The Cambridge Classical Journal (2016) 62, 65–84 doi:10.1017/S1750270516000026
© The Author(s) 2016. Published by Cambridge University Press

THE MODAL PARTICLE IN GREEK

Stephen Colvin*
University College, London

Five forms of the modal particle are attested in ancient Greek (ἄν, κε, κεν, κᾱ, and κ'). This article argues that ἄν is an inherited particle, and that the k-forms were the result of reanalysis of prevocalic οὐκ and εἰκ (i.e. εἰκ was reanalysed as εἰ κ'), supported by the vestiges of an old topicalising/conditional force of the IE particle *$k^{w}e$ (which appears elsewhere in Greek as connective τε). The attested forms in Greek grew out of *$k^{w}e$ in contexts where an adjacent u caused the labiovelar *k^{w} > k (West Greek κᾱ was influenced by indefinite *$k^{w}ā$). The form κεν is a creation of epic diction.

The modal particle in the dialects of archaic and classical Greek has five forms, of which one is a phonologically conditioned allomorph. The dialect division of the forms is as follows:

ἄν	Attic, Ionic, and Arcadian; and Homeric epic
κε	Lesbian, Thessalian (*Pelasgiotis, Thessaliotis*), Cypriot; and Homeric epic
κεν	'eastern Aeolic', i.e. Lesbian and literary Lesbian; and Homeric epic
κᾱ	West Greek dialects, but never in 'high' poetry; Boeotian, Thessalian (*Histiaeotis*)
κ'	optional prevocalic form of κε and (apparently) κᾱ

In spite of the morphological variety, the function of the particle across the dialects seems more or less identical.[1] The occasional trivial differences in usage which are attested are no greater than the sort of variation which occurs in modal grammar in other languages, and there are some developments over time. There is more flexibility in the usage of the particles in the language of Homeric epic, which is peculiar in many respects: it is oral formulaic poetry which may have been composed as early as the eighth

* E-mail: s.colvin@ucl.ac.uk

I am indebted to Alan Griffiths and Julian Méndez Dosuna for valuable criticism of an earlier draft, and I also thank the anonymous readers for extremely helpful comments.

1 The particles mark the action of a verb as potential, counterfactual or habitual (iterated). In some cases their presence is predictable (what Bers (1984) 117) has called 'stylistically required concomitants of a mood'); in other cases the modal interpretation of a verb (and the syntax of the sentence) is determined by the presence of a particle. See in general Horrocks (1996).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

century BC, and the stock of traditional language which the monumental composer(s) inherited includes features of Greek which reflect periods earlier than the period of composition (in a few rare cases going back as early as the late Bronze Age, the Mycenaean period). In addition to features which reflect different periods and different regions of the Greek world, epic language also contains features (phonological, morphological and lexical) which are 'artificial' in the sense that they were innovated by and within the poetic tradition and were never features of the spoken language.[2]

There are a number of peculiarities in the form and distribution of the five forms above. On the whole the form of the particle correlates reasonably neatly with the traditional dialect groups: ἄν in Attic-Ionic, κᾱ in West Greek, and κε in two of the three 'Aeolic' dialects. That Boeotian has κᾱ is not very surprising, though it is traditionally grouped with Lesbian and Thessalian in the Aeolic group: this dialect is heavily overlaid with West Greek features, to the extent that even the classical dialectologists of the early twentieth century, who relied more heavily on a *Stammbaum* model than modern linguists, regarded it as a 'mixed' dialect.

The three dialect groups are (more or less) inherited from the ancient Greek world, where they were correlated with ethnic subdivisions among the Greeks. A fourth group, Arcado-Cypriot, is a modern (twentieth-century) linguistic grouping; if the Greeks had views on the dialectal affiliations of Arcadian and Cypriot, they have not survived. Of the attested dialects they seem to have the closest affinity to Mycenaean Greek, a form of the language written in the Linear B script on clay tablets from the late Bronze Age, approximately 1400–1200 BC. The putative Bronze Age ancestors of Arcadian and Cypriot are usually grouped with Mycenaean in a dialect grouping (sometimes labelled 'Achaean') assigned to the late Bronze Age Peloponnese, before the collapse of Mycenaean palatial civilisation around the end of the thirteenth century. There are few sentences in the surviving Linear B tablets (which are lists of inventory and economic records from the bureaucracies of the Mycenaean palatial centres), and almost no complex sentences: as a result there are no clearly attested instances of the particle in the tablets.[3] Arcadian, Cypriot and Mycenaean are East Greek dialects: they share the assibilation of *-ti* to *-si* in verbal endings (δίδωτι > δίδωσι) and certain other common features which mark them off from West Greek. Arcadian shares ἄν with Attic-Ionic, the other East Greek dialect grouping, while Cypriot shares κε with the Aeolic dialects Lesbian and Thessalian.

The Aeolic dialects do not fit easily into the East/West classification, since the status of the descriptor 'Aeolic' is unclear and disputed. The three dialects share a rather small number of overlapping features, which do not allow clear conclusions about the historical affiliations of a supposed 'proto-Aeolic' dialect group in the Bronze Age. Some have

2 The seminal work in the field is generally taken to be Leumann (1950): the principles had already been set out by Milman Parry (cf. 'The Artificial Element' in Parry (1932)). For a clear introduction to the development of epic diction see Janko (1994) 8–19.

3 Palmer (1980) and Ruipérez (1987) argued that the modal particle in the form *$k^{w}e(n)$ can be seen in Mycenaean *e-ke-qe* (in the Pylos Eo, Eb and Ep series). This has not been widely accepted: see Hajnal (2004).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

made this an eastern group, and others a western group;[4] and since the 1970s a number of scholars have questioned the retrojection of Aeolic to the Bronze Age, arguing that the dialects are (either largely or entirely) a post-Mycenaean development which acquired their distinctive features through contact and areal development.[5]

The difference between the Arcadian and Cypriot forms of the particle is not particularly surprising. Even after the decipherment of Linear B, we have a very limited insight into the varieties of the spoken language in late Bronze Age Greece. If we suppose that the Greek language was taken to Cyprus by Mycenaean mercantile activity and migration at the end of the Bronze Age,[6] which would explain the similarities of the Cypriot dialect with Mycenaean and Arcadian, there is nevertheless no reason to assume (and it would be remarkable coincidence) that the variety which prevailed in Cyprus was exactly similar to the one which gave rise to Arcadian. Linear B texts have been discovered across the Peloponnese, and elsewhere. The Peloponnese alone is a large and geographically challenging area; although the language of the Linear B tablets lacks regional variation (its uniformity suggests a chancellery language), it would be surprising if the Mycenaean Greek of Messenia in (say) the mid-thirteenth century was identical to that spoken in the Argolid (Mycenae and Tiryns).

More striking is the confinement of κεν to eastern Aeolic, and the conditions under which it alternated with κε, which, in both Thessalian and Cypriot, could be reduced to κ' before a vowel (which makes it clear that κεν is not a simple pre-vocalic form of κε). The particle κεν is found in the poetry of Sappho and Alkaios; it is also found in Homeric epic, where it is regarded as an 'Aeolicism'.[7] However, even in Sappho and Alkaios κεν looks like a literary form. It co-exists with, and is outnumbered by (in a ratio approximately 2:3), κε and κ'. It occurs before vowels, where it breaks hiatus and adds a short syllable to the line, and before consonants, where it adds a long syllable to the line.[8]

Non-poetic inscriptions are generally recognised as the best indicators of whether a form or usage is vernacular in a particular dialect. The data for κεν from the Lesbian-speaking area (Lesbos and the adjoining region of Asia Minor) do not support the assumption that κεν was a feature of the spoken language. There are just five instances of κεν in

4 Risch (1955) grouped Aeolic with Doric in a renamed 'Northern' group (against the Southern dialects Attic-Ionic and Arcado-Cypriot), a classification accepted by Chadwick (1956); Palmer (1980) included Aeolic with Arcado-Cypriot in the (East Greek) 'Achaean' group. For a history of classification before the decipherment of Linear B see Morpurgo Davies (1992).

