texten besondere Schwierigkeiten bereiten.