



SCUOLA
NORMALE
SUPERIORE
PISA

Sara Eco Conti

Reflections on the verb in Apollonius Dyscolus

1 Introduction

Apollonius Dyscolus¹ was one of the most prominent Greek grammarians of his age and his influence spread throughout late antiquity. His authority was acknowledged by Roman grammarians such as Priscian,² and we can find echoes of his theories in Byzantine commentaries of the ninth and tenth century AD.³ Furthermore, the works of Apollonius represent the largest and more significant extant source of all Greek grammatical production.⁴ He wrote on different topics: syntax, adverbs, conjunctions, pronouns, and we know that he also wrote a treatise on the verb, which, however, is lost. We can find a great deal of information on the Greek verb in the above mentioned works, so much so that Apollonius can be considered the principal source as far as the verbal system is concerned.

From the Hellenistic age (third-first century BC) up to the first centuries of the Christian Era a wide and complete reflection on Greek grammar was elaborated. Apollonius' in-depth analyses show that during the second century AD a high level and consolidated systematization was in existence, as well as an intense debate on the definition of verbal tenses (the present, perfect, and aorist). In their studies of the verb, the Hellenistic grammarians,⁵ established the criteria for the classification, terminology and definitions of grammatical terms, which remained fundamental for grammatical theory in the following ages.

¹ Apollonius Dyscolus was born in Alexandria and lived in the second century AD.

² Priscianus Caesariensis, was a Latin grammarian who lived in Constantinople in the fifth-sixth century AD. He wanted to adapt the works of Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodianus to the Latin language.

³ See the commentaries collected in the Hignard's edition (*GG I 3, GG IV 2*).

⁴ "Apollonius may have invented syntax as a grammatical discipline; even if he did not, his works are the earliest surviving discussions of the topic and represent an important and original contribution that laid the foundations for the future discussion." Dickey (2007: 74).

⁵ Among the most noted grammarians of the Hellenistic age we find Aristophanes of Byzantium, Aristarchus of Samothrace and Dionysius Thrax, they all lived in the second century BC. Very little of their works is left if we exclude the *Téchnē* (see footnote n.11).

We can find the origin of the definitions of the Greek verb in the first reflections on language developed by classical and Hellenistic philosophers. Plato distinguished ὄνομα and ῥῆμα (name and verb).⁶ Aristotle singled out the verb as one of the parts of speech and described its fundamental features.⁷ With the Stoics linguistic studies reached a high grade of theoretical elaboration.⁸ Later on, the separation of grammar from philosophy and other disciplines became clear, and grammar was studied and taught as autonomous discipline, with highly specialized methods, as we can see in the grammatical manual *Téchnē Grammatikḗ*.⁹ This text, along with Apollonius' work, represent the most important source on Greek grammar. The problem is with the controversial attribution of this work.¹⁰ Although traditionally ascribed to Dionysius Thrax, second-first century BC, the *Téchnē Grammatikḗ* should more probably be assigned a later date.¹¹ Furthermore it appears to be the outcome of a process of stratification. This poses many still-unsolved problems for interpretation.

In the *Téchnē Grammatikḗ* the verb was identified as one of the eight parts of speech and was defined as a word without cases, but with tenses, persons, numbers, and active or passive forms, moods, species, figures, conjugations.¹² This classification, however, is not the result of a univocal and linear process. On the contrary, it enfolds within itself a variety of orientations and controversies. The sources¹³ show the existence of an intense debate on the definition of the values (temporal or aspectual) of verbal tenses. We can find evidences of this debate especially in the texts of Apollonius Dyscolus, on which I will focus in this essay. The inconsistencies of his statements are due essentially to the difficulty in assigning the correct value to verbal forms with regard to

⁶ Plato *Sophist* 261d-262d; *Cratylus* 424e-425a.

⁷ See in particular: Aristotle, *On Interpretation* 3.16b 6; *Poetics* 20.1457 a 14-18; *Metaphysics* 1048b,18-37; *Nicomachean Ethics* 10.3 (1173a 35).

⁸ We do not have complete works of the Stoics but we can find the discussions of their theories quoted in several authors. See the collection of von Arnim (1903).

⁹ "Art of Grammar." The standard edition of the *Téchnē* is Uhlig (1883, *GG* I 1); a recent edition with translation and commentary is Lallot (1989).

¹⁰ For a survey of the different hypothesis see: Pecorella (1962: 7-10), Lallot (1989: 19-30), Robins (1995: 13-24).

¹¹ Di Benedetto re-opened the discussion in 1958; he thinks that the *Téchnē* should be placed between the third and fifth centuries AD. See Di Benedetto's articles (1958, 1959, 1990).

¹² *Téchnē*, Chapter 13 on verb: Ῥῆμα ἐστὶ λέξις ἄπτωτος, ἐπιδεκτικὴ χρόνων τε καὶ προσώπων καὶ ἀριθμῶν, ἐνέργειαν ἢ πάθος παριστάσα. Παρέπεται δὲ τῷ ῥήματι ὀκτώ, ἐγκλίσεις, διαθέσεις, εἶδη, σχήματα, ἀριθμοί, πρόσωπα, χρόνοι, συζυγίαι. The *Téchnē* is divided in twenty chapters.

time. Some scholars¹⁴ attribute these difficulties to a lack of perception of the aspectual values on the part of the ancient grammarians. We have to remember that the category of aspect, by which we interpret the tenses of the verbal moods,¹⁵ is a product of modern linguistics.¹⁶ Nonetheless, as many other scholars argue,¹⁷ there was an awareness of aspect in ancient grammarians, even though the terminology is controversial and not specific. I think that this can be seen from Apollonius' texts, in which different interpretative possibilities and not just a single value for tenses are considered.

In order to analyse the description of the present, perfect and aorist tenses, I will comment on some passages from Apollonius' works *Syntax*, *Conjunctions* and *Adverbs*,¹⁸ in which Apollonius discusses how tenses behave with regard to moods. In particular I will focus on the relationship between tenses and the optative, imperative and subjunctive moods.¹⁹

2 Analysis of the Relationship between Tenses and Moods

2.1 The Optative

To start with the optative,²⁰ I cite the text from *Syntax* 3.98-100²¹:

98. Ἦδη μέντοι καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐγγινομένης χρονικῆς διαθέσεως ἐν τῇ ἐγκλίσει διαποροῦσί τινες, ὡς μάτην εἰσκυκεῖται ἢ τῶν παρωχημένων χρόνων φωνὴ κατὰ τὴν ἔγκλισιν [...]

καὶ δὴ οὖν ἐπὶ τοῦ προκειμένου ἐκεῖνό φασιν· «εἰ ἐν τοῖς οὐκ οὖσιν αἱ εὐχαὶ γίνονται εἰς τὸ ἐγγενέσθαι, πῶς τὰ γενόμενα εὐχῆς ἔτι δέεται;»

¹³ Besides the *Téchnē* and Apollonius the most important sources are the scholia to the *Téchnē* (GG I 3) and Choeroboscus (GG IV 2).

¹⁴ See Lallot (1997) and Berrettoni (1989a) for a discussion of the main opinions.

¹⁵ Except the future and the indicative, which also have temporal values.

¹⁶ For a detailed survey on the history of aspect and related categories see Porter (1989: 17-65).

¹⁷ See in particular Berrettoni's articles (1988, 1989a-b, 1992).

¹⁸ Uhlig (1910, GG II 1, II 2). The most recent translations of the *Syntax* are: Householder (1981), Bécars Botas (1987), Lallot (1997), Bednarski (2000). For the *Conjunctions*, Dalimier (2001) and for the *Adverbs*, Brandenburg (2005).

¹⁹ The information on the tenses in relation to the indicative mood can be found in *Synt.* 3.19, 21, 29 (GG II 2, 283.9-288.4; 294.9-295.11) and *Adv.* (GG II 1, 123.16-124.25). Other general observations on the indicative are in *Synt.* 3.88, 136 (GG II 2, 346.3-347; 386.11-15).

