

selected
papers

the **10th**
International
Conference of
Greek
Linguistics

Edited by

Zoe Gavriilidou

Angeliki Efthymiou

Evangelia Thomadaki

Penelope Kambakis-Vougiouklis

Komotini 2012



■ **Οργανωτική Επιτροπή Συνεδρίου**
Organizing Committee

Z o e G a v r i i l i d o u
A n g e l i k i E f t h y m i o u
E v a n g e l i a T h o m a d a k i
Penelope Kambakis-Vougiouklis

■ **Γραμματειακή Υποστήριξη**
Secretarial Support

Ioannis Anagnostopoulos
Maria Georganta
Polyxeni Intze
Nikos Mathioudakis
Lidija Mitits
Eleni Papadopoulou
Anna Sarafianou
Elina Chadjipapa

■ **ISBN 978-960-99486-7-8**

■ **Τυπογραφική επιμέλεια**

Νίκος Μαθιουδάκης
Ελένη Παπαδοπούλου
Ελίνα Χατζηπαπά

■ **Σχεδιασμός εξώφυλλου**

Νίκος Μαθιουδάκης

■ **Copyright © 2012**

Δημοκρίτειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θράκης
Democritus University of Thrace

Εργαστήριο Σύνταξης, Μορφολογίας, Φωνητικής, Σημασιολογίας, *+Μόρφωση* ΔΠΘ
Laboratory of Syntax, Morphology, Phonetics, Semantics, *+MorPhoSE* DUTH

Διεθνές Συνέδριο Ελληνικής Γλωσσολογίας
International Conference of Greek Linguistics

www.icgl.gr

MODAL AND FUTURE PERIPHRASES WITH *EIMAI* IN THE HISTORY OF GREEK AND ITS DIALECTS

Nikos Liosis

Institute of Modern Greek Studies
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

nikoslios@yaho.gr

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Είναι γνωστό διαγλωσσικά ότι περιφραστικές ρηματικές δομές που σχηματίζονται με τη χρήση ενός βοηθητικού ρήματος με την αρχική σημασία ‘είμαι’ ή ‘γίνομαι’ όχι μόνο εκφράζουν συχνά δεοντική ή επιστημική τροπικότητα αλλά και αποκτούν κάποτε (εξειδικευμένες ή μη) μελλοντικές χρήσεις. Με αφετηρία τη διαπίστωση ότι η κοινή νεοελληνική αλλά και πολλές, ιδίως ανατολικές, νεοελληνικές διάλεκτοι διαθέτουν τέτοιες δομές επιχειρείται εδώ η ανίχνευση της παρουσίας και η περιγραφή της σημασιολογικής διαδρομής και γραμματικοποίησής τους σε προγενέστερες φάσεις της ελληνικής με έμφαση στην ύστερη μεσαιωνική περίοδο.

Keywords: copula, obligation, ability, possibility, predestination, scheduled / expected future

1. Introduction: *είμαι* as modal/future marker

Many languages possess structures expressing modality of obligation that are formed with the auxiliary verbs ‘be’ or ‘become’ or with affixes that are derived from these verbs (For a catalogue of such languages, see Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca, 1994:182-3). For example, both Greek and English have modal periphrases expressing obligation with *be to* and *είμαι να* respectively:

- (1) - *I am to go* to the doctor
- *Είναι να πάω* στο γιατρό

The common semantic basis of the two structures is that “the agent has been set or scheduled to do something by outside forces” and for this reason is obliged to act. The difference between these structures and the equivalent but more frequent deontic constructions with *have to* and *έχω να* is that the latter express a more general sense of obligation, not limited to situations where something has been planned or arranged. In addition, in the cases of *be to* and *είμαι να*, the obligation of the agent is more relaxed or remains open (Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca, 1994: 184).

How does it happen that the meaning of obligation comes to be expressed by a structure based on a verb whose prototypical meaning involves existence, being, situation? According to the three authors (184), the sense of obligation also comes partly from the infinitival complement; more analytically, the structure with the copula ‘to be’ shows that the agent is linked to an action, the time reference of which may be either past, present or future. Thus the action may be either complete, in which case it may be expressed with a past participle, e.g. *είμαι γραμμένος* / *I am written*, current, in which case it is often expressed by a present participle or a gerund, e.g. *είμαι γράφων* / *I am writing*, or projected, in which case it may be realized with an infinitive, e.g. **είμαι γράφειν* / *I am to write*. The application of this typological schema in Greek means of course that the linking of the agent with a future action also involves a complement clause – expressing purpose or volition – as a syntactic equivalent to the infinitive, e.g. *είμαι (για) να γράφω* (see also footnote 1). In almost all the above examples, *είμαι/be* can be replaced by the possessive auxiliary *έχω/have*. The fact that these are interchangeable is a syntactic indication that ‘be’ can acquire a suggestion of possession. This may also be observed in various other syntactic environments (e.g. with spatial markers, possessive modifiers etc.): if an object ‘is to me’ (also on me, near me, of John, of Mary etc.), then it ‘belongs to me’ (to John, to Mary etc.). And of course there is a close relationship between possession and obligation; if an action belongs to me, I am

under obligation to bring it to completion (For the stages between possession and obligation, see Heine, 1993:42; for obligation in Greek, see Newton and Veloudis, 1980).

