

THE ASPECTUAL DIFFERENCES  
BETWEEN THE PRESENT AND AORIST SUBJUNCTIVES  
IN MODERN GREEK

INTRODUCTION

Any Greek who has heard foreigners speaking his native tongue knows that one of their greatest problems is to make the right choice between the aorist and present stems of the Greek verb. Whenever they pronounce a verbal form, there is quite a chance that they choose the wrong aspect. One of the principal causes, of course, is that, whereas anyone to some extent can master the Greek language, not everybody has the ability or the opportunity to obtain possession of the linguistic feeling that is one of the birth-rights of a Greek. Another cause, and one which could be eliminated, is that in grammars and handbooks used at universities where Modern Greek is taught not enough attention is paid to the aspectual differences between the aorist and the present stems of the verb. Some of them give very plausible rules and illustrate them with clear examples, but the authors just do not have enough space to dwell on the subject.

This is why, after struggling with these aspectual problems for many years, I have decided to write a handbook, not on the Greek language in general, but only about verbal aspect in Modern Greek. Such a handbook cannot be written, of course, if it is not preceded by some research-work, and so this present article on the subjunctive is meant to be one of the preliminary studies <sup>1</sup>.

---

1. Some research-work has been done already: HANSJAKOB SEILER gave in his book *L'Aspect et le temps dans le verbe néo-grec* (Paris 1952) a first-rate account of the present indicative, the perfect tense and the aspectual differences between the imperfect and the aorist indicative. The author of this article wrote his dissertation about the Greek imperative in general (*The Greek Imperative. An investigation into the aspectual differences between the present and aorist imperatives in Greek prayer from Homer up to the present day*, Amsterdam 1966) and a study on the imperative in Modern Greek in particular (*The Aspect of the Imperative in Modern Greek*, *Neophilologus* 49 [1965] 89-103 and 203-210).

The readers of this periodical, especially the Greeks among them, probably wonder why it publishes an article which treats a subject that, from the Greek point of view, has not anything problematic about it. The very fact, however, that Greeks, due to their linguistic feeling, do not consider the aspectual differences between the present and aorist stems as something difficult to grasp and understand, is the reason why I have asked the editorial staff of *Ἑλληνικά* to insert this article in their periodical: in this way this article will be read by as many Greeks as possible and, I hope, they will be so kind as to send me their comments on the mistakes and shortcomings in this article <sup>1</sup>.

*The difference between the present and aorist stems in general*

Before going deeper into the subject of this study, the subjunctive, it is good perhaps to give a brief outline of the characteristics of the present and aorist stems in general. It is unquestionably the merit of Hansjakob Seiler that in describing the aspectual differences we do not any longer have to use vague terms like “durative” and “punctual”. In his study *L'Aspect et le temps dans le verbe néo-grec* he opened new perspectives by introducing the notion “coincidence”. About the imperfect he says <sup>2</sup>: “L'imparfait est un passé, il établit toujours une référence à un autre énoncé verbal, de sorte que les deux se situent l'un à l'égard de l'autre”. Let me illustrate this by means of one of his own examples <sup>3</sup>:

Μιά μέρα περνοῦσε μιὰ γυναίκα τὸν ἄκουσε, μπαίνει μὲς στὸ μαγαζί, λέει τοῦ ράφτη: Τί ἔλεγες αὐτοῦ μὲς στὰ δόντια σου; —Δὲν εἶπα, λέει, τίποτα, “Un jour, une femme passait; elle l'entendit, entre dans le magasin et dit au tailleur: Qu'est-ce que tu disais tout à l'heure entre tes dents? —Moi, dit-il, je n'ai rien dit”.

From the view-point of the woman who says τί ἔλεγες αὐτοῦ there is a coincidence, a relation with another happening. She is not only thinking about the fact that he said something, she has something else in mind as well. That other happening is not expressed explicitly, but is implied in αὐτοῦ. “What did you say there?”. The word “there” points to the occurrence ποῦ πέρασα: “the moment I passed by”. With this happen-

1. This is the right place, I think, to express my gratitude to two people, Mrs. Τοτούλα van Gemert - Κατμάκη from Amsterdam and Mr. Γιάννης Καλλίας from Amphissa, who were so kind to answer all my questions.

2. SEILER, p. 113.

3. SEILER, p. 136.

ing the imperfect *ἔλεγε* has a relation. Symbolizing *ἔλεγε* as a line, we could say that the point *πὸ πέρασα* is situated somewhere on this line. For the tailor who says *δὲν εἶπα τίποτα* there is no other happening, no coincidence: he does not think of another occurrence at the moment he pronounces these words. By using the aorist he shows that he does not think of anything else than of the fact that he did not say anything. He just states a fact, or rather an “absolute” fact, and nothing more.

The next example takes us right into the territory of the subjunctive. I chose it on purpose, because in my study on the imperative of some years ago I have proven, I think, that not only with respect to the imperative, but also in regard to the so-called prohibitive and adhortative subjunctives, coincidence plays a very important part. The question, then, is what is the difference between the present-form *μὴ θυμῶνης* and the aorist-form *μὴ θυμώσης*. The first can be used only when the hearer is angry or is about to get angry: only in that case is the speaker able to view a relation, a coincidence between the action he forbids and the present situation, i.e. a situation where someone is angry or is obviously about to get angry. The aorist stem, which expresses an “absolute” fact (and this is meant literally), does not take any relations into consideration. Accordingly it will be used only when one is afraid or supposes that the hearer will be angry or get angry in the near or distant future, without relation, however, to the situation as it is at the moment the quoted words are being pronounced.

Thus it is clear that, just like in the case of the imperfect, coincidence plays an important part in this kind of subjunctives. It remains to be seen, however, whether this holds true for the subjunctive in general. But before going deeper into these questions, one remark has to be made. By choosing in the former example a prohibitive subjunctive, i.e. a subjunctive that is independent, I shirked a certain difficulty: in most cases the subjunctive is related to another form, is even dependent<sup>1</sup>. It is clear that this relationship gives rise to special difficulties in interpreting the function and meaning of the subjunctive-form, as the other form has also to be taken into account. These difficulties might not be insurmountable, however, if it could be proven that with regard to the subjunctive, too, coincidence plays a part. The coincidence might be realized, then, in the relationship between the subjunctive and the other form.

---

1. See also SEILER, p. 46.

The first thing, then, that has to be studied is the question whether in case of the subjunctive in general we can speak of coincidence. This cannot be done without a deeper understanding of the aspectual differences between the present and aorist subjunctives. The first step to understanding these differences is to study those verbs which to all appearance are always followed either by the present subjunctive or by the aorist subjunctive.

*Verbs followed by the present subjunctive*

Verbs like *ἀρχίζω*, *παύω*, *σταματώ*, *συνεχίζω* and *ἐξακολουθῶ* are always followed by the present subjunctive:

Sam. 89<sup>1</sup>: ...τὴν ὥρα ποὺ ἀρχισε νὰ με καταδιώκη αὐτός..., "...the moment he started chasing me..."

Vass. 56: Σταμάτησε νὰ βρέχει, "It stopped raining".

Plask. 34: ἐξακολουθοῦσε νὰ μουνγκρίζη ἀπειλητικὰ καὶ νὰ μᾶς καταριέται..., "howling and roaring she continued threatening and cursing us..."

Taking a closer look at our first example we see that the action of "chasing" starts at a certain point. This is the point from where the speaker views the action in its perspective, in its development. Symbolizing "chasing" as a line, we may see *ἀρχισε* as a point situated right at the beginning of the line, as the starting-point of the action of "chasing". We shall call this "the point of coincidence". In the case of verbs like *παύω* and *σταματώ* this point is not situated at the beginning, but at the end of the line, whereas verbs which have the meaning of "continue" have this point of coincidence somewhere in the middle of the line. The reason why the verbs mentioned above are always followed by a present is that who wants to speak of starting, stopping or continuing an action cannot help viewing it in its perspective<sup>2</sup>.

1. I have taken my examples from the following modern pieces of prose:

ΑΝΤΩΝΗ ΣΑΜΑΡΑΚΗ, Ζητεῖται ἐλπίς. Σῆμα κινδύνου (Βιβλιοπωλεῖον τῆς "Ἐστίας", Ἀθήνα 1966) = Sam.

ΒΑΣΙΛΗ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΥ, Οἱ φωτογραφίες (Βιβλ. τῆς "Ἐστίας", Ἀθήνα 1966) = Vass.

ΣΠΥΡΟΥ ΠΛΑΣΚΟΒΙΤΗ, Οἱ γονατισμένοι (Φέξης, Ἀθήνα 1964) = Plask.

Ι. Μ. ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Ἀνθρώπινη δίψα ("Ἴκαρος", Ἀθήνα 1959) = Pan.

ΒΟΥΛΑΣ ΔΑΜΙΑΝΑΚΟΥ, Στὴν ἀνεμοζάλη ("Ἴκαρος", Ἀθήνα 1960) = Dam.

ΕἰΡΗΝΗΣ Γ. ΠΑΠΑΓΩΑΝΝΟΥ, Ἀπὸ τὸ ἡμερολόγιό τοῦ ἀρχιτέκτονα Δ. Μ. ("Ἴκαρος", Ἀθήνα 1967) = Pap.

2. See also SEILER, pp. 46-47.

Verbs which express perception and such-like generally take the present subjunctive :

Vass. 38: "Ἀκουσε τὴν πόρτα τῆς κάμαράς του ν' ἀνοίγη...", "He heard the door of his room being opened...".

Sam. 89: ...τὸν εἶδα νὰ τρέχη πίσω μου..., "...I saw him running after me...".