²⁰ On the name of the optative Apollonius said above: "the optative received its denomination for derivation from the 'desire' (εὐχή) it expresses." (GG II 2, 350.3-4).

²¹ GG II 2, 354.11-357.10. All translations from the Greek are mine unless otherwise noted.

99. Πρὸς ὃ ἔστιν φάναι ὡς πᾶσα ἀνάγκη ὑπάρξει καὶ τὴν ἐκ παρῳχημένου εὐχὴν· φέρε γὰρ τὸν ἐπιβάλλοντα χρόνον τοῦ γινομένου ἀγῶνος Ὀλυμπίασι παρῳχηθῆναι, καὶ πατέρα εὔχεσθαι ὑπὲρ παιδὸς ἀγωνισαμένου περὶ τῆς τούτου νίκης· καὶ δῆλον ὡς οὔτε ποιήσεται εὐχὴν διὰ τῆς τοῦ ἐσομένου χρόνου οὔτε μὴν τοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα παρατεινομένου (τὰ γὰρ τοῦ παρῳχημένου ἀντίκειται), ἐξ οὗ ἂν ἀκολούθως γένοιτο ἢ εὐχὴ εἴθε νενικήκοι μου ὁ παῖς, εἴθε δεδοξασμένος εἴη.

100. Ἔστι καὶ οὕτως φάναι, ὡς ἀληθεύει ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῖς μὴ συνοῦσιν αἱ εὐχαὶ γίνονται· οὐ συνόντος γὰρ τοῦ φιλολογεῖν φαίημεν ἂν φιλολογοῖμι, οὐ συνόντος τοῦ πλουτεῖν τὸ πλουτοῖμι· χρὴ μέντοι νοεῖν ὡς τὸ ἐξαιτούμενον ἐκ τοῦ εὐκτικῆς ἢ εἰς παράτασιν τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος παραλαμβάνεται, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ διαγίνηται, ὡς εἴ τις φαίη ζῶοιμι ὦ θεοί, ἢ εἰς τελείωσιν τῶν μὴ ὄντων πραγμάτων, ὡς ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων εὔχεται, εἴθε ὦ θεοὶ πορθήσαιμι τὴν Ἴλιον· εὐχὴ γὰρ νῦν γίνεται εἰς τὸ παρῳχημένον καὶ συντελές τοῦ χρόνου. τὴν γὰρ παράτασιν ἀπευκταίαν ἔξει· πορθοῦντι γὰρ αὐτῷ τὴν Ἴλιον

ἐννέα δὴ βεβάασι Διὸς μεγάλου ἐνιαυτοί,

καὶ δὴ δοῦρα σέσηπε νεῶν καὶ σπάρτα λέλυνται {B 134 σεθ.}.

καθότι πάλιν κατὰ τὸ ἐναντίον ἔστιν ἐπινοῆσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ ζῶοιμι. οὐ γὰρ δὴ γέ τις παραλήψεται εἰς εὐχὴν τὴν τοῦ ζῆν συντέλειαν ἐν τῷ ζῆσαιμι. ἢ γὰρ τοιαύτη συντέλεια τῆς εὐχῆς δυνάμει περιγράφει τὴν τοῦ βίου διατριβήν.

98. Some are confused by the attribution of the temporal value²² to this mood (ἔγκλισις), since the occurrence of the form of past tenses is without reason in this mood [...].²³ They say, “If wishes/prayers are for the fulfilment of something which does not exist, how can what is past have any need for wish?”

99. To this statement we can reply that a wish in the past is absolutely necessary. Suppose that the appointed time for an Olympic contest has gone by and a father is praying for victory of a son who competed. Clearly he will not pray in the future tense or the present in extension (the past opposes it); consequently his wish would be: εἴθε

²² In Greek is: χρονικῆς διαθέσεως. This is not the common use of the term διάθεσις (usually “disposition, condition, function, voice”). The codex A has διανοίας, and Lallot is wondering if this “ne nous garde pas la trace du flottement, observé I, §§114-5, entre *diáthesis* et *énnoia* appliqués à un signifié temporel.” (1997: 214 n. 230). In fact it occurs also in *Synt.* I.114-5.

²³ Here I quote the other part of paragraph 98: “This is impossible as in the case of other words; the interference of the meaning is the cause of the impossibility to combine certain forms of the word. For example, in verbs like πλουτῶ ‘I am rich’ and ὑπάρχω ‘I exist’ and similar [intransitives], there is no passive form; or in verbs like μάχομαι ‘I fight’ there is no active; or, in regard to gender, nobody will look for the masculine of ἐκτροῦσα ‘She is having an abortion’ [feminine participle], nor the feminine of ἄρσην ‘male’. That is why the combination is hard to understand.”

νευικήκοι μου ὁ παῖς “May my son have won!,” εἶθε δεδοξασμένος εἶη “May he has been honoured!”

100. We can also say that it is true that wishes are for things not existing. It is when I am not busy studying (φιλολογεῖν) that I could say φιλολογοῖμι “I hope to study,” and when I am not rich that I say πλουτοῖμι “I pray to be rich!” We must observe that what is requested in the optative can be used either for the extension of the present, so that it will go on, as when one says ζῶοιμι ὦ θεοί “O gods, may I continue to live!” or for the accomplishment of something not²⁴ existing, as when Agamemnon prays εἶθε ὦ θεοὶ πορθήσαιμι τὴν Ἰλιον “Allow me, gods, to destroy Troy!,” the prayer in fact concerns the accomplishment and conclusion of the event, the prolongation being hateful; while he has been besieging Troy:

“Already have nine years of great Zeus gone by, and the timbers of our ships have rotted, and the tackling has been loosed” (*Iliad* 2.134-135).

For this we have to understand in an opposite way for ζῶοιμι, since no one will express in his desire the completion of life with ζήσαιμι [aorist optative] “May I finish life,” for the fulfillment of the desire potentially delimits the continuation of life.

We can divide the foregoing text into two parts: in the first one Apollonius examines wishes that refer to the past, and in the second one, wishes concerning the future. Let us consider the first one.

Apollonius says that it is not strange that the optative has past-tense forms because it can indeed refer to a past event, and he gives the example of the father’s wish, which uses the opposition present/perfect. When Apollonius says that since the father is praying for a past event, he will formulate the wish with neither the future nor the present tense, he uses the expression “extended present” (τὸν ἐνεστῶτα παρατεινομένου). Probably he specifies “extending,” and does not just simply say “present,” in order to underline the difference between the present and the perfect tenses. In fact, according to a famous scholium attributed to Stephanus,²⁵ the perfect was defined by the Stoics as the “present συντελικός.”²⁶ They opposed an extended

²⁴ With regard to the negation, which is deleted by some scholars, see Lallot (1997 II: 215)

²⁵ Uhlig’s dating: seventh century AD. The name of Stephanus occurs often in the commentaries to the *Téchnē* (GG I 3) and this scholar “semble avoir eu une bonne culture philosophique, notamment stoïcienne.” Lallot (1989: 34).

²⁶ Basing on this passage modern scholars attempted to sketch possible models of the Stoic verbal system. Cf. Versteegh’s survey (1980); see also: Pinborg (1975), Lallot (1985), Caujolle-Zaslowsky (1985), Frede (1987: 305-307), Berrettoni (1989a and 1989b).

present (ἐνεστώσ παρατατικὸς) (which was usually called the present tense) to a completed present (ἐνεστώσ συντελικός) (which is the perfect); and for the past they opposed the imperfect and pluperfect, calling them respectively: extended past (παρωχημένον παρατατικόν), and completed past.²⁷

Let us return to Apollonius' text. In the example he gives, a temporal vision of the events is implied, and he uses two verbal forms of the perfect optative in order to express a past value. But the wish, even if it concerns a past and concluded event, refers to the present and to the result of that event, which continues to have effect. We can therefore note the resultative value of this tense.