5 García-Ramón (1975), and Brixhe (2006).

6 The archaeological record does not give a clear idea of the date or mechanisms of the establishment of Greek on Cyprus: most recently Voskos and Knapp (2008) 679 conclude: 'at some point during the 11th century BCE, some people of Aegean origin (migrants, not purposive colonists) became established on Cyprus … We cannot define this event any more precisely because the social processes involved in it – social exchange, migration, hybridization – had been going on for 200–300 years.'

7 See Jones (2012) for a history and critical overview of the 'Aeolic phase' in Homeric diction.

8 These data ignore the 2014 Sappho fragments (Obbink (2014)), which in fact show an identical distribution: two instances of κε and one of κεν, which occurs line-end, as a heavy syllable, before a vowel-initial word at the start of the next line.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

surviving inscriptions, as against over one hundred instances of κε. Of the five instances of κεν, only two occur in inscriptions before 300 BC:

(1) Hodot MYT 05 (*ZPE* 63 (1986) 109; Mytilene), line 2
ὥς κεν οἱ πόλιται, 'in order that the citizens …' (but αἰ δέ κε ἄλλον τινά *ibid.* 16)

(2) Hodot NAS 01 (*IG* XII/2.645, Buck 27; Nesos), line 51
τῶγ κεν εὐεργέτη τὰμ πόλιν, 'of the services he renders to the city' (but ὅτα κε ἀ πόλις *ibid.* 33)

It is not obvious why κεν was used in these two cases, since both inscriptions also contain numerous instances of κε, including before a vowel. Both the syntactic and phonological contexts can be paralleled in sequences which have κε. If κεν reflects literary Lesbian, its use in a public inscription may have been a marker of local pride and local identity. Both of these texts reflect a crisis in the region provoked by Macedonian expansion in the 330s and 320s. It could be argued that in (1) the particle, which occurs in the preamble giving the reason for the decree (attempt at national reconciliation after a crisis), is in a far more salient clause than the four instances of κε in the text: '… in order that the citizens inhabit the city under a democratic government perpetually, being as well-disposed to one another as possible …' (tr. Heisserer and Hodot (1986)). In (2) κεν appears in the very final clause of the inscription and may throw weight on to the critical last words 'of the services he renders to the city'.

The other three instances of κεν occur in two inscriptions which are clearly written in an artificial revival Lesbian. Both are from Kyme:

(3) Hodot KYM 014 (*IvK* v.13), *c.* 130 BC, line 18
καθότι κεν Ἀρχίππα προαιρῆται, 'in accordance with the preferences of Archippe'[9]

(4) Hodot KYM 016 (*IvK* v.19, Buck 28), *c.* first decade of the Common Era, lines 30 and 51
ἐν πάντεσσι τοῖς ἀγώνεσσιν, οἵς κεν ἀ πόλις συντελέη (line 30), 'in all the festivals which the city organises'
καὶ ἐντάφην, ἐν ὦ κεν ἂν εὔθετον ἔμμεναι φαίνηται τόπω, 'and be buried there, in whichever place seems most appropriate' (line 51)[10]

If κεν is a feature of poetic language, there are two possibilities: either it is an archaism lost from the spoken language, or it is a creation of the epic tradition. If it is an archaism,

9 Engelmann ad loc. (*IvK* v p. 27) comments 'Die Dekrete … sind in äolischem Dialekt geschrieben. Man hat aber damals in Kyme nicht mehr äolisch gesprochen. Die Dialekt-Fassung ist künstlich, man hat die Dekrete in den Dialekt rückübersetzt.'

10 Misreported in Buck (1955) (ἐν ὦ κ' ἂν εὔθετον) and at Schwyzer 647 (ἐν ὦ κε ἂν εὔθετον).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

loss of the final -n in the vernacular form κε needs to be explained. It might be argued that the -n was reanalysed as a moveable n (*nu ephelkystikon*) and omitted before a following consonant: the form κε was subsequently generalised. There are two objections to this. First, moveable n was a feature of Ionic, but not of vernacular Lesbian, though it was used as a metrical device by Sappho and Alkaios (as by poets in the Doric tradition, including Alkman and Stesichoros). Secondly, it is hard to see why the -n would be generalised away before a following vowel, if the reason for extending it from verbs and nouns in the first place was precisely to avoid hiatus.

As a working hypothesis, therefore, I shall assume that κεν was a creation of a poetic tradition: this was presumably the eastern Aegean epic tradition, which we know as Homer, and which in some form or another must have been in interaction with poetic traditions (epic or monodic) of Lesbos and eastern Aeolis.[11]

If κεν is a Greek poetic creation, then the interesting and influential theory of Forbes (1958) cannot be exactly correct in its original form. Forbes sought to give a phonological and morphological history of the dialect forms of the particle, which took them all back to an original form *kn̥/*ken (where *kn̥ is the normal zero-grade form of the morpheme, and *ken the *e*-grade form).[12] Zero-grade *kn̥ would give Greek κα and possibly (by the Sievers-Edgerton 'law') καν before a vowel.[13] Early Greek would then, by normal sound-change, have κεν, and κα/καν; Forbes suggested that the analogy of κα/καν produced κε (out of κεν). It is hard to see how this analogical process could happen outside of poetic diction, however. κα is a feature of West Greek, and there are no grounds for supposing the type of extended, early contact between κα dialects and κε(ν) dialects which might have led to the creation of κε in Thessalian, Lesbian and Cypriot. Moreover, *kn̥ would give a short vowel in κα: the attested form κᾱ would have to be accounted for separately, and is a weak analogical model for κε.[14]

Forbes suggested that Attic, Ionic and Arcadian ἄν was the result of a resegmentation of the sequence οὐ καν as οὐκ ἄν. This, in itself, is perfectly plausible. The form *καν is not generally recognised as a form of the potential particle, but Forbes drew attention to a peculiar sequence of particles in three incriptions from Tegea in Arcadia:

(5) *IG* v/2.3 (Buck 18, Dubois (1986) II.20–34), line 16
EIKAN διελαυνόμενα τύχῃ, 'if they are being driven through'

11 See West (1973) 191.

12 This is a standard alternation in the Indo-European languages, and is known as ablaut: a third possibility is the *o*-grade form, which in this case would be *kon. This *e*/*o*/zero alternation is a morphological process, and has nothing to do with sound change.