Dam. 99: ...νιώθω τὸ χέρι του νὰ μὲ ὀδηγᾷ, "...I feel his hand leading me".

Vass. 23: Καὶ φανταζόταν ἄνθρωπους τοῦ γινώριζε, νὰ τὸ παρερμηνεύουν, νὰ ἐξηγοῦν ἄλλιῶς τοὺς στίχους του, νὰ χάνουν τὸ νόημά τους, "And he imagined how people he knew misinterpreted it (his poem) explained his verses in the wrong way, failed to understand their meaning".

We observe the same thing as before: the action is viewed in its perspective from the speaker's view-point. In the example from Samarakis, for instance, the speaker sees someone running after him. The point εἶδα is situated somewhere on the line of the action νὰ τρέχη. It does not matter whether it is at the beginning, in the middle or at the end: the action of "running" and the observation may start at the same moment, but it is also possible that the action of "running" starts earlier and the observation is made at a later point of its development. The important thing is that the two actions get into contact with each other, that they "coincide" with each other, whether that is at a certain point or all along the line <sup>1</sup>.

The verb βρίσκω, too, takes the present subjunctive: it always coincides with the action expressed by the subjunctive:

Vass. 25: Τὸν εἶχε βρῆ νὰ κάθεται στὸ βᾶθος τοῦ μαγαζιοῦ, "He had found him sitting in the back of the shop".

Dam. 53: Βρέθηκε νὰ βαδίζη σ' ἕναν ἔρημο δρόμο..., "She found herself walking along a deserted road..."<sup>2</sup>.

It is quite clear why the verbs mentioned above prefer the present subjunctive: the relationship between them and the other action is so narrow that coincidence cannot be avoided. Yet I have found a few examples where the aorist subjunctive is used:

Plask. 140-141: "Ἄν βρισκόταν τῶρα, ἔστω κι ἕνας ἄνθρωπος, νὰ κουβεντιάση ... μαζί του. This does not mean: "If only there was somebody, even though it were a human being, who was talking with him", or rather "I wish there was somebody talking with me". In this case the action of "talking" would be viewed in its perspective, so that βρισκόταν

1. A good example of two actions which could be symbolized as two lines coinciding with each other all the time and not only at one definite point is Dam. 99.

2. For other examples of the verbs βλέπω, ἀκούω and βρίσκω see SEILER, pp. 47-48.

could coincide with it. Only the present stem could express that. The aorist denotes something altogether different: "I wish there was somebody to talk with". By using the aorist the author makes it clear that he does not want to consider the action of "talking" as something that is actually happening (and accordingly coinciding with βρισκόταν), but as an absolute fact, as an action "loose" from βρισκόταν. In a sentence like this the aorist denotes an action that has to happen yet, *if* it is going to happen.

Pan. 32: ...μέ εἶδες... νὰ πάθω τίποτα; "...have you noticed perhaps that I got sick or something like that?". An old man is angry with his wife, because, in spite of her great age, she helped building a road. Our example is her reply to his rebukes. By means of these words ("Is my health affected perhaps? I'm still as sound as a fish!") she wants to indicate that, as far as she is concerned, the action πάσχω did not occur. She could have said as well ἔπαθα τίποτα; The use of the present would have indicated, on the other hand, that she emphasized the first words: μέ εἶδες;

Dam. 113: Ἀκούστηκε ἔμωσ νὰ παραπονεθῆ καμιὰ νοικοκυρά...; "Has anybody, for that matter, heard any complaints from a real housewife...?". Some women are making complaints against somebody, who defends herself by suggesting that just by raising these complaints they prove their inferiority as housewives. By using the aorist she avoids a coincidence between the two actions "hear" and "complain". If there was a coincidence, the women would think that she wanted to know whether they had *heard* something or not. But that is not what she is aiming at. The only thing that interests her is the question whether a real housewife (who deserves that name) raised a complaint or not (Παραπονέθηκε καμιὰ νοικοκυρά;). She wants the other women to think: "Well, no, there was no complaint from that kind of woman".

Before this paragraph is concluded, two remarks should be made. The first is that in the three examples discussed above we have seen how a Greek makes use of the possibilities offered him by his language: he does not choose the aorist, for instance, only because it expresses exactly what he wants, but also because the present would denote something he does not intend. In such cases the choice is made not for positive, but for negative reasons. In the second place it should be stated that, if after the examples discussed above the impression is created that the present subjunctive denotes an action that actually takes place and the aorist subjunctive exactly the opposite, this is wrong. It does not hold

true for the present and aorist subjunctives in general (as we shall see later), but only for those following after verbs of the type discussed here. This is not an intrinsic quality of these verbs, but originates from usage: the fact that these verbs are always accompanied by the present subjunctive causes the Greeks to use the aorist subjunctive, when they want to give their words a special flavour.

*Verbs followed by the aorist subjunctive*

Just like there are verbs usually followed by a present, there are verbs which prefer the aorist stem.

Sam. 86: Ἦταν ἔτοιμος νὰ βγῆ, "He was about to leave". So he was ready to start, but had not started yet. This is the reason why an aorist and not a present is used: there is no coincidence, as, from an aspectual point of view, there is no connection between the situation described in "he was about" and the action of "leaving". In the present situation (the situation of "he was about") the action denoted by the subjunctive has not been realized yet. This action is part of the future, however near it may be, and accordingly has to be expressed as an *absolute fact*.

Plask. 85: Ὄταν φτάσανε, ... κόντευε νὰ νυχώση, "When they arrived, it was nearly dark". It is exactly the same as in the other example: darkness is not there yet, it is only approaching, so there is no connection between the two actions.

Vass. 118: Σταμάτησε ὁμως σὲ μιὰ διασταύρωση περιμένοντας ν' ἀλλάξη τὸ φῶς, "He stopped, however, at a cross-over, waiting until the light would change".

Sam. 17: ... φοβότανε μὴ τὴν ξυπνήση, "...he was afraid he would wake her up".

Vass. 24: Ἐλπίζει τὸ ἔργο νὰ τὸν τραβήξῃ, "He hopes the movie will grip him".

Verbs of the type employed in the last three examples cannot be followed by a present, because there would be a "gap" between the action of "waiting (hoping, fearing)" and the line by means of which the present may be symbolized. The existence of such a "gap" is not allowed, as at one point or another the "line" must make contact, must coincide, with the present situation. These verbs are not verbs like βλέπω and ἀκούω with which an action that is happening at the same moment may coincide. Because of their meaning they can be connected only with future actions, with "abstractions" we might say.

Sam. 117: ...ἦρθα νὰ σᾶς ζητήσω (κάτι), "...I have come to ask something of you". The reason why the aorist is used is the same again: there is no connection between the actions of "coming" and "asking" and thus coincidence is out of the question. The phrase νὰ σᾶς ζητήσω κάτι is not an occurrence that is part of reality, but only the purpose the speaker has in mind, an abstraction.

Dam. 52: ...τὸν παρακάλεσε νὰ τῆ βοηθήσῃ νὰ βρῆ δουλειά, "...she asked him to help her in finding a job". Verbs like παρακαλῶ, ζητῶ and

προσεύχομαι are usually followed by an aorist subjunctive: one asks for an action that is supposed to occur in the near or distant future, i.e. an action that has no connection with the present situation.

As I have stated above, the type of verb we are discussing here is *usually* followed by an aorist. Sometimes the present, too, makes its appearance. In these cases, however, the present subjunctive does not denote one single occurrence in one definite situation, but a repetition of the same action or has a general value<sup>1</sup>. The following examples make that perfectly clear:

Plask. 67: ...φοβόμουν νὰ τὸν πλησιάζω ἀπὲς τὶς ὥρες, "...I did not dare to approach him at those moments". It is clear that the use of the present stem cannot be explained in the same way as we did before. There is no coincidence between the actions φοβόμουν and πλησιάζω, at least not in the same way as we have seen it with verbs like βλέπω and ἀκούω. Here the present subjunctive does not denote a single occurrence that coincides with another happening, but expresses a repetition of the same action. It must be stated, however, that, if we perhaps might think that this present is different, it only *seems* to be different. The only difference is that the present stem does not denote a single occurrence, but a series of occurrences, or rather a quality that realizes itself in a series of occurrences. Here, too, the action is viewed in its perspective, in its development, and that from the speaker's view-point. And there is also coincidence: the quality the boy in question has, "the fear to approach him (i.e. his father)", is not realized all the time, but only "ἀπὲς τὶς ὥρες". These are the points of coincidence where the boy's fear comes into contact with reality.

Dam. 133: ...τὸν παρεκάλεσα (sc. τὸν Θεὸ) νὰ σοῦ δίνη ὑγεία, "...I have prayed to God that He may give you health all the time". The words of the speaker make it perfectly clear that it was not her intention that health should be given to the other person *now*. In that case she would have used the aorist subjunctive νὰ δώσῃ. The use of that form, however, would have implied that the other person was actually sick. This is a typical example of the so-called "general" use of the present stem. The subjunctive νὰ δίνη does not allude to a single occurrence in one definite situation nor to a series of occurrences, but to an action that takes place all the time. This subjunctive has the same function

---

1. That "repetition" is not an intrinsic value of the present stem, but only a secondary function, will be shown later. See also SEILER, pp. 45 and 130.



as always: the woman who prays views the action in its perspective; the coincidence makes itself felt in the relation between the subjunctive and any situations one can think of in the rest of the other person's life,

| | | | | | |

starting from the situation depicted by *παρεκαλεσα*.