After the wishes that refer to the past (using the perfect), Apollonius examines the optative when it is used to express wishes for things/events that do not exist at the moment of the utterance. He says that wishes refer to something that is not existing (μὴ συνοῦσιν), and he gives the examples “I hope to study,” and “I pray to be rich!” with the present optative. However, we have to consider that what is asked for using the optative could be understood in two ways: for the παράτασις of the present or for the τελείωσις. Even although it is difficult to give an exact translation of these two terms, we will use and understand them in the sense of extension and accomplishment. In these examples he uses the present and the aorist optative, neither of which express past temporal notions but rather describe the action in terms of extension or accomplishment. Apollonius' arguments seem to refer to a different dimension that is from the temporal, and we may define it as aspectual, though Apollonius does not use a univocal terminology. In fact he uses terms indicating the “past” (παρωχημένου· 99,7; 100,11: το παρωχημένον καὶ συντελὲς τοῦ χρόνου). In spite of that, in these and the following analyses Apollonius grasps the aspectual character of tenses. Even though in the passage we quoted most of the terms belong to the temporal vocabulary, the value of completeness (συντελὲς) seems stronger than that of past time (παρωχημένον).

We may summarize the above in the following points:

²⁷ Here is part of Stephanus' scholium, *Scholia Vaticana*, GG I 3, 250.26:

Τὸν ἐνεστώτα οἱ Στωικοὶ ἐνεστώτα παρατατικὸν ὀρίζονται, ὅτι παρατείνεται καὶ εἰς <παρεληλυθότα καὶ εἰς> μέλλοντα· ὁ γὰρ λέγων «ποιῶ» καὶ ὅτι ἐποίησέ τι ἐμφαίνει καὶ ὅτι ποιήσει· τὸν δὲ παρατατικὸν παρωχημένον παρατατικόν· ὁ γὰρ <λέγων> «ἐποίουν» ὅτι τὸ πλέον ἐποίησεν ἐμφαίνει, οὐπω δὲ πεπλήρωκεν, ἀλλὰ ποιήσει μὲν, ἐν ὀλίγῳ δὲ χρόνῳ· εἰ γὰρ τὸ παρωχημένον πλέον, τὸ λείπον ὀλίγον· ὃ καὶ προσληφθὲν ποιήσει τέλειον παρωχηκότα, τὸν γέγραφα, ὃς καλεῖται παρακείμενος διὰ τὸ πλησίον ἔχειν τὴν συντέλειαν τῆς ἐνεργείας· ὁ τοίνυν ἐνεστώσ καὶ παρατατικὸς ὡς ἀτελεῖς ἄμφω συγγενεῖς, διὸ καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς συμφώνους

1. The problem is: how are past-tense forms of the optative possible if wishes refer to the future?
2. Wishes for the past are possible; the examples use the perfect optative;
3. With the optative we can also express wishes for the future (the examples use the present optative: φιλολογοῖμι, etc.);
4. Explanation: we use the present optative for wishes about events that are in progress and that we want to have continued (i.e. we are interested in the παράτασις); We use the aorist optative for wishes about events that do not exist and that we want to have happened (i.e. we are interested in the τελείωσις).

2.2 The Imperative

In the following paragraphs Apollonius examines the imperative mood, *Synt.* 3.101-102²⁸:

101. Τὸ αὐτὸ ἄπορον μέτεισι καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ προστακτικά. πάλιν γὰρ τὰ οὐ γενόμενα προστάσσεται, καὶ ἀληθὲς ὅτι τὰ παρωχημένα γέγονεν. καὶ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ οὐ χρῆ παρωχημένου χρόνου προστακτικὸν παραλαμβάνειν. Καὶ ἔστιν γε πάλιν ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων ταῦτὸν φάναι, ὡς τὸ πρῶτον διαφέρει τὸ κλειέσθω ἢ θύρα τοῦ κεκλείσθω, καθὸ ἡ μὲν κατὰ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα ἐκφορὰ ὑπαγορεύει τὴν ὑπόγυον πρόσταξιν, ὅπερ ἐνεστῶτος τοῦ παρατεινομένου ἦν ἴδιον, τό γε μὴν κεκλείσθω τὴν ἐκπαλαι ὀφείλουσαν διάθεσιν γενέσθαι.-

102. Ἄλλὰ καὶ εἵπομεν ὡς ἂ μὲν προστάσσεται αὐτῶν εἰς παράτασιν. ὁ γὰρ ἀποφαινόμενος οὕτως, γράφε, σάρου, σκάπτε, ἐν παρατάσει τῆς διαθέσεως τὴν πρόσταξιν ποιεῖται, ὡς ἔχει καὶ τὸ

βάλλ' οὕτως, αἶ κέν τι φόως Δαναοῖσι γένηαι {Θ 282}·

φησὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ καταγίνου εἰς τὸ βάλλειν. ὃ γε μὴν λέγων κατὰ τὴν τοῦ παρωχημένου προφορὰν γράψον, σκάψον, οὐ μόνον τὸ μὴ γινόμενον προστάσσει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ γινόμενον ἐν παρατάσει ἀπαγορεύει, εἵγε καὶ τοῖς γράφουσιν ἐν πλείονι χρόνῳ προσφωνοῦμεν τὸ γράψον, τοιοῦτόν τι φάσκοντες, μὴ ἐμμένειν τῇ παρατάσει, ἀνύσαι δὲ τὸ γράφειν.

101. The same problem also occurs with imperatives. Here, again, commands concern things that did not happen; and it is true that what is past has happened. Therefore, for the same reason, one should not use the imperative of a past tense. To these arguments we

χρῶνται, οἷον τύπτω ἔτυπτον. Ὁ δὲ παρακείμενος καλεῖται ἐνεστῶς συντελικός, τούτου δὲ παρωχημένος ὁ ὑπερσυντέλικος· ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐκάτερος τελείως παρόχηται.

²⁸ GG II 2, 357.11-358.13.

can reply in the same way, first of all κλειέσθω ἡ θύρα [present imperative] “The door should be closed!” differs from κεκλείσθω [perfect imperative] “I order that door to be closed!”²⁹ for the present [tense] form signifies an immediate command, which is peculiar to the extended present, while κεκλείσθω indicates a condition that should have happened a long time ago.³⁰

102. But we said³¹ that some commands are concerned with extension (παράτασιν). When we say γράφε [present imperative] “Write!”, σάρου [present imperative] “Sweep!”, σκάπτε [present imperative] “Dig!”, we are giving a command for the extension of a condition, as is the case in:

“Shoot on in this wise, and may you be a light to the Greeks” [*Iliad* 8.282]

where he [Agamemnon] during the battle is telling [Teucer] to occupy himself with shooting. But when we say, using a past form like γράψον [aorist imperative] “Write!”, σκάψον [aorist imperative] “Dig!”, we do not only command what is not existing, but forbid the extension of an act; if we order γράψον “Write!” to those who take too much time writing, we are telling them not to remain in the extension and finish up their writing (μὴ ἐμμένειν τῇ παρατάσει, ἀνύσαι δὲ τὸ γράφειν).

The description of the imperative follows that of the optative, because both moods present the same problem when they are used in the past-tense forms. Apollonius uses the same dual-argument structure to reject the opinion of those who do not think it is possible to have past-tense forms of the imperative. First he shows how it is possible as regards an imperative that refers to past time, and he gives two examples: one in the perfect with past value and the other one in the present. Then he moves on to an explanation that involves the concepts of extension and accomplishment, thus implying an aspectual dimension but not a temporal one. To this end he gives examples using the aorist in opposition to the present tense. In the two cases (optative and imperative), therefore, both temporal and aspectual values are implied.

Apollonius says that it is possible to use the present imperative for an immediate command and perfect imperative for something that should have been done previously.

²⁹ These two examples (κλειέσθω ἡ θύρα and κεκλείσθω) are difficult to translate, let us compare the translations of Householder and Lallot. Householder: “‘The door be closed!’ i.e. ‘Let it continue to be getting closed!’”, and “‘Let it be closed’ i.e. ‘Let it be in a closed state’” (1981: 191). Lallot writes: “qu’on ferme la porte!” and “qu’on ait fermé la porte!” (1997 I: 241).

