REVIEW ARTICLE

Theodore Markopoulos. *The Future in Greek: From ancient to medieval*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. xiv + 291; tab. 37; fig. 10. ISBN 978-0-19-953985-7.[1]

This exceptional academic work constitutes a reworking of the author's PhD thesis,[2] enriched with additional primary source material. It contains a total of six chapters, accompanied by an impressively wide bibliography and by indexes of names and subjects. In the first chapter (*Introduction*), the subject and aims of the book, its theoretical framework, the methods followed, as well as issues relating to the corpus of texts made use of by the author, are presented and analyzed. The next four chapters correspond to four periods in the history of the Greek language (*Classical, Hellenistic-Roman, Early Medieval* and *Late Medieval Greek*). Within this framework Markopoulos (hereafter: M.) analyzes three different auxiliary verb constructions (hereafter: AVCs) used to render the future in Greek: structures with μέλλω «I am about to, intend», ἔχω «have» and (ἐ)θέλω «want». The last chapter presents the conclusions of this large-scale study and a summary of answers to controversial issues that have been raised by research into the genuinely exciting subject of the development of the future in Greek, as well as questions for further investigation. Each chapter is reviewed separately below.

Chapter 1

The subject of the book is «the notional category Future in Greek» (p. 1), as rendered by the use of AVCs, and its aim is to fill the gaps in our understanding of the development of this tense, especially as regards the medieval period. The fact that until now there has been a comparative lack of research dealing with this period, during which the use of periphrases with auxiliary verbs gradually increased to the point where they were ultimately established as the basic future structures in Greek, is given as reason for the

---

1. My review follows the full and informative review article by B. Joseph, in: *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 9 (2009) 195-214. In the meantime I attended a postgraduate course given by Prof. Tzitzilis which involved a critical examination of bibliography on verbal periphrases in the Balkan languages and M.'s work was the object of careful evaluation. Thus, in my review I have tried not to repeat observations already made in Joseph's review, but have included some of Prof. Tzitzilis' comments from his course and from several subsequent discussions with him on this subject.

2. Th. Markopoulos, *The Category of Future in Greek*, PhD, University of Cambridge, 2006.

relative brevity of chapter 2, on Classical Greek (27 pages), and the much greater length of chapter 5, on the later medieval period (110 pages).

M. promises (p. 14), and genuinely fulfils this promise, that he will investigate the causes and the exact processes involved in the development of the future periphrases, as well as the implications of his research on a theoretical and a typological level. However, I believe that it would be useful if the diachronic examination of periphrases with μέλλω, ἔχω and (ἐ)θέλω, although fairly comprehensive by today's standards, had also included a fourth auxiliary, the copula εἰμί, which is known cross-linguistically as a source of future periphrases,[3] and, more frequently still, of conditional / counterfactual structures.[4] It is in fact used in many dialects of eastern Greek,[5] for example, in the Tsakonian dialect of the Propontis, where it seems it has undergone a phonetic reduction analogous to that of θα in Standard Modern Greek, e.g. μα γράψου (= εἴμαι να γράψω) «I will write»,[6] or in the Pontic dialect of Amisos, e.g. να με πιανείνανε να ήτουνε «if they caught me / had caught me»,[7] as well as in the Tsakonian dialect of the Peloponnese (the same pattern of reduction is attested here, too), e.g. κια (< έκι να) γράψου (= ήταν να γράψω) «I would write / have written»,[8] and also appears sporadically in other dialects, for example in the Cretan dialect, e.g. ήτονε να πάω «I would go / have gone».[9] Indeed, on p. 64 M. himself recognizes the cross-linguistic association of the verb «be» with the meanings «predestination» and «planned future» (cf. the planned event in the Standard Modern Greek utterance Είναι να πάω στον γιατρό αύριο), while on p. 219 in the extract ἡ τόση λάβρα ποὺ μὲ καῖ ἂν ἦτον νὰ σὲ βράζῃ (565) (from the Cretan literary text *Ἱστορία καὶ ὄνειρο* by Falieros) included by M.

---

3. J. Bybee – R. Perkins – W. Pagliuca, *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago, U.C.P., 1994, pp. 251-252, 258-264.

4. E. Traugott, «On conditionals», in: J. Haiman (ed.), *Iconicity in Syntax*, Amsterdam, Benjamins (1985) 289-307.

5. For the problems relating to the term eastern Greek, as well as the typological classification of modern Greek dialects based on which auxiliary is used to form future and counterfactual structures, see Χρ. Τζιτζιλής, «Εισαγωγή», in: Χρ. Τζιτζιλής (ed.), *Οι νεοελληνικές διάλεκτοι*, Θεσσαλονίκη, Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη), to appear in 2011 (hereafter: *Οι νεοελληνικές διάλεκτοι*).

6. Ν. Λιόσης, «Η γραμματικοποίηση στις περιφραστικές δομές μέλλοντα της τσακωνικής: ιστορικές και κοινωνιογλωσσικές παρατηρήσεις», *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα* 30, Θεσσαλονίκη, Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη) (2010) 372-384 (hereafter: *Μελέτες*).

7. Ά. Παπαδόπουλος, *Ιστορική Γραμματική της Ποντικής Διαλέκτου*, Αθήναι, Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών [Παράρτημα 1 του περιοδικού *Αρχείον Πόντου*], 1955, p. 173.

8. N. Liosis, «Counterfactuals in Tsakonian: a contribution to the history of ήθελα and ήμουν», in: A. Ralli – B. Joseph – M. Janse – A. Karasimos (eds), *On-line Proceedings of the Forth International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory* (Chios 11-14 June 2009), Patras, University of Patras (2010) 89-102 (hereafter: Counterfactuals).

9. Γ. Πάγκαλος, *Περί του γλωσσικού ιδιώματος της Κρήτης*, Αθήνα 1955, p. 331.

without comment, we meet with the structure ἤμην νὰ + subjunctive, and note that this is in the non-asserted environment of the protasis of a counter-factual conditional. It would therefore be worthwhile attempting to ascertain the presence (or otherwise) of AVCs with εἰμί in the medieval texts, and also within a wider Balkan framework from the medieval period down to the present day. M. acknowledges on p. 233 that something similar would indeed be desirable, although he is referring to ὀφείλω «ought, owe» rather than εἰμί.