As we shall see a little further on, the verb *προφταίνω* usually prefers the aorist subjunctive, but one does find examples where the present is employed:

Dam. 147: A resistance-fighter has found a little baby that is so hungry that the man starts chewing pieces of bread to feed it: 'Εκεῖνο βάλθηκε ... νὰ χάφτη τῇ θροφῇ του με λαίμαργία τόση, πὸν ὁ ἀντάρτης - παραμᾶνα δὲν πρόφταινε νὰ μασάη καὶ νὰ τοῦ δῖνη, "The little one started gulping down its food with such greediness that it was absolutely impossible for the «fighter-nurse» to chew fast enough to feed it". It is obvious that the two subjunctives denote a repetition of actions. They coincide with the whole situation that arises after the child has started eating.

The aorist subjunctive (which just like any other form based upon the aorist stem denotes an absolute fact) seems, according at least to the examples we have discussed, to realize itself as an occurrence that does not (yet) take place and, if it takes place, as an occurrence that takes place in the near or distant future. In order to prevent that one gets the impression that this is the only way the aorist subjunctive is used, we shall now discuss as our last example of verbs followed by the aorist an example of the verb *προφταίνω*.

Dam. 24: ...πρόφτασε νὰ πάρη τὸν λόγο ἡ Εὐπραξία, "...just in time Efraxia began to speak". This aorist subjunctive obviously does not denote a future action that has no connection with the present situation, but states a mere fact. The verb *προφταίνω*, not denoting a real action on its own, needs a supplement, be it explicite, be it implicate. This supplementary verb usually is expressed in the form of an absolute fact.

\*

If everything that has been discussed has given the impression that the choice between the present stem and the aorist stem (so far the subjunctive is concerned) is not so difficult after all, this is the right time to take away that impression. It is true: the verbs which have been discussed above take either the present or the aorist subjunctive. This,

however, is not a stringent rule, as I have tried to show by means of some examples where the "rule" was not, or rather could not be followed. A more important point, however, is that the cases where the choice between the present subjunctive and the aorist subjunctive is almost fixed form a rather small minority. There are many more cases where the choice (to the poor foreigner) seems to be completely free. The rest of this study will be devoted to these cases. Let us start, then, with those cases where, if the present stem is used, the subjunctive coincides with the verb upon which it depends, something we have observed already in the examples of, for instance, βλέπω and ακούω.

## I

The verb σκέφτομαι is only sporadically followed by a present subjunctive. I have found one example:

Vass. 20: ...σὲ σκέφτομαι νὰ περπατᾶς σκυφτὸς πλάι σὲ μιὰ θάλασσα, "...in my mind I see you walking by a sea-shore with your head down". It is clear that σκέφτομαι when followed by a present, is employed as a verb that indicates "perception", as for instance, βλέπω.

Accompanied by the aorist, it gets an altogether different meaning:

Sam. 35: ...τὸ σκέφτηκε κεῖνο τὸ πρωὶ νὰ πάρη ἓνα λαχεῖο, "...that morning the idea occurred to him to buy a lottery-ticket". This time σκέφτομαι does not have an action in progress as its object, but an occurrence that has yet to take place. The "idea" is still in the speaker's mind and, as a result, is not yet part of the situation described by the verb σκέφτηκε. Coincidence, therefore, is impossible.

Sam. 144: Τὸν ἄφησα νὰ κλαίη, "I let him cry". The action of "crying" is viewed in its perspective: there is a coincidence between this action and ἄφησα. The action of "crying" is taking place, but the subject of ἄφησα does not interfere, does not take action, lets the crying person be.

Sam. 144: ...ἄφησε τὸ μαχαίρι νὰ πέση, "...he dropped the knife". As there is no coincidence here, the verb ἀφήνω gets an altogether different meaning. We could say: "He made the knife fall" or "He caused the knife to fall". The relationship we observed in the first example is not present here, as the action of "falling" does not (yet) form part of the situation described by ἄφησε<sup>1</sup>.

1. When the aorist subjunctive is preceded by an imperative, one might think

Vass. 43: ...τὴν ἐμπόδιζα, φαίνεται, νὰ ὀδηγῆ, "... I bothered her, it seems, while she was driving". The presence of coincidence between the two actions of "bothering" and "driving" makes clear that someone is actually driving, while the speaker is giving her trouble.

Pap. 168: ...ἐμπόδιζε τὴ σκέψη μου νὰ γυρίσῃ, "...it kept my thoughts from returning". In this sentence the subjunctive is expressed as an absolute fact: there is no coincidence between the two actions. Accordingly, νὰ γυρίσῃ, not forming part of the situation described by ἐμπόδιζε, is not an actual occurrence and will never be until the obstacle has been taken away.

Pap. 94: ...βάλθηκε νὰ παίζη μὲ τὴν τσάντα της, "...she began to play with her purse". The verb βάλθηκε is the starting-point of the line by means of which we may symbolize the present νὰ παίζη<sup>1</sup>. The only difference between βάλλομαι and ἀρχίζω is that the first may be also accompanied by an aorist subjunctive:

Pan. 40: ...βάλθηκε νὰ τὴ φτάσῃ. One feels inclined to render this sentence as "He began to catch up with her". This time, however, there is no coincidence, so that βάλθηκε cannot be the starting-point of a line. In our translation, too, it must become obvious that there is no relationship between the actions βάλθηκε and νὰ φτάσῃ. A better translation is: "He set himself to, he launched an attempt to catch up with her". The form βάλθηκε is not the starting-point of a line, but something that is done with a view to a definite purpose<sup>2</sup>.

The verb παίρνω, when accompanied by a present subjunctive, has

---

that ἀφῆνω has a meaning that is closer to the one we have observed in the first example than to the other one. Plask. 125: Ἀφῆστε με νὰ σᾶς ἐξηγήσω, "Let me explain". It is quite impossible to say here: "Make me explain". The fact, however, that the action of "explaining" is not viewed in its perspective makes it clear that the speaker is not yet explaining. So he does not ask the other person "to leave him be" or rather "not to make him stop explaining", but "Give me the chance, and I shall do it".

1. See p. 81.

2. This is clearly illustrated by the fact that sometimes this purpose is effected and sometimes not. Dam. 83: ...βάλθηκα νὰ μεγαλώσω τὰ ὄρφανά, "...I set myself to bring up the orphans". This purpose is effected, as a little later follows: Τὰ μεγάλωσα τὰ ὄρφανά. Dam. 134: Ἐσηκώθη ἀμέσως καὶ μὲ τὴ μεγαλύτερη βιάση ἐβάλθη νὰ ἐτοιμαστῆ γιὰ ἔξω..., "She got up right away and in the greatest hurry she prepared to get ready to go out...". A little later, however, it appears that she did not get ready: her purpose has not been effected.

the same meaning as *ἀρχίζω*. But one can also find it followed by an aorist, just like *βάλλομαι*.

Vass. 41: ...*ἡ μπάλα μου... πῆρε νὰ κατακυλᾷ τὴν κατηφόρα*, "...my ball started rolling down the slope".

Pan. 112: *Τέλος, πῆρε νὰ γράψῃ στὸ φοιτητῆ...*, "At last she decided to, proceeded to write a letter to the student...". The author does not tell us that she actually started writing, as becomes perfectly clear from what follows: *Μὲ μύριους τρόπους ἔμαθε τὴ σύστασή του, ...στὴν Ἀθήνα, μὲ μύριους τρόπους, μὴ λάχῃ καὶ τὴν πιάσῃ μάτι, ἔριξε τὸ γράμμα στὸ μεγάλο κουτί...*, "Secretly and cunningly she got to know his address in Athens; secretly and cunningly, so that nobody would see her, she dropped the letter in the big box". The author does not see the action of "writing" in its perspective and, accordingly, does not make us see the girl actually writing. He just informs us of the fact that she took the decision to write a letter. By using the aorist, he indicates that he does not see the act of "writing" as an actual occurrence, but as something that, at least from the point of view of the situation described by *πῆρε*, is still in her mind.

If it is true that the verb *παίρνω*, when it is followed by an aorist subjunctive, has a meaning that comes close to "to decide", then there are some examples which give me great difficulties:

Pan. 18: *Μὰ τὴν ὥρα ποὺ ἔπαιρνε νὰ βραδιάσῃ...*, *ἦρθε ἀπὸ τὴ χώρα ὁ μηχανικός*, "At the time, however, that it started getting dark (?) the mechanic came from town".

Pan. 39: *Ἐπαιρνε νὰ βασιλέψῃ ὁ ἥλιος στὰ πέρα βουνά*, "Far away, there where the mountains were, the sun started setting (?)".

Pan. 146: *Μόλις ἔπαιρνε νὰ χαράξῃ ἡ μέρα, ζυπνοῦσε...*, "Every morning, as soon as it started dawning(?), he got up...".

If *παίρνω* in such cases does not have the meaning of just "begin", but actually does have a "volitional" colour, something that comes close to a decision, then we would have to assume that it is a peculiarity of Panagiotopoulos to personify, as it were, the sun. On the other hand it should be said that he does not always do that, as I have found another example where the present is employed:

Pan. 10: *...ἔπαιρνε νὰ νυχτώῃ*, "...it was getting dark..."<sup>1</sup>.

It may be concluded that, in all these examples where the subjunctive coincides with the verb upon which it depends, the present

1. The verb *πιάνω* is always followed by the present subjunctive, even in those cases where sunrise or sunset is concerned: Pan. 109: *Σὰν ἔπιασε νὰ νυχτώῃ*... Pan. 167: *Σὰν ἔπιασε ν' ἀπομνημεριάσῃ*... Dam. 62: *...δταν ἔπιασε νὰ νυχτώῃ*...

subjunctive indicates an occurrence that actually takes place and that the aorist subjunctive denotes an occurrence that does not (yet) form part of the situation described by the main verb, just like in the examples discussed before.