³⁰ Householder translates as: “*kekleistho* indicates [a command] for a condition that ought to have been brought about long ago.” (1981: 192).

In the two aforementioned examples (present and perfect), Apollonius uses for the present the same words (ἐνεστῶτος τοῦ παρατεινομένου) that we found in the paragraph devoted to the optative. Here the present is again characterized as “extended” in opposition to the perfect.

In this passage we find two terms that Apollonius also uses in *Adverbs*,³² i.e. the adjective ὑπόγυον and the adverb ἔκπαλαι.³³ The term ὑπόγυον, which means “immediate, close,” seems to stress the immediateness and the proximity of the action with respect to the moment of utterance, and it is construed in the present. The adverb ἔκπαλαι (“long time ago”), which is associated with the perfect, is probably used by Apollonius to illustrate the example of an imperative as regards the past, because it is related to a command that is supposed to have been carried out a long time ago.³⁴

Apollonius’ explanation of these examples is complex.³⁵ The action expressed by perfect probably has a resultative value. The speaker stresses the resulting state of the action because he or she is interested in the effects of the command. The use of the perfect could indicate that the action of closing the door should be completed and its result needs to last, i.e. the door will remain closed. In this case the perfect preserves its usual value without the feature of past time precisely because it is a command. Therefore, by using perfect Apollonius would probably insist more on the result than on the process.³⁶

In the second part of the text we notice that the present/aorist opposition and the use of the tenses is linked to the παράτασις of the action in the case of the present, but to the συντελείωσις in the case of the aorist. If we use γράφε we are interested in the

³¹ He is probably referring to *Synt.* 1.114-115 (*GG* II 2, 96-97.14) and to the work on the verb, which is lost.

³² These terms are similar to the ones used in the scholia to explain the difference in the past tenses in terms of distance and proximity to the moment of utterance. See for example *Scholia Marciana GG* I 3, 404.24-405.21; 250.26-251.25.

³³ Priscian is most likely referring to Apollonius when in *Institutiones grammaticae* 8.40, p. 406,15, he says: “Imperativus vero praesens et futurum naturali quadam necessitate videtur posse accipere; ea etenim imperamus, quae statim in presenti volumus fieri sine aliqua dilatione.” Ruijgh says that this text “traduit sans aucun doute la version plus élaborée qu’il trouvait dans le ῥηματικόν d’Apollonius. En effet sa description convient mieux à l’impératif du TPr [the present tense] grec, qui s’oppose par le trait ‘immédiatement’ à celui du Tao [the aorist tense], qu’à l’impératif du latin.” (1985: 24).

³⁴ The adverb πάλαι appears in *Adverbs* (*GG* II 1, 124.15-25), where it is usually used with pluperfect but not with perfect (usually with πρόην).

³⁵ See Lallot (1997 II: 216-17), Householder (1981: 191-92).

³⁶ We should also notice that both examples (present/perfect) are in the passive form (while the following ones -- present/aorist -- are all in the active form) and that in Greek the perfect tense has a connection with the passive voice.

παράτασις, if we choose γράψον we insist on the accomplishment of the action, whether it is already going on or it has not yet happened. The terminology is close to that of the paragraphs on the optative: in both we find παράτασις, whereas τελείωσις and συντέλεια are here expressed by μὴ ἐμμένειν τη παρατάσει, ανύσαι (“to not prolong things, and to finish up their writing”).

Also, in this case the present and the aorist have aspectual values, though some terms are related to the temporal dimension by their names as in the expression του παρωχημένου προφορὰν (“past form”). The aspectual terminology and the explanation of these tenses are the same as we find in *Syntax* 1.114-6 where Apollonius says that the imperative always has a future value, whether it is considered according to the extending process (εἰς παρατατικὴν διάθεσιν) or the accomplished one (εἰς συντελικήν).

I shall now analyse these paragraphs. Apollonius is talking about the construction of the participle with the article and says that this construction, in combination with the imperative, causes an indefinite interpretation³⁷ and he adds *Synt.* 1.114-116³⁸:

114. [...] Καὶ προφανῶς ἐκ τοῦ τοιούτου δείκνυται ὡς ἅπαντα τὰ προστακτικὰ ἐγκειμένην ἔχει τὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος διάθεσιν, προστασσόμενα ἢ εἰς παρατατικὴν διάθεσιν ἢ εἰς [ὑπερ]συντελικήν. σχεδὸν γὰρ ἐν ἴσῳ ἐστὶν τὸ ὀ τυραννοκτονήσας τιμάσθω τῷ τιμηθήσεται κατὰ τὴν τοῦ χρόνου ἔννοιαν, τῇ ἐγκλίσει διηλλαχός, καθὸ τὸ μὲν προστακτικόν, τὸ δὲ ὀριστικόν.-

115. Πῶς οὖν οὐ γελοιοί εἰσιν οἱ [μὴ] ὑπολαβόντες ῥήματα προστακτικὰ μέλλοντος χρόνου, ὅπου γε πάντα συνωθεῖται εἰς τὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος ἔννοιαν; ἐπὶ γὰρ μὴ γινομένοις ἢ μὴ γεγονόσιν ἢ πρόσταξις· τὰ δὲ μὴ γινόμενα ἢ μὴ γεγονότα, ἐπιτηδειότητα δὲ ἔχοντα εἰς τὸ ἔσεσθαι, μέλλοντός ἐστιν, εἴγε καὶ τῶν προσταχθέντων τὰ μὴ γινόμενα τὸν λόγον ἔχει μετὰ ἀποφάσεως καὶ τῆς τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐννοίας, οὐ δυνήσομαι, οὐ ποιήσω. κἂν γὰρ οὕτω φαμέν, οὐ δύναμαι βαστάσαι, ἐν ἴσῳ ἐστὶ τῷ οὐ δυνήσομαι. εἰς τὸ γίνεσθαι οὖν ἢ γενέσθαι ἢ πρόσταξις γίνεται, ἀποφασκομένη μετὰ τῆς τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐννοίας,

³⁷ For this part I cite the translation of Householder: “114. One should also note that use of the imperative construction [as the main verb] causes an articular participle [used with it] to be interpreted indefinitely (i.e. generically): *ho turannoktonēsas timasthō* (‘Let the tyrannicide –i.e. anyone who kills a tyrant– be honored.’) Indicative mood [i.e. the constative illocutionary force], if the tense is present or past, makes the article anaphoric [normally]: *ho turannoktonēsas timatai/etimēthē* (‘The tyrannicide is being/was honored.’) [...] But with the future tense we get the indefinite (i.e. generic) sense again, as in our opening observation: *ho turannoktonēsas timēthēsai* (‘The –i.e. any– tyrannicide will be honored.’) and this is reasonable because the present and the past are known, but the future is uncertain, and hence the construction becomes indefinite (generic).” (1981: 65-66).

³⁸ *GG* II 2, 96-97.14.

εἰς μὲν παράτασιν, σκαπτέτω τὰς ἀμπέλους, εἰς δὲ συντελείωσιν, σκαψάτω τὰς ἀμπέλους.

114. [...] this clearly shows that all imperatives denote a process that takes place in the future, whether the commands are for an extended process or for an accomplished one. As a matter of fact, with regard to the temporal value it is almost the same to say: “Let the tyrannicide be honoured!” (ὁ τυραννοκτονήσας τιμάσθω) and “The tyrannicide will be honoured” (ὁ τυραννοκτονήσας τιμηθήσεται), the two sentences differing only in mood: one is with the imperative and the other with the indicative.

115. Therefore, those who believe in the existence of the imperative of the future tense are fools, since all imperatives are characterized by a future sense. A command applies to actions that are neither already on-going nor completed. But things that are not on-going or completed, due to their connection with future ones, belong to the future, since when commands are not in progress they are rejected with the negation and future meaning: “I will not be able to, I will not do it.” As a matter of fact, if we say “I cannot stand,” it is the same as “I will not be able [to stand].” A command, implying a negation with future value, is directed to what has to happen or what has to be completed, in the extension “Dig the vineyard!” (σκαπτέτω τὰς ἀμπέλους [present imperative, third person singular]), or in the accomplishment (εἰς δὲ συντελείωσιν) “Dig the vineyard!” (σκαψάτω τὰς ἀμπέλους [aorist imperative, third person singular]).