M. explains language change based on the theory of grammaticalization, and his wider theoretical viewpoint is that of the functional-typological school; he believes that the concept of gradualness presupposed by grammaticalization, which also accompanies the definitions of auxiliaries and periphrases, as well as the semantics of the future itself, which «rests in the very border of temporality and modality» (p. 10), create grey areas which are much better described by this school than by generative grammar, which speaks of distinctive categories. Within the same framework he suggests that the appearance of some of the future constructions (hereafter: FCs) he investigates may, to a certain degree, be attributable to language contact.

The method of approaching the material is quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative in that he investigates an enormous quantity of material with the help of descriptive statistics, and qualitative in that he has the patience to analyze individually each of the many examples he provides, often with the addition of stylistic or sociolinguistic observations. He is also careful in his handling of the body of texts: he only includes low register texts, or the lowest available (middle register), at least when dealing with those periods in the history of the language where the phenomenon of diglossia resulted in the production of a great number of texts in a conservative language which is not particularly useful if one is studying the emergence of new linguistic forms.

Chapter 2

The study of periphrases in the classical period (5th-3rd centuries BC) leads M. to the following conclusions: the AVC with μέλλω is the most common FC, but it has not undergone grammaticalization. In contrast, out of the other AVCs which already fulfil some of the criteria of grammaticalization, (ἐ)θέλω + INF is still rare, while ἔχω + INF does not yet have future reference, but only modal meaning (ability). M., however, based on a somewhat ambiguous example from Aeschylus (pp. 36-37), of which he admits that ability (in the past), futurity (in the past) and irreality «are plausible interpretations», comes to the conclusion that this structure «nonetheless becomes more tightly linked with futurity in past conditionals» (p. 45). Methodologically speaking, in order to date the emergence of a new type or a new meaning, it is essential,

as Prof. Tzitzilis points out, to locate its first *certain* appearance, especially given that the interpretation of this structure as a counterfactual periphrasis (with past reference) as proposed by M. goes back as far as classical antiquity.

Chapter 3

The study of future periphrases in the Hellenistic-Roman period (3rd century BC - 4th century AD) occupies an important place in this book. M. considers that all three AVCs, constructed with the infinitive, have already acquired future reference, but remain distinct from one another due to their different morphosyntactic, semantic and pragmatic / sociolinguistic characteristics. However, we once again encounter methodological problems similar to that referred to in the previous paragraph, some of which concern critical points of M.'s analysis. For example, utterances (6) and (7) (non-papyri) with ἔχω + INF, the future reference of which is considered by the author «undisputable / highly preferred» (p. 61), even if they admit of a *possible* future reading, something which is called into question by both Joseph[10] and Prof. Tzitzilis, *cannot* be used to relocate the initial appearance of the future meaning of the periphrasis with ἔχω from the 5th century AD (or the 3rd-4th centuries AD) as far back as the 1st century BC - 1st century AD (p. 71), precisely because their future meaning is simply possible, not certain. The same applies in the case of the papyrus extract (9) from the 1st century BC, which M. considers to have future reference, while admitting that «there is nothing to exclude an obligation meaning» (p. 65).

M. notes on the same page (61) that there is a further example in the *Apocalypsis Esdrae*, the source of example (7), which he considers as having future meaning. However, once again the meaning ability/potentiality is possible, if not more probable than that of the future: in the passage in question (31.8-19) there are four examples of the structure ἔχω + INF within the framework of the discussion between the dying prophet Ezra and the angels concerning possible parts of the body through which the angels could extract his soul: καὶ πόθεν τὴν ψυχήν μου ἔχετε ἐξενεγκεῖν; [...] διὰ τοῦ στόματος ἔχομεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτήν. [...] οὐκ ἐξέρχεται ἔνθεν. [...] διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σου ἔχομεν αὐτὴν ἐξενέγκαι. [...] διὰ τὴν κορυφήν σου ἔχομεν αὐτὴν ἐξενέγκαι. [...] διὰ τῶν ἀκρωνύχων σου ἔχομεν αὐτὴν ἐκβαλεῖν. «And from where can (will) you take my soul? [...] We can (will) take it out of your mouth. [...] It won't come out of there. [...] We can (will) take it out of your eyes. [...] We can (will) take it out of your head. [...] We can (will) take it out of the tips of your toes».

There are several other occasions, admittedly minor, where the modalities / meanings detected by M. come into conflict at least with my own intuition. For

---

10. Joseph, op.cit. (n. 1), 205.

example: p. 77, excerpt (16): here the periphrasis οὐ θέλουσιν ἀναστῆναι (subject οἱ αἱρετικοί) cannot have a future meaning because, as is well known, *everyone* will be raised from the dead. This is simply a case of the original volitional meaning of θέλω: the heretics do not want to be resurrected because they know that at the hour of judgment they will be damned. P. 170, example (37): here, too, θέλω in ἐδὰ ἄρτε εἰς ἔναν μοναχὸν θέλω νὰ πολεμήσω; from *Digenis* probably retains one of its lexical meanings. It is known that from ancient Greek up to the present day this verb has been used with the meaning «agree, consent».[11] This meaning seems to fit better with the context: Digenis, considering the challenge made to him by a gang of three to fight them one by one, asks himself: «now I consent to fight each of them alone?» (= «what a shame for me that would be!»). In this light the first appearance of the non-lexical meaning of the periphrasis θέλω νά + subjunctive as early as the epic cycle is rendered somewhat less certain. Thus I agree with M. (p. 183) that the first examples of the generalization of the future meaning to this structure too date back no earlier than the 15th century. In contrast, Joseph and Pappas[12] assert, based on the above example from *Digenis*, that the structure was used with this meaning from the very beginning of the late medieval period (see below for further discussion of this issue). P. 219, example (76): δὲν ἤθελα καὶ νά 'φυγες ἐκ τὴν ἀραθυμία (v. 569). I agree with M. that ἤθελα here cannot be the product of phonetic reduction of ἤθελε νά as van Gemert believes,[13] because it is followed by νά. Therefore, ἤθελα can only be first person and have a lexical meaning, but, I think, not that assumed by M. (p. 220). He maintains that in this example θέλω could mean «believe, think», something which is not, however, attested for the medieval period.[14] In any case, it is not necessary to resort to an unattested meaning, as the original volitional meaning of ἤθελα fits very well here if we take into account the protasis in line 566 and the justification in line 570 ἄ σ' ἔκοψεν ὁ πειρασμὸς τοῦ πόθου ποὺ μὲ σφάζει (566), ...δὲν ἤθελα καὶ νά 'φυγες ἐκ τὴν ἀραθυμία (569), ὅτι ζηλώσειν ἤθελες τό 'χω σὲ πεθυμία (570). «If you suffered by the temptation of lust that is killing me..., I wouldn't want you to escape from your intense desire, because you would be longing for what I desire.»[15] In other words, the boy says that if the girl was tormented by desire like him, he would not want her to stop, because in reality they would both desire the same thing (note the difference between lexical ἤθελα νά + subjunctive and the genuine infinitival counterfactual ζηλώσειν ἤθελες).