Closely linked with the idea of obligation are the concepts of being expected, scheduled or predestined to take place. Crosslinguistically, these meanings too may sometimes be expressed by structures with ‘to be’. Less commonly, ‘to be’ may be used in similar structures that express the modality of ability (For a catalogue of languages which express the abovementioned modalities using the verb ‘to be’, and for a theoretical discussion of the subject, see Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca, 1994: 186-7 and 249-51).

It is known that future tenses very often develop from structures expressing modalities of obligation or pre-arranging (Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca, 1994: 258-64), given that both strongly imply the speaker’s intention to carry out an action, and by extension a prediction concerning the realization of this action. Similarly, modality of ability can develop into root possibility, then subsequently intention, and ultimately future (265-6). Thus it is not surprising that typologically the verb ‘to be’ is a common source of future tenses (253).¹

Greek is among the languages that make use of this crosslinguistically widespread means for expressing a fairly broad range of modalities (obligation, predestination, ability, root possibility, epistemic possibility, intention etc.), including future tense. All the above observations underline the high degree of syntactic and semantic flexibility possessed by this verb, and justify its characterization as a highly generalized marker for the expression of modal and temporal distinctions.

2. Corpus - method - aim

Starting from the obvious fact that Modern Greek, both in its standard and (much more so) dialect forms, possesses such verbal constructions with *είμαι*, this paper focuses on earlier stages of the history of the Greek language, from the Classical and Hellenistic periods to approximately 1500 AD or a little later, with particular emphasis on the vernacular literary texts of late medieval period. The sheer amount of material available has consequences both for the method that I follow here, basically qualitative, and for the aim of this paper: I attempt, within the framework of grammaticalization theory, to formulate working hypotheses concerning the origin, function and development of the modal structures with the present tense of the copula *είμαι* that we find in Greek.

3. Analysis of the material

3.1 Classical Greek

The best-known use of *είμαι* in a modal periphrasis in Ancient Greek is found in the already impersonal structure *ἔστι* + infinitive. Indeed, this structure seems to cover a large part of the range of modalities that corresponds to Modern Greek *μπορεί*:

(2) εἴ τις [...] εἶχε [...] οὐλὰς ἐν τῷ σώματι [...] ζῶν, καὶ τεθνεῶτος τὸ σῶμα ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ταῦτα ἔχον

If someone had scars on his body while yet alive, you can see that his body still has them after his death.²

(*Gorgias* (Plato), 524c; 4th c. BC)

In example (2), the original modality of ability gives rise to a meaning of root possibility: the agent is able, and external conditions do permit it. The same stage, or perhaps a step further in the direction of epistemic possibility, appears to be represented in the following example; the general conditions are fulfilled, or the situation described in the proposition may represent the truth:

¹ See also the following predicates which lead together with *είμαι* to the future projection of an action: a) result clauses, in the construction *είμαι ὥστε* (see below, example 4 and footnote 3), b) prepositional phrases, in the constructions *είμαι πρὸς* (*γὰρ*, *σε* etc.) + noun (These structures appear in the Hellenistic and subsequent periods, e.g. [ἦν]ωχλήθην ἰσχυρῶς, νυνὶ δὲ πρὸς τῷ ἀναλαμβάνειν εἰμί ‘I fell gravely ill, but now I am nearing recovery’ (*p.zen.pestm.51* (3); 257 BC), *εἶναι πρὸς σωτηρίαν* ‘he is going to be saved’ (*Spaneas*, O 207) etc.), c) genitive articular infinitives, in the construction **είμαι τὸν γράφειν* (see below example 5).

² The translations are mine (except where indicated otherwise), and are as faithful as possible to the original.

(3) τοιάδε μέντοι τῶν φρενοπλήκτων βουλευμάτων ἔπη τ' ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι
You may hear such words and thoughts from furious people.

(*Prometheus Bound* (Aeschylus), 1054-5; 5th c. BC)

The frequentative meaning implicit in utterance (3) ('Every time that anyone is furious, they think and speak like that.') highlights the shift of the modal verb towards epistemic modality (see Traugott 1989:43, and especially Βελοῦδης 2010:59, where reference is made to the close relationship between weak epistemic modals, frequentative meaning, and prophetic future).