In the first part of the quotation Apollonius states that all imperatives have future meaning and what changes is the way in which the process is expressed, in extension or accomplishment (εἰς παρατατικὴν διάθεσιν ἢ εἰς [ὑπερ]-συντελικήν).

The text also clearly shows that the difference between the imperative and the indicative is only in terms of modality and not of time, because both express future meaning.

Apollonius says that commands concern either γίνεσθαι or γενέσθαι, which are present/aorist infinitives of the same verb, and we can translate them as “what is happening” and “what is completed.”³⁹ There is a parallel between these two present/aorist infinitives and the two terms παράτασις and συντελείωσιν (at the end

³⁹ Let us see some modern scholars’ translations: Householder (1981: 66): “A command is directed toward imperfective or perfective happening”; Louw (1959: 46): “The order (command) concerns either the γίνεσθαι (duration) or the γενέσθαι (the single event)”; Lallot (1997 I: 133): “L’ordre (...) est donné pour qu’[un acte] se fasse ou soit fait.”

of the sentence): therefore the present infinitive expresses an action that happens in extension, while the aorist expresses a completed action, an action with a limit.

We should also pay attention to the use of the term χρόνος, which in Greek means both “time” and “tense.” Several times in the text we find the expressions: μέλλοντος χρόνος “the time of the future” and μέλλοντος ἔννοια “the meaning of the future.” It seems that there is a difference between them, insofar as the first one corresponds to the future tense and the second one to the value of future time, which we can translate “future value/meaning.” At the end of §114, when Apollonius says that the imperative and the future indicative have the same future meaning, he uses μέλλοντος ἔννοια. In the first sentence of §115, when he reports the (according to him wrong) opinion of those who believe that the imperative has a future tense form, he opposes προστακτικὰ μέλλοντος χρόνου to the μέλλοντος ἔννοια that all imperatives have. Therefore, it emerges that he uses the two expressions in opposition in order to say that there is no imperative of the future tense, but that the imperative has a future temporal meaning on its own.

Finally (§116), Apollonius adds morphological evidence to support his thesis explaining what generated this wrong opinion (i.e. the imperative of the future): there are non-standard forms of sigmatic aorist, which differ from the normal ones only in writing and not in tense,⁴⁰ or poetic forms (such as οἶσε), which can be similar to future tenses.⁴¹

In summary:

1. The problem: Someone thinks that an imperative of the future tense exists;
2. Apollonius’ answer: The imperative always has a future meaning and is used either for παρατατικὴν διάθεσιν (extended process) or [ὑπερ]-συντελικήν (accomplished process);
3. Explanation:
 - a. The difference between the two forms, present imperative and future indicative, is a difference of mood and not of time;

⁴⁰ Apollonius probably discussed this issue in his (lost) work on the verb; with regard to the indicative cf. also *Synt.* 1.61 (*GG* II 2, 51.12-52.7).

⁴¹ 116. “What is it that confused those who admit an imperative of future? Just forms as γραφέτω, γραψάτω and οἶσε...” Lallot (1997 II: 63) says that probably γραφέτω is a theoretical form invented by grammarians.

- b. A command to γίνεσθαι or γενέσθαι (what is happening and what is completed), could be expressed with the present tense for the παράτασις or with the aorist for the συντελείωσις;
4. Origin of the problem: the similarity of some forms of the aorist to those of the future indicative.⁴²

2.3 The Subjunctive⁴³

I now turn to the subjunctive⁴⁴ and return to book III. Here Apollonius examines a phenomenon concerning the conjunctions εἰάν, ἵνα and similar ones construed with the subjunctive, *Synt.* 3.137-140⁴⁵:

137. Ὅφειλόμενόν ἐστι καὶ τῆ συντάξει τῶν ἐπιζευκτικῶν ἐπιστῆσαι, τί δὴ ποτε τὰ τέλη παρητήσαντο τῶν παρῶχημένων φωνῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἐφικτὴ ἡ σύνταξις τοῦ εἰάν ἔλεγον, εἰάν πέποιθα καὶ τῶν παραπλησίων [...]

138. Φαίνεται δ' ὅτι τῆς τοιαύτης ἀκαταλληλίας ἐστὶν αἴτιον τὸ μάχεσθαι τοὺς παρῶχημένους χρόνους τῆ ἐκ τῶν συνδέσμων δυνάμει. δισταγμὸν γὰρ τῶν ὡς ἐσομένων πραγμάτων παριστῶσιν, καὶ ἔτι τῶν ὡς τελεσθησομένων, οὓς καὶ ἀποτελεστικούς συνέβη καλεῖσθαι· πόθεν οὖν τὸ γεγονὸς τῷ [μὴ] ἐσομένῳ συνοισθήσεται; ἔνθεν οὖν ἀσύστατον τὸ εἰάν ἔλαβον, ἵνα ἀνέγνω, καὶ ἔτι ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοειδῶν συνδέσμων, συστατὸν δὲ τὸ ἵνα ἀναγνώ, εἰάν ἀναγνώ· τέλει γὰρ ἐχρήσατο τὰ ῥήματα οὐ δυναμένῳ χρόνον παρῶχημένον σημᾶναι κατὰ πρῶτον πρόσωπον [...]

139. Φαίνεται οὖν ὅτι ὁ αἰτιολογικὸς σύνδεσμος τῆ πρὸς τὸν ἀποτελεστικὸν ὁμοφωνία συνήρπασε καὶ τὰ τῆς συντάξεως εἰς ταῦτό, τάχα καὶ τῆς ἐπιρρηματικῆς ὁμοφωνίας συλλαμβανομένης τῷ λόγῳ· συντασσόμενα γὰρ τὰ ὀριστικὰ μετὰ τοῦ ἵνα ἐνδείκνυται τὸ τοπικὸν ἐπίρρημα,

ἵνα τ' ἔτραφεν ἢ δ' ἐγένοντο {κ 417}.

ὁμόλογον γὰρ ὅτι οἱ αἰτιολογικοὶ παρῶχημένοι χρόνοι συντάσσονται, ὅτι ἔγραψα, ὅτι ἐνόησα.

140. Ἐχρῆν μέντοι γινώσκειν ὡς αἱ ἐγγινόμεναι παραθέσεις ἐξ ἐνεστώτων εἰσὶν καὶ παρῶχημένων, τοιοῦτόν τι τῆς συντάξεως ἐπαγγελλομένης ἐν τῷ εἰάν μάθω, εἰ ἀνύσαιμι τὸ μαθεῖν, εἰάν δράμω, εἰ ἀνύσαιμι τὸ δραμεῖν· ἔν γε μὴν τῷ εἰάν τρέχω, εἰάν ἐν παρατάσει γένωμαι τοῦ τρέχειν. καὶ ἔνθεν ἀνέφικτος ἡ τοῦ

⁴² Some variants of the aorist that contain the vowel e may seem like future tense forms.

⁴³ I will take into account the following passages: *Synt.* 3.137-140 (*GG* II 2, 387-389.12); *Conj.*, *GG* II 1, 243.11-245.5.

⁴⁴ In §136 he writes that the subjunctive, like the imperative and optative, is modeled on the indicative.

⁴⁵ *GG* II 2, 387-389.12.

μέλλοντος σύνταξις· αὐτοὶ γὰρ οἱ σύνδεσμοι τὸ ὡς ἐσόμενον σημαίνουσιν εἰς παράτασιν <ἢ ἄνυσιν>.⁴⁶

137. It is necessary to analyse the construction of the connective conjunctions: why do they reject past tense endings (φωνή)? In fact the constructions of ἐὰν ἔλεγον [imperfect indicative] “If I said,” ἐὰν πέποιθα [perfective indicative] “if I trust”⁴⁷ and the like are not possible [...]

