

Ezra la Roi

# Habitual auxiliaries in Ancient Greek

## Grammaticalization and diachronic collocation shifts

**Abstract:** This article discusses the grammaticalization of the habitual auxiliaries εἶωθα, φιλέω, ἐθέλω and νομίζω in Archaic and Classical Greek. I aim to (1) provide a more complete understanding of the Ancient Greek expressions of habituality; (2) distinguish clearly between habitual aspect and (possibly diachronically) related semantic categories such as iterativity and genericity; (3) demonstrate the usefulness of grammaticalization and collocation criteria to measure the relative degree of grammaticalization of the habitual auxiliaries. I argue that their degree of grammaticalization can be measured by whether they have developed past uses, undergone a diachronic collocation shift to inanimate subjects and, subsequently, stative infinitives, and whether they have acquired an anti-present implicature. Finally, I suggest that habitual ἐθέλω occurred already in Archaic Greek and was the source for the futurity use that it developed in Classical Greek.

**Keywords:** habitual aspect, diachronic collocation shift, grammaticalization, statives, genericity, iterativity, Archaic Greek, Homeric Greek, Classical Greek

## 1 Introduction

Research on tense and aspect in Ancient Greek has generally focused on the temporal-aspectual values expressed by finite verbs, expressed either synthetically or periphrastically.<sup>1</sup> As a result, discussions of expressions of habitual aspect, the meaning that a situation is customarily the case on several different occasions (Comrie 1976: 27–28; Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 127),<sup>2</sup> limit themselves to habitual meaning as generated by specific tenses or aspects. A remark typically found in our standard grammars is that a certain tense/aspect can also be used for habituais (e.g. Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 170–171). Since in Ancient Greek,

---

<sup>1</sup> The literature on Ancient Greek aspect is too large to cover here. A compact overview is offered by de la Villa 2014. For an overview of periphrastically expressed aspect, see Bentein 2016; Sturm 2019. For non-finite aspect in infinitives and participles, see Stork 1982; Mendez Dosuna 2017.

<sup>2</sup> By contrast, iterative aspect refers to repeated situations on the same occasion, Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 160.

however, habitual situations can be expressed by the present, the imperfect, the future (e.g. h.hom. 1.10–12) and the aorist (Smyth 1920: 421–432),<sup>3</sup> it would actually be more rewarding to know to which degree these values are grammaticalized, but we lack an answer to such a question for Ancient Greek thus far.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, what about the auxiliary ways which languages generally possess to express habitual meanings?<sup>5</sup> After all, according to Dahl’s cross-linguistic investigation of tense and aspect systems, the majority of habitual markers are periphrastic (Dahl 1985: 96).<sup>6</sup> The most well-known example of a grammaticalized habitual auxiliary is English *used to*. Some examples from other European languages are: *soleo* (Latin), *pflegen* (German), *bruka* (Swedish), *gewoon zijn* (Dutch), *znati* (Serbo-Croatian). As with habitual meaning generated by a specific tense or aspect, the degree of grammaticalization of such auxiliaries not only differs cross-linguistically but also language-internally (if a language possesses several habitual auxiliaries). English, for example, also uses *be wont to* and *would* (Tagliamonte & Lawrence 2000), but it is common knowledge that the habitual auxiliaries *would* and *used to* are limited to expressing past habituais due to being grammaticalized to a great extent (see Tagliamonte & Lawrence 2000; Neels 2015).

I aim to demonstrate that Ancient Greek possessed at least four habitual auxiliaries which have not received separate attention yet: εἶωθα ‘be in the habit of’, φιλέω ‘be wont to’, ἐθέλω ‘be wont to’ and νομίζω ‘to be accustomed to’. A famous context rich in habituais can be found in Plato’s *Phaedo*,<sup>7</sup> see ex. (1).

- (1) ἀεὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ τὰς πρόσθεν ἡμέρας εἰώθεμεν φοιτᾶν καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι παρὰ τὸν Σωκράτη, συλλεγόμενοι ἔωθεν εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἡ δίκη ἐγένετο: πλησίον γὰρ ἦν τοῦ δεσμοτηρίου. περιεμένομεν οὖν ἐκάστοτε

<sup>3</sup> The situation that past, present and future temporal reference can be used for habituais is cross-linguistically well attested; see Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 153.

<sup>4</sup> Allan (2019) argues that habitual (, generic and iterative) “uses” are not dependent on the aspect of the verb but rely on contextual information, general world knowledge or linguistic signals (e.g. the presence of a generic subject noun, special adverbial expressions or the particles ἄν or “epic” τε). In my view, the wide temporal-aspectual distribution of habituais may support such a view. For differences in degree of grammaticalization of habitual values in the aspect-temporal system, I refer the reader to Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 151–160. For the combination with future markers, see Tsutahara 2013.