## II

In this paragraph those cases will be discussed where the verb upon which the subjunctive depends does not play a great part or is missing altogether. When the present stem is used, the subjunctive sometimes does not even coincide with the main verb. The coincidence manifests itself, then, in the fact that the present subjunctive which refers to an occurrence that is actually taking place or should be or might be taking place to the speaker's mind is connected with the situation present at the moment. We shall start with some examples where the subjunctive is preceded only by *νά*, *ἄς* and *μή*<sup>1</sup>.

Dam. 135: *Νά γαβγίζης, νά γαβγίζης καί καλὰ κάνεις, ἀλλά ὄχι μέσα στὴν ἐκκλησία...*, "You may bark as much as you want, that is quite alright, but don't do it in the church...". The speaker views the action in perspective from his own point of view which is determined by the situation, i.e. that the other person was "barking" already.

As the aorist subjunctive does not have the coincidence that we observed in the preceding example, it often denotes an occurrence that should take place in the future:

Vass. 91: *...νά τοῦ πῆς στίς ἕξι...*, "...tell him (that he should be there) at six o'clock...". The speaker cannot view the action of "telling" in its perspective, as there is no relationship possible between the present situation and this action: the person who will eventually receive the message is not present, so the action ordered will take place later.

Vass. 110: *Νά σᾶς συστήσω...*, "Let me introduce you to each other...". This time the aorist stem is not chosen, because the action will have to take place later, as the required persons are both present. If there was a coincidence between the present situation and the action referred to, the speaker would say something like "Let me continue introducing you..." or "Let me start introducing you from this very moment on...". It is

1. See also BAKKER, *The Aspect of the Imperative in Modern Greek*, *Neophilologus* 49 (1965), pp. 93-94 and Id., *The Greek Imperative*, pp. 68-69.

very simple really: in such circumstances Greeks do not usually view a relation between the present situation and the action they want to perform. The only thing they do, then, is give a simple, plain statement, and that is all. In the examples discussed above we saw that the present stem reserved for itself as its territory “an occurrence that is actually taking place” and that the aorist stem was forced to the only territory left (in combination, at least, with the verbs discussed then): “an occurrence which takes place in the future, if it takes place at all”. Here, for the first time<sup>1</sup>, we meet the aorist stem denoting something else: “a plain statement, a mere fact”.

Vass. 73: Ἄς κυλοῦν τ' αὐτοκίνητα τὶς ρόδες τους, ἄς στριγγλίζουν τὰ φρένα, ἄς περπατοῦν οἱ ἄνθρωποι κάτω ἀπ' τὰ μεγάλα σπίτια..., “Let the wheels of the cars roll on, let the brakes screech, let the people go on walking along the foot of the tall houses...”. The coincidence manifests itself in the continuation of an action that was already taking place.

Pan. 25: ...ἄς τὴ μοιραστοῦμε τὴν ἔγνοια..., “...let us divide these worries among ourselves...”. Of course, the speaker could have viewed a relation between the situation present at that moment and the action of “dividing”, saying: “Let us start dividing these worries right now”. He would have confronted the other person with an accomplished fact by expressing himself in this way. The only thing he wants to do, however, is to make a proposal. And that is exactly what the aorist stem is often used for, for making proposals! The aorist stem, not having any relationship with the present situation, does not force the hearer into a certain position, but gives him an honest chance to turn the proposal down<sup>2</sup>.

Pan. 18: Μὴ μὲ διώχνης, “Don’t chase me off!”. The supervisor of a roadbuilding-company sends away an old woman, so that she may have some rest. Misunderstanding his intentions, she thinks that he is firing her and, accordingly beseeches him not to do that. She uses the present stem, as, in her view, she is referring to an occurrence that is actually taking place.

Plask. 67: Πρόσεξε, νὰ μὴν τὸ χαλάσης!, “Be careful, don’t damage it!”. A little boy, who is sick, is allowed to play with the cap of his father. The quoted words are not pronounced, while he is playing with the thing. In that case the present subjunctive would have been used (if we assume,

1. See, however, p. 86.

2. Cf. ΒΑΚΚΕΡ, *The Greek Imperative*, pp. 51-52 (especially note 53).

at least, that the boy was not careful enough). No, the boy is told to be careful at the moment he gets the cap in his hands. The aorist stem expresses a warning for the future <sup>1</sup>.

The subjunctives in the next examples are of the same type as the ones we just saw, with one difference, however: they depend upon verbs.

Plask. 105: Εἶχα τὴν ἰδέα πῶς πρέπει νὰ μὲ θυμοῦνται ἀκόμα μερικοὶ φίλοι στὴν Ἑλβετία, "I had the idea that some friends of mine in Switzerland must still remember me". There is no coincidence between the subjunctive νὰ θυμοῦνται and πρέπει, but there is between the first and the clause εἶχα τὴν ἰδέα. At the time when he had that idea the (at least in his view) actual occurrence of "remembering" was taking place.

Plask. 136: Θὰ πρέπει κεῖ - κάτω νὰ βρῖσκεται ἡ ἀποβάθρα καὶ τ' ἄλλα, "The quay and the rest must be down there". The speaker views the action denoted by νὰ βρῖσκεται in its perspective from the situation present at the moment he utters his thoughts.

Pap. 10: Πρέπει νὰ πάρω καντρονόξ, "I shall have to start taking "cadronox" (a medicine against insomnia)". If the speaker had used the present subjunctive, he would have indicated that he was a regular consumer of this medicine. The aorist, however, refers to the future.

Vass. 106: «Μπορεῖ νὰ λείπουν στὴν ἐξοχή», σκέφτηκε..., "«They may be out of town on a holiday», he thought...". There is a coincidence between νὰ λείπουν (the action that may be taking place) and σκέφτηκε (the view-point of the speaker, the present situation).

Vass. 156: "Ὁμως στὸ πρῶτο φῶς ἔξω ἀπ' τὸ πάρκο ἡ κοπέλα τὸν σταμάτησε. — Μὴν ἔρθης πὶο κάτω, τοῦ εἶπε. Μπορεῖ νὰ μᾶς δοῦν, "As soon as they had reached the first light outside of the park, the girl made him stop. — Stay here, she said, don't come along with me. They may see us". Here, there is no coincidence. The girl's fear of being seen by someone is directed in the future, not on the situation present at that moment <sup>2</sup>.

1. Cf. BAKKER, *Neophilologus* 49 (1965), p. 99 *infra*.

2. This use of the aorist subjunctive is made even more clear by the following example. Sam. 103: Ἐνδεχομένως νὰ σᾶς καλέσω γιὰ συμπληρωματικὴ ἐξέταση, κύριε Βασιλειάδη, "I may call you (in the future) for a complementary examination, Mr. Vasiliadis".

Sam. 59:—Τὶ τρέχει; ρώτησε...—Τὶ θες νὰ τρέχει;, “—What is going on, he asked...—What do you want to be going on?”.

Pap. 19: “Ὅπως ξέρετε, γιατρέ, εἶμαι ὀλομόναχος καὶ δὲν θὰ ἤθελα νὰ μοῦ κρύβετε τίποτα, “I’m all alone, doctor, you know it, and I wouldn’t like you to keep anything from me”. In saying this, the speaker is not referring to the future, but is viewing the action denoted by νὰ κρύβετε in its perspective, as were it an occurrence that is actually taking place <sup>1</sup>.

Pap. 58: Εἶχα ρίξει ὄλο τὸ βάρος στὰ σχέδια τοῦ ξενοδοχειακοῦ συγκροτήματος κι ἤθελα νὰ τὰ παραδώσω ἔγκαιρα..., “I was giving all my attention to the designs of the hotel-block, as I wanted to hand them in in time...”. The action denoted by the aorist subjunctive νὰ παραδώσω will take place sometime in the future. There is no connection between this action and the speaker’s view-point. In this example the view-point would be determined by the form ἤθελα <sup>2</sup>.

Plask. 45: ...θέλεις νὰ δουλέψης στὸ χυτήριο; ...Εἶναι δουλειὰ πού θὰ σοῦ ταιριάζη, “...do you want to work in the foundry (of steel-works)? That is work that will suit you”. The speaker, of course, could have connected the present situation and the action of “working” with each other, saying: “Do you want to work in the foundry right from this very moment on?”. He does not want to say that much: he wants to refer to the mere fact of “working”, without secondary thoughts <sup>3</sup>.

Vass. 51: Γρήγορα ἔμωσ κατάφερα νὰ μὴν τὰ σκέφτωμαι ὄλα αὐτά, “But quickly I managed to stop thinking all that”. From his point of view (κατάφερα) the speaker views the action of “thinking” in its perspective <sup>4</sup>.

1. In the examples which have been discussed above it was always possible to identify the speaker’s view-point with the present situation. Sometimes, however, the speaker takes the liberty to view the action in its perspective from another point (mostly in the future). Pap. 124: “Ἦθελα νὰ ζῶ ὕστερα ἀπὸ τριάντα χρόνια, “I would like to be still alive (to be living) thirty years from now”.

2. Here as well as in the preceding examples we see that the verb θέλω is different from πρέπει and μορεῖ in this respect that, whereas the latter two never play a part in coincidence, θέλω may coincide with the dependent subjunctive (this in contradiction to what has been said in the introductory words on p. 90).

3. See Vass. 110 on pp. 90-91.

4. What has been said in note 2 about the verb θέλω holds true as well for καταφέρνω. Considering the capability of these verbs to coincide with the dependent subjunctive, they could have been discussed in paragraph I. This has not been done, however, because of the fact that these verbs are quite different in character from the ones discussed there.