Two points about the modality of *ἔστι* in Ancient Greek must be borne in mind here. The first is that in precisely these constructions, the accent of the auxiliary moves obligatorily to the penultimate syllable, which is an indication not only that it is increasingly syntactically bound to the following infinitive, but also that it is behaving as a clitic. That these structures are in the early stages of grammaticalization can also be seen from the analogous accent shift observed in periphrastic quantifiers with the 3rd person singular of the auxiliary, e.g. *ἔστιν ὅς* 'someone', *ἔστιν ὅπου* 'somewhere', *ἔστιν ὅτε* 'sometimes' etc., or after some grammatical words (such as *οὐκ*, *καί*, *ἀλλά* etc., e.g. *οὐκ ἔστι* 'it is not', cf. *τοῦτο ἐστί* > *τοῦτ' ἔστι* 'in other words' etc.). The second point is semantically and syntactically important. I quote the next distich from Sophocles's *Philoctetes* (5th c. BC) together with its English translation (Jebb, 1898:656-7):

(4) ἄρ' ἔστιν ὥστε κἀγγύθεν θεῶν λαβεῖν καὶ βαστάσαι με προσκύσαι θ' ὥσπερ θεόν;

Is there any way that I might have a closer view of it – and handle it, and salute it as divine?

Here Neoptolemos is not wondering about his ability to see or his chances of seeing the bow of Philoctetes, but whether it is allowed, whether he has permission to see it – permission which is given immediately afterwards. Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1994:199) note that the modality of permission is a branch of root possibility. From a syntactic point of view, what is different here is that the auxiliary is combined with a result clause, or rather with the result marker *ὥστε* which is prepositioned before the infinitival complement.³

3.2 Hellenistic Koine and early medieval Greek

A third syntactic possibility, already available in the Hellenistic period, is exemplified by the following example from the Septuagint (3rd-2nd c. BC):

(5) καὶ εἶπεν· ἐὰν κραταιωθῇ Συρία ὑπὲρ ἐμέ, καὶ ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς σωτηρίαν, καὶ ἐὰν κραταιωθῶσιν υἱοὶ Ἀμμὼν ὑπὲρ σέ, καὶ ἐσόμεθα τοῦ σῶσαί σε

And he said: if Syria becomes stronger than me, then you will (be about to) save me, and if the sons of Ammon become stronger than you, then we will (be about to) save you

(2 Samuel 10.11)

From a morphosyntactic point of view, what is important about the structure *ἐσόμεθα τοῦ σῶσαί σε* (literally: 'we will be of to save you') is that 'be' remains inflected, while the complement has the genitive of purpose of the articular infinitive (see also the parallel expression *ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς σωτηρίαν* in the preceding line, where in place of the articular infinitive we have as a complement a prepositional phrase showing purpose, too). From the point of view of semantics, it seems that this structure is just a step away from the immediate or expected future. In LSJ this example is included in the entry *εἰμί* for the meaning 'to be about to' (C.2.f), while in the Latin and English translations in the Digital Library of Perseus, the periphrasis is rendered by the futures 'auxiliabor tibi' and 'we will come and help you' respectively. Notwithstanding the fact that the future reading of this structure may be affected by the presence of the synthetic future *ἐσόμεθα*, it is more likely that the structure in question actually conveys the readiness/imminence of the subject to act. Whatever the case, we are dealing with an agreement by the terms of which mutual help is expected or prearranged for the near future in the face of an external threat (for the terms 'immediate' and 'expected/scheduled' and the close relationship between them, as well as with the simple future, see Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca, 1994:244-7, 249-51).

³ It is not by chance that, as Jebb (1932) observes in his comments on this verse, similar result structures are found with other premodal verbs such as *θέλω* or *δυνατόν* (*ἐστί*), e.g. *ἀδύνατον ὑμῖν ὥστε Πρωταγόρου τοῦδε σοφώτερόν τινα ἐλέσθαι* (*Protagoras* (Plato), 338) 'It is impossible for you to choose...'.

A new development in this period is the identification of 3sg. *ἔνι* (alternative form of 3sg. *ἔνεστι*, from the prefixed verb *ἔνειμι* ‘to be in’) with *ἐστί*, resulting in their parallel use (Mandilaras, 1973:77). The two types also coincide in their impersonal uses with the general meaning of ability / root possibility, although the structures with *ἔνι* are rare and relatively late-attested (there are only three examples, all in private papyri from the end of the Hellenistic and beginning of the early Medieval periods):

- (6) ἐπι δὲ οὐκ ἔνι ἀπελθῆν ὅσοις τέσ\σαιρες/

Because I can’t (it is impossible for me to) leave with four animals. (?)