<sup>5</sup> With Heine (1993: 70) I define an auxiliary as a “linguistic item covering some range of uses along the verb-to-TAM chain,” with TAM referring to tense, aspect and modality. For other verbs with aspectual meanings, see Lavidas & Drachmann 2012.

<sup>6</sup> For the debated notion of periphrasticity and the criteria for identifying these multi-word constructions, I refer the reader to Bentein 2016: 59–103.

<sup>7</sup> The texts for this article stem from the most recent OCT editions; the translations are based on the most recent Loeb translations.

ἕως ἀνοιχθείη τὸ δεσμοτήριον, διατρίβοντες μετ' ἀλλήλων, ἀνέωγετο γὰρ οὐ πρῶ: ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνοιχθείη, **εἰσῆμεν** παρὰ τὸν Σωκράτη καὶ τὰ πολλὰ **διημερεύομεν** μετ' αὐτοῦ.

'You see I and the rest **were** always **in the habit of** going to see Socrates regularly on the preceding days too, **gathering** at daybreak at the court where the trial took place: it was in fact next to the prison. So **we used to wait** each time until the prison was opened and talked among ourselves since the prison didn't open early. But when it was opened, we **would go** in to Socrates and **spend** most of the day with him.' Pl. *Phd.* 59d1–7

This context shows the auxiliary habitual εἰώθεμεν being used side by side with tense-aspect habituais (non-finite participles and finite imperfect verbs) in the same way. Still, this habitual auxiliary (but none of the others that I mentioned above) is only given occasional mention in our standard grammars without explanation of function or origin (Schwyzer & Debrunner 1950: 171; Rijksbaron 2006: 83). Furthermore, adverbials with affinity towards habitual contexts occur such as ἀεὶ 'always' and ἐκάστοτε 'on every such occasion' and iterative subordinate clauses surround the main-clause habituais.<sup>8</sup> The listing of an example with these contextual collocations in Rijksbaron's syntax of the Classical Greek verb might suggest that such contextual signals are important for the realization of habitual meaning with a habitual auxiliary such as εἴωθα.<sup>9</sup> Do these contextual signals need to occur with habitual auxiliaries or are they just combined on occasion? I will conduct a corpus-based analysis concerning these questions for εἴωθα.

In addition to non-generic subjects with the habituais above, habituais can also occur with generic subjects,<sup>10</sup> as in ex. (2) below.

- (2) ὡς οὖν εἶδεν ἡμᾶς ἡ Ξανθίππη, ἀνηυφήμησέ τε καὶ τοιαῦτ' ἄττα εἶπεν, οἷα δὲ **εἰώθασιν αἱ γυναῖκες**, ὅτι ᾧ Σώκρατες, ὕστατον δὲ σε προσερούσι νῦν οἱ ἐπιτήδειοι καὶ σὺ τούτους.'

'Now when Xanthippe saw us, she cried out and said the kind of thing that **women usually do**: "Socrates, this is the very last time that your friends will be speaking with you, and you with them."' Pl. *Phd.* 60a3–6

<sup>8</sup> Habituais also occur with temporal expressions which specify the time window in which a habit is carried out on different occasions such as *day and night they would guard the house*; see George 2014: 15.

<sup>9</sup> Rijksbaron (2006: 83) lists this example in his explanation of habitual past temporal clauses but does not explain the role of habitual auxiliary εἰώθεμεν 'we used to'.

<sup>10</sup> Thus, habituais can but need not be generic, *pace* Allan (2019: 21), who follows Langacker's cognitive linguistic categorization (2000: 251) of habituais, iteratives and generics where habituais always refer to specific instances in the world (e.g. my cat).

It is worthwhile to delve deeper into this feature, because habitual uses of tenses are often subsumed under generic uses of tenses (see esp. Rijksbaron 2006: 4 fn. 1). So how often do generic subjects occur in habitual situations and to what extent can habituals be called generic?

Finally, habitual auxiliaries also occur with inanimate subjects and stative infinitives, see ex. (3).

- (3) καὶ μάρτυράς γε πολλῶ πλείους (εἰκὸς) ἦν τὸν ἐγγυῶντα παρακαλεῖν ἢ τὸν ἐγγυώμενον τὴν τοιαύτην: οὐδεὶς γὰρ ὑμῶν ἀγνοεῖ ὅτι **ὀλίγα διαμένειν εἴωθε** τῶν τοιούτων.