In tables 3.9 (p. 63) and 3.10 (p. 67) we learn that there are 8 appearances of the ἔχω periphrasis with future meaning before the 3rd century AD in non-papyrus sources and 2 in the papyri. I realize that in a printed edition

---

11. For the late medieval period see E. Κριαράς, *Λεξικό τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς ἑλληνικῆς δημώ-δους γραμματείας. Τόμος Ζ'*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1980, p. 98, where several examples of this usage are provided; even M.'s example (18) on page 110 θέλησον, εἴπερ βούλει, ἐκμισθῶσαι from the early medieval period could possibly retain this lexical meaning: «agree, if you wish, to rent».

12. B. Joseph – P. Pappas, «On some recent views concerning the development of the future system», *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 26 (2002) 247-273, pp. 252, 261-62.

13. A. van Gemert, *Μαρίνου Φαλιέρου «Ἐρωτικά Ὄνειρα»*, Ἀθήνα, ΜΙΕΤ, 2006, p. 162

14. Cf. Κριαράς, op.cit. (n. 11), p. 98.

15. For the meanings ἀραθυμία «intense desire» and ζηλώνω «long for», see van Gemert, op.cit. (n. 13), pp. 162 and 189 respectively.

space is limited, but for such an important issue it might have been worthwhile including an analytical comparison of these examples, or at least of some more representative ones than those which are ultimately analyzed.

One point which arises from the early chronology proposed for the future meaning of the ἔχω periphrasis concerns an argument of the author: examining the way in which ἔχω + INF acquired future meaning, he rejects the possibility that this meaning was intermediated by a modality of obligation, to the extent that the only example of this modality (from LSJ, 3rd century AD) is doubtful, also stating that it «comes from a time that the future meaning of the AVC seems well established» (p. 64, n. 9). In contrast, M. claims, based on example (10) from the 3rd/4th century AD (p. 66), in which he detects a modality of possibility, that this modality *was* an intermediate stage before ἔχω + INF acquired future reference, even though this example is even later than that of the LSJ, and despite the fact that he admits that «the relative chronology of attestations do not seem to favour such an account at first glance» (p. 66) and that «the data [...] do not contain one unambiguous example of a possibility meaning, a fact partly expected, given the close association of possibility with ability» (p. 70).

M's early chronology proposed for the appearance of periphrastic serial verbs (i.e. the pattern verb + subjunctive verb (V + Vs)) is based on the extract (13) from a 4th century AD papyrus (p. 71) which he gives as εἶχες ... εὐφ[ρ]ανθης [leg. εὐφ[ρ]ανθῆναι (?)] σὺν αὐτῷ «you could / would have enjoyed yourself with him». In other words he considers that the type εὐφρανθῆναι is an erroneous correction by the editor and that in reality this example «constitutes the earliest attestation» of the periphrasis ἔχω + «bare» subjunctive (p. 72). Structures V + Vs will be discussed below. The important thing here is that εὐφρανθῆναι is a correction by the *scribe* himself and *not* by the editor,[16] and we are in fact dealing here with the expected periphrasis ἔχω + INF. This structure, therefore, is not the first attestation of the periphrasis ἔχω + Vs, nor can it act «as the syntactic source for similar attestations found in subsequent periods» (p. 72). For the same reasons we do not need to resort to reanalysis of an infinitive εὐφρανθῇ (‹ -θῆναι) in order to justify this type, as proposed by Joseph.[17] It would of course be possible to speculate on the reasons that led the writer to make this particular mistake, but that would be pure conjecture without any real scientific value.

In the table on page 74 we read that in the *non*-papyrus sources there are 32 examples of co-referential appearances of the structure θέλω (volitional) + Vs, but two pages later (p. 76) that in the papyri «[t]he sole new develop-

_____

16. I would like to thank Prof. G. M. Parassoglou, who sought out the image of the papyrus and confirmed what the editors state in their apparatus, namely that the correction was made by the scribe.

17. Joseph, op.cit. (n. 1), 206.

ment, *not attested in the other textual sources*[18] and hitherto unknown, is the generalization of the V + Vs pattern to include cases of co-referentiality». The only way to resolve this discrepancy is to assume that the table contains a typo: Vs(co-ref.) should presumably be corrected to Vs(disjoint). In the table on page (76) dealing with the papyri, co-referential θέλω + Vs occurs only twice, once in the 2nd century AD in an example which M. does not present or analyze, and once in the 4th century AD in an example presented and analyzed on the same page, example (15): θέλεις ἀποσπάσῃς τὴν φιλίαν «you wish to end the friendship». Therefore, based on the number of appearances of this structure (32 in the non-papyrus sources, 2 in the papyri), we would be forced to conclude that the papyri appear spectacularly more conservative, something which would be totally unexpected.