(sb.18.13598 (9); 6th–7th c. AD)

See also *bgu.4.1024* (5, 20-1); 360 AD and *p.cair.masp.2.67199*; 520–530 AD. In contrast, the impersonal structures with *ἔστι* are much more common and occur regularly throughout the period in question, e.g. *χιτωνάριον δὲ τῷ παιδαρίῳ οὐκ ἔστιν εὔρεῖν* ‘I can’t find a little tunic for our little child’ (*p.cair.zen.4.59644* (12), mid-3rd c. BC; see also *psi.4.297*; 5th c. AD etc.).⁴

In the material from the papyri I also found an example of the periphrasis *ἦν* (= *ἦ*; subjunctive) + infinitive in an embedded purpose clause with *ἵνα*:

- (11) καὶ οὕτως ὄρμασα<ι> τῷ σὲν ζυγὴν μαχαίρην καλὸν καὶ πρόσοψιν λέων ἔχοντα ἵνα ἦν
εὐζηλότερον γενέσθαι καὶ θαυμάζομεν (leg. θαυμάζωμεν)

And so I decorated your good penknife with a lion’s face, so that it can (in order to) be more enviable and we (can) admire it.

(o.claud.2.279 (5-9); 2nd c. AD)

The important thing here is that, functionally, the structure seems to have been generalized: it is nothing more than a subjunctive / subordination marker (*ἦν γενέσθαι* = *γέννηται*), presumably as a consequence of the falling together of the two forms of the auxiliary (*ἦ* / *ἦν*). The same conclusion is reached by Markopoulos (2009:149-55) regarding the structure *να ἔχω* + infinitive which appears in late Byzantine texts.

3.3 Late Medieval Greek and Modern Greek Dialects

Almost the same syntactic pattern seen in example (5), differing only in that the infinitive (but not its article) has been replaced by a *να*-clause, appears more than a thousand years later in the *Ermoniakos* (14th century). The relatively conservative character of the language of this text is what makes possible a comparison with the equivalent Hellenistic structure. On the level of form, *εἶναι* now appears in place of *ἐστί* (for the development of the morphology of *εἶμι*, see Καψωμένος 1953). At the point which interests us, a disheartened Patroklos conveys to Achilles the wretched image of the battle with the Trojans and, having referred to a long list of dead and wounded, emphasizes the fact of the imminent death of two more heroes:

- (12) ο δε Σίσυφος και Νέστωρ συν γαρ τῷ Λοκρῷ τῷ Αἴᾳ εἶναι γουν του ν’ ἀπεθάνουν [...] και
προς κίνδυνον οι πάντες εἶναι γαρ του να γενώσιν

Sisyphus and Nestor, together with the Locrian Ajax, are about to die, and everyone is about to find themselves in danger.

(*Ermoniakos*, P 245-56)

It is obvious that the two structures with *εἶναι του να* + subjunctive have the meaning of immediate / expected future, although from these particular examples it is not possible to confirm the impersonal syntax of the auxiliary. In the same text we also find two archaic structures of the type *εἶναι* + infinitive; this time the old modality of ability / possibility has been replaced by a meaning of preordained or predestined future similar to that expressed by the Modern Greek structure *μου (σου, του etc.) μέλλει να*:

⁴ For more examples, including one with the future *ἔσται* and two with the optative *εἴη*, see Mayser 1906 (II, 1: 165, 307, 339).

- (13) και το κυρωθέν καθάπαξ ου γαρ είν' αναλυθήναι
And that which has been sealed (by fate) now and forever is not destined to be erased
(B 88-91)

(See also *Ψ* 287, where we find the same structure with the same modality). Ambiguity between possibility and preordained future is found in the works of Sachlikis (14th c.), the earliest representative of Cretan literature (Vitti, 1960):

- (14) μη λυπηθής την πολιτικήν εις όσα και αν κλάψη
ότι ποτέ το κλάμα της δεν είναι να την βλάβη
Don't pity a prostitute, however much she cries
because her tears can never (are never going to) do her any harm
(367-8)

Here the periphrasis with *είναι*, which now takes a subordinate clause (*να* + subjunctive) as a complement, expresses the fact that not only it is impossible for tears to harm the prostitute, but also that this is not destined to happen, which is emphasized by the use of the temporal adverb *ποτέ* (see also *καθάπαξ* in the previous example).

The meaning of imminent / near or preordained / predestined future can be clearly discerned in another poem by Sachlikis, as well as in a number of 14th-15th century sources of Cretan, Cypriot and more generally south-eastern origin, especially when the situation described involves concepts such as fate, death, illness etc. (see also examples 12 and 13): *κι όταν παγαίνουν κι έρχονται και ρωτούν πώς ιστέκει, λέγουν το δια να μάθουσιν αν ένι ν' αποθάνη* 'And when they come and go and ask how he is, they say it to find out whether he is going to die' (*Sachlikis* (Wagner, 1874), 129-30; Crete), *από της πείνας της πολλής όλοι <εί>ναι ν' αποθάνουν* 'Because of the great hunger everyone is going to die' (*Diegesis Apolloniou*, 118; maybe from Cyprus), *λοιπόν, παιδί μου, σαν θωρώ, δεν είναι πλια να φθάσω* 'so, my child, as I see it I am not going to live anymore' (*Rimada Apolloniou*, A 1789; see also A 1784-5, A 407-8), *και λαλούν τον: «είναι να γίνει μέγαν σκάνταλον»* 'And they say to him: "there's going to be a big scandal"' (*Boustronios*, A 125r 5; Cyprus; see also A 125r 11-2, A 24v 9-14, A 92v 5-6), *ουδένας γοιον εμέν δ' είναι να μοιάση* 'there will not be anyone like me' (*Love Poems*, κα' 12; Cyprus; see also ν' 7-8 and ξε' 6-7) etc.