‘Also, it is probable that he who gave her in marriage would have summoned many more witnesses than the man who was marrying such a woman; for everybody knows that **little** of such marriages **usually last**.’ Is. 3.29.1–4

Here the habitual situation referred to is that little of such marriages (inanimate subject) are in the habit of lasting (stative infinitive).<sup>11</sup> Thus, instead of habits of persons (as in ex. 1 and 2), the habitual auxiliary here refers to a customary situation that is the case on several occasions in a more abstract fashion than referring to the habit of a person.<sup>12</sup>

This article will make three related claims about habitual auxiliaries in Ancient Greek: (1) Ancient Greek possessed a set of grammaticalized habitual auxiliaries, which do not need contextual signals (e.g. generic subjects or collocations with adverbials or sentences with iterative-generalis semantics) to express habitual aspect, a meaning distinct from iteratives and generics, (2) the habitual auxiliaries of Ancient Greek differ in their degree of grammaticalization, but are all not highly grammaticalized, and (3) diachronic collocation shifts of the habitual auxiliaries towards the use of inanimate subjects and, subsequently, stative infinitives are a helpful method to measure their degree of grammaticalization.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2.1 I investigate the most frequently used habitual auxiliary, εἴωθα ‘be in the habit of/used to’, in detail for the necessity of contextual signals. Section 2.2 first introduces some of the basic tenets of grammaticalization which are relevant to the outcomes of this paper. Subsequently, by applying grammaticalization criteria that have been applied to other grammaticalizing habitual auxiliaries, I demonstrate that a diachronic

<sup>11</sup> For an explanation of verb types (“Aktionsart” or lexical aspect) such as dynamic (which I will call non-stative, see fn. 13) and stative, with examples from Ancient Greek, I refer the reader to Fanning 1990: 129–163.

<sup>12</sup> For this reason, definitions of habitual aspect should not be limited to persons or habit (cf. Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 156), *pace* Allan (2019: 21) who using insights from cognitive linguistics says that the fact that generics can be states distinguishes them from habituals.

collocation shift has taken place for εἴωθα, first from animate to inanimate subjects and, subsequently, from non-stative to stative infinitives.<sup>13</sup> These changes indicate its gradual ongoing grammaticalization from Homeric to the end of Classical Greek. I thus focus on detailing the semantic and functional development, but will not discuss phonological aspects such as erosion which can but need not take place for highly grammaticalized items (see Section 2.2). In Section 3 I investigate the other less frequent habitual auxiliaries, φιλέω, ἐθέλω and νομίζω, in the same way to underline that collocation shift is a useful measure for degrees of grammaticalization. Also, I will pay attention to the possible diachronic relation between iterativity and habituality (see φιλέω) and the grammaticalization of a future auxiliary (see ἐθέλω). Section 4 concludes the article and points to further research opportunities.

The *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG) was used to collect the occurrences of these auxiliaries from Archaic (i.e. Homer, Hesiod and the Homeric hymns) and Classical Greek (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Habitual auxiliaries in Ancient Greek

| Era             | εἴωθα | φιλέω | ἐθέλω | νομίζω           |
|-----------------|-------|-------|-------|------------------|
| Archaic Greek   | 2     | 1     | 3     | 0                |
| Classical Greek | 135   | 58    | 11    | 54 <sup>14</sup> |

Since the habitual auxiliaries are not that frequent (especially in the older language of Homer compared to Classical Greek) and our diachronic data for Archaic Greek is very limited from the perspective of corpus linguistics,<sup>15</sup> I will not perform detailed testing for significance. Rather, the point of laying bare the collocation shifts of these habitual auxiliaries is to measure the gradual grammaticalization which they are undergoing, especially in contemporary Classical Greek (see Section 2.2) where more occurrences are documented. Also, as I will argue below, their low frequency strengthens the impression that habitual aspect was more frequently expressed by using specific tense-aspects.

<sup>13</sup> I use the term non-stative instead of dynamic, because there is a distinction in Ancient Greek linguistics between declarative and dynamic infinitives, Rijksbaron 2006: 97.

<sup>14</sup> The count for Classical Greek νομίζω is merely indicative, since I had to confine my count to the occurrences in the third person singular and plural, both middle and active because νομίζω + infinitive is highly frequent in Classical Greek in the meaning ‘consider/believe’.

<sup>15</sup> For the pitfalls of the Ancient Greek data with respect to corpus linguistics, see Markopoulos 2009: 9–18.

## 2 The grammaticalization of habitual auxiliaries: the case of εἴωθα

This section consists of two parts. First I will analyze the role of contextual signals (generic subjects, adverbials and iterative or generalis clauses) for εἴωθα and discuss the relation between generic and habitual expressions. Subsequently I will introduce the basic tenets of grammaticalization and use grammaticalization criteria, especially diachronic collocation shifts, to measure the degree of grammaticalization of εἴωθα.