13 This 'law' has been vigorously debated since Forbes wrote; for a critical overview see Collinge (1985) 159–74.

14 Lee (1967) 52 pointed out the difficulty of coexisting καν and κε(ν): 'I cannot conceive of the same speaker, or singer, being able to continue to say οὐ καν and at the same time say ἔνθακε(ν), καί νυκε(ν), etc. If he continued to say καν in the one case, why not in the other? That is to say, it is hard to imagine retention of καν only in the cluster οὐκαν.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(6) *IG* v/2.6 (Buck 19, Dubois (1986) II.39–61), line 2
EIKAN τι γίνητοι, 'if anything occurs'

(7) Buck 22 (Dubois (1986) II.61–77), line 34
EIKAN τι αὐτοῖς ἐ[π]απύλογον ἦι, 'if there is a defence case against them'

There are eight instances in total in these three inscriptions, which date to the late fifth and fourth centuries BC. Forbes (followed by Dubois and others) saw the potential particle καν in this sequence, which she divided εἴ καν. This seems *prima facie* quite unlikely, given that the same inscriptions also present sequences εἰκ ἐπί (one instance) and εἰ δ' ἄν (twenty instances), which point to a division εἰκ ἄν rather than εἴ καν for (5)–(7):

(8) *IG* v/2.3 (Buck 18, Dubois (1986) II.20–34), line 21
εἰκ ἐπὶ δῶμα πῦρ ἐποίσε[.], 'if one brings fire near the temple'

(9) *IG* v/2.3 (Buck 18, Dubois (1986) II.20–34), line 2
εἰ δ' ἂν καταλλάσσε̄, 'if one makes any change'

It seems clear that Arcadian has merely innovated εἰ/εἰκ on the analogy of οὐ/οὐκ, where the final -κ prevents hiatus before a following vowel.[15]

Forbes suggested that the putative Greek form καν was cognate with forms in Hittite and Sanskrit. Specifically, she drew attention to the Homeric collocation νύ κε(ν) in sentences such as *Iliad* 5.311–12:

(10) καί νύ κεν ἐνθ' ἀπόλοιτο ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὀξὺ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη

And there would Aeneas, leader of men, have perished,
had not Aphrodite daughter of Zeus quickly perceived him.

She compared the Sanskrit sequence *nú kam* and the Hittite *nu-kan*. The Sanskrit particle *kam* is a vague asseverative 'indeed, yes, well' in Vedic sentences such as the following:

(11) vidád gávyaṃ sarámā dr̥ḷhám ūrváṃ yénā nú kam mā́nuṣī bhójate víṭ

Saramā found the cattle's firm-built prison whereby *nú kam* the race of man is still supported. (*Rig Veda* 1.72.8)

In Hittite, *nu* is a clause connector which stands at the head of a sequence of particles; *kan* stands last in a sequence of particles, so *nu* and *kan* will appear next to each other only if there are no other elements in the sequence. The meaning and function of *kan* are not

15 So Wackernagel (1926) I.223–4. Dubois' conclusion ((1986) I.227–31) that Arcadian possessed multiple forms of the particle, viz. κ', δαν, καν, ἄν, is extremely implausible.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

completely understood, however. It is particularly associated with verbs and adverbs of movement or location; it may also (Hoffner (2006)) intensify the telic force of a verb. In (12) the verb *šamen-* 'withdraw, pass by' becomes 'do without, forfeit' with *kan*:[16]

(12) Law 30 (OH/NS): Hoffner (1997) 39–40
takku LÚ-š=a DUMU.MUNUS naui dāi | n=an=za mimmai | kūšata=ma kuit piddāit | n=aš= kan šamenzi[17]

But if a man has not yet taken a girl and refuses her, the bride price which he paid he forfeits.

Here, n=an=za is *nu-* [connective] + *an* [enclitic pronoun acc. 'her'] + *za* [morphosyntactic middle marker], while n=aš=kan is *nu-* [connective] + *aš* [enclitic pronoun 'he'] + *kan*. In spite of the superficial similarity of the collocation with *nu*, a historical connection between Greek κεν and the Sanskrit and Hittite words seems extremely unlikely. A serious linguistic objection to the Hittite parallel is that the marking of an apodosis with *nu* seems to be a feature of later Hittite texts (i.e. it is a development within the history of Hittite).[18]

On this scenario, Greek inherited **nu-km̥* and **nu-kem*; **nu-kem*, ancestor of the Homeric form, became νύ κε by analogy while κεν speakers were in contact with καν/κα speakers. This process must presumably have been complete by the start of the late Bronze Age (*c.* 1500 BC), to allow for the contact-induced innovation κε not only to spread but to become the dominant variant. But it cannot have been too early, because the sound change **km̥* > κα must have already happened for the analogy καν : κα :: κεν : *x* (*x* → κε) to work.[19] It might be argued that the innovation κεν → κε was influenced instead by the ancestor of Attic-Ionic, since the scenario supposes that Attic and Ionic (like West Greek) derive from a **km̥* dialect. However, early Attic-Ionic speakers would need to be isolated relatively early after the (supposed) change **km̥* > κα, καν, or the innovated form ἄν from οὐκαν would be expected in other **km̥* dialects (i.e. in West Greek dialects); and furthermore, the development of ἄν presupposes a dialect which had in fact generalised καν and discarded κα.

Starting with οὐκ, ἄν and the new possibility of εἰκ, I suggest a split development in the dialects along the same lines as Forbes, except that the inherited particle ἄν was retained (on this scenario) by Attic-Ionic and Arcadian; Lesbian, Thessalian and Cypriot ended up

16 See Hoffner and Melchert (2008) 366–74, esp. 371, 373.

17 Words transcribed in capitals indicate that the scribe has inserted a Sumerian logogram rather than spelling out the Hittite word phonetically. The sign '=' is used to indicate a boundary between a word, or particle, and enclitic(s).

18 Hoffner (1997) 12; Hoffner and Melchert (2008) 392.

19 Vocalic **m̥ *n̥* cannot have been vocalised in Common Greek, given differences among the dialects in the Greek realisation (e.g. Myc. *spermo* 'seed' < **spermn̥*, Attic and West Greek *sperma*). For arguments for the emergence of 'Greek' from dialect convergence, rather than the divergence of the dialects from a common proto-Greek, see Garrett (2006).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

with κε/κ' as the result of the reanalysis of εἰκ ἄν and οὐκ ἄν in conjunction with a phonetic variant κε of the particle τε < *k^we. Dunkel and others have suggested that the way to explain the first-millennium diversity is to reconstruct multiple forms *ke, *ken (from *kem) and *an.[20] West Greek κᾱ is explained by analogy (e.g. adverbial forms in -$ā$). This is perfectly possible, though it ignores the interesting coincidence that all forms of the particle either begin or end with an /n/ or a /k/, i.e. precisely those consonants which were used to prevent hiatus in Greek. I shall argue that ἄν was an inherited form (rather than back-formed within Greek from *$kn̥$), and conversely that the *k*-forms are the result of a Greek mixture of reanalysis of word-final -*k* and the vestiges of an old topicalising/conditional force of the IE particle *k^we (which appears elsewhere as τε).

My starting point is an article by Cowgill in 1960, which set out to demonstrate that the Greek negative οὐ(κ) has its roots in an IE phrase *ne H_2oyu (k^wid) 'never', composed of *ne 'not', an adverbial accusative * H_2oyu 'ever', and an optional indefinite pronoun *k^wid. The form of the negative in Greek is otherwise a puzzle: the well-attested IE *ne is not found in Greek, and Greek οὐ(κ) has no obvious etymology. A third form οὐκί is found in Homer: Cowgill started from the assumption that the prevocalic οὐκ is elided from οὐκί, and that this form contains the neuter indefinite pronoun *k^wid as a reinforcing particle (the root of *H_2*óyu* 'life, age' appears in αἰών, αἰεί from *αἰF-, i.e. *H_2eyu-).[21] In Greek, οὐ and οὐκί were reduced to preconsonantal οὐ and prevocalic οὐκ.[22] The phonotactic rules of Greek do not generally allow any consonant in word-final position except -ν, -ρ, -ς. For this reason the form οὐκ'/οὐκ is likely to have been marked as a prevocalic variant (originally at least), licensed perhaps by the prevocalic perfect tense variant ἔθηκ', ἔδωκ' etc.[23]

An adverbial particle ἄν in early varieties of Greek may have been a potential or indefinite marker which became increasingly restricted to situations which depended on the prior achievement of some condition, and clauses with a verb in the subjunctive mood, including the indefinite relative.[24] Greek also inherited a particle *k^we which

20 Dunkel (1990); Pokorny (1959) 515 gave a lemma '*ka *ke *kom "wohl!"' The present account follows Dunkel (1990) 109 in assuming that 'Der Verschiedenheit der Funktionen müßte eigentlich eine Verschiedenheit der Formen entsprechen'; the difference is that κε and κεν are not here derived from separate inherited particles.