Vass. 61: Σβήνει τὸ φῶς καὶ λέει πὼς τὰ κατὰφερε ἐπιτέλους νὰ νυστάξη, "She switches off the light and says that at last she succeeded in getting sleepy". She succeeds neither in stopping the action (or status), nor in starting it nor in making it continue, but she simply manages to make an occurrence take place. Verbs like καταφέρνω always need a factual complement, which, naturally, is expressed by means of the aorist subjunctive.

### III

The examples to be discussed here will give the same picture as the ones we have seen in the preceding paragraph: the present subjunctive coincides with the situation present at the moment the subjunctive is pronounced. There is only one difference: in the following examples the present situation is indicated, not by the verb upon which the subjunctive depends, but by some verb in the context <sup>1</sup>.

In the first example we meet the present subjunctive used independently. It occurs quite often in descriptions and may be compared with the imperfect. An example of an aorist cannot be given, as the aorist subjunctive is never used in this way.

Pan. 151-152: The cook of a "taverna" has left his kitchen, because he wants to see some young people dancing and singing. In order to have a better view he has climbed a tree. At a certain moment, however, he hears his boss calling him and, terrified, he starts climbing down. But too late! The boys and girls start dancing right in his vicinity... Κι ἄρχισαν νὰ γυροφέρνουν καὶ νὰ τρεκλιζοῦν καὶ νὰ ῥχωνται τσίμα τσίμα στὴ μεγάλη φτελιά... Κι ὁ Σταμάτης νὰ μὴ μπορῆ ἐκεῖ ψηλὰ νὰ σαλέψη καὶ νὰ συμμαζώνεται, νὰ συμμαζώνεται, μὴ λάχη καὶ τὸν πάρη μάτι ἀνθρώπου, "They started whirling and tottering around and came nearer and nearer to the big elm-tree... And up there Stamatis could not make the slightest movement and made himself smaller and smaller, afraid that someone might see him". There is coincidence between Stamatis' condition and the general situation that starts from ἄρχισαν.

Pap. 7: Βγήκα στὸ μεγάλο διάδρομο· ἡ προϊσταμένη, ποὺ ἔτυχε νὰ περνᾶ, μοῦ χαμογέλασε..., "I went out into the main corridor. The matron-in-chief, who happened to pass by (just at that moment), smiled at me...".

1. We have seen this in Plask. 105 (p. 92).

The words “just at that moment” indicate the point of coincidence between the present subjunctive *νά περνᾷ* and *βγῆκα*.

Pan. 17: “*Ἐτυχε...κατὰ τὸ μεσημέρι νά δροσερέψη...*,” “By noon it happened to get cooler...”. The author just wants to inform us of a fact that occurred. He might have said as well *δροσέρεψε*, the aorist indicative <sup>1</sup>.

Pan. 151: Stamatis, the cook whom we met in one of the preceding examples, is afraid to be discovered in his tree and climbs, therefore, to that side where the foliage is more dense, and ... *μήτε πιά πού μποροῦσε νά βλέπη τίποτα, μόνο νά κρύβεται, νά κρύβεται ὁ ἀμαρτωλός, ἄλλο πιά δὲν ποθοῦσε*, “...but now he could not see a thing any longer; the only thing he, the trespasser, desired was to be hidden”. The subjunctive *νά βλέπη* clearly denotes a status during which the action (of the story) continues. Between that action (a great accumulation of occurrences) and the subjunctive there is a relationship. This relationship, for that matter, becomes more obvious in the second part of the sentence, where the translation perfectly shows that *νά κρύβεται* does not denote a simple factual occurrence, but a status: he desires to be hidden during everything that is yet going to happen.

Dam. 35: *Τὴ βρῆκε στήν ὥρα πού δὲ μποροῦσε ν' ἀντισταθῆ σὲ τίποτε*, “It found her at the moment that she could not resist anything”. The words *δὲ μποροῦσε ν' ἀντισταθῆ* express the condition the woman is in at the moment she is found: the imperfect *μποροῦσε* coincides with *βρῆκε*. But why *ν' ἀντισταθῆ* and not *ν' ἀντιστέκεται*? The authoress does not want to open still another perspective, does not want to say “She was not able «to be resisting» (during actions to be visualized by the reader or explicitly stated)”. The only thing she wants to tell us is that the woman was not able to do something, viz. “to resist”. Such a

1. It is said sometimes that the aorist stem denotes only a single occurrence and the present stem repetition. Such a statement might be easily refuted by the following example, where the aorist subjunctive is used in a sentence which indicates “repetition”. Plask. 111: *Καμιά φορά, σὰν ἔπιανε πολὺ τὸ κρύο, ἡ νοικοκυρά τύχαινε ν' ἀνάψη δῶ μέσα ἀπὸ νωρίτερα μερικὰ κούτσουρα στή μικρὴ σόμπα*, “Sometimes, when it got to be very cold, it occurred that his land-lady made the fire in his room a little earlier, by kindling some chunks of wood in the little stove”. The author has avoided using the present subjunctive *ν' ἀνάβη*, probably because the use of a present would have called for another occurrence in order to coincide with it. Something like this would have been the result: “Sometimes...it happened that his land-lady was busy making a fire (*ν' ἀνάβη*), when he came in (*ὅταν ἔμπαινε*)”.

factual complement is always expressed by means of the aorist stem.

Vass. 123: ...γιαὶ τὸν Φώντα ποὺ γεννήθηκε ἄρρωστος καὶ δὲν μποροῦσε νὰ κολυμπήσει, δὲν μποροῦσε νὰ παίξει μὲ τὰ ἄλλα παιδιά..., "...about Fondas who was already sick when he was born, who could not swim, who could not play with the other kids...". The reason why the author does not use present subjunctives is that, if he wrote δὲν μποροῦσε νὰ κολυμπᾶ, this would mean that the boy did not know to swim<sup>1</sup>. Although it is quite conceivable that the boy actually did not know how to swim, it is not the intention of the author to tell us that, but only that the boy could not go out swimming, even if he would have wanted to.

In conclusion of this paragraph something should be said about the adverb χωρὶς (δίχως), which may be followed by a subjunctive.

Vass. 131: ...περπατοῦσε ἔτσι μὲ τὸ μαχαίρι στὴν πλάτη, χωρὶς νὰ νιώθῃ τὴν πληγὴ..., "...thus he was walking, with the (imaginary) knife in his back, without feeling the wound...". The condition expressed by χωρὶς νὰ νιώθῃ runs parallel with the status of "walking". This condition is viewed in its perspective just like the imperfect περπατοῦσε.

Vass. 132: Τὴν ἔβλεπε χωρὶς νὰ τὸν βλέπῃ..., "He saw her without being seen by her...". In this example we see that the subjects of the imperfect and the subjunctive need not be the same. If the word χωρὶς is followed by a present subjunctive, it is preceded by an imperfect in most cases. That this is not a stringent "rule" is clearly shown by the following example (it must be said, though, that this is the only example I could find):

Plask. 33: Ἐτοιμάστηκα νὰ σβήσω τὸ καντήλι, δίχως νὰ μπορῶ ἀκόμα νὰ ξεχωρίσω..., "I got ready to blow out the candle, without being able yet to distinguish...". There is a coincidence between the present subjunctive and ἐτοιμάστηκα. The two actions are not running parallel like in the preceding examples, but the condition of "not being able to distinguish" already exists before "he gets ready". This is, in my view, the reason why the author employed the present stem<sup>2</sup>.

1. See Vass. 17 on p. 103.

2. Another example (and again the only one) of an aorist followed by χωρὶς + present subjunctive provides another picture: Dam. 156: Προχώρησε μὲ τὰ ποδαρᾶκια του, χωρὶς νὰ νιώθῃ πῶς ὅλο περισσότερο ξανοιγόταν στὴν ἐρημιὰ καὶ στὸ κρύο, "He (a little boy) pushed on with his little feet, without noticing that he ventured further and further into the desolation and the cold". In this example the condition of "without noticing" cannot have begun before the occurrence denoted by προχώρη-

Sam. 119: Ἐφυγα χωρὶς νὰ χτυπήσω, “I left without having rung the bell”. The speaker was standing in front of a door, doubting whether he should ring the bell or not. He decided not to and left. The author wants to inform us of two facts: “the man left” and “he did not ring the bell”. He does not view a coincidence between the two or between one of them and some other occurrence. In such a case a Greek chooses the aorist stem, the stem that denotes an absolute fact.

Vass. 37: ...ἦταν ἓνα γράμμα ποὺ τῆς ἔγραψε, χωρὶς νὰ τῆς τὸ στείλλῃ, “...it was a letter that he had written to her, without sending it, though...”. Here again we see two occurrences, happening (if both of them had actually taken place) the one after the other, expressed as absolute facts.

Sam. 157: Γλίστρησα χωρὶς νὰ μὲ πάρουν εἶδησι, δὲ μὲ πῆραν εἶδησι, ἔγραφαν ἀκόμα..., “Stealthily I left without them noticing me; they did not notice me: they were still writing...”. This example differs from the two preceding ones by the fact that here the two occurrences take place (or not) at the same time. Notwithstanding that, the author puts the two next to each other as two absolute facts. Both of them constitute points of coincidence for the following imperfect ἔγραφαν (they were writing). It is here that the author starts viewing a perspective <sup>1</sup>.

σε. In order to understand this sentence better, a few words (which are implied anyway) should be added: Προχώρησε ...κι ἐνῶ προχωροῦσε δὲν ἔνωθε πῶς... In this way it becomes clear that the subjunctive νὰ νιώθῃ does coincide with the aorist προχώρησε and, of course, with the rest of the description that follows. It must be said, however, that this combination does not seem to be very much in use.