### 2.1 Contextual signals, genericity and habituality

I have found and analyzed 137 occurrences of εἴωθα in both its finite perfect form (100) and pluperfect form (37) from Homeric (2 occurrences) and Classical Greek<sup>16</sup> (135 occurrences).<sup>17</sup> To be sure, formally εἴωθα is a perfect but it acts as a present, whereas its pluperfect form acts as an imperfect. In other words, εἴωθα belongs to that group of perfect presents to which verbs such as οἶδα ‘I know’ belong, for both of which the present form, in fact, has become obsolete.<sup>18</sup> Of the 137 occurrences only 4 collocations exist with ἀεί ‘always’ and 3 with ἐκάστοτε ‘on every such occasion’. The low frequency shows that these adverbials are by no means a necessary collocation.<sup>19</sup> I found 25 collocations with subordinate clauses with generic (e.g. Pl. *Hp.Mi.* 369d2), i.e. the subjunctive generalis, or iterative semantics (see ex. 1), something which could be expected since habituals involve repeated actions (but on different occasions) and make generalizations over states of affairs (possibly concerning generic subjects). Again, however, the collocations are not a necessary requirement, which shows that the habitual function of the auxiliary is clear enough from the use on its own.

The amount of generic subjects found with both the present and past uses of εἴωθα is lower than one might deduce from the grouping of generic and habitual

<sup>16</sup> I excluded the occurrences in the work of Hippocrates and Aristotle and fragmentary or spurious works.

<sup>17</sup> Of course, participle uses also exist, e.g. *Hdt.* 3.80. Adverbial uses of εἰώθα which might be on a par with English *usually* are very infrequent, occurring only 12 times in Classical Greek, e.g. *Hdt.* 3.27 and *X. Oec.* 7.1.3. Even more infrequent is συνήθως ‘usually’ with 2 certain examples, *Aeschin.* 2.132 and *D.* 26.3.

<sup>18</sup> See Kühner & Gerth 1904: 149. The last example of a present form is attested only once and as a present participle, see *Il.* 9.540.

<sup>19</sup> For more on the role of ‘always’ in sentence semantics, see Krifka et al. 1995: 41.

uses together in our grammars: 46 out of the 137 (33,58%). In fact, habituales are often simplified as a subtype of generics in general linguistics even though habituales (1) can have both generic and non-generic subjects (cf. fn. 10) and (2) are semantically not the same as generic sentences. An example of such a simplification is Ziegeler 2006: 91: “In the present study ... generics refer to multiple participants over which a single event or property may hold, while habituales refer to a single participant to which multiple events may be attributed. Because of the common semantic characteristic of iterativity (over either events or participants) habituales will be considered here to be a subclass of generics.” What generic and habitual expressions share is that they present a characterizing generalization (see Krifka et al. 1995: 3). The difference between them is that a generic truth is of a law-like nature that holds in all occurrences of the described state of affairs (see ex. 4), whereas an habitual expression signals that “what is expressed in a sentence took place in the majority of occasions that the sentence describes” (Dahl 1985: 97; cf. the discussion in Krifka et al. 1995: 4–8).

(4) τῶν δὲ κροκοδείλων φύσις ἐστὶ τοιήδε.

‘The nature of the crocodile is as follows.’

Hdt. 2.68.1

Typically the total number of occurrences when the habitual situation was the case is undetermined, but the context can provide clues as to why the habitual expression is not a law. Thus, I argue that it is more precise to distinguish between generic truths (ex. 4), generic habituales (ex. 5) and non-generic habituales (ex. 1), as has been done by Dahl (1985: 96–100) *contra* Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins (1994: 152).<sup>20</sup> After all, the next example (5) has a generic subject but reports a habit of lazy minded people that only occurs in the majority of the occasions but is not a law.

(5) ἔασόν με ἑορτάσαι, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀργοὶ τὴν διάνοιαν εἰώθασιν ἐστιᾶσθαι ὑφ’ ἑαυτῶν, ὅταν μόνοι πορεύωνται.