What all the above cases have in common is the fact that the auxiliary is in the third person, appearing in its usual forms *ένι*, *έναι*, *είναι(ν)*. In contrast, I have noted only two instances where the auxiliary is declined for person: the first is from the chronicle of Machairas:

- (15) λαλείς πως είσαι να βάλης εις νομήν τον αφέντην μας
You say that you are going to put our master in charge.
(491.28-9; Cyprus, 15th c.)

Dawkins ascribes lexical meaning to the auxiliary: 'you wish to put', but this interpretation finds little support in the preceding theoretical discussion or in the material available from Greek. It is most likely that we are dealing either with immediate or scheduled future, or, at least, with the modality of intention.

The second case, which is also the only example where *είμαι* is combined with the purposive complementizer *ίνα* instead of *να*, is from the *Thanatikon tis Rhodou* by Georgilas (211; circa 1500):

- (16) αμμή εγώ θωρώντα σε είμαι δια ν' αποθάνω
But I, seeing you, deserve to die

However, this structure cannot easily be ascribed future reference.⁵ In fact it is very reminiscent of the equivalent Modern Greek expressions *είναι (για) να τον κλαίνε*, *είναι να τρελαίνεσαι* etc. where the periphrasis expresses the meaning 'is justified' or 'deserves' (for these expressions and their meanings see LKN, entry *είμαι*).

In texts from the same period (15th – early 16th century) and the same general area (Crete – Cyprus), I have only rarely encountered structures which could be considered to express simple obligation (without the additional meaning of prescheduled future). These are examples 17-20, but in none of

⁵ See also the slightly later (mid-16th century) *αν δεν το κάμω σαν θωρείς, είμαι για να παγώσω* 'If I don't do it as you think right I deserve to freeze' (*Aitolos (Aisopou Mithoi)*, 125 12).

these cases is it possible to exclude a reading from the point of view of ability / root possibility or other modalities:

- (17) Το φυσικόν της αρχοντιάς δεν είναι να κρατήζη
την χρείαν τ' ανθρώπου περιπλιός όντε τη θε ζητήξει
(*Falieros (Istoria kai Oniro)*, 158-60; 15th c.)

The meaning of this couplet, according to van Gemert (1980:147, 187), is that the nobleman, because of his nature, should not (it is not appropriate for him to) refuse help to someone in need, especially if he asks for it.

- (18) δια τρεις αφορμές ένι να φύγωμεν θυμού, μίσου και φάμας
(*Machairas*, 255.11-2; 15th c.)

Dawkins translates (18) as follows: 'There are three ways we may take to avoid wrath, hatred and scandal'. However, as these three ways are not mentioned in the text that follows, I take the meaning to be 'We should avoid (it) for three reasons: wrath, hatred and scandal', in which case the periphrasis has clearly deontic meaning.

Similarly, in the next two examples, hidden behind deontic modality we find the meanings 'it is not right', 'it is not justified', 'does not deserve' (see also 16 above):

- (19) και δεν είναι να τους αποθαρρούμεν. Διати μίαν φοράν ήύραμέν τους δια παράβουλους
And we should not trust them. Because we have once found them to be oath-breakers.
(*Boustronios*, A 108r 5-6; beginning of the 16th c.)

- (20) το λοιπονίν δεν είνε να το θαυμαστή τινάς τούτον το γίνην, ότι αξ αυτόν μου εγίνην
So no-one should be surprised at what happened, because it happened because of me.
(*Machairas*, 251.21-2; 15th c.)

As can be seen from the above examples, all the structures with *είμαι* come from medieval texts that belong to the so-called southern-south-eastern group of dialects. It is characteristic that I could not find even one example of modal use of the present tense of the copula outside this area (e.g. in the *Chronicle of the Morea* or the *Chronicle of the Tocco family of Kefalonia* etc.), with the exception of the archaic infinitive constructions from *Ermoniakos* (examples 12 and 13). Indeed, the relatively frequent appearance of the structures with *είμαι* in the arc Crete-Dodecanese-Cyprus supports the hypothesis that in precisely these areas it is possible to find examples not simply of semantic generalization / reduction (e.g. the use of the copula in place of a modal marker) or decategorization (e.g. the fact that the form used is almost always impersonal) as seen in the above examples, but also cases of phonological reduction of the auxiliary and its coalescence with other grammatical morphemes, for which see below. The fact that all these different aspects of the phenomenon are present shows that the structures in question present an increased degree of grammaticalization, and that we can indeed consider them to be periphrases (for the terminology, see Hopper & Traugott (2003), Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca (1994), Lehmann, 2002 etc.; for the criteria defining periphrasticity, see Vincent (1987), Bertinetto (1990), Haspelmath (2000) etc.).