138. It seems that the cause of this ungrammaticality is the incompatibility between the past tenses and the value of these conjunctions, for they present uncertainty about future actions, including those that are going to be accomplished, and they are called ἀποτελεστικοί “final.”⁴⁸ How can a past event be associated with what is [not]⁴⁹ going to be? Therefore [constructions like] ἐὰν ἔλαβον [aorist indicative] “If (in the future) I took,” or ἵνα ἀνέγνω [aorist indicative] “In order that I had read” and those with other conjunctions of the same type are ungrammatical, but ἵνα ἀναγνῶ [aorist subjunctive] “So that I may read” or ἐὰν ἀναγνῶ [aorist subjunctive] “If I read” are grammatical; in fact these verbs have an ending that cannot signify past time in the first person [...]

139. [...] It is generally accepted that causal conjunctions are construed with past tenses, e.g. ὅτι ἔγραψα [aorist indicative] “Because I wrote,” ὅτι ἐνόησα [aorist indicative] “Because I thought.”

140. But we must observe that the juxtapositions [of the subjunctives with ἵνα and ἐὰν] are derived both from present and from past [tenses].⁵⁰ The construction ἐὰν μάθω [aorist subjunctive] “If I learn” means “If I accomplish the act of learning” (εἰ ἀνύσαιμι τὸ μαθεῖν [aorist optative + aorist infinitive]), or ἐὰν δρᾶμω [aorist subjunctive] “If I run”, i.e. “If I accomplish the act of running” (εἰ ἀνύσαιμι τὸ δραμεῖν [aorist optative + aorist infinitive]); whereas ἐὰν τρέχω [present subjunctive] “If I run” means “If I am in the process of running” (ἐὰν ἐν παρατάσει γένωμαι τοῦ τρέχειν [aorist

⁴⁶ There are different lections in the manuscripts: εἰς συντέλειαν ἢ εἰς παράτασιν B!; εἰς παράτασιν AC. (Suppr. Bekker, εἰς παράτασιν <ἢ ἄνυσιν> Uhlig).

Lallot adopts the lection of the manuscript B and explains his choice: “Il se peut que *suntéleian* è, qui manque dans AC, ne soit rien d’autre qu’une correction du copiste de B, qui ne comprenait pas mieux que nous pourquoi l’aspect extensif serait seul mentionné ici. Bekker résolvait le problème en supprimant cette mention. Uhlig a voulu aboutir au même sens que B, mais par une correction de son cru, s’autorisant de l’emploi du verbe *anúsai* dans le § pour exprimer l’aspect perfectif, il introduit l’abstrait *ánusis* ‘achèvement’; l’usage grammatical de ce terme n’étant pas confirmé par ailleurs, il me paraît plus sage de s’en tenir à la leçon de B.” (1997 II: 239 n. 336).

⁴⁷ The correct constructions should be with the conjunction εἰ.

⁴⁸ Literally is: “productive, conclusive.”

⁴⁹ The negation is deleted by Uhlig (1910).

⁵⁰ Here ἐγγινόμεναι would indicate the forms ἐὰν μάθω etc., and not the following (εἰ ἀνύσαιμι τὸ μαθεῖν).

subjunctive + present infinitive]). This is why the construction with the future is not possible; for the conjunctions themselves signify the future, whether for extension or accomplishment.

The subjunctive, in the descriptions of the grammarians, always appears as a mood of subordination, and is usually considered along with the eventual particle *ἐάν*.⁵¹

In the paragraphs cited above there are two levels of interpretation: (1) the aspectual one, because if we use these conjunctions, we want to express *παράτασις* or *συντέλεια* and (2) the one concerning modality, because we use the subjunctive and not the future tense (this is for the non-factual content of the statements). There cannot be a future because the way in which events are presented requires these prepositions, which cannot be construed with a realis mood. It also clearly emerges that with the future aspectual values play a secondary role.

In §141 and §143, Apollonius proves false the opinion that there are forms of the future subjunctive.⁵²

To summarize:

1. Conditional and final conjunctions (as *ἐάν* and *ἵνα*) cannot be construed with past tenses, because they have future value: *ἐάν* expresses the future because it has a conditional value; *ἵνα* expresses the future because it introduces a final clause;
2. Therefore, none of them can be construed with the aorist indicative, which is a past tense, but they can be construed with the aorist subjunctive;
3. The difference in the constructions with the present/aorist subjunctive, can be explained in terms of *παράτασις* and *συντέλεια/ἄνυσις*.

We find other information about the subjunctive in the work *Conjunctions*. The conjunctions *ἵνα*, *ὅπως*, *ὅφρα*, present two values: causal and final, and they are construed with the subjunctive. Apollonius reports the opinion according to which, depending on the value of *ἵνα* (and equivalent conjunctions), different tenses are used (*Conj.*, *GG* II 1, 244.24-245.7):

⁵¹ Its name is ὑποτακτική “subjected, subordinate, dependent.”

⁵² According to some, Dorians do not use the circumflex accent for the future subjunctive forms. But this is a mistaken argument, Apollonius says, because the future subjunctive does not exist and the Doric future keeps the circumflex accent in the entire conjugation.

Μηδὲ ἐκεῖνο δὲ παραλειπτέον, ὡς ὁ ἵνα καὶ οἱ ἰσοδυναμοῦντες σύνδεσμοι παρὰ τὸ διάφορον τῆς συντάξεως, λέγω τὸ ἀποτελεστικὸν καὶ αἰτιολογικόν, καὶ διαφόρους ἔξουσι τοὺς συντασσομένους χρόνους, ὥστε τὸν μὲν ἀποτελεστικὸν καὶ μέλλουσι συντάσσεσθαι, τὸν δὲ αἰτιολογικὸν λεγόμενον παρωχημένους· τὰ γὰρ γεγονότα αἰτιολογεῖται.-

ὁ γοῦν λέγων ἵνα γράψω ταῦτά μοι ἐγένετο, ὁμολογεῖ τὸ ἤδη γεγραφέναι, ὥστε ἐνήργησεν ἤδη τὸ ἔγραψα καὶ αἰτίαν κατ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπήγαγε· τὸ μέντοι οὕτω λεγόμενον δὸς ἵνα γράψω οὕτω γέγονε, τὸ δὲ μὴ γεγονὸς μέλλοντός ἐστιν ἀποτελεστικόν· μέλλοντι ἄρα συντάσσεται. – χωρὶς εἰ μὴ οὕτω νοήσαιμεν, δὸς ἵνα ἐν τελειώσει γένηται τὸ γράψαι. ὅπερ οἶμαι βέλτιον. καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἀπὸ τῶν φωνῶν κανὼν ὁμολογεῖ τὸν ἀόριστον, τουτέστι τὸν παρωχημένον, εἴγε κερῶ μὲν ὁ μέλλον, ἔκειρα δὲ ὁ ἀόριστος, καὶ οὐ φαμεν δὸς ἵνα κερῶ ἀλλ’ ἵνα κείρω.

We do not have to forget that ἵνα, and equivalent conjunctions, according to the different construction (I mean the final and causal), will be construed with different tenses; therefore the final one will be construed with future tenses, while the one we call causal, with past tenses: indeed, the causes of past events are explained. Saying, for example, “Because I wrote, this happened to me” admits I have already written, because the [action] “I wrote” (ἔγραψα [aorist indicative]) was already accomplished and this has caused the accusation. But if we say δὸς ἵνα γράψω [aorist imperative + aorist subjunctive] “Let me write,” this has not been accomplished and what has not happened has an effect in the future,⁵³ and therefore it will be construed with the future. Unless we understand it as: “Allow me to complete the act of writing” (δὸς ἵνα ἐν τελειώσει γένηται τὸ γράψαι [aorist imperative + aorist subjunctive]) that I think is the best explanation. And also according to the rules, we recognize an aorist as a past; since κερῶ [future indicative] “I will cut” is a future, ἔκειρα [aorist indicative] “I cut” is an aorist, and we do not say “Allow that I will cut” (δὸς ἵνα κερῶ [aorist imperative + future indicative]), but “Let me cut” (ἵνα κείρω [aorist subjunctive]).