‘but just grant me this: let me take a break, just as **lazy people like to** make a feast of their thoughts when they are traveling alone.’ Pl. R. 458a1–2

Furthermore, with regards to our standard grammars it could also be that the grouping of generic and habitual expressions is made because of the shared non-specific temporal reference found in both generic and habitual usages, rather than

<sup>20</sup> See esp. Krifka et al. (1995: 2–3) who distinguish between generic as reference to a kind (i.e. generic subjects) and characterizing/generic sentences as report of a general property. Cf. also Binnick 2005: 339, who suggests for English that “habitual expressions may, in general, also express generic aspect (as in ex. 6) referring to a characteristic propensity and not an actual series of eventualities.” See also Allan 2016: 93 who suggests that genericity is not only expressed through a generic subject.

the belief that habitual sentences are completely generic in make-up.<sup>21</sup> Take, for example, the following remark by Rijksbaron (2006: 4) on the role of the present indicative in generic and habitual statements: “The primary indicative does not only serve to describe states of affairs taking place at the moment of occurrence, but is also – and, in fact, more often – used in a so-called generic way: i) in the case of state of affairs located in the ‘present’ in a much broader sense, without reference to a specific point in time (habitual present, mostly used in the description of habits and characteristic qualities), and (ii) in the case of states of affairs located in no specific time (universal or timeless present).”<sup>22</sup> Thus, Rijksbaron rightly suggests that both habitual presents and universal generic presents are more diffuse in temporal scope by not referring to a specific point in time, whereas the generic present is actually without specific location in time.

Nevertheless, I would like to note that contextual cues can seem to link a nonspecific habitual situation to specific present reference, that is, imply that the nonspecific time reference coalesces with the specific present in the immediate linguistic context.<sup>23</sup> Ex. (6) is part of the exhortation speech of Pagondas to attack the Athenians in order to prevent them from carrying out a surprise attack on the Boeotians. The customary situation that those who have the habit of attacking their weaker neighbors and being more dangerous, as the Boeotians’ neighbors the Athenians are now, in this context refers to a current custom of the neighboring Athenians (see τὴν παροίκησιν τῶνδε ἔχομεν). Thus, it is implied here that the characteristic habit applies in the current present. To facilitate fuller understanding of this use in context, I included some more of the previous context.

- (6) (As between neighbours generally, freedom means simply a determination to hold one’s own; and with neighbours like these, who are trying to enslave near and far alike, there is nothing for it but to fight it out to the last. Look at the condition of the Euboeans and of most of the rest of Hellas, and be convinced that others have to fight with their neighbours for this frontier or that, but that for us conquest means one frontier for the whole country,

<sup>21</sup> For an elaborate discussion of the synchronic relation between genericity, imperfective and perfective aspect, see Allan 2016: 91–95, who argues that the choice between perfective and imperfective aspect in generic expressions boils down to a difference in *construal*, a notion adopted from Cognitive Grammar.

<sup>22</sup> See also Allan (2016: 97–100) who applies the cross-linguistic findings on generic expressions by Dahl 1995 to explaining the relation between genericity and the present.

<sup>23</sup> Of course, temporal expressions that locate habits in a certain time window can collocate with habituals, as in the following example: κύκλω μὲν νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐφύλαττον περὶ τὰ βασιλεια ὅποτε ἐπὶ χώρας εἶη. ‘They stood guard in a circle around the palace night and day whenever he was in the area’ (X. Cyr. 7.5.68).

about which no dispute can be made, for they will simply come and take by force what we have.)

τοσοῦτω ἐπικινδυνότεραν ἑτέρων τὴν παροίκησιν τῶνδε ἔχομεν. εἰώθασι τε οἱ ἰσχύος που θράσει τοῖς πέλας, ὥσπερ Ἀθηναῖοι νῦν, ἐπιόντες τὸν μὲν ἡσυχάζοντα καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ μόνον ἀμυνόμενον ἀδεέστερον ἐπιστρατεύειν, τὸν δὲ ἔξω ὄρων προαπαντῶντα καί, ἦν καιρὸς ἦ, πολέμου ἄρχοντα ἥσσον ἐτοίμως κατέχειν.

‘So much more have we to fear from **this neighbour** than from another. Besides, people who, **like the Athenians in the present instance**, are tempted by pride of strength to attack their neighbours, **usually march** most confidently against those who keep still, and only defend themselves in their own country, but think twice before they grapple with those who meet them outside their frontier and strike the first blow if opportunity offers.’

Th. 4.92.5

## 2.2 Grammaticalization and diachronic collocation shifts: the case of εἰώθα

Analyzing grammaticalization means answering “such questions as how lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions or how grammatical items develop new grammatical functions” (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 1). Those adopting a grammaticalization approach generally work under the following assumptions:<sup>24</sup> (1) historical change follows the direction from lexical items to grammatical items or from less grammatical items to more grammatical items,<sup>25</sup> (2) this directionality of changes translates into cross-linguistically common grammaticalization paths,<sup>26</sup> (3) change is gradual in nature and involves subtle changes in semantics and morphosyntactic patterns,<sup>27</sup> and (4) types of changes which are generally acknowledged are:

<sup>24</sup> For a short overview of the changing face of grammaticalization studies, see Markopoulos 2009: 2–8, and for its historical roots, see Lehmann 2015: 1–9.