Example (15) brings us back to the very interesting matter of serialization of two verbal forms. M. (pp. 38-39), expanding Goodwin's study,[19] shows that the structure V + Vs is a pattern of subordination which exists in ancient Greek tragedy, in syntactic contexts of disjoint reference and in interrogative utterances (which normally require interrogative subjunctives), and concerns as first members the volitional verbs θέλω and βούλομαι, as well as the jussive verb κελεύω. In the subsequent Hellenistic-Roman period the change that M. has detected is, as mentioned in the preceding paragraph, the appearance of the structure with θέλω in co-referential contexts. But in the same period, and a bit later, the papyri provide us with quite a few examples of this (co-referential and in one case impersonal) structure, in which the first members are drawn from various semantic fields, although most of them could have a modal or aspectual reading:[20]

(a) *δύναμε αὐτῷ πεδεύσω* (P.S.I. 972.18-19: 4th century AD) «I am able to chastise him» (ability),

(b) *εἴ τι ἐὰν δυνήσατε συνλέξατε*[21] *ἀργύρια* (P.Lond. 1916.24-25: 4th century AD) «if you were able to collect any money» (ability),

(c) *ἦλθα εὔξω* (P.Abin. 7.11-12: 4th century AD) «I came to entreat» (movement verb),

(d) *τὸ τί ὀφίλουσιν ποιήσουσιν* (P.Oxy. 1071.4 and 9: 5th century AD) «what ought they to do» (obligation),

---

18. The emphasis is mine.

19. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, New York, St Martins's Press, 1875.

20. The examples are gleaned form H. Ljungvik, *Beiträge zur Syntax der spätgriechischen Volkssprache*, Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz, 1932, pp. 101-2, and S. Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit*, München, Beck, 1938, p. 113, n. 2.

21. Instead of the expected subjunctive συλλέξητε (?); cf. below on the same papyrus (line 29) the phrase ὁράτε μὴ ἀμελήσατε (instead of ἀμελήσητε) «be careful not to neglect (it)».

(e) οὐ *παύομαι ὁμολογήσω*[22] *τὰς χάριτάς σου* (P.Lond. 1729.28: 6th century AD) «I don't stop mentioning your favors» (= I keep mentioning...: continuous/progressive),

(f) *συνέβη με ἐνπέσω εἰς νόσον* (P.Lond. 1729.13: 6th century AD) «It happened that I fell sick» (impersonal syntax).

If we add to the above the formulaic (but similarly co-referential) structure *καλῶς ποιήσῃς* + Vs with the modal meaning of a polite request, one example of which is included by M. (p. 57, ex. (4)): *καλῶς οὖν ποιήσῃς ἐξαυτῆς ἐλεύσῃ* «I'd rather you come at once», we may conclude that this was a legitimate syntactic pattern at this period,[23] which went anything but unnoticed in the bibliography on the Hellenistic-Roman period.[24] It is worth noting in any case that M. does not find a single example of this structure with θέλω, ἔχω and μέλλω in co-referential environments from the early medieval period that follows (see table 4.7 on page 104), a fact that could have something to do with the well-known problems concerning the surviving texts from this period. This lack means that the only secure examples of bare subjunctives, co-referential (and subsequently impersonal) syntax and non-lexical meanings of the three auxiliaries date from LMG (e.g. p. 128 for μέλλω, pp. 142-43 for ἔχω and p. 166 for θέλω), thus making it difficult to totally reject the interpretation of Joseph and Pappas,[25] who consider that the emergence of the future form θέλω + Vs came about through reanalysis of the equivalent infinitival construction. According to Tzitzilis,[26] serialization is a wider pattern of verbal syntax which includes not only this structure but also types such as Vimp. + Vimp. (the well-known Balkan characteristic of «unassociated / concatenated imperative», see SMG *ἔλα δες*, Alb. *eja shih* etc.) or Vimp. + Vs, a structure which is just as old, as shown by the examples with hortative meaning given by Ljungvik[27] *ἄφες*

---

22. Instead of the expected imperfective aspect ὁμολογῶ, which means that the repetitive nature of the action is conveyed solely by the lexical meaning of οὐ παύομαι, and that ὁμολογήσω is probably neutral as regards aspect.

23. See also the example with κελεύω from Moschos (*Spiritual Meadow*) identified by M. (p. 104). Moser refers to a similar structure in the *Ἐρωτοπαίγνια*, a literary text from the Dodecanese dating from the time of the Turkish conquest of Constantinople, where we meet, many centuries later, the same modal use (ability) of the structure δύναμαι + finite verb. A. Moser, *The History of the Perfect Periphrases in Greek*, PhD, University of Cambridge, 1988, p. 254.

24. At least in the German-language bibliography, see Ljungvik, op.cit. (n. 20), pp. 100-102, where there is also a discussion of the gradual shift from parataxis to hypotaxis, as shown by the co-referentiality of the examples from Late Antique papyri.

25. Joseph – Pappas, op.cit. (n. 12).

26. Ch. Tzitzilis, «Das Mittelgriechische im Lichte der Balkanlinguistik», in: Ch. Tzitzilis – Ch. Symeonidis (eds), *Balkanlinguistik. Synchronie und Diachronie*, Thessaloniki, Fakultät der Aristoteles-Universität Thessaloniki (2000) 257-272, pp. 265-267 (hereafter: *Balkanlinguistik*).

27. Ljungvik, op.cit. (n. 20), p. 101.

ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος «let me remove the mote» (Matth. 7.4), ἐάσατέ με προσαγάγω ὑμᾶς «let me guide you» (Clement Homily 13.3).[28] In this light, what is there to prevent us from considering the structure θέλησον ... παρασχοῦ with its two imperatives in M.'s example (22) (p. 81) from the 4th century AD every bit as serialized as the V + Vs structures?[29] The semantic common ground of interrogative subjunctives, imperatives, and verbs with similar hortative / jussive lexical meanings appears to be a common denominator in most of the above examples.