In the following examples the auxiliary shows signs of phonological reduction and coalescence with the negative particle:

- (21) «δένα (ed: δεν 'ν' να) βρεθεί και ο Σαπλάνες έχει στο Κολόσσιν κανέναν πράμαν δικόν του»
It will not / is not going to be found that Saplanes has any property of his own at Kolossi.
(*Boustronios*, A 104v 5-6; beginning of the 16th c.)

(See also the same structure in A 130v 9-10; also *νύκταν ημέραν κόβγεις τους και δεν να σε κοζήσουν* '[Death,] you reap day and night and no-one can (is going to) change your mind' (*Georgilas*, 227; circa 1500). In all three examples I think it preferable to reconstruct the complex *δε(ν) εν να > δε(ν)α* with dissimilatory deletion of the first nasal, where *εν* is a common medieval form of the 3rd person singular alongside *έν(ι/αι)* and *είν(ι/αι)* (see Καψωμένος, 1953), rather than to propose a simple future meaning for *να*, the position of which immediately following the negative *δεν* would be in any case problematic. However, the phonological reduction undergone by the auxiliary in this structure cannot really be taken as proof of the grammaticalization of the periphrasis *είναι να* + subjunctive in particular, because in various Modern Greek dialects today, including those in question, we quite

regularly find forms of the negative particle *δένι*, *δέναι* (= *δεν έν(ι/αι)*) (Τζιτζιλής, to appear (a)), so we must conclude that the coalescence of *δεν ένι* is not confined to the periphrases examined here. What these examples show is a general tendency for decharacterization or bleaching of *είναι*. The example given below, however, is a case where the phonological reduction of the auxiliary can indeed be understood as an indication of the grammaticalization of the structure *είναι να* + subjunctive. It comes from Crete:

- (22) Αν απεθάνει η Τάρσια ποιος ένα (ed: *έ' να / έν' <ν>α*) μας γυρεύει
If Tarsia dies, who will interrogate us?

(*Rimada Apolloniou*, A 1213; 15th c.)

The editor of the text takes the meaning of this structure to be simple future (p. 217), and in his comments on the language of the Cypriot Boustronios he adopts the etymology from *(θ)έ(λει)ν να > εν να*, which is the preferred form of the future in Cypriot today, alongside *θεννα*. However, I believe that the degree of phonetic reduction presupposed by this etymology is much greater than that presented in the sources from the southern / south-eastern dialects from this period (see Markopoulos (2009), where it is shown that at least until the 15th century the basic form of the future is *θέλω* + infinitive). Another thing that leads us to reject the interpretation of *εννα* as deriving from the volitional *θέλω* is the large number of periphrases with 'be' in the texts from Cyprus, Crete and the Dodecanese. Taking this into account, the modern futures with *εννα* + subj. in the dialects of Cyprus, e.g. *εν να φάω* 'I will eat' (Χατζιωάννου, 1999:92) and the Dodecanese, e.g. *εννα χτυπήσεις* 'you will hit' (Παπαχριστοδούλου 1986:181, Rhodes), *γιάαινε κ' εννα 'ρτεί κ' εκείνος* 'Go and he will come with you' (Μηνάς 2002:65, Karpathos) etc. are more plausibly (and more economically) explained as deriving from constructions with the copula rather than the volitional auxiliary. This hypothesis is supported by the existence of futures with 'be' in a number of dialects from Asia Minor, including that of Farasa (Αναστασιάδης, 1976:188-9), e.g. *αρέ ε να νάρτου* 'I'll come soon' (*ε* is a marker of immediate future or obligation⁶ in contrast to the simple future particle *α(ν)*; for the likelihood that *ε* is to be identified with the medieval *εν*, see Τζιτζιλής, to appear (b)), as well as the Cappadocian dialects of Ulagac and Axos (Janse, to appear), e.g. *να έρτομ' δέ 'ναι* 'we won't come' (Ulagac), *να πάμ' δέ 'ναι* 'we won't go' (here *(έ)ναι* is only present in an environment of negation with *δεν*), Propontis Tsakonian, e.g. *μα γράψ' < είμα να γράψου* (Λιόσης 2010) 'I will write', and probably also in the dialect of Silli, for which Κωστάκης (1968:162) gives the form *εννα* (= *θα*). We encounter the same structure in the neighbouring Cyclades, also with the meaning of immediate future, e.g. *να πάου είμαι στο χωριό* 'I'll go soon' (Μάνεσης 1997, 1:307; Mykonos). Here the fact that the copula follows the main verb and is finite, on the model of the simple future as seen in example *να τσι φάς θες* 'I'll beat you' (Μάνεσης 1997, 1:348), excludes the possibility of interference from Standard Modern Greek.