<sup>25</sup> The reverse process, for example from grammatical to lexical, is called degrammaticalization and demarcated as a separate process by some (e.g. Norde 2009) while others find the proposed examples not cogent enough (e.g. Lehmann 2015: 18–21).

<sup>26</sup> The seminal work in this tradition is by Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins (1994), who systematically investigated the various grammaticalization paths of tense, aspect and modality items in a large typological language sample.

<sup>27</sup> See esp. Traugott & Trousdale 2010 for the role of gradualness in grammaticalization.

1. “extension, i.e. the rise of novel grammatical meanings when linguistic expressions are extended to new contexts (context-induced reinterpretation);
2. desemantization (or ‘semantic bleaching’), i.e. less (or generalization) in meaning content;
3. decategorialization, i.e. loss in the morphosyntactic properties characteristic of lexical or other less grammaticalized forms;
4. erosion (or ‘phonetic reduction’), i.e. less in phonetic substance” (Markopoulos 2009: 4).

Though these processes tend to go hand in hand in grammaticalization, not every grammaticalizing linguistic item goes through all these types of change. For example, not all grammaticalizing items also display phonetic erosion,<sup>28</sup> but semantic and functional changes are essential to reanalysis and analogy, which make up the core of grammaticalization (see Hopper & Traugott 2003: 39–70).

Cross-linguistically the grammaticalization of habitual expressions is strongly affected by tense. Languages either have expressions that are not restricted in tense usage, expressions that are restricted to the past or zero expressions that are used for present habituais. In my opinion, Ancient Greek would be of the non-restricted type, since habituais can be expressed in the present, the imperfect, the future and the aorist (Smyth 1920: 421–432). The cross-linguistic asymmetry between the grammaticalization of past and present habituais has been explained pragmatically: “explicit mention of habitualness is less necessary in the present, where the default meaning includes habitualness, than in the past, where it does not. The higher frequency in the past led to its grammaticization, while the lower frequency in the present led to the disappearance of the construction” (Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 155–156; “grammaticization” refers to grammaticalization). This explanation, for example, accounts for the restriction of ‘used to’ to past contexts. It also explains why habitual auxiliaries in Ancient Greek as substitute for tense/aspect habituais are not incredibly frequent, since Ancient Greek had many tense options available to express habitual aspect. Furthermore, it has been suggested that no grammaticalization paths to strictly present habituais exist. Instead, the “only way to arrive at a present habitual is by developing a progressive that cuts out part of an originally more general present and leaves the present habitual as a default reading”. This is what the English progressive did to the English present which became restricted to habitual and generic readings (Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins

---

**28** Note that the highly grammaticalized *used to* did undergo phonetic reduction, Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 155. Since I did not find evidence for phonetic reduction, I will leave this parameter out of the analysis.

1994: 151). Lexical sources that come to be used for habitual aspect are typically semantically close to ideas of custom or habit, something which we will witness for Ancient Greek habitual auxiliaries as well.

Moreover, previously lexical sources can grammaticalize to such an extent that they become one of the prime expressions of habitual aspect. A recent article by Neels on the habitual auxiliary *used to* convincingly puts forward different types of evidence that *used to* has undergone a long period of grammaticalization from 14th century English to present day English.<sup>29</sup> The long diachronic evolution from *use*, a borrowing from Anglo-Norman French, can be summarized as in Table 2.

**Table 2:** Evolution of English *used to* (examples taken from Neels 2015).

| 'be in the habit of VERB-ing'   | 'the situation of VERB-ing is/was characteristic of an extended period of time' | 'the situation of VERB-ing (which was characteristic of the past) no longer obtains at present' |
|---|---|---|
| = lexical sense<br><i>Englische men used for to goo into abbayes of Fraunce</i><br>(1387AD) | = habitual aspect<br><i>Did you use to go to church?</i>                        | = anti-present-perfect<br><i>There used to be a house there</i>                                 |

The criteria that Neels has used to lay bare the process of grammaticalization in which *used to* has been involved are the following:

1. tense: present (*use to*) versus past (*used to*);
2. subject animacy: animate (e.g. *my father used to*) versus inanimate (e.g. *these sunsets used to*);
3. verb type: non-stative (e.g. *used to read*) versus stative (e.g. *used to know*);
4. pragmatic enrichment: *anti-present* implicature or not;
5. discourse frequency;
6. \*negation: *do*-support (*did not use to*) versus no *do*-support (*used not to*) versus *never* (*never used to*);
7. \*question formation: *do*-support (*did subject use to*) versus inversion (*used subject to*);
8. \*morphological behavior of past-tense *used to* in syntactic structures with *do*-support: variant (*did not use\_ to*; *did subject use\_ to*; *did use\_ to*) versus invariant (*did not used to*; *did subject used to*; *did used to*);
9. \*occurrence as perfect form with *have* (*have/had used to*);

<sup>29</sup> See Neels 2015: 178 and his bibliography for several other relevant studies of English *used to*.