One final observation concerning this chapter: on pages 77-81 M. discusses the rarity of the structure θέλω + INF with future reference in both the non-papyrus (1 uncertain example: New Testament, Matth. 26.15) and the papyrus texts (3 certain: P.Oxy. 1763.10, P.Bingen. 74 and P.Ryl. 691.9, and 2 uncertain examples: P.Bad. 35.8 and SB 9026). But the relevant examples become more if we include those by Mayser[30] (included in M.'s bibliography). Mayser informs us that the periphrastic future with θέλω was indeed rare in this period, and the two examples he gives (one certain (P.Par. 49.22) and one uncertain (P.Hib. 65.25)) are important for two reasons. On the one hand they add to the total number of attestations of this structure, supporting M.'s conclusion that it retains its future reference during the H-R period; on the other hand, however, the example from the Paris papyrus in particular, διὰ τὸ εἰς τὴν πόλιν με θέλειν δοῦναι ἀπενεγκεῖν, shows that θέλω can appear in the infinitive, weakening somewhat M.'s assertion that the small(er) degree of grammaticalization of μέλλω can be inferred from the fact that it can appear as an infinitive or as a participle, in contrast to the other two auxiliaries (cf. pp. 22-25 and 48-51). Dieterich[31] (also included in M.'s bibliography) also supports with several examples the future meaning of the periphrasis θέλω + INF during the early Christian period.

Chapter 4

According to M.'s findings, in the early medieval period (5th-10th centuries AD) all three FCs continue to be used, and there is not much change from the situation in Roman times. The status of μέλλω + INF becomes higher and

---

28. Cf. also S. Kapsomenakis, op.cit. (n. 20), p. 113 and n. 2, for further examples of the pattern Vimp. + Vs: e.g. γράψον το γραμματι (leg. τῷ γραμματεῖ) *δόσῃ* ἡμῖν «write the secretary to give us» (BGU 546.2: 4th-7th century AD) etc.

29. Cf. also P. Genova 72.2 (6th century AD), P.Grenf. II 94.3-4 (6th-7th centuries AD) for further examples of unassociated imperatives with θέλησον, and P.Oxy. 1071.3-4 (5th century AD) for an example with καταξίωσον «deem worthy», a near synonym of θέλησον in this context.

30. E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, Band II 1, Satzlehre, Berlin, De Gryter, 1970, p. 226.

31. K. Dieterich, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, Hildesheim and New York, Georg Olms Verlag, 1970, pp. 245-246.

higher, while ἔχω + INF greatly increases its functionality. Based on indirect evidence, e.g. the dominance of θέλω + INF as FC in LMG, M. concludes that this structure must have increased in popularity during the period in question. It is important that μέλλω is becoming differentiated from the other two auxiliaries: it is only with μέλλω that the infinitive cannot be replaced by a subordinate clause as a complement, something that had gradually begun to occur with ἔχω and θέλω during the preceding period, although not when they had future meaning. Another important development is the use of ἔχω + INF in subordinate clauses where the subjunctive would «normally» be required, as seen in example (7) (p. 98), although I do not think that the use of this structure in a main wh-question (example (8), p. 99) constitutes «another example of the ἔχω AVC used in a Subjunctive context», as even in ancient Greek it was quite normal for these clauses to be expressed with the monolectic future (indicative), as M. subsequently concedes.

Chapter 5

As previously stated, this is the longest and most important chapter in the book. Here we follow the fortunes of the three periphrases during the LMG period (11th-15th centuries AD, although some non-literary texts dating from up to the end of the 16th century are also included in this category). The θέλω AVC emerges as the dominant means of expressing future meaning, μέλλω has become specialized mainly as a means of expressing deontic modality in high register texts, while ἔχω is now found chiefly in the context of the (past) perfect. The table below summarizes M.'s findings concerning the differentiation of μέλλω from the other auxiliaries on a syntactic as well as a semantic level (infinitive or clausal complement, impersonal syntax):

aux.	inf.	*νά* + sub.	impersonal form
μέλλω	+	+	+
θέλω	«semantic split»		– («extremely rare»)
ἔχω	+	– ? («occasionally»)	– («almost no example»)

What M. means by «semantic split» is the fact that the future and volitional meanings of θέλω are now expressed by the infinitive and the *νά*-clause respectively. However, this is not the first time this observation has been made in the bibliography. Tzitzilis[32] discusses the diachronic tendency of θέλω to produce this type of distinction: when the original distinction between the two constructions (infinitive vs. *νά* + subj.) was obliterated by

---

32. *Balkanlinguistik*, op.cit. (n. 26), p. 263.

the generalization of the future meaning to the structure with νά as well, there arose a new tendency for distinction between the two meanings whereby θέλει νά was used for the volitional meaning and θὲ νά for the future. M.'s examples (pp. 187-195), in which θὲ νά also has volitional or modal meaning at least during the first 3 centuries after its emergence (14th-16th centuries), show (although in some of these the volitional meaning is far from secure) that this is simply a tendency, not a rule. Unfortunately, this is the only part of the book which lacks the quantitative analysis that could enlighten us as regards the relative frequencies of the volitional and future meanings of θὲ νά in LMG. However, this kind of statistical study does exist for the period that follows. For example, Tzitzilis[33] finds that in Ἐρω-τόκριτος the future θὲ νά appears far more frequently than the volitional (17 and 6 examples respectively; on the contrary, Holton[34] considers that there are more appearances of the volitional θὲ νά in this text). Similarly Μαρ-κόπουλος,[35] in addition to the general observation that «the structure θὲ νά + subjunctive appears fairly frequently in Cretan Renaissance texts with its future meaning», informs us that in the Κρητικός πόλεμος the future usage of θὲ νά is much more frequent than the volitional (86 and 14 appearances respectively). Cf. also p. 203 where M. comes to the same conclusion as regards the increased frequency of the future θὲ νά in Cretan literature (16th-17th centuries).