In this text we can find a structure similar to the others: first an explanation related to aspect and then a morphological validation. In this case, Apollonius shows why the

⁵³ Dalimier translates this as “ce qui ne s’est pas encore produit a un effet d’accomplissement sur un fait futur.” (2001: 163).

construction with the future is not possible.⁵⁴ Apollonius again attempts to reject an opinion concerning future time. In summary:

1. Problem: some think that the conjunction ἵνα (and similar), depending on its value, is construed with different tenses: if it is final, with future tenses, if it is causal with past tenses;
2. Causal ἵνα + aorist subjunctive = past meaning;
3. Final ἵνα + aorist subjunctive = τελείωσις;
4. Final ἵνα is used with the aorist subjunctive and not with the future, and there is morphological evidence based on modal reasons for this (since the two tenses have different forms).

3 Some Remarks

We have noticed that Apollonius, in all these texts, wants to give explanations or refute opinions of other grammarians who do not understand the perfect and aorist tenses of the optative, imperative and subjunctive, because these moods are related to the future dimension. Apollonius deals with these problematic issues, both from the aspectual and temporal point of view. In some cases he tries to justify the past value of the aorist and perfect (for example the perfect imperative), in other cases he states that these moods have future value and explains their tenses in terms of παράτασις/(συν)τελείωσις (for example aorist and present imperative, and subjunctives).

Choeroboscus (who often refers to Apollonius' works)⁵⁵, in a more explicit way, states that all moods except the indicative have a temporal future value.⁵⁶ The following is a quotation from the *Prolegomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini* (GG IV 2, 256.32-259.5):

Δεῖ δὲ γινώσκειν, ὅτι μόνη ἡ ὀριστικὴ ἔγκλισις [ἔχει] τὴν σημασίαν τῶν χρόνων, ἐνεστῶτός φημι καὶ παρατατικοῦ καὶ παρακειμένου καὶ ὑπερσυντελικού

⁵⁴ In the following lines a further confirmation is given, by re-proposing the argument of the Doric future, which we have already seen above.

⁵⁵ Choeroboscus was a Byzantine teacher and author of a number of grammatical works who lived in the eight and ninth centuries AD. As far as the importance of Choeroboscus Lallot says: “[...] il se fondait sur une connaissance directe des œuvres, pour nous en grande partie perdues, des maîtres du II^e siècle, Apollonius et Hèrodiën. De ce fait, l’œuvre de Chæroboscus constitue sans aucun doute un maillon essentiel dans la chaîne qui a permis, non seulement aux éditeurs modernes, mais aussi à nombre de commentateurs byzantins, d’avoir accès à la doctrine apollonienne [...]” (1989: 33).

⁵⁶ We find the same statement in the commentary of Johannes Charax (GG IV 2, 410, 28-31).

καὶ ἀορίστου καὶ μέλλοντος· [...] αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ ἐγκλίσεις, λέγω δὴ ἡ ἀπαρέμφατος καὶ ἡ προστακτικὴ καὶ ἡ εὐκτικὴ καὶ ἡ ὑποτακτικὴ, μέλλοντος καὶ μόνου ἔχουσι τὴν σημασίαν, καὶ οὔτε ἐνεστώτος οὔτε παρωχημένου. [...] ἀλλ' ἢ πρὸς παράτασιν ἢ πρὸς συμπλήρωσιν λαμβάνονται οὗτοι οἱ χρόνοι ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἐγκλίσεσιν·

We have to know that only the indicative mood has temporal meanings: I mean of the present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect, aorist and future; [...] Whereas the other moods – I mean the infinitive, imperative, optative, and subjunctive – have only a future meaning, and not a present or past one. [...] but the tenses in these moods have to be interpreted for in terms of extension or fulfillment. [...]⁵⁷

The terms used for this opposition are παράτασις and συμπλήρωσις. We have to notice that in this text the examples Choeroboscus uses to exemplify the opposition παράτασις/συμπλήρωσις are not in the same tenses as they are in Apollonius. In Choeroboscus we find present/perfect instead of present/aorist.

We can summarize Apollonius' arguments concerning the tenses of the optative, imperative, subjunctive in the following way. The aorist and the present are clearly opposed in terms of παράτασις/(συν)τελείωσις, and this occurs in all the passages we have examined. It is clearly stated that it is not the temporal value that counts; in fact, most of the cases are referring to the future. What does count is how the process is represented either by extension or accomplishment.

The perfect tense is more complex because Apollonius' explanation, which implies a past temporal value for these forms (especially for the imperative), is not completely clear. In the case of the imperative (1.101-2) the opposition of present/perfect is particularly difficult to understand and is expressed by passive verbal forms (which are not the same as those he uses for the succeeding examples in the present/aorist). Apollonius probably wanted to emphasize the resultative state, which is particularly evident in a passive structure.

The terminology that we see in the texts is mixed. Even though most of the terms belong to the temporal dimension, some of them, like παράτασις and (συν)τελείωσις, are used to describe features related to the aspectual dimension.

⁵⁷ The only exception is the construction of the subjunctive with causal ἵνα, which we have already seen in Apollonius (*Conj.*, *GG* II 1, 244.24-245.7).

Bibliographical References

- BARATIN, Marc & Françoise DESBORDES, 1981, *L'analyse linguistique dans l'antiquité classique. 1. Les Théories*, Paris, Klincksieck.
- BÉCARES BOTAS, Vicente, 1987, *Apolonio Díscolo, Sintaxis, Introducción, traducción y notas*, Madrid, Gredos.
- BÉCARES BOTAS, Vicente, 1984, *Diccionario de terminología gramatical griega*, Salamanca, Ed. Univ. de Salamanca.
- BEDNARSKI, Michał, 2000, *Apollonios Dyskolos: O składni*, Kraków, Polska Akademia Umiejętności. (Biblioteka Przekładów z Literatury Starożytnej 12)
- BERRETTONI, Pierangiolo, 1973, "Per un'analisi delle categorie del verbo greco", *Studi e Saggi Linguistici*, 13: 120-32.
- BERRETTONI, Pierangiolo, 1988, "La definizione stoica dell'aoristo", *Studi e Saggi Linguistici*, 28: 57-79.
- BERRETTONI, Pierangiolo, 1989a, "An Idol of the School: the aspectual Theory of the Stoics", *Rivista di Linguistica*, 1,1: 33-68.
- BERRETTONI, Pierangiolo, 1989b, "Further remarks on the Stoic Theory of Tenses", *Rivista di Linguistica*, 1,2: 251-275.
- BERRETTONI, Pierangiolo, 1992, "Un passo di Aristotele e la consapevolezza dell'aspetto verbale nella cultura greca antica", *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*, LXVII, 1-2: 38-65.
- BERRETTONI, Pierangiolo, 1997, *Atene e Lipsia: saggi di storiografia del pensiero grammaticale*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
- BLANK, David, 1982, *Ancient Philosophy and Grammar: the Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*, Chico, CA, Scholars Press.
- BLANK, David & Catherine ATHERTON, 2003, "The Stoic Contribution to Traditional Grammar", in Brad Inwood (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Stoics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- BRANDENBURG, Philipp, 2005, *Apollonios Dyskolos. Über das Pronomen. Einführung, Text, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen*, Diss. Kiel 2003, München/Leipzig (BzA 222).
- BRUGMANN, Karl, 1885, *Griechische Grammatik*, München, C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- CAUJOLLE-ZASLAWKY, Françoise, 1985, "La scholie du Stephanos. Quelques remarques sur la théorie des temps du verbe attribuée aux stoïciens", *Histoire, Épistémologie, Langage*, 7: 19-46.
- CHANTRAINE, Pierre, 1938, "Remarques sur les rapports entre les modes et les aspects en grec," *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 40: 69-79.
- CURTIUS, Georg, 1846, *Die Bildung der Tempora und Modi im Griechischen und Lateinischen Sprachvergleichend Dargestellt*, Berlin, W. Besser.