21 The development in Greek can be paralleled in French *ne … pas*, in which the negative *ne* was strengthened by *pas* 'step' (and a range of other particles in archaic and dialect French). In French, as in Greek, the secondary element *pas* gradually took over the functional load of the negative. See Ashby (1981) for the French data.

22 The negative οὐ is attested in Mycenaean, but the prevocalic form is not. A sequence *o-u-ki-te-mi* is found in a Knossos tablet (KN V280), but neither the meaning of *te-mi* nor the general subject matter of the tablet is clear: the interpretation οὐχί (in Ventris and Chadwick (1956)) has been mostly abandoned in favour of οὔκις < *ou k^wis (Attic οὔτις). See Palaima (2000) 13–14, 18–19.

23 The preposition ἐκ is a different case: it is the result of the simplification of ἐξ before a consonant, and therefore does not appear before a vowel. Some dialects have ἐς before a consonant (e.g. Arcadian), and Cypriot keeps ἐξ in all positions.

24 In early Greek modal particles emphasised what 'may be implied by the sentence without their aid' (Goodwin (1875) 144 n. 1). Gerö has argued that the modal particles characterised intensional propositions in Greek: 'In intensional contexts, which are induced by various linguistic items, e.g. modals and so-called verbs of attitude, expressions have reference in alternative worlds … , in extensional contexts they have reference in the "real" world' ((2000) 183).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

presents a range of overlapping functions in the IE languages, including conjunction, coordination and subordination. In addition to its semantic force (and here it differs from a marker of potentiality), it also plays a role in the ordering and presentation of discourse.[25] It is familiar in Greek as the connective and 'epic' τε, and (if my argument is right) it was also a formal and functional ingredient in the attested *k*-forms of the modal particle. In the emergent Greek *Sprachbund* the dialects in contact formed, with some morphological variation, a distinct subordinating conjunction 'if' (εἰ, αἰ and ἠ in the dialects), and a specialised modal particle which developed a similar range of functions as the syntax of conditional and indefinite relative clauses took on a distinctively Greek shape.

It is not possible to reconstruct a word 'if' in Indo-European (the word is innovated in IE languages which have it). There are, however, some commonalities in conditional syntax across the languages. Cross-linguistically, conditional grammar can be effected without additional marking by pragmatic or discourse-structuring devices, of which juxtaposition is a straightforward example:

(13) πρεσβύτερός τις τῆι θύραι
ὑπακήκο'· εὐθὺς πατέρα καὶ πάππα[ν λέγω].
γραῦς· μητέρ'.

An older man opens the door: right away [I say] 'Father' and 'Grandad'. An old woman – Mother'. (Men. *Dys.* 493–5)

(14) Negat quis, nego; ait, aio

Somebody denies something, I deny it; they affirm it, I affirm it.
(Ter. *Eun.* 252)[26]

Here the first clause sketches the situation or context in which the second clause (main clause or apodosis) will be valid. The similarity between a condition (protasis) and a topic was noted by Haiman during the development of discourse analysis as a specialised field in the 1970s.[27] The examples above are asyndetic; in English and other languages a frequent connector between the 'topic' (condition) and the main clause is a word meaning 'and'. Greek (like Latin and English) uses *and* when the protasis has the form of an imperative:[28]

25 Gonda (1954) 189 notes that in early texts * k^we is almost never in fact a simple connective, but 'seems to have been a means of indicating complementary unity, that is to say: it was a marker pointing to, or emphasizing, the fact that two (or more) words of the same category (substantives, adjectives etc.) were not only considered as belonging together, but constituted a complementary pair (or set)'.

26 Discussion and further examples in Bertocchi and Maraldi (2011) 94–7.

27 Haiman (1978) 564: 'Conditionals, like topics, are givens which constitute the frame of reference with respect to which the main clause is either true (if a proposition), or felicitous (if not)'.

28 Early modern English used *an[d]* more widely as a conditional: 'I'll tell you when, an you'll tell me wherefore', (Shakespeare, *Comedy of Errors* III.1.39). Folios hesitate between the spellings *and*, *an* when the word has this function.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(15) αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν

Ask and it shall be given to you. (Matthew 7:7)

In this case the 'left-subordinating *and*' has the effect of making the imperative 'ask' the structural equivalent of a subordinate clause.[29] Blakemore (1987) argues persuasively that discourse connectives such as *and* are procedural rather than representational words: they point the hearer to the context and indicate the inference (how to take the representational elements).[30]

In (16) and (17) the connective introduces the subordinate clause in a more straightforward way. In early Latin *apsque* could link a condition to a principal clause:

(16) nam apsque te esset, hodie numquam ad solem occasum uiuerem

if it hadn't been for you, I would never have lived till sunset today

(Plaut. *Men.* 1022–3)

Klein and Condon (1993) have shown that Gothic *nih* from **ne k^{w}e* has a subordinating value on four occasions in the Gospel of John, as in the following example:

(17) nih wesi [= εἰ μὴ ἦν] sa fram guda, ni mahtedi [= οὐκ ἐδύνατο] taujan ni waiht

if he were not from God, he would not have been able to do anything

(John 9:33)

Latin *neque/nec* does not have this subordinating function, though it adds a negative condition in early Latin:

(18) Si intestato moritur, cui heres nec escit, adgnatus proximus familiam habeto.

If a man dies intestate, and if he does not have an heir, the nearest agnate kinsman shall have possession of his household. (*Twelve Tables*, 5)[31]

29 See Culicover and Jackendoff (1997), who see this as an 'asymmetric conjunction that is coordinate in syntactic structure, just the way it looks, but that corresponds explicitly to subordination at the level of conceptual structure'.

30 Wilson and Sperber offer an attractive account of *and* in terms of relevance, following Blakemore: 'An utterance can . . . be expected to encode two basic types of information: representational and computational, or conceptual and procedural – that is, information about the representations to be manipulated, and information about how to manipulate them' (Wilson and Sperber (1993) 2). See also Clark (1993).

31 Cf. also Cato, *De agr.* 141 *Mars pater, siquid tibi in illisce suouitaurilibus lactentibus neque satisfactum est, te hisce suouitaurilibus piaculo* ('Father Mars, if something in the offerings of these suckling pigs was not satisfactory to you, I make expiation with the offering of these pigs').

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Gonda, in his critical review of Ruijgh's (1971) *Autour de TE épique*, noted that the Sanskrit particle *ca* 'and' < IE *k^{w}*e* can in Vedic also mark a conditional clause:[32]

(19) imāṃ ca vācaṃ pratiharyathā naro viśved vāmā vo aśnavat

and if you gladly receive this speech, o noble men [= gods], it will attain all things of yours worth winning (*Rig Veda* 1.40.6; tr. Jamison and Brereton (2014))

He compared this to *Iliad* 1.218, 'where the protasis is virtually conditional and *te* no doubt helps to combine the two parts of the sentence into a whole':

(20) ὅς κε θεοῖσ' ἐπιπείθηται, μάλα τ' ἔκλυον αὐτοῦ

Whoever obeys the gods, readily do they listen to him.