10. \*occurrence with modal auxiliaries (e.g. *must use to*);
11. \*occurrence of constituents between *use(d)* and *to* (e.g. *used sometimes to*).

The criteria with an asterisk are grammatical tests that are specific to the English language and will therefore not be taken into account here. Instead I will apply the other criteria in an attempt to demonstrate the gradual process of grammaticalization which εἴωθα is undergoing in Archaic and Classical Greek. Since these criteria have been shown to play an important role in the cross-linguistic evolution of habitual expressions (see Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 151–160; Hellman 2005), it is hypothesized that they will be useful for the analysis of the grammaticalization path of Ancient Greek habitual auxiliaries as well.

As discussed above, I found 100 present uses (perfect form) and 37 past uses (pluperfect form) in Homeric and Classical Greek. This temporal distribution contrasts with the limited temporal distribution of the more heavily grammaticalized habitual *used to* in English to the past. Since both present and past reference are still possible for εἴωθα, this might suggest a lesser degree of grammaticalization, although it is of course almost impossible to compare both due to the large differences in corpus size.

The criteria of animacy and verb type will be treated together because the numbers for these criteria betray a clear diachronic collocation shift.<sup>30</sup> Collocations have recently been emphasized as being insightful indicators of the grammaticalization process.<sup>31</sup> An example can be found in the grammaticalization of *going to* as a purposive marker (*I am going to the store to get some fruit*) to a futurity marker (*Next year is going to be a tough election year*), where the expansion to inanimate subjects (and stative infinitives) signals the semantic acquisition of the latter meaning. Similar to the change in collocation in grammaticalizing futures, this collocation shift is the first indicator of host class expansion or loss of syntagmatic selectional criteria that is typically found with grammaticalizing verbs and point to generalization of a construction (see Neels 2015: 199–201; Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 506). The same phenomenon is visible in the case of habitual auxiliary εἴωθα: the increase, first in animate subjects and subsequently in stative

<sup>30</sup> Before Neels, the importance of inanimate subjects and stative infinitives as a witness to diachronic generalization of habitual *used to* had already been noted by Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins (1994: 156).

<sup>31</sup> A key advocate of the importance of collocations in grammaticalization is Martin Hilpert, e.g. Hilpert 2006; 2008. Also on a synchronic level collocations are an insightful means of analysis: la Roi 2019 and forthcoming., for example, use the low frequency of collocations of subjective particles with the optative mood in Classical Greek to analyze the semantics of the Classical Greek optative mood (in the main clause).

infinitives, both indicate the host class expansion of the habitual auxiliary. The diachronic collocation shift to inanimate subjects and stative infinitives also explains why we only find animate subjects and non-stative infinitives in the older examples from Archaic Greek, *Il.* 5.766 and *Od.* 17.394.<sup>32</sup>

In Classical Greek, 15 (15.31%) of the 98 present uses are inanimate and 4 (10.81%) of the 37 past uses are inanimate, as in ex. (7) and (8) respectively.

- (7) οὐδενὸς δὲ προειδότος, οἶμαι, τὸ πρᾶγμ' οὐδὲ φυλάττοντος, ὥσπερ **εἴωθε τὰ τοιαῦτα** παρ' ὑμῖν γίνεσθαι  
 'Nobody, of course, had any inkling; nobody was watching, as **such things usually** happen with you.' Th. 18.149
- (8) καὶ **προσβολαί**, ὥσπερ **εἴώθεσαν**, ἐγίνοντο τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἱππέων ὅπη παρείκοι, καὶ τὸν πλεῖστον ὄμιλον τῶν ψιλῶν εἴργον τὸ μὴ προεξιόντας τῶν ὅπλων τὰ ἐγγὺς τῆς πόλεως κακουργεῖν  
 'And **the attacks**, as **they used to be**, were from the Athenian cavalry, wherever it was practicable, and they prevented the mass of the light troops from advancing from their camp and wasting the parts near the city.' Th. 3.1.2

The second indicator of host class expansion in Classical Greek is the increase in collocation with stative infinitives. Of the 98 present uses 21 infinitives are stative (21,43%) and of the 37 past uses 8 infinitives are stative (26,62%). The following two examples (9) and (10) with stative infinitives (εἶναι and πολιτεύειν, respectively) demonstrate the ongoing grammaticalization of εἴωθα.