- DALIMIER, Catherine, 2001, *Apollonius Dyscole, Traité des conjonctions*, Paris, Librairie philosophique J. Vrin.
- DARBO-PESCHANSKI, Catherine (ed.), 2000, *Constructions du temps dans le monde grec ancien*, Paris, Editions du CNRS.
- DI BENEDETTO, Vincenzo, 1958, “Dionisio Trace e la Techne a lui attribuita (1)”, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, II, 27: 169-210.
- DI BENEDETTO, Vincenzo, 1959, “Dionisio Trace e la Techne a lui attribuita (2)”, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore*, II, 28: 87-118.
- DI BENEDETTO, Vincenzo, 1990, “At the Origins of Greek Grammar”, *Glotta*, 68: 19-39.
- DI BENEDETTO, Vincenzo, 1995, “Afterword”, in Vivien Law & Ineke Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē*, Münster, Nodus Publikationen: 151-152.
- DICKEY, Eleanor, 2007, *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*, London and New York, Oxford University Press US.
- FREDE, Michael, 1987, “The Origins of Traditional Grammar”, in *Essays in Ancient Philosophy*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press: 338-359.
- GOODWIN, William W., 1889, *Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb*, Boston, Ginn and Company.
- HOFFMANN, Philippe, 1983, “Paratasis. De la description aspectuelle des verbes grecs à une définition du temps dans le néoplatonisme tardif”, *Revue des études grecques*, 96: 1-26.
- HOUSEHOLDER, Fred W., 1981, *The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*, Amsterdam, J. Benjamins. (Studies in the History of Linguistics 23).
- ILDEFONSE, Frédérique, 1997, *La naissance de la grammaire dans l'antiquité grecque*, Paris, Vrin.
- ILDEFONSE, Frédérique, 2000, “La théorie stoïcienne des temps grammaticaux”, in C. Darbo-Peschanski (ed.), *Constructions du temps dans le monde grec ancien*, Paris, Editions du CNRS: 299-319.
- JULIEN, Jacques, 1985, “Mode verbal et *diathesis* chez Apollonius Dyscole”, *Histoire, Épistémologie, Langage*, 7: 83-125.
- LALLOT, Jean, 1985, “La description des ‘temps’ du verbe chez trois grammairiens grecs (Apollonius, Stéphanos, Planude)”, *Histoire, Épistémologie, Langage*, 7: 47-81.
- LALLOT, Jean, 1989, *La grammaire de Denys le Thrace*, Paris, CNRS Éditions. [Repr. 1998].
- LALLOT, Jean, 1995, “*Grammatici certant* : vers une typologie de l’argumentation *pro et contra* dans la question de l’authenticité de *Technē*”, in Vivien Law & Ineke Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē*, Münster, Nodus Publikationen: 13-26.

- LALLOT, Jean, 1997, *Apollonius Dyscole, La syntaxe*, Paris, Libraire philosophique J. Vrin.
- LALLOT, Jean, 2000, “Chronos chez les grammairiens”, in C. Darbo-Peschanski (ed.), *Constructions du temps dans le monde grec ancien*, Paris, Editions du CNRS: 287-297.
- LAMBERT, François, 1978, “Le terme e la notion de διάθεσις chez Apollonius Dyscole”, in J. Collart, *Varron, grammaire antique et stylistique latine*, Paris: 245-252.
- LAW, Vivien & Ineke SLUITER (eds.), 1995, *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē*, Münster, Nodus Publikationen.
- MARTÍNEZ VÁSQUEZ, Rafael, 1989, “Aspecto verbal en Apolonio Díscolo: el tema de aoristo”, in *Actas del VII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, I, Madrid, Universidad Complutense: 235-40.
- PECORELLA, Giovan Battista, 1962, *Dionisio Trace. Τέχνη Γραμματική*, Bologna, Cappelli.
- PINBORG, Jan, 1975, “Historiography of Linguistics: Classical Antiquity: Greece”, in T. A. Sebeok (ed.) *Current Trends in Linguistics* 13, La Haye-Paris, Mouton: 69-126.
- PORTER, Stanley E., 1989, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament with Reference to Tense and Mood*, New York, Peter Lang.
- ROBINS, Robert H., 1967, *A Short History of Linguistics*, Longman, London.
- ROBINS, Robert H., 1957, “Dionysius Thrax and the Western Grammatical Tradition”, *Transactions of the Philological Society*, vol. 67-106.
- ROBINS, Robert H., 1987, “The Technē Grammatikē of Dionysius Thrax in historical perspective”, in P. Swiggers & W. van Hoecke (eds.), *Mots et parties du discours*, Leuven, Leuven University Press.
- ROBINS, Robert H., 1995, “The Authenticity of the Technē: The status quaestionis”, in Vivien Law & Ineke Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē*, Münster, Nodus Publikationen: 13-26.
- SCHÖPSDAU, Klaus, 1978, “Zur Tempuslehre des Apollonios Dyskolos”, *Glotta*, 56: 273-294.
- SCHWYZER, Eduard & Albert Debrunner, 1950, *Griechische Grammatik*, München, Beck.
- SWIGGERS, P. & W. VAN HOECKE (eds.), 1987, *Mots et parties du discours*, Leuven, Leuven University Press.
- TRAGLIA, Antonio, 1956, “La sistemazione grammaticale di Dionisio Trace”, *Studi Classici e Orientali*, 5: 38-78.
- VERSTEEGH, Cornelis H. M., 1980, “The Stoic Verbal System”, *Hermes*, 108: 338-357.
- WOUTERS, Alfons, 1995, “The grammatical Papyri and the Technē Grammatikē of Dionysius Thrax”, in Vivien Law & Ineke Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē Grammatikē*, Münster, Nodus Publikationen: 95-110.

TEXTS

Grammatici Graeci:

- GG I 1 *Grammatici Graeci*, I, vol. 1: *Dionysii Thracis ars grammatica*, ed. Gustav Uhlig, 1883, Leipzig, Teubner. [Repr. 1965, Hildesheim, Olms].
- GG I 3 *Grammatici Graeci*, I, vol. 3: *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis artem grammaticam*, ed. Alfred Hilgard, 1901, Leipzig, Teubner. [Repr. 1965, Hildesheim, Olms].
- GG II 1 *Grammatici Graeci*, II, vol. 1: *Apollonii Dyscoli scripta minora*, ed. Richard Schneider, 1878, Leipzig, Teubner. [Repr. 1965, Hildesheim, Olms].
- GG II 2 *Grammatici Graeci*, II, vol. 2: *Apollonii Dyscoli de constructione libri quattuor*, ed. Gustav Uhlig, 1910, Leipzig, Teubner. [Repr. 1965, Hildesheim, Olms].
- GG IV 2 *Grammatici Graeci*, IV, vol. 2: *Georgii Choerobosci prolegomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini canones isagogicos de flexione verborum. Sophronii patriarchae Alexandrini excerpta ex Ioannis Characis commentariis in Theodosii Alexandrini canones*, ed. Alfred Hilgard, 1894, Leipzig, Teubner. [Repr. 1965, Hildesheim, Olms].

Grammatici Latini:

- GL II *Grammatici Latini*, vol. II: *Prisciani Caesariensis Institutionum Grammaticarum libri XVIII, Vol. I, libros I-XII continens*, ed. Martin Hertz (ed.), 1855, Leipzig, Teubner. [Repr. 1961, Hildesheim, Olms].
- GL III *Grammatici Latini*, vol. III: *Prisciani Caesariensis Institutionum Grammaticarum libri XVIII, Vol. II, libros XIII-XVIII continens*, ed. Martin Hertz, 1859, Leipzig, Teubner. [Repr. 1961, Hildesheim, Olms].

Stoicorum veterum fragmenta, H. Von Arnim (ed.), 1903, Leipzig, Teubner.