Patri has added data on *k^{w}*e* from Slavic to the discussion, and in a wide-ranging analysis of the function of the particle in Indo-European, argues persuasively that the appearances of the particle across the various languages can be understood by supposing an early unitary value: at the head of a phrase it introduces a condition, or topic, and in other places in the phrase it is a connector (more or less 'and').[33] A plausible case can (in this context) be made for traces of *k^{w}*e* in the conditional grammar of Greek.

Attic and Arcadian

The conjunction εἰ 'if' retained a pre-vocalic form εἰκ in Arcadian on the analogy of οὐ/οὐκ, and this appears in the sequence εἰ + ἄν → εἰκ ἄν.[34] In Attic and Ionic εἰ + ἄν simply melded into ἐάν, ἄν (Attic) and ἤν (Ionic),[35] which explains the different word order in the adversative Attic ἐὰν δέ against Arcadian εἰ δ' ἄν and West Greek αἰ δέ κα.

West Greek, Boeotian, Thessalian

We now need to explain how the forms κε, κα and κ' arose. After the development of οὐ/οὐκ as the negative particles across all varieties of early Greek, the conjunction εἰ (αἰ)

32 Gonda (1975) 301, and cf. Gonda (1954); also Szemerényi (1985) 384; and Klein and Condon (1993) 48, who compare Hittite *takku* 'if' < *to-k^{w}*e*.

33 'Or si l'on admet que *-k^{w}*e* était en indo-européen un indice de topicalisation, c'est à dire, essentiellement, l'expression d'un connection, il devient alors facile d'admettre que quittant la position de tête, ce relateur ne soit plus interprétable comme l'expression d'une connection entre ce qui a été dit par rapport à ce qui va être dit, mais devienne, automatiquement, celle d'une relation entre un constituant de l'énoncé et un autre' (Patri (2003) 298–9).

34 For the sporadic appearance of εικ/αικ elsewhere in (literary) Greek see Gallavotti (1992).

35 In Attic inscriptions the spelling EIAN is late: see Threatte (1980) 147–52.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

developed a regular variant εικ (αικ). Consider the following conditional clause at *Odyssey* 2.76:

(21) εἴ χ' ὑμεῖς γε φάγοιτε, τάχ' ἄν ποτε καὶ τίσις εἴη·

If you were to devour [my goods], amends would perhaps be made one day.

This would reflect greater flexibility in the placing of the modal particle than in classical Attic if one follows the normal interpretation of χ' as the modal particle κ(ε), and there are plenty of parallels for this. Compare, for example, *Iliad* 6.49–50:

(22) τῶν κέν τοι χαρίσαιτο πατὴρ ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα
εἴ κεν ἐμὲ ζωὸν πεπύθοιτ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.

From this [wealth] my father would bestow upon you ransom past counting,
if he learned that I was alive at the ships of the Achaeans.

In (21), however, χ' is formally ambiguous: it might be interpreted as the final consonant of the conjunction εἰ(κ), and this would be (of course) perfectly acceptable grammatically. It is worth remarking that a similar use of ἄν with the optative occurs only once, and this instance (unlike the examples of κε/κεν) is embedded in indirect speech (*Iliad* 2.597–8):

(23) στεῦτο γὰρ εὐχόμενος νικησέμεν εἴ περ ἂν αὐταὶ
Μοῦσαι ἀείδοιεν ...

For he boasted that he would be victorious, even if the Muses themselves were to sing ...

There are traces elsewhere in Greek both of a prevocalic form εικ and of an earlier period of fluidity in modal grammar.[36] At Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 1098–9 (Laconian dialect) an Athenian greets the Spartan ambassadors with the words 'We've been having a tough time [*sc.* without sex]', to which the Spartan responds 'A dangerous time, more like, if they [the Herm-clippers] noticed us with erections.'

(24) ὦ πολυχαρείδα, δεινά γ' αὖ πεπόνθαμες,
αἰκ ἔ(F)ιδον ἁμὲ τὤνδρες ...

36 Solmsen (1908) 335 had come to similar conclusions: 'Dass die Möglichkeit κα beliebig zu setzen oder fortzulassen dann bis zu einem gewissen Grade zur Vermeidung des Hiatus ausgenutzt worden ist, ... ist nicht verwunderlich ... Wir müssen uns für die mundartliche Syntax immer noch mehr von dem frei machen, was uns vom Ionisch-Attischen her als Regel im Blute sitzt. Ob im Arkadischen εικ' oder εικ, im Dorischen αικ' oder αικ gesprochen wurde, können wir nicht wissen.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

My friend, it's a dangerous time we've been having
if that gang saw us …

This is not an unfulfilled condition ('if they had seen us'), which would not make sense as a response to the Athenian comment, but a logical condition which merely asserts 'the inexorable connexion of the two members of the sentence' (they may or may not have seen us).[37] There is no reason to emend γ' to κ' in 1098 (with Ahrens): but it is difficult to be certain whether the K of AIK represents an allomorph of αἰ, or what Gow called 'a freedom in the use of κα or κε which is also found in certain Doric inscriptions'.[38] Gow is commenting here on Theocritus 11.73–4:

(25) αἰκ' ἐνθὼν ταλάρως τε πλέκοις καὶ θαλλὸν ἀμάσας
ταῖς ἄρνεσσι φέροις, τάχα κα πολὺ μᾶλλον ἔχοις νῶν.

If you went and wove some cheese crates, and gathered some greenery
to take to the lambs, you would show a lot more sense.

A fragment of Epicharmus is similarly disconcerting, but the text (a complete trimeter) is relatively secure:

(26) πρᾶτον μὲν αἰκ ἔσθοντ' ἴδοις νιν ἀποθάνοις

First of all, if you saw him eating you'd die … (*PCG* I fr. 18)

There are parallels in epigraphic texts from West Greek and Boeotian. The following example is from North-West Greek (western Locris), mid-fifth century (*IG* IX/1².717 = Buck 58, *SEG* 26.640):

(27) αἰκ [αἴ κ' edd.] ἀδίκō συλῶι ⋮ τέ-|τορες δραχμαί

In the case of an unjust seizure, [the penalty is] four drachmae.

This points to the conclusion that at an early stage the prevocalic variant εἰκ was subject to reanalysis as a modal sequence εἰ κ', which led to the back-formation of κε; partly motivated by parallel sequences εἰ δ(έ), εἴ γ(ε), and εἴ τ(ε), and also by the analogy of οὐκ, which was formally ambiguous:

37 Gildersleeve (1882) 435. This interpretation follows Sommerstein (1990) rather than Colvin (1999) 227–8 or Dover (1957) 94.

38 Gow (1952) 219.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(a) the prevocalic form of οὐ, or
(b) in a sequence *οὐ κ^{w}ε ἄν > οὐ κ' ἄν (indistinguishable from οὐκ ἄν).[39]

At *Iliad* 2.258, for example, the verb κιχήσομαι is formally ambiguous between an aorist subjunctive and a future indicative, which in turn makes two analyses possible for εἰκ/εἰ κ':

(28) εἴ κ' ἔτι σ' ἀφραίνοντα κιχήσομαι ὥς νύ περ ὧδε
If I find you playing the fool again, like you are now ...