4. Conclusions

In a previous paper (Liosis 2010) I discussed structures of counterfactual modality with the imperfect of *είμαι* in modern Greek dialects, applying the typological division made by Τζιτζιλής (to appear (a)) based on the verb used in each dialect to express this modality. Thus dialects may be divided according to whether they use *ήθελα*, *είχα* or *ήμουν*. In the last category belong, not by chance, Cypriot, Dodecanesian and Cretan, as well as many dialects from Asia Minor (those of Cappadocia, Farasa, Silli, and Propontis Tsakonian). I believe that this picture is confirmed in the light of the data from the medieval texts; the periphrases with the present tense of *είμαι* are generally found in the same areas, are more or less grammaticalized, and cover a broad range of modalities, which theoretically and typologically precede the future (e.g. ability, obligation, possibility), or are later non-future developments (e.g. epistemic modality), or can be described as specialized futures (immediate, scheduled, predestined future). In some cases they have been grammaticalized to the point where they have replaced the simple future.

⁶e.g. *τα ζύα ε να κοπούν σήμουρον* 'the wood must be cut today' (see also the equivalent negative deontic structure from Pontic Greek *κ' έν να γίνεται αέτσ* 'it must not happen like that' (Παπαδόπουλος 1958, 1:288)).

References

Secondary Sources

- Αναστασιάδης, Β. 1976. *Η σύνταξη στο φαρασιώτικο ιδίωμα της Καππαδοκίας*. PhD diss., Πανεπιστήμιο Ιωαννίνων.
- Βελούδης, Γ. 2010. *Από τη σημασιολογία της ελληνικής γλώσσας. Όψεις της 'επιστημικής' τροπικότητας*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Bertinetto, P. 1990. "Perifrasi verbali italiane: criteri di identificazione e gerarchia di perifrasticità". In *La temporalità nell'acquisizione di lingue seconde*, edited by G. Bernini and A. Giacalone-Ramat, 331-350. Milano: Angeli.
- Bybee, J., R. Perkins and W. Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: U.C.P.
- Bybee, J. 1985. *Morphology: A Study of the relation between meaning and form*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Jebb, R. 1932. *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments, with critical notes, commentary, and translation in English prose. Part IV: The Philoctetes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, M. 2000. "Periphrasis". In *Morphologie: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung*, edited by G., Booij, V. Lehmann and J. Mugdan Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Heine, B. 1993. *Auxiliaries: cognitive forces and grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hopper, P. & E. Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Janse, M. To appear. "Η καππαδοκική διάλεκτος". In *Οι νεοελληνικές διάλεκτοι* edited by X. Τζιτζιλής. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Jannaris, A. 1897. *An historical Greek Grammar, chiefly of the Attic Dialect*. Oxford.
- Κατωμένος, Σ. 1953. "Συμβολή στην ιστορία του ρήματος εἰμί". In *Προσφορά εις Στίλωνα Π. Κυριακίδη (Ελληνικά)*, 305-325. Θεσσαλονίκη.
- Κωστάκης, Θ. 1968. *Το γλωσσικό ιδίωμα της Σίλλης*. Αθήνα.
- Lehmann, Chr. 2002. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Vol. 2. Erfurt, Universität Erfurt.
- Λιόσης, Ν. 2010. "Η γραμματικοποίηση στις περιφραστικές δομές μέλλοντα της τσακωνικής: ιστορικές και κοινωνιολογικές παρατηρήσεις". In *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα* 30, 372-384. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Liosis, N. 2010. Counterfactuals in Tsakonian: a contribution to the history of *ήθελα* and *ήμουν*. In *On-line Proc. 4th International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory. Chios, 11-14 June 2009*, edited by A. Ralli, B. Joseph, M. Janse and A. Karasimos, 89-102. Patras. Available at: <http://www.philology.upatras.gr/LMGD/el/index.html>.
- Mandilaras, B. 1973. *The verb in the Greek non-literary papyri*. Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences.
- Μάνεσης, Σ. 1997. *Ιστορικό λεξικό του μυκονιάτικου ιδιώματος*. Μύκονος: Δήμος Μυκονίων.
- Markopoulos, Th. 2009. *The Future in Greek. From Ancient to Medieval*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mayser, E. 1970. *Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. Band II 1, Satzlehre. De Gruyter, Berlin.
- Μηνάς, Κ. 2002. *Τα γλωσσικά ιδιώματα της Καπάθου*. Ρόδος.
- Newton, B. and I. Veloudis. 1980. "Necessity, obligation and Modern Greek verbal aspect". *Lingua* 50:25-43.
- Παπαδόπουλος, Α. 1958. *Λεξικόν της ποντικής διαλέκτου*. Vol. 1. Αθήνα.
- Παπαχριστοδούλου, Χ. 1986. *Λεξικό των ροδίτικων ιδιωμάτων*. Αθήνα.
- Traugott, E. 1989. "On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic Change". *Language* 65(1), 31-55.
- Τζιτζιλής, Χ. To appear (a). "Εισαγωγή". In *Οι νεοελληνικές διάλεκτοι* edited by X. Τζιτζιλής. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Τζιτζιλής, Χ. To appear (b). "Το ιδίωμα των Φαράσων". In *Οι νεοελληνικές διάλεκτοι* edited by X. Τζιτζιλής. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών.
- Vincent, N. 1987. "The interaction of Periphrasis and Inflection: Some Romance Examples". In *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*, edited by M. Harris and Paolo Ramat, 237-256. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Χατζιωάννου, Κ. 1999. *Γραμματική της ομιλούμενης κυπριακής διαλέκτου*. Λευκωσία: Εκδόσεις Ταμασός Λίμιτεδ.
- Ψάλτης, Σ. 1918. "Περί των υποθετικών λόγων εν τη μέση και νεωτέρα ελληνική". *Λεξικογραφικόν Αρχεῖον της Μέσης και Νέας Ελληνικής* 5:40-57.