1. Although I have not been able to find examples to prove it, I do not think that an aorist subjunctive should be preceded by an aorist all the time. A sentence like the following is correct Greek, I imagine: Ἐνῶ ἔφυγε χωρὶς νὰ χαιρετήσῃ κτύπησε τὸ τηλέφωνο, “While he was leaving without saying good-bye, the telephone rang”. Someone may remark that I should have written χωρὶς νὰ χαιρετάῃ. I did not intend, however, to make the actions of “leaving” and “saying good-bye” run parallel, so that both of them might coincide with κτύπησε. I just wanted to inform people of the fact that this person was leaving without saying good-bye, without creating any other relationships. In such circumstances verbs like χαιρετῶ often get an “iterative” colour, as may be made clear by the following example. Dam. 70: Ταξιδεύαμε, ταξιδεύαμε, χωρὶς ποθενὰ νὰ πιάνουμε λιμάνι..., “We continued travelling without calling at any port...”. The imperfect ταξιδεύαμε and the subjunctive νὰ πιάνουμε are running parallel and both of them coincide with something like “at that time”. This parallelism produces an “iterative” effect in the meaning of the subjunctive, as πιάνω is a momentaneous verb. We can imagine the speaker thinking: “...and there we did not call at... and there we didn’t... and not there... and not there...”.

## IV

In the former paragraphs our subject was especially that kind of present subjunctive which expresses an action that is happening in the situation present at the moment. We shall now devote some space to those present subjunctives (and their aorist counterparts) which denote an action that extends from the view-point of the speaker into the future. We already met some examples in the present subjunctives following after verbs like ἀρχίζω, βάλλομαι and παίρνω. We shall start with subjunctives preceded by verbs like βάζω and κάνω, to proceed with that kind of subjunctive that denotes the purpose of some preceding action.

Pan. 75: Μᾶς ἔβαλαν νὰ δουλεύουμε σὲ φάμπρικα..., "They made us work in a factory...". The speaker views the action denoted by the subjunctive νὰ δουλεύουμε in its perspective. In the sequel it becomes quite clear why he does this. He wants to dwell upon the action of working, so that he may elaborate it into a full description of the conditions prevailing in the factory.

Pan. 72: ...τοὺς ἔβαλαν νὰ σκάψουν τὸ λάκκο τους καὶ τοὺς κρέμασαν..., "...they made them dig their own grave and hanged them...". There is no coincidence between the actions denoted by ἔβαλαν and the subjunctive νὰ σκάψουν. This time the author does not dwell upon the action of digging. He just wants to tell what happened and uses, therefore, aorists.

Vass. 45: ...ἡ μυρωδιὰ... μ' ἔκανε νὰ θέλω νὰ ξεράσω..., "...the smell (that hung there) was so sickening that it gave me the feeling that I would have to vomit any moment...". From the view-point of ἔκανε there is a perspective on νὰ θέλω νὰ ξεράσω. These words do not denote an action, but a status that continues during the following description<sup>1</sup>.

Vass. 160: Someone is playing the piano so loudly that... ἔκανε τὰ τζάμια νὰ τρίζουν..., "...it shook the windows...". The author does not mean that it shakes them just once. He views the "shaking" in its perspective, as a status that lasts throughout the whole scene.

Pap. 100: "Ἐνα φιλικὸ χτύπημα στὴν πλάτη μ' ἔκανε νὰ γυρίσω", "A friendly poke in my back made me turn around". The authoress just wants to tell us that two occurrences take place: "someone is poked in his back"

---

1. In the words νὰ θέλω νὰ ξεράσω the present subjunctive νὰ θέλω expresses the status, whereas the aorist subjunctive νὰ ξεράσω denotes *what* he "wants to do". It is only a factual complement.

and "this causes him to turn around". There is no coincidence, as she views them as absolute facts.

Dam. 123: ...*ἐδέχτηκε νὰ πάρη τὴν Ντίνα, πράγμα πὸ ἔκανε τὴ φτωχὰ γυναῖκα νὰ πετάξῃ ἀπὸ τὴ χαρὰ τῆς καὶ νὰ τῆς φιλήσῃ τὰ χέρια*, "...the fact that she accepted to take Dina into her house made the poor woman leap for joy and kiss her hands". The same can be said here as in the preceding example. This time, however, the authoress could have viewed the two actions denoted by *νὰ πετάξῃ* and *νὰ φιλήσῃ* in perspective, as the "leaping" as well as the "kissing" must have lasted a while. If she had used presents instead of aorists, she would have dwelled upon the two actions and would, probably, have elaborated the scene by informing us about what else happened during that time. The authoress, however, has chosen otherwise, probably because she wanted to continue her story, after telling us about the woman's reaction <sup>1</sup>.

In conclusion of this paragraph we shall deal with some examples where the subjunctive denotes the purpose of the preceding action.

Pan. 14: *Καὶ κάθισαν ὅλοι ν' ἀφουγκραίνονται*, "And they all sat down so that they could listen". The perspective on the action of "listening" opens from the moment "they sat down". The present subjunctive does not only denote the purpose of the first action. The author does not just inform us about the reason why they sat down. He dwells upon it, he views it as a status, during which other occurrences (expressed explicitly or implied by the author) take place.

Pan. 112: ...*κάθισε στὸ χάνι σ' ἓνα σκαμνί, νὰ περιμεῖνῃ τὸ λεωφορεῖο...*, "...he sat down on a stool in the inn to wait for the bus...". It remains unknown how long he has to wait, but the author, at all events, does not dwell upon this action. He just tells us why this person sits down. That is all.

Pan. 76: *Ἡ Μαρουδιὰ σύρθηκε σιμότερά του, νὰ τὸν χαϊδεύῃ στὸ πρόσωπο...*, "Maroudià edged up to him, so that she could caress his face...".

Plask. 86: *Σήκωσε τὸ χέρι του νὰ τὴ χαϊδέψῃ...*, "He lifted his hand to caress her...".

The difference between these two examples is that the aorist *νὰ χαϊδέψῃ* is only a piece of information by means of which the author tells us why the man of the second example lifted up his hand, whereas the

1. It becomes clear here again that the question whether an action lasts a while or not does not decide about the speaker's choice between present and aorist.

present *νά* *χαϊδεύη* opens a perspective upon the whole scene that follows the action denoted by *σύρθηκε*. By means of this present the author tells us that the woman of the first example continues caressing, while she is talking to the other person.

Plask. 60: "Ἐπιασε δυὸ σβόλους λάσπη καὶ βούλωσε τ' αὐτιά του, *νά* μὴν ἀκούη, "He took two clods of mud and stopped up his ears so not to hear anything".

Pan. 24: "Ὅλοι συμμαζώχτηκαν δλόγυρά τους ν' ἀκούσουν...", "They all gathered around them to listen...".

That the author does not employ the clause *νά* *μὴν ἀκούη* of the first example just to indicate the purpose of the action denoted by *βούλωσε* becomes quite clear in the sequel: "Ἐτσι, γὰ μέρεις ἔπειτα, τριγύριζε... μὲ τ' αὐτιά βουλωμένα...", "Thus, for days afterwards, he was walking around with his ears stopped up...". Here, all our attention is directed not to *βούλωσε*, but to the status denoted by the present subjunctive. In the second example we see exactly the opposite: here the verb *συμμαζώχτηκαν* gets all the attention, whereas the subjunctive *ν' ἀκούσουν* has been added only to indicate the reason why these people get together.

In reading the preceding examples, one might gather that the present subjunctives which were discussed there, have not so much a final, but rather a consecutive meaning. In the two next examples this is even more obvious.

Pan. 116: "... τ' ἀπίθωσε (τὸ μωρὸ) στὸ γιατάκι της, *νά* βαβίζη ἀπελπισμένο, "...she put the baby on her bed, where it started crying despairingly". It is obvious that the subjunctive *νά* *βαβίζη* does not denote the purpose of the action *ἀπίθωσε*, but rather the consequence. The fact that the author views the action of "crying" in its perspective makes us understand that the baby continues crying during the following scene.

Pan. 211: 'Εκεῖνος ἔπεσε χάμου... *νά* συλλογιέται, "He fell down and plunged into thought". The action denoted by *νά* *συλλογιέται* is seen in its perspective from the speaker's view-point indicated by the verb *ἔπεσε*. An aorist *νά* *συλλογιστῆ* would make a rather strange impression here, as it would mean that this person fell down with the purpose to think.

After these examples, where a mere *νά* indicates the purpose of the preceding action, we shall discuss some subjunctives, both present and aorist, which are introduced by the particle *γὰ* *νά*.

Vass. 137: ... (ὁ παλαιστής) εἶχε ἀλειφτῆ ὀλόκληρος γιὰ νὰ γλιστράη..., "...the wrestler had oiled his whole body so that it was slippery...". The perspective indicated by the present subjunctive γιὰ νὰ γλιστράη automatically directs our thoughts to "during the whole fight". The author does not just tell us why the wrestler had oiled himself, he gives us much more: he opens us a wide perspective on everything that is going to happen.

Vass. 159: ... τοῦ ἀπαντοῦσε ἔχοντας γυρίσει πάνω στοῦ κάθισμα γιὰ νὰ βλέπη..., "... he answered him after turning round, so that he could see him...". We may add "during the rest of their conversation".

Dam. 77: Τρία ἡμερώνυχτα οἱ χωριανοὶ ...ἔψαχναν γιὰ νὰ βροῦν τὰ παιδιὰ, "Three days and nights the villagers were searching for the children".

Dam. 35: ... ἔτρεξε νὰ βρῆ δουλειὰ ... γιὰ νὰ τὸ θρέψη (τὸ παιδί)..., "...she went everywhere to find work, so she could feed the child...".