It has long been noticed that there is an overlap in the function of τε and κε in the syntax of indefinite/potential propositions, which are often semantically close to conditional clauses (the proposition may be dependent on a set of circumstances distinctly or indistinctly envisaged).[40] At *Odyssey* 7.311–14 Alkinoos expresses the wish that Odysseus might stay in Phaiakia; he continues as follows (in the edition of Von der Mühll (1984)):

(29) ... οἶκον δέ κ' ἐγὼ καὶ κτήματα δοίην,
εἴ κ' ἐθέλων γε μένοις·
I would give a house, and possessions, if you wished to remain.
(*Odyssey* 7.314–15)

Line 314 could stand alone in context, and most of the manuscripts have δέ τ' ἐγώ (so Bérard (1933)). In Homeric relative clauses τε marks a general or undefined state of affairs; in *Iliad* 1 Calchas makes a general point about the dangers of annoying a king:

(30) εἴ περ γάρ τε χόλον γε καὶ αὐτῆμαρ καταπέψῃ,
ἀλλά γε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχει κότον, ὄφρα τελέσσῃ
For even if he swallows his anger for the day,
nevertheless he maintains his bitterness, until he accomplishes its object ...
(*Iliad* 1.81)

39 See below for the dissimilation of κ^{w} to k in the vicinity of a u vowel. A sequence *νύ κ^{w}ε ἄν would have given *νύκαν, replaced by νύκεν in epic since *καν was not synchronically analysable, while κεν could be seen as a form of κε (see below).

40 Lillo (1993) argues that κε and 'epic' τε derive from the same original form and syntagm, since they are syntactically interchangeable in a number of passages. His historical account is different from the one offered here, but our accounts coincide in seeing the partial functional overlap between the two particles in Homer as significant, and in connecting κε with inherited *k^{w}e: '... la no aparición de κε con subjuntivo eventual, sino τε, se deba a que no resultaba tan obvio para esos aedos o rapsodos de última época que tales subjuntivos funcionaran como eventuales, ya que los giros y contextos usados en su época que de alguna manera pudieran equipararse a los homéricos utilizaban el modo indicativo ... el funcionamiento de τε es negativo, es decir, ha quedado relegado a los giros en que la partícula modal κε resultaba incómoda desde la perspectiva, como ya hemos dicho, de unos estadios lengua alejados de los que se podrían considerar originarios u «homericos».'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The protasis lacks a modal particle, and τε marks the general nature of the condition. Sometimes the distinction is a matter of interpretation, and Monro ((1891) 259) gave a list of passages in which he thought that the appearance of κε was due to 'alteration of the original text'. His list includes the famous declaration of Achilles at *Iliad* 9.312–13:

(31) ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν
ὅς χ᾽ ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃι ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴπῃι.

Hateful to me is he, just as the gates of Hades,
who hides one thing in his mind, and says another.

In a nuanced discussion Chantraine, though he accepts the complexities in analysing the Homeric passages, rightly rejects emendation in this and almost all other cases.[41] There is, as he notes, a grey area between a situation envisaged for the future (modal particle with subjunctive) and a general relative (no modal particle):

(32) ὃ δέ κεν κεχολώσεται ὅν κεν ἴκωμαι.

He will be angered, the man whom I visit. (*Iliad* 1.139)

The back-formation of modal κε from εἰκ is hard to imagine without additional motivation: a connection (historical and phonetic) between κε and τε could be the source. The connective particle τε is derived from earlier *$k^{w}e$, which gives Latin *-que*, Sanskrit *-ca* 'and'. It appears in the form *-qe* in Mycenaean, where the labiovelar *k^{w} has not yet disappeared: by the time of alphabetic Greek, this sound had become τ (before the front vowels *e*, *i*), and π (before the back vowels *o*, *a*). In Greek the sound *k^{w} underwent dissimilation to κ before or after the sound *u*, and this has already happened in Mycenaean. It is the same process that produced Latin *secundus, cum* (conjunction) from earlier *sek^{w}-, *$k^{w}om$ (in Latin dissimilation is also triggered by an adjacent *o*). The dissimilation can be seen in the Myc. word *qo-u-ko-ro* [g^{w}oukoloi], later βουκόλοι 'cow-herds', where the second element *-kolos* < *-$k^{w}olos$ following *u*.

To recapitulate, the connective *$k^{w}e$ became κε by dissimilation after a *u* vowel (and τε elsewhere by regular sound change); two obvious sequences which would have triggered the dissimilation are οὔ κε and νύ κε.[42] On this account the Greek modal particle κε/κ᾽ has a

41 Chantraine (1953) 247, 350. He is followed by Ruijgh ((1971) 430), who however bases his argument on his assumption of a 'digressif-permanent' sense for τε. The polite reviews of Ruijgh by Morpurgo Davies (1977) and Chantraine (1973) both contain objections fatal – in my view – to his thesis. See also Lillo (1993) 210–12.

42 Ruipérez (1987) 331 and n. 29 argued for a different history of κεν, but suggested a similar mechanism: 'It is no doubt sound to postulate a stage where sandhi gave birth to two variants depending on the final vowel of the preceding word, *ken* (or *kem*) and $k^{w}en$ (or $k^{w}em$)'. See the discussion of Lillo (1993), esp. 217–19. Palmer (1980) 51, 67–8 derives the modal particle κε (Myc. *qe*) from *$k^{w}en$, and (following Forbes) derives ἄν from resegmentation. But his account depends on two dubious claims: (a) that a modal particle *qe* can be identified in Mycenaean texts (with injunctive force), and (b) that this particle is entirely distinct from the connective/gnomic particle *$k^{w}e$ > τε (Myc. *-qe*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dual origin: the allomorphs εἰκ οὐκ in conditional sentences, combined with the phonetically conditioned variant κε < *k^{w}e. We can see traces in Homer of the development of the syntax of the classical conditional, and of indefinite relative clauses, and this process must have been mirrored by a growth in the role and distribution of the particle. In the following example the particle occurs with an optative (rather than the indicative) in a past counterfactual apodosis (οὔ κε … ἀκαχοίμην):

(33) … ἐπεὶ οὔ κε θανόντι περ ὧδ᾽ ἀκαχοίμην
εἰ μετὰ οἷς ἑτάροισι δάμη Τρώων ἐνὶ δήμῳ

since I would not have grieved thus for his death [*participle for protasis*],
if he had fallen at Troy with his comrades (*Odyssey* 1.236–40)

This is exceptional: the spread of the modal indicative, marked with a modal particle, in place of the optative, is mostly complete in Homer (Goodwin (1875) 161–2).

To this derivation of κε Ruijgh (2011) and others have objected that the dissimilation k^{w} > k next to *u* is already evident in Mycenaean (as in *qo-u-ko-ro* [g^{w}oukoloi] above); we would, therefore, expect the writing *ke* in Mycenaean rather than *qe* in the attested word *o-u-qe* [ouk^{w}e], which became οὔτε in later Greek. This, however, simply pushes the question back to: why is οὔτε not *οὔκε? The answer is analogy. Thessalian κις (Attic τις) is usually explained as the result of a dissimilation of *ou-k^{w}is which was then generalised, whereas in other dialects the free-standing form τις supplanted the expected form -κις in the negative compound. Sound-changes happen with regularity, but can be undone by analogy: *ou-k^{w}is, like *ou-k^{w}e, is a perfectly transparent form, and the restitution of *k^{w} in Myc. *o-u-qe* is unremarkable. In the case of Latin, *equus* and *sequuntur* should, on purely phonological grounds, be **ecus* and **secuntur*: this change must have been similarly inhibited or reversed by the analogical pressure of the paradigm (e.g. gen. *equi* and 3 sing. *sequitur*).