We now come to the issue of language contact as a factor in the development of this structure and/or its increased frequency of use. M. refers repeatedly (pp. 109-10, 170, 172 etc.) to the possibility that the future with θέλω owes its wider use in this period to the Slavic language, which possessed exactly the same structure with the verb *xošto* «want». His argument runs as follows: the Old Church Slavonic translations from the Greek New Testament systematically make use of the Slavic *xošto* wherever the Greek has μέλλω. The Greek structure with μέλλω is different from the Slavic structure with «want», which means that a future with «want» must have already existed in Slavic, otherwise the translators would not have used it. However, as Prof. Tzitzils points out, Slavic lacked the means to make the stylistic distinction between the high-register μέλλω and the low-register θέλω that existed in Greek, and therefore the translators rendered the former with the only available synonym in Slavic, *xošto*. I will make no further reference here

---

33. *Balkanlinguistik*, op.cit. (n. 26), p. 263.

34. D. Holton, «The formation of the future in modern Greek literary texts up to the 17th century», in: N. Panayotakis (ed.), *Origini della letteratura neograca*, Vol. 1, Venezia (1993) 118-128, p. 122.

35. Θ. Μαρκόπουλος, «Γραμματικοποίηση και γλωσσική ποικιλία: ο μέλλοντας στην εποχή της Κρητικής Αναγέννησης (16ος-17ος αι.)», *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα* 30, Θεσσαλονίκη, Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη) (2010) 251-263, pp. 257-258.

to gaps in M.'s otherwise comprehensive bibliography as regards the Balkan perspective on the future and the Balkan dimension of Greek in general.[36] Among experts in medieval Slavic and its Balkan dimension the Greek origin of Slavic *xošto* is almost commonplace. For example, Birnbaum[37] – M.'s argument is based on his work concerning the rendering of the future in New Testament Greek – states explicitly that he believes the Slavic future with *xošto* to be a product of Greek influence: «Wir glauben nämlich, dass SANDFELD mit Recht die Ansicht verfochten hat, wonach der gemein-balkanische Futurtypus mit einer Form ([...]) des Verbums mit der Bedeutung «wollen» griechischen Ursprungs ist.» Similarly Minčeva[38] considers that the future with *xošto* in Slavic until the 13th century remained a literary element which had been borrowed into the language. In his discussion of the structure θὲ νά (pp. 186-202) M. concludes that Western influence is responsible to a large degree for the emergence of this form. The arguments showing the difficulties inherent in this viewpoint have been nicely set out by Joseph.[39] More generally, if we consider this hypothetical Venetian influence within the wider framework of influences proposed by M., we get the following picture (see also n. 36): The Greek future with θέλω is (partly) the result of Slavic influence (early years of late medieval period), θὲ νά is (partly) the result of Venetian influence (later stages of late medieval period) and «the convergence observed in the modern languages [Bulgarian and Greek, concerning the development of the future] must have originated in sub-sequent periods, when Balkan populations were really intermixed under the Ottoman rule» (p. 207). It is clear that in order to propose such a tangled web of influences, especially given the fact that all the developments in question can be explained by language-internal processes, one really ought to base oneself on much firmer ground than that provided in this book. A thorough examination of the external setting, of the linguistic behavior(s) and of the other structural consequences concerning the languages involved would appear to be necessary.

---

36. Cf. Joseph, op.cit. (n. 1), pp. 197-8, n. 3. It is noteworthy that M., referring to A. Aikhenvald and R. Dixon, *Grammars in Contact: a Cross-linguistic Typology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007, and T. Kuteva, *Auxiliation: an Enquiry into the Nature of Gram-maticalization*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2001, devotes approximately two pages (pp. 205-7) simply to undermining the common developments followed by the Balkan (more specifically the Bulgarian) and Greek future, at least in the period with which his study is concerned.

37. H. Birnbaum, *Untersuchungen zu der Zukunfts-umschreibungen mit dem Infinitiv im Altkirchenslavischen*, Stockholm, Almqvist and Wiksell, 1958, p. 255.

38. A. Minčeva, «Die Rolle des griechisch-slavischen Bilinguismus für die Literarizität der ersten slavischen Übersetzungen», in: *Sprache in der Slavia und auf dem Balkan*, Slavistische und balkanologische Aufsätze. Norbert Reiter zum 65, Geburtstag (1993) 169-180.

39. Joseph, op.cit. (n. 1), pp. 207-210.

Another point, rather minor, where the appearance of new structures is attributed, wholly or partly, to contact with other languages can be found in n. 23 on page 167. Here M. states that the serialized structure V + Vs was probably reinforced by an equivalent model which exists in the Arabic dialects of the central Mediterranean (Maltese and Pantesco). To attempt to explain the equivalent Greek structure in this way is like explaining something unknown with something even more unknown. Naturally the presence of such a model in these Arabic dialects should come as no surprise. Lehman[40] makes the cross-linguistic observation that it is possible for serialized structures to develop into verbal periphrases. Similarly Anderson[41] considers that cross-linguistically these structures are among the most common sources of AVCs.

In this context it is difficult to justify M.'s interpretation (pp. 155-156) of the obsolescence of the future reference of ἔχω. He maintains that this is only partly due to its past perfect usage, because according to his analysis of the data the decline of the future with ἔχω precedes the first appearance of the past perfect by approximately 2 centuries, and the first appearance of the present perfect by 4 centuries (11th and 13th centuries respectively). Therefore, he claims, we must attribute this partly also to Greek contact with the Slavs, «who probably already used an FC of volitional origin». However, if we take into account the first appearance of the perfect in the 11th century in southern Italy,[42] together with at least one example of this type of perfect in the Chronicle of Morea (v. 837), which M. considers «obscure» (p. 158)[43] it seems reasonable to suppose that the decline of the future in ἔχω and the emergence of the perfect probably occurred at around the same time.

M.'s hypothesis that the preservation of the infinitive complement of the

---

40. C. Lehmann, *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*, Erfurt, Universität Erfurt, 2002, pp. 30-1. Cf. also Σ. Τσολακίδης, «Γραμματικοποιημένες δομές δυνητικής τροπικότητας», in: M. Janse – B. Joseph – P. Pavlou – A. Ralli (eds.), *Studies in Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, Nicosia, Kykkos Cultural Research Centre (2010) 233-43, p. 238 and n. 25.