The aorist subjunctives used in the last two examples do not open any perspectives, but indicate only the purpose of the preceding actions.

Vass. 34: Σκαρφάλωσε πάνω στοῦ μαξιλάρι γιὰ νὰ μπορῆ νὰ βιγλίζη καλύτερα τὶς βουνοσειρῆς τῶν σεντονιῶν, "He climbed up the pillow to have a better view over the mountain-ridges formed by the sheets".

Vass. 37: ...πῆγε ἀπ' τὴν ἄλλη μεριά γιὰ νὰ μπορέση νὰ τὸ διαβάση (τὸ χαρτί), "...he went over to the other side, so that he could read it".

The difference between these two examples is clear: the present subjunctive of the first example indicates a position, a status that lasts for a certain time, however short it may be. By means of the aorist of the second example the author tells us with which purpose in mind "he went over to the other side" <sup>1</sup>.

Dam. 39: ... τὸ ἀγόρι, ποὺ λὲς κι εἶχε γεννηθῆ μόνο καὶ μόνο γιὰ νὰ βασανίζη τοὺς ἄλλους, "...the boy who was born, you might say, only to tease other people".

Dam. 40: ... πότε-πότε τῆ δεχόντουσαν στὰ παιχνίδια τους, καὶ τότε βέβαια γιὰ νὰ τῆ βασανίσουν..., "...sometimes they let her play with them, but the only reason why they did it was that they might tease her". The

1. It is good, perhaps, to point out that the speaker, in deciding upon the choice between present and aorist subjunctive, is often forced into a definite direction by the nature of the verb he is going to use. The verb βιγλίζω may easily be considered as a status, whereas the verb διαβάζω, employed in the sense of "to read something", is usually viewed as an absolute fact.



present subjunctive of the first example obviously opens a perspective on the boy's whole life, informing us not about one of his actions, but about one of his qualities. In the second example the aorist tells us only why the other children "let her play with them", and nothing more.

## V

The present subjunctive does not only denote a single action in a definite situation, but also has a general sense. It is risky to deal with the present of a general nature and the so-called "iterative" present (in the following paragraph, no. VI) in a separate paragraph. One might get the impression that in such cases the present stem is quite different from the one employed to denote a single action in a definite situation. As I have pointed out before, this difference does not exist<sup>1</sup>. The present stem in general opens a perspective on the action, whether it manifests itself in one single action taking place in one definite situation or in a status or quality that lasts for a longer time (*e.g.* for life), or in a series of actions occurring in a series of situations.

In this article the present stem that manifests itself in a single action on the one hand and the present of a general nature and the "iterative" present on the other hand are dealt with separately, because in this way it becomes absolutely clear that the present stem is indeed (and frequently) employed in order to denote one single action taking place in one definite situation. It seems to be necessary to point this out again and again, as one may still hear the opinion put forward that it is only the aorist that is employed in order to denote a single action. This misunderstanding is obviously caused by the fact that one (unconsciously) has in mind examples of only that present which we are going to discuss, *viz.* the present of a general nature. When one considers the aorist stem as the opposite of this use of the present, one may arrive at the result previously described.

Some verbs are always followed by a present subjunctive that manifests itself as "a present of a general nature":

Pap. 8: ...συνήθισα ἀπὸ μικρὸς νὰ ζῶ μόνος..., "...since the years of my childhood I have got used to living alone...".

Sam. 126: Ξέρετε, δὲ μ' ἀρέσει νὰ βλέπω γυναῖκες νὰ κλαῖνε, "I don't like it, you know, to see women crying".

1. See pp. 85, (+ note) and 86.

Sometimes a quality is expressed by way of a present subjunctive:

Pan. 158: Ἀπόμειναν οἱ πλάτες του φαρδιές, τὰ λαιμά του γερά, τὰ χέρια του νὰ στίβουν τὴν πέτρα..., “His shoulders remained broad, his neck strong, and his hands able to squeeze out rocks...”.

Pan. 203: ...εἶχε τὴν τέχνη νὰ τὸν ἀρμαθιάζη τὸ λόγο μαστορικά, “...he was able to array his words with consummate skill”.

Plask. 40: ...μηδὲ ἤξερε νὰ καπνίζη..., “...he didn’t even know how to smoke..”.

Pan. 123: Ἄλλο τίποτα δὲν ἤξερε ἢ μάνα νὰ πῆ, “His mother did not know what else to say”.

On comparing these two examples, it becomes quite clear that in the first example the speaker views the “action” in its perspective, whereas in the second example we are informed about what happened, or rather about what did not happen.

Sam. 84: Δὲν μπορῶ ν’ ἀνοίγω τὴν καρδιά μου, “I cannot open (unburden) my heart”.

Vass. 17: Ἡ κυρία Πόπη γύρισε ἀπ’ τὴ Ρωσία συντηρητική. Ἐμεινε ἔξι χρόνια κοντὰ στὴ νύφη της. Τώρα δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ παίξη χαρτιά..., “Mrs Popi came back from Russia as a conservative. She stayed there with her sister-in-law for six years. Now she cannot play cards...”.

This example and Pan. 123 seem to be alike. There is one difference, however: whereas in the example Pan. 123 the author obviously refers to one single action in one definite situation, the contrary is the case in the example Vass. 17. Here the word τῶρα does not mean “right at this moment”, but has a much more general sense, notwithstanding the fact that not the “general” present, but the aorist is employed. Yet the author could not have used a present subjunctive, as he did not want to refer to a quality: the sentence μπορεῖ νὰ παίζη χαρτιά means “she knows how to play cards”. He does not want to tell us about Mrs. Popi’s qualities. He wants to inform us of a *fact*: Ἀπόμαθε νὰ παίζη χαρτιά κι ἔτσι δὲν μπορεῖ νὰ παίξη (καμιὰ φορά), “She forgot how to play cards and thus cannot play (at any occasion)”. Or we might see it like this; she does not like to play cards, and even if she would like to, she couldn’t<sup>1</sup>.

Pap. 126: ... θὰ ἔπρεπε νὰ καθιερώσω μιὰ μεσημεριάτικη ἀνάπαυση, κι ἂν αὐτὸ δὲν τὸ κατόρθωνα, θὰ ἔπρεπε νὰ τρώγω ὅσο γινόταν πιὸ ἐλαφρά, “...I would have to start resting for an hour at noon, and if I was not able to do that, I would have to eat meals as light as possible (henceforward)”. The author puts the verb καθιερώνω in the form of an aorist, in the first place because an institution (an hour of rest) can be established

1. Cf. Vass. 123 on p. 96.

only once, and in the second place because he does not want to dwell on the subject, does not want to view it in perspective, but views it as an absolute fact <sup>1</sup>. He does view in perspective, however, the action denoted by the subjunctive *νά τρώγω*, and that “from this day forward”. In my opinion, there is also coincidence: this, almost abstract, idea to eat lighter meals henceforward will be actualized at each moment in the future when it is time to eat <sup>2</sup>.

Dam. 100: ...τώρα ἀπό δῶ κι ἐμπρός πρέπει *νά κοιτάξης* γιά τήν ψυχή σου κι ἐσύ κι ἐκεῖνος κι ὅχι *νά τὸ ρίχνετε* στήν παραλυσία..., “...from this day forward you must look after your soul, you and your husband, and stop that licentiousness of yours...”. Here again the aorist subjunctive is used, while one would have expected a “general” present. Both admonitions refer to actions which have to be started “from this day forward”, but one of them is expressed as an absolute fact. The reason why the authoress expressed these two admonitions differently is that she wanted to take into account a difference that exists between them. By way of the aorist she wants to say: *Πρέπει ν’ ἀρχίσης* *νά κοιτάξης*· ὡς τῶρα δὲν *κοίταζες*, “You must start looking after your soul: Until now you didn’t do that!”. In the second admonition she uses the present, because she refers to something they were doing up to that moment, but which should be discontinued “from this day forward”.

## VI

Let us now proceed to a discussion on the phenomenon “repetition”.

Plask. 117: *Νά περνᾷ*, τοῦ εἶπε, τακτικά ἀπ’ τὸ ἰδιαιτέρο γραφεῖο του... Γι’ αὐτὸ *νά περνᾷ*, *νά περνᾷ* κάθε βδομάδα, “He should drop in, he told him, at his private office regularly... That’s why he should drop in, every week”. If we compare this sentence with a statement like, for instance, “Τὸν βλέπω *νά περνᾷ*”, “I see him passing by”, we see that in both cases the action denoted by *νά περνᾷ* is viewed in its perspective. There is, however, also a difference: the present subjunctive in the statement “Τὸν βλέπω *νά περνᾷ*” is an actual occurrence taking place in a definite situation determined by the verb *βλέπω*, with which it coincides; the other subjunctive *νά περνᾷ* does not refer to an actual

1. See note on p. 101.

2. See also Plask. 117 on pp. 104-105.

occurrence taking place in a definite situation, but to, let us say, a way of behaving. Yet there is, in my opinion, coincidence: each week this “way of behaving” will be actualized (if the boy does what is told him) into an action occurring in a definite situation (he drops in). In such cases there is not one point of coincidence, but more, a whole series of them <sup>1</sup>.

Some other examples are:

Pap. 70: ...μιά φορά τὸ μήνα πρέπει νὰ τὸν ἐπισκέφτωμαι, “...once a month I must pay him a visit”.

Plask. 68: Ἄνοιξε ...κι ἕνα μεγάλο μπαλκόνι ... νὰ βγαίνει καὶ νὰ εὐφραίνεται τ’ ἀπόβραδα τὸ ναργιλέ του..., “He also built a big balcony, so that he could go out and enjoy his narghile, when the evening came...”.