The particle κεν is artificial in the sense that it was a creation of epic poetry. The tradition now had ἄν, κε and κ᾽ at its disposal: all that was needed (for the greatest flexibility in composition) was a syllabic particle in the shape CeC. The obvious solution was κεν, an enlargement of κε on the analogy of ἄν.[43]

West Greek κᾱ

The West Greek particle presents an unexpected alternation κᾱ ~ κ᾽. In metrical texts, where the vowel length can be confirmed, it is always long: this is a phonological problem, since one would not expect a long vowel to be elided in Greek (crasis would be the normal outcome). In high (lyric/choral) poetry the form κα is entirely absent: poets use the forms κεν, κε, κ᾽ (this is

43 Cf. Janko (1994) on *Iliad* 13.289 (οὐκ ἄν MSS and Aristarchus, οὔ κεν papyrus), 'οὔ κεν avoids the sequence ἄν ἀν-, and οὐκ ἄν never precedes α-. Here οὐκ ἄν avoids κεν ἐν.' The doublet νυ/νυν (νῦν) may also have been a model.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

formally ambiguous), and ἄν. This avoidance must be a literary/stylistic choice, since κα is found in comedy (Epicharmus, and the dialect sections of Aristophanes), Sophron and epigraphic prose.[44] In epigraphic (prose) texts κ' is found before a vowel, κα before a consonant, though sometimes the 'plene' form κα is written before a vowel.

Forbes suggested that the long vowel in κα might be metrical licence (i.e. the colloquial language had κᾰ, which explains the elided form κ'): this will strike anyone familiar with Greek literary language as extremely unlikely. Poets, especially comic poets, did not simply lengthen vowels as convenient (and even if they had, we would expect at least *some* instances of κᾰ). Equally implausible is the suggestion (Lee (1967) 47) that the vowel of κα was lengthened to distinguish it from the ending of the temporal ὅκα 'when': it would be difficult to think of a linguistic parallel for this.

It was suggested above that the form κε has its origin in εἰκ, a back-formation assisted by the by-form *κε < *$k^{w}e$. The most economical explanation for κᾱ́/κ' would be a similar back-formation from αἰκ: in this case we need to understand what gave rise to the long ᾱ.

A long vowel -ᾱ is found in Greek among the fossilised IE endings which characterise adverbs in dialects other than Attic-Ionic: thus ἁμᾶ 'at the same time', κρυφᾶ 'in secret' (in Attic-Ionic the normal sound change gave -η, e.g. in Attic ἁμηγέπη, 'somehow or other'). An instrumental ending, it is mostly indistinguishable in sense from the old dative/locative ending -ᾱι/-ηι, with which it became confused (manuscripts usually give the familiar dative-style ending with *iota*). It appears in the opening lines (two hexameters) of the famous Damonon inscription from Sparta (Schwyzer 12, Buck 71):

(34) νικάϝας ταυτᾶ ϝᾶτ' οὐδεὶς πήποκα τῶν νῦν
having been victorious in such a way as none of the men of today[45]

West Greek has a particle with the form πᾶ/πᾶι, with the force 'how?/anyhow' and 'where/anywhere'. It is the instrumental of the IE indefinite and interrogative stem *$k^{w}o$- which supplied pronouns and adverbs. At Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 170–1 a Spartan ambassador asks:

(35) τὸν τῶν Ἀσαναίων γα μὰν ῥυάχετον
πᾷ κά τις ἀμπείσειεν αὖ μὴ πλαδδιῆν;
How will anyone persuade the Athenian rabble not to act crazy?

And at *Acharnians* 732 the Megarian merchant says to his daughters:

(36) ἄμβατε ποττὰν μᾶδδαν, αἴ χ' εὕρητέ πᾳ.
Run forward for some food, if you can find it anywhere.

44 See Molinos Tejada (1992) for references and discussion, and Colvin (1999) 241–2.

45 The πη in πήποκα is also an old instrumental (with a long *e*), equivalent to the πω in Attic πώποτε.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The particle πᾶ < *$k^{w}ā$ by normal development of the labiovelar before a back vowel. A doublet πᾶ/*κᾶ could be explained in the same way as its Attic-Ionic equivalent ποῦ/κοῦ (where the Ionic κ-form reflects dissimilation), or τε/*κε < *$k^{w}e$ above, where the form *κε was explained by invoking dissimilation in collations with οὐ (and νυ). A negative sequence **ou-*$k^{w}ā$ would give οὔ κᾱ, or οὔπᾱ (Laconian at Ar. *Lys.* 1157) by analogical extension of the π to labial contexts (proximity to υ). In Homer around three quarters of the instances of indefinite πῃ occur after a negative (οὐ, οὔτε, or οὐδέ). The phonetic variant κᾶ replaced reflexes of *$k^{w}e$ in indefinite contexts, and then (with the pressure of prevocalic αἰκ) became specialised as the modal particle. The form κ' (from αἰκ and *$k^{w}e$) was naturally maintained as the prevocalic variant, just as modern spoken English preserves the unstressed or allegro form *'em* from Old English *hem*, in spite of the replacement of *hem* by *them* (Old Norse) for functional reasons in the Middle English period.

The particle ἄν has an accent, which is unsurprising if it was inherited as an adverbial particle from the parent language. The *k*-forms κε, κεν and κα, on the other hand, are all atonic (enclitic). This becomes a little easier to explain if the above account is right: the Greek forms are to some extent *disiecta membra*, of which the most important ingredient was the IE enclitic particle *$k^{w}e$, and an indefinite *$k^{w}ā$.

Summary

Connecting the *k*-forms of the Greek modal particle to PIE *$k^{w}e$ permits a comparison with the conditional grammar of other IE languages. It avoids the need for unattested *καν in Greek, and the weakly attested κεν is removed from the heart of the system to the periphery. It connects the κ-forms κε, κεν and κα (rather than supposing them to have been separate entities inherited by Greek). It also offers an explanation of the ambiguous syntax and semantics of εἰκ(')/αἰκ(') in a small but significant number of texts.