Primary Sources

- Aitolos (Aisopou Mithoi)*. Παράσογλου, Γ. 1993. *Ανδρόνικος Νούκιος, Γεώργιος Αιτωλός. Αισώπου Μύθοι*. Αθήνα: Βιβλιοπώλειον της «Εστίας».
- Boustronios*. Κεχαγνόγλου, Γ. 1997. *Τζώρτζης (Μ)πουστρός (Γεώργιος Βο(σ)τρ(υ)ηνός ή Βουστρώνιος)*. Διήγησις *Κρονίκας Κύπρου*. Λευκωσία: Κέντρο Επιστημονικών Ερευνών Κύπρου.
- Chronicle of Morea*. Καλονάρος, Π. 1940. *Το χρονικόν του Μορέως*. Αθήνα: Δημητράκος.

- Dellaportas. Μανούσκακας, Μ. 1995. *Λεονάρδου Ντελλαπόρτα Ποιήματα (1403 / 1411)*. Αθήνα: Ακαδημία Αθηνών.
- Diegesis Alexandrou. Holton, D. 1974. *Διήγησις του Αλεξάνδρου. The tale of Alexander. The rhymed version*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Σφακιανάκης και Υιοί.
- Diegesis Apolloniou and Rimada Apolloniou. Κεχαγιόγλου, Γ. 2004. *Απολλώνιος της Τύρου: Υστερομεσαιωνικές και νεότερες μορφές*. 3 vol. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη).
- Digenis. Αλεξίου, Σ. 1985. *Βασίλειος Διγενής Ακρίτης και το Άσμα του Αρμούρη*. Αθήνα: Ερμής.
- Ermoniakos. Legrand, É. 1890. *La guerre de Troie*. (BGV V). Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Falieros (Istoria kai Oniro). van Gemert, A. 2006. *Μαρίνου Φαλιέρου «Ερωτικά Όνειρα»*. Αθήνα: MIET.
- Fisiologos. Legrand, É. *Le Physiologus. Poème sur la nature des animaux en grec vulgaire et en vers politiques*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Georgilas (Thanatikon tis Rhodou). Wagner, W. 1874. *Carmina Graeca Medii Aevii*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Gorgias and Protagoras. Burnet, J. 1903. *Platonis Opera*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Imperios. Yiavis, K. *A critical Edition of the Rhymed Medieval Romance 'Imberios and Margarona'*. PhD diss., University of Cambridge.
- Kallimachos. Κριαράς, Ε. 1955. *Βυζαντινά ιπποτικά μυθιστορήματα*. Αθήνα: Αετός.
- Love Poems. Legrand, É. 1881. BGV II. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Machairas. Dawkins, R. 1932. *Leontios Makhairas: recital concerning the sweet land of Cyprus entitled chronicle*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Philoctetes. Jebb R. 1898. *The Philoctetes of Sophocles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Prometheus Bound. Weir Smyth, H. 1926. *Prometheus*. PhD diss. London: William Heinemann, Ltd.
- Rimada Velissariou, Adis Pikatorou, Parainetikon Komninou and Diigisis Pediofrastos. Wagner, W. 1874. *Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Sachlikis. 1. Wagner, W. 1874. *Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi*. Leipzig: Teubner. 2. Vitti, M. 1960. "Il poema parenetico di Sachlikis". *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 14:173–200.
- 2 Samuel. 1. Greek text: (Βασιλειών Β'). Available at: <http://www.imgap.gr/file1/AG-Pateres/AG%20KeimenoMetafrasi/PD/10.%20VasilionB.htm>. 2. Latin text: Saint Jerome. Vulgate Bible. Bible Foundation and On-Line Book Initiative.ftp.std.com/obi/Religion/Vulgate. 3. English text: Rainbow Missions, Inc. World English Bible. Rainbow Missions, Inc.; revision of the American Standard Version of 1901. Available at: <http://ebible.org/bible/web>.
- Spaneas. Legrand, É. 1880. BGV I. Paris: Maisonneuve.