Vass. 102: Θέλω νὰ μοῦ γράφης ὅπου κι ἂν βρισκεσαι..., “I want you to write me, wherever you are...”. In this example we see that the points of coincidence are sometimes not indicated explicitly, but have to be supplied by our own fantasy.

In composite sentences the present stem sometimes appears both in the main clause and in the subordinate clause:

Pap. 81: Γιὰ νὰ κερδίζω χρόνο, γύριζα καταμεσήμερο στὴν Ἀθήνα..., “In order to gain time I came back to Athens each day around noon...”. From the fact that this type of sentence very seldom occurs one may gather that Greeks prefer the aorist stem in such cases and use the present stem only when they want to emphasize the notion of repetition. The present subjunctive is more commonly used, however, after the imperfect (if it denotes a repeated action) of verbs like *κάνω*, *ἀναγκάζω* and *καταφέρνω*. The fact that these verbs in themselves do not have a complete meaning and always need a supplement apparently gives Greeks the idea that the notion of repetition should also be present in the supplementary verb. Some examples are:

Plask. 71: ...καὶ πότε-πότε, ἀναστενάζε ἢ κατάφερνε ν’ ἀνοίγη καμιά μικροκουβέντα ...μὲ τοὺς πιὸ νέους ἀπ’ τοὺς ἐπισκέπτες..., “...and occasionally she sighed or got the courage to start chatting with the younger people among the guests...”.

Dam. 151: Τὰ κατάφερνε πάντοτε, ἀκόμα καὶ σὲ πολεμικοὺς καιροὺς, νὰ παίρῃ τὰ νέα μοντέλα ἀπὸ τὸ Παρίσι... “She always succeeded, even in wartime, in getting the latest models, from Paris...”.

Plask. 13: Καὶ κάθε φορά κατόπι γινόταν τὸ ἴδιο... κάτι ἐλάχιστες σταγονίτσες ἀνάβλυζαν στὸ ἐπάνω χεῖλος, ξπείτα στὰ ρουθούνια καὶ τὰ βλέφαρα, τὴν ἀναγκάζαν νὰ μισο-

1. I do not see why this way of explaining “general” and “iterative” presents should be “forced” (gewaltsam), as has been pointed out by Mrs. Helena Kurzová in a review of my dissertation “The Greek Imperative”, published in *Listy filologicke* 91 (1968), pp. 447-448.

κλείνη τὰ μάτια, "And each time after that the same happened: some very small drops (of sweat) developed on her upper lip, then on the sides of her nose and her eyelids, and forced her to half-close her eyes".

Plask. 14: Μπαινόβγαινα στὸ σαλόνι... καὶ τὴν ἔκανα νὰ τὰ χάνη μπροστὰ στὴν ἀδερφοῦλα μου, "Again and again I entered and left the drawing-room and thus made her lose her self-assurance in front of my little sister"<sup>1</sup>.

As has been said before, the notion of repetition, when present in the main clause, is not carried through in the subordinate clause. In the following examples it will become clear why.

Dam. 50: Κάπου τύχαινε κι ἔπιανε δουλειά, ἀλλὰ σὲ δυὸ ἢ τρεῖς ἡμέρες τὴν ἔδιωχναν πάλι ἢ τὴν ἀνάγκαζαν νὰ φύγη..., "Occasionally she was lucky and found a job, but after two or three days they fired her or forced her to leave...". According to what has previously been said about the verb ἀναγκάζω a present subjunctive might have been expected. The aorist is used, however, because a present would have meant that the girl was forced to leave the same job more than once.

Sam. 56: ...ὁ μπουφὲς ποὺ σκαρφάλωνε γιὰ νὰ βροῖ τὸ γλυκό, "...the side-board which he (frequently) climbed to find some candy".

Plask. 73: Τοὺς πρώτους μῆνες ἔγραφε ἀναφορές ... ἴσως γιὰ νὰ ἐξηγήσει πὼς δὲν ἦταν μαζί τους..., "During the first months he wrote reports ...perhaps in order to explain that he was not on their side...". The man writes so many reports, not because he wanted to explain again and again, but because he wanted to explain once and for all that he had nothing to do with them<sup>2</sup>.

Pan. 220: Κατέβαιναν στὸ κανάλι νὰ ἰδοῦν τὰ καράβια..., "They were accustomed to go down to the canal to see the ships...". The present subjunctive νὰ βλέπουν could be used here, of course, except that the purpose of an action is usually expressed by way of an aorist. Only when the speaker wants to emphasize the notion of repetition, will he employ the present stem in the subordinate clause<sup>3</sup>.

1. Pan. 110: ...τὸν ἄφηνε νὰ τῆς πιάνη τὴ μέση..., "... (each time they were walking) she let him put his arm around her waist...". Here the present subjunctive is not used because of the iterative colour of the sentence. The author is forced to employ the present, because an aorist subjunctive would have an altogether different (and even impossible) meaning: the girl, then, would not "let" him, but would "make" him put his arm around her waist (by grasping, for instance, his hand). See p. 87.

2. Cf. Dam. 40 on pp. 101-102.

3. See Pap. 81 on p. 105.

The same holds true for subordinate clauses, introduced by a temporal conjunction:

Sam. 35: "Έφηνεγε κάθε πρωί, νωρίς νωρίς, από τὸ δωμάτιο του, ... προτοῦ ξυπνήση ἡ σπιτονοικοκυρά του...", "Every morning he left his room as early as possible, before his land-lady woke up...".

Pan. 26-27: ...ἔπρεπε νὰ σηκώνωνται πρὶν καλοφρέξη..., "...every morning they had to get up before sunrise...".

Vass. 48: Φεύγουν ὅποτε τοὺς καπνίσουν, "They leave whenever they feel like it."

It would obviously be extravagant to indicate the moment at which an occurrence repeatedly takes place by means of the present stem, except maybe when the notion of repetition is strongly emphasized<sup>1</sup>.

In more composite sentences, consisting of a subordinate clause and a main clause that is followed by another subordinate clause, this last clause has the aorist subjunctive, just like in the clauses which were previously discussed.

Pan. 215: Σὰν ἔπεφτε τὸ πρῶτο σκοτάδι, ... ἔπαιρναν τὸ δρόμο ... νὰ περπατήσουν, "As soon as darkness came, they used to go out to make a walk".

Pap. 16: ... κάθε φορὰ ποὺ τέλειωνα ἓνα σχέδιο, ... βιαζόμουνα νὰ βάλω μπρὸς ἀμέσως κάτι ἄλλο, "... when I finished a design, I always was in a hurry to start another one right away".

The same holds true for sentences where not the main clause, but the subordinate clause is followed by another subordinate clause:

Pap. 17: Κάθε φορὰ ποὺ ἐπρόκειτο νὰ ἐπισκεφτῶ τὸ γιατρό, ἡ μέρα μου πῆγαινε σχεδὸν χαμένη, "Every time when I had an appointment with the doctor, my day was almost wasted".

Pan. 218: Σὰν ἀπλώνε τὸ χέρι ν' ἀνάγη τὸ φῶς..., συλλογιόταν..., "When he stretched out his hand to switch on the light, he used to think...".

An exception is formed, of course, by subordinate clauses preceded by a verb that is usually followed by a present subjunctive:

1. I have found no such examples. TZARTZANOS, *Νεοελληνικὴ Σύνταξις*, Τόμ. Β', 2η ἔκδοσις, Athens 1953, concedes that in temporal (and hypothetical) clauses the present subjunctive very seldom occurs: see pp. 61-66 and 100-102. In temporal and hypothetical clauses the aorist subjunctive does not usually denote repetition, but a single occurrence in the future. Some examples are: Pap. 9: Τὴν Πέμπτη ἔμωσ, ἀν μὲ ξαναρωτήση, θὰ τοῦ τὰ πῶ, "If he asks me again on Thursday, I shall tell him". Vass. 109: Καὶ θὰ σοῦ γράψω ἀμέσως μόλις κατεβῶ, "And I'll write you as soon as I have arrived in Athens". Pap. 159: "Ὅταν βγῶ ἀπ' τὸ νοσοκομεῖο, ποῦ θὰ πάω;", "Where shall I go when I leave the hospital?".

Pan. 146: "Εβγαζαν καὶ τραπέζια σιμὰ στὴ θάλασσα, σὰν ἄρχιζαν οἱ καιροὶ νὰ γλυκαίνουν, "As soon as the weather got better, they used to put tables outside, close to the sea".

Pap. 78: ...καὶ μόνον σὰν... ἔβλεπα νὰ ὑψώνεται ὁ σκελετὸς ἡσύχαζα, "...and only when I saw the skeleton rising higher and higher, did I usually quiet down".

\*

Our conclusion may be as follows.

The present subjunctive denotes an action seen in its perspective, coinciding with another occurrence. It manifests itself as:

1. a single occurrence actually taking place in a definite situation determined by another occurrence with which it coincides.
2. the purpose of an action, expressed in the form of a status which will be in force in a situation determined by another occurrence (or other occurrences) with which the status coincides.
3. a status which is in force in a situation (which may last as long as "life") determined by other occurrences with which it coincides.

The aorist subjunctive denotes an absolute fact that has no relationship with any other occurrence. It manifests itself as:

1. an occurrence which (probably) will take place in the near or distant future and has no connection with the present situation.
2. a factual complement, expressed as an absolute fact.
3. the purpose of an action, expressed as an absolute fact.
4. a mere fact, a plain statement about an occurrence taking place in the present situation or in the immediate future.

Utrecht, Rijksuniversiteit  
 Instituut voor Klassieke Talen  
 en oude Geschiedenis

W. F. BAKKER