41. G. Anderson, *Auxiliary Verb Constructions*, Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2006, p. 11.

42. The structure in question is ἔχουν δεθῆν (= δοθεί) «they have been given», first mentioned in K. Μηνάς, *Η γλώσσα των δημοσιευμένων μεσαιωνικών ελληνικών εγγράφων της Κάτω Ιταλίας και της Σικελίας*, Αθήνα, Ακαδημία Αθηνών, 1994, p. 124. Cf. Α. Ράλλη – Δ. Μελισσαροπούλου – Σ. Τσολακίδης, «Ο παρακείμενος στη νέα ελληνική και στις διαλέκτους: παρατηρήσεις για τη μορφή και την εξέλιξή του», *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα* 27, Μνήμη Α.-Φ. Χριστίδη, Θεσσαλονίκη, Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη) (2007) 361-372, p. 368 and n. 17. In consequence, the formation of the past perfect must be considered older still. M. is aware of the presence of this form (p. 158, n. 19), but he does not really take it into account because this would render unnecessary his reference to contact with Slavic, which is of particular importance to his interpretations of increases and decreases in the occurrence of the AVCs.

43. Thus concluding that this construction doesn't exist in the Chronicle, following G. Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, Wiley-Blackwell, West Sussex, 2010 [1997], pp. 300-1, and contra J. Aerts, *Periphrastica*, Amsterdam, Hakkert 1965, p. 182; R. Browning, *Η ελληνική γλώσσα: μεσαιωνική και νέα*, μτφρ. Δημήτρης Σωτηρόπουλος, Αθήνα, Εκδόσεις Παπαδήμα, 1972, p. 117 and Moser, op.cit. (n. 23), pp. 243-4.

ἔχω/εἶχα perfect is probably due to contact with Venetian and French (p. 164) seems to me similarly unfounded. Once again, internal «role redistribution»[44] of the existing structures is sufficient to explain this development: from the moment that εἶχα/ἔχω + νά became established in modal environments (irrealis and deontic respectively), as shown by example 29 with the counterfactual conditional in M. (p. 162), as well as by the plethora of counterfactuals with εἴχα να in the Modern Greek dialects,[45] there arose a new syntactic distinction which probably protected the infinitive in order to avoid ambiguity. Moreover, if we follow the criterion of frequency, which M. himself calls upon many times in order to interpret the replacement or preservation of a structure (= the more frequently a structure is used, the less likely it is to change), we may suppose, as an extension of the reasoning in the previous paragraph, that the very fact that the perfect ἔχω + INF was not replaced by a perfect ἔχω + subjunctive is an indirect indication of the early increased frequency of this structure.[46]

One final observation concerning the perfect with ἔχω: the medieval dimension of the periphrasis Aux. + indeclinable participle in -οντα(ς) is identified and nicely presented by M., with examples such as ἔχω λαμβάνοντα «I have received» (p. 148; Crete, 16th century), ἤχεν κρατώνταν «he had owned» (p. 157; S. Italy, 12th century), together with accurate reference to the preservation of this model in Modern Greek dialects, often in the same areas that provide us with the medieval examples. However, the line καὶ οὐκ εἶχε λέγοντα σωστὸν καὶ βλέπω... given by M. on p. 162, from Falieros (Ἱστορία καὶ ὄνειρο, v. 395; Crete, 15th century) as an example of the past perfect tense (εἶχε λέγοντα), could admit of a different syntactic reading, involving the third pattern of constructing perfect tenses in the history of the Greek language, Aux. + indeclinable verbal adjective in -τός: in medieval Greek, as in modern Greek, one meaning of the verb σώζω was «to be or do something in time, to finish», and the periphrasis οὐκ εἶχε σωστὸν (λέγοντα) could mean «he had not (yet) finished (speaking)»; although the predicative use of the participle λέγοντα seems rather strange for this period, it is semantically preferable to the periphrasis οὐκ εἶχε λέγοντα «he had not said». This type of periphrasis is also attested in other medieval texts, for example in the Πρακτικό τῆς Λατινικῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς τῆς Κεφαλλονιάς,[47] a non-literary text from 1264 AD dealing with property

──────────

44. For the term see Τζιτζιλής, Οἱ νεοελληνικές διάλεκτοι, op.cit. (n. 5).

45. Cf. Τσολακίδης, op.cit. (n. 40) and Liosis, «Counterfactuals», op.cit. (n. 8).

46. For a discussion of the issues surrounding the preservation of the infinitive in the perfect tense see also Moser, op.cit. (n. 23), pp. 255-256, and Α. Μπαζούκης, Γιὰ τὴν πορεία γραμματικοποίησης τῆς περίφρασης τοῦ νεοελληνικοῦ παρακειμένου α΄, postgraduate study, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 2003.

47. Θ. Τζαννετάτος, Τὸ πρακτικόν τῆς Λατινικῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς Κεφαλληνίας καὶ ἡ ἐπιτομή αὐτοῦ, Ἀθήνα 1965.

owned by the Catholic Church on the island of Kefalonia, there are three instances of the structure: ἔχη ἀγοραστὸν ἡ μονή (195 and 320-321) and ἔχωμεν ἀγοραστόν (1004) «the monastery has / we have bought». These examples constitute two more early appearances of the ἔχω past perfect from the 13th century, although, admittedly, ἔχω + verbal adjective equals ἔχω + passive particle in -μένος, a construction quite old in the history of Greek. Still, the use of ἔχω with the adjective shows the ever increasing tendency of this auxiliary to be associated with perfect tenses. As we might expect, this structure is preserved in several Modern Greek dialects, including Tsakonian, e.g. εμι έχου γραφτέ «I have written»,[48] and, not by chance, Cretan: έχω θωρετά «I have seen».[49]

On page 161 we read of the specialization of ἔχω (and especially of εἶχα + INF) to the protasis of counterfactual conditionals, which is justified by the theoretical and cross-linguistic tendency for an older structure to be preserved in this type of «very specific (embedded) syntactic domain». Here a reference to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca would be needed, as they explicitly state that «As we pointed out there [in chapter 6.11] since new gram-maticizations of tense and aspect forms tend to arise in main, asserted clauses, pre-existing tense and aspect forms tend to be preserved longer in subordinate clauses, especially those that are not asserted but rather have some other modality, such as the expression of conditions or purposes or complements to verbs of wanting or ordering».[50]