Works Cited

Ashby, W. J. (1981) 'The loss of the negative particle *ne* in French: a syntactic change in progress', *Language* 57.3, 674–87.
Bérard, V. (1933) *Homère: L'Odyssée, Chants i–vii*, Paris: Belles Lettres.
Bers, V. (1984) *Greek poetic syntax in the classical age*, New Haven, CT.
Bertocchi, A. and Maraldi, M. (2011) 'Conditionals and concessives', in P. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin (eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax*. Volume iv, Berlin, 93–194.
Blakemore, D. (1987) *Semantic constraints on relevance*, Oxford.
Brixhe, C. (2006) 'Remarques sur les origines "éoliennes" du dialecte béotien', in C. Brixhe and G. Vottéro (eds.), *Peuplements et genèses dialectales dans la Grèce antique*, Nancy.
Buck, C. D. (1955) *The Greek dialects*, 2nd edn, Chicago.
Chadwick, J. (1956) 'The Greek dialects and Greek prehistory', *G&R* 3, 38–50.
Chantraine, P. (1953) *Grammaire homerique*. Volume ii, Paris.
(1973) Review of Ruijgh (1971), *Revue de Philologie* 47, 319–23.
Clark, B. (1993) 'Relevance and "pseudo-imperatives"', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16, 79–121.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Collinge, N. E. (1985) *The laws of Indo-European*, Amsterdam.
Colvin, S. C. (1999) *Dialect in Aristophanes*, Oxford.
Cowgill, W. (1960) 'Greek οὐ and Armenian *oc*', *Language* 36, 347–50.
Culicover, P. and Jackendoff, R. (1997) 'Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination', *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, 195–218.
Dover, K. J. (1957) 'Aristophanes 1938–1955', *Lustrum* 2, 52–112.
Dubois, L. (1986) *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*, 3 vols., Louvain-la-Neuve.
Dunkel, G. E. (1990) 'Jacob Wackernagel und die idg. Partikeln **só*, **ke*, **kem* und **an*', in H. Eichner and H. Rix (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, Wiesbaden, 100–30.
Engelmann, H. (1976) *Die Inschriften von Kyme*, Bonn.
Forbes, K. (1958) 'The relations of the particle ἄν with κε(ν), κα, καν', *Glotta* 37, 179–82.
Gallavotti, C. (1992) 'La congiunzione εικ da Empedocle a Callimaco e il nesso EIK AN in Arcadia', *Helikon* 32, v–xlvii.
García-Ramón, J.-L. (1975) *Les origines postmycéniennes du groupe dialectal éolien* (Suppl. *Minos* 6), Salamanca.
Garrett, A. (2006) 'Convergence in the formation of Indo-European subgroups: phylogeny and chronology', in P. Forster and C. Renfrew (eds.), *Phylogenetic methods and the prehistory of languages*, Cambridge, 139–51.
Gerö, E.-C. (2000) 'The usage of ἄν and κε in Ancient Greek: towards a unified description', *Glotta* 76, 177–91.
Gildersleeve, B. L. (1882) 'Studies in Pindaric Syntax i: The Conditional Sentence in Pindar', *AJPh* 3, 434–55.
Gonda, J. (1954) 'The history and original function of the Indo-European particle k^{u}*e*, especially in Greek and Latin', *Mnemosyne* (4th ser.) 7, 177–214.
(1975) Review of Ruijgh (1971), *Mnemosyne* 28, 299–301.
Goodwin, W. W. (1875) *Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb*, Boston.
Gow, A. S. F. (1952) *Theocritus*, 2nd edn, Cambridge.
Haiman, J. (1978) 'Conditionals are topics', *Language* 54.3, 564–89.
Hajnal, I. (2004) '*e-ke-qe* oder *e-ke*? – Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit in den mykenischen Palastarchiven', in T. Krisch *et al.* (eds.), *Analecta homini universali dicata: Festschrift O. Panagl*, Stuttgart, 233–51.
Heisserer, A. J. and Hodot, R. (1986) 'The Mytilenean decree on concord', *ZPE* 63, 109–28.
Hodot, R. (1990) *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie: la langue des inscriptions, VIIe s. a.C.–IVe p.C.*, Paris.
Hoffner, H. (1997) *The laws of the Hittites*, Leiden.
(2006), 'Studies in the Hittite particles II: On some uses of -KAN', in O. Carruba (ed.), *Per una grammatica ittita*, Pavia, 137–52.
Hoffner, H. A. and Melchert, H. C. (2008) *A grammar of the Hittite language*. Part i: *Reference grammar*, Winona Lake, IN.
Horrocks, G. (1996) 'On condition . . .: aspect and modality in the history of Greek', *PCPS* 41, 153–73.
Jamison, S. W. and Brereton, J. P. (2014) *The Rigveda: the earliest religious poetry of India*, Oxford.
Janko, R. (1994) *The Iliad: a commentary*. Volume IV, Cambridge.
Jones, B. (2012) 'Relative chronology and an "Aeolic phase" of epic', in Ø. Andersen and D. Haug (eds.), *Relative chronology in early Greek epic poetry*, Cambridge, 44–64.
Klein, J. S. and Condon, N. L. (1993) 'Gothic -u(h): a synchronic and comparative study', *TPhS* 91, 1–62.
Lee, D. J. N. (1967) 'The modal particles *an*, *ke*(n), *ka*', *AJPh* 88, 45–56.
Leumann, M. (1950) *Homerische Wörter*, Basel.
Lillo, A. (1993) 'El uso de τε épico y su relación con la partícula modal', in E. Crespo *et al.* (eds.), *Dialectologica Graeca*, Madrid, 209–20.
Molinos Tejada, M. T. (1992) 'La particule κα dans la littérature dorienne', *REG* 105, 328–48.
Monro, D. B. (1891) *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*, Oxford.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Morpurgo Davies, A. (1977) Review of Ruijgh (1971), *CR* 27, 55–9.
(1992), 'Mycenaean, Arcadian, Cyprian and some questions of method in dialectology', in J.-P. Olivier (ed.), *Mykenaika* (*BCH* suppl. 25), Paris, 415–32.
Obbink, D. (2014) 'Two new poems by Sappho', *ZPE* 189, 32–49.
Palaima, T. G. (2000) 'Θέμις in the Mycenaean lexicon', *Faventia* 22, 7–19.
Palmer, L. R. (1980) *The Greek language*, London.
Parry, M. (1932) 'Studies in the epic technique of oral verse-making II: The Homeric language as the language of an oral poetry', *HSCP* 43, 1–50. Repr. in A. Parry (ed.), *The making of Homeric verse: the collected papers of Milman Parry*, Oxford (1971), 325–64.
Patri, S. (2003) 'La syntaxe de *-k^{w}*e* «si, et» en novgorodien et en vieux slave, topicalisation et connectivité', *IF* 108, 279–304.
Pokorny, J. (1959) *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern.
Risch, E. (1955) 'Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht', *MH* 12, 61–76. Repr. in *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin (1981), 222–35.
Ruijgh, C. J. (1971) *Autour de 'TE épique'*, Amsterdam.
(2011), 'Mycenaean and Homeric language', in Y. Duhoux and A. Morpurgo Davies (eds.), *A companion to Linear B*, Louvain, II.253–98.
Ruipérez, M. S. (1987) 'Subjunctive forms in Mycenaean texts', in P. Ilievski and L. Crepajac (eds.), *Tractata Mycenaea*, Skopje, 323–31.
Solmsen, F. (1908) 'Ein dorisches Komödienbruchstück', *RhM* 63, 329–40.
Sommerstein, A. H. (1990) *Lysistrata: edited with translation and notes*, Warminster.
Szemerényi, O. (1985) 'The syntax, meaning and origin of the Indo-European particle *k^{w}*e*', in *Fs. H. Gipper*, Baden Baden, II.247–75. Repr. in *Scripta minora* (ed. P. Considine and J. T. Hooker). Volume I, Innsbruck, 1987, 365–95.
Threatte, L. (1980) *The grammar of Attic Inscriptions I: Phonology*, Berlin.
Ventris, M. and Chadwick, J. (1956) *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge.
Von der Mühll, P. (1984) *Homeri Odyssea*, 3rd edn, Stuttgart.
Voskos, I. and Knapp, A. B. (2008) 'Cyprus at the end of the Late Bronze Age: crisis and colonization or continuity and hybridization?', *AJA* 112, 659–84.
Wackernagel, J. (1926) *Vorlesungen über Syntax*. Volume I, 2nd edn, Basel.
West, M. L. (1973) 'Greek poetry 2000–700 BC', *CQ* 23, 179–92.
Wilson, D. and Sperber, D. (1993) 'Linguistic form and relevance', *Lingua* 90, 1–25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270516000026 Published online by Cambridge University Press