Finally, in example (80) on page 221 ὅπιος θέλη ἤθελεν τὴν διασήσει (De Montesantos, 78; 16th century non-literary text from Kefallonia) «whoever will/would doubt her», M. considers that the use of the third person singular θέλη marks the future reference of the conditional. In my view it would be preferable to interpret θέλη as an infinitive, and that ἤθελεν θέλει as a whole functions as a counterfactual marker, i.e. this is what marks as modal imperfect the counterfactual meaning of the periphrasis, which naturally has future reference.[51] The possibility that the double auxiliary is a

48. N. Liosis, «Auxiliary Verbs and the Participle in the Tsakonian Dialect: Towards a Periphrastic Verbal System». Announcement in the 9th International Conference on Greek Linguistics (Chicago, 29-31 October, 2009), to appear in 2010 (hereafter: «Auxiliary verbs»).

49. Πάγκαλος, op.cit. (n. 9), pp. 326-7. For a typological description of perfect periphrases in the Modern Greek dialects see Τζιτζιλής, Οι νεοελληνικές διάλεκτοι, op.cit. (n. 5). Cf. Ράλ-λη – Μελισσαροπούλου – Τσολακίδης, op.cit. (n. 42).

50. Bybee – Perkins – Pagliuca, op.cit. (n. 3), p. 296. Reference to this work is similarly lacking on p. 212 in the context of the analysis of ἤθελα, see however p. 153, where we do in fact find a similar reference.

51. It is in any case well-known that the modal imperfect in Greek, as well as in other languages, is neutralized with regard to time, to the point that it can have future as well as past reference (cf. F. Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 203-221, and Horrocks, op.cit. (n. 43), pp. 237-238). The ambiguity is resolved by the use of the past perfect in cases with past reference, cf. the modal utterances μακάρι να έβρεχε αύριο/χτες

scribal error cannot, of course, be totally overruled but this example is in any case worthy of note. It could be an instance of a «periphrasis within a periphrasis» of the form [ἤθελα + INF] + INF, and may be added to the number of complex periphrases that are found today in dialects such as Tsakonian, cf. the epistemic utterance [θα ζάει] θέλει τʰο γάμο «he may go to the wedding»[52] or the perfect [εμι έχου] γραφτέ (= *[εἰμὶ ἔχων] γραπτό) where εἰμὶ ἔχων is the periphrastic equivalent of the present ἔχω.[53]

The type ἠθέλει which M. finds in the same text (De Montesantos, 243) seems unlikely to constitute an indication that the overlap he discerns between θέλω and ἤθελα (resulting in the latter acquiring future reference, cf. n. 51) has been extended to the level of morphology (with the augment appearing in conjunction with the present ending). It is probably an entirely separate phenomenon; similar augmented presents are quite common in the modern dialects of Kefallonia and Ithaca, e.g. εβγάνω «take off», ηγλέπω «see» etc.[54]

Chapter 6

This chapter includes M.'s general conclusions regarding the diachrony of the three AVCs, as well as observations of a theoretical/typological nature which may be summarized as follows:

(a) the lack of phonetically reduced forms of the auxiliaries up to the end of the late medieval period, despite the fact that they had been used for centuries in future periphrases, supports the view[55] that phonetic change is optional, and does not constitute an obligatory element of grammaticalization,

(b) the retention of the volitional meaning of θὲ νά for several centuries after its first appearance shows that the desemanticization of an auxiliary is not inevitable in the first stage of its grammaticalization,

---

and μακάρι να είχε βρέξει χτες but not *μακάρι να είχε βρέξει αύριο. Therefore there is no reason to think that the capability of ἤθελα to refer to the present/future results from its identification with θέλω. It has more to do with the inherent atemporal use of the imperfect within the framework of conditional structures.

52. Λιόσης, *Μελέτες*, op.cit. (n. 6), p. 382.

53. Liosis, «Auxiliary verbs», op.cit. (n. 48).

54. Ει. Κρίκη – Ν. Λιόσης, «Επτανησιακά Ιδιώματα», in: Χρ. Τζιτζιλής (ed.), *Νεοελ-ληνικές Διάλεκτοι*, Θεσσαλονίκη, Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών (Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη), to appear in 2011. For the presence of characteristics of the dialects of the Ionian islands in late medieval and post-medieval texts from this area see also Ei. Kriki – N. Liosis, «Remarks on the Medieval Form of the Ionian Dialects», *Announcement in the Second International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory* (Mytilene, 30 September - 3 October 2004).

55. First articulated in B. Heine, *Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1993.

(c) stylistic factors, such as the specialization of μέλλω to high register texts, are responsible for its shift from the area of the future to that of deontic modality, despite the fact that from a typological point of view we would expect the opposite change (from deontic modality to future).

Reading this book I found it to be a bold scientific work written with much passion. There are many good ideas and a radical angle, proceeding from a wide body of data which the author is able to show to its best advantage. Given this, its two main weaknesses, namely

(1) the many and somewhat ill-founded references to possible language contacts, with or without the contribution of language-internal factors, while avoiding to deal in any meaningful way with the most fundamental issue of contact between the Balkan languages, and the consequent failure to recognize that the Greek periphrastic future with θέλω is (also) a basic Balkanism which is likely to have had its starting point in Greek, and

(2) a few methodologically unsound practises such as (a) the tendency to date a phenomenon from the beginning rather than from the end of the grey area where old and new types coexist, (b) the numbers in some of the tables, which do not correspond to analyzed examples, thus denying the reader the chance to confirm certain statements, and relying on his/her good faith, (c) the partial representation of the German language bibliography, which is rather fundamental on this type of subject, especially where the H-R period is concerned,

are not enough to detract substantially from the general particularly positive impression left by this work. I am certain that Markopoulos's book will become a reference point and essential aid to anyone dealing with the history of the Greek language, and also with issues such as tense-modality-aspect categories and grammaticalization theory.

Institute of Modern Greek Studies   NIKOS LIOSIS
(Manolis Triantaphyllidis Foundation)