- (9) ἄνδρες Πελοποννήσιοι, ἀπὸ μὲν οἷας χώρας ἤκομεν, ὅτι αἰεὶ διὰ τὸ εὐψυχον ἐλευθέρας, καὶ ὅτι Δωριῆς μέλλετε Ἴωσι μάχεσθαι, ὧν **εἴωθατε κρείστους εἶναι**, ἀρκείτω βραχέως δεδηλωμένον:  
 'Peloponnesians, the character of the country from which we have come, one which has always owed its freedom to valour, and the fact that you are Dorians and the enemy you are about to fight Ionians, than whom **you are usually stronger**, are things that do not need further comment.' Th. 5.9.1
- (10) καὶ τοὺς μὲν Μενδαίους μετὰ ταῦτα **πολιτεύειν** ἐκέλευον ὥσπερ **εἴώθεσαν**, αὐτοὺς κρίναντας ἐν σφίσι αὐτοῖς εἶ τινὰς ἡγοῦνται αἰτίους εἶναι τῆς ἀποστάσεως  
 'After this the Athenians told the Mendaeans that they might **possess their civil rights**, as they **used to**, and themselves judge the supposed authors of the revolt.' Th. 4.130.7

<sup>32</sup> Cf. for habitual εἴωθα in Homer Cunliffe's Homeric lexicon (1963) who gives the meaning 'to be wont/accustomed'.

Note that the stative infinitive may be implicit, when it is contextually given. In ex. (10) πολιτεύειν ‘possess civil rights’ precedes the habitual auxiliary and is to be supplied to it.

Furthermore, there are two examples which might qualify for what has been called an anti-present use. An example from English is *That door used to be white* which implies that the door is not white anymore now. The following examples (11) and (12) from Ancient Greek are similar, but in my opinion also differ in an important respect.

- (11) ἡ μὲν πρότερον ἄρξασα, τῆς ὕστερον γενεῆσι πέντε πρότερον γενομένη, τῇ οὐνομα ἦν Σεμίραμις, αὕτη μὲν ἀπεδέξατο χῶματα ἀνά τὸ πεδῖον ἐόντα ἀξιοθέητα: **πρότερον** δὲ **ἐώθεε** ὁ ποταμὸς ἀνά τὸ πεδῖον πᾶν πελαγίζειν. ‘The first of these lived five generations earlier than the second, and her name was Semiramis: it was she who built dikes on the plain, a notable work; **before that** the whole plain **used to be** flooded by the river.’

Hdt. 1.184

In ex. (11), a clear contrast is made between the situation on the plain before (πρότερον) and after the dikes, where the plain used to be flooded before. Explicitly comparing these temporally distinct situations (see πρότερον) is what creates the implicature that the previous habitual situation does not apply anymore.<sup>33</sup> Similarly in ex. (12), the anti-present implicature is the result of an explicit comparative construction: ἡσυχαιτέροι ἢ ὡς (literally translated as: ‘more subdued than as’).

- (12) ὡς οὖν ταῦτα ἤκουσεν ὁ στρατὸς τοῦ Κύρου, ἐν φροντίδι τε ἐγένετο, ὡσπερ εἰκός, ἡσυχαιτέροι τε ἢ ὡς **εἰώθεσαν** διεφοίτων, φαιδροί τε οὐ πάνυ ἐφαίνοντο, ἐκυκλοῦντό τε καὶ μεστὰ ἦν πάντα ἀλλήλους ἐρωτώντων περὶ τούτων καὶ διαλεγομένων  
‘When Cyrus’s army heard this report, they were disturbed, as was natural; they went about more subdued than **had been their wont**, they gathered in groups, and every corner was full of people discussing the situation and asking one another’s opinion.’

X. Cyr. 6.2.12

I found no other examples where the anti-present implicature was generated besides these two examples where a comparison is made. Therefore I suggest that we are merely dealing with a pragmatic implicature that is generated because of the explicit comparison. After all, English anti-present *used to* (e.g. *the door used to*

<sup>33</sup> Anti-present uses due to collocations with adverbials meaning ‘earlier’ or ‘before’ are also attested in Serbian, Bosnian and Croatian (Hellman 2005: 86).

*be white*), for example, does not need such a comparison but has conventionalized the anti-present implicature to a greater extent in the form *used to*.

Finally, I would like to discuss the frequency numbers of habitual εἶωθα. Naturally the 137 attestations that I investigated stand in stark contrast with the corpus that has been investigated by Neels for the history of English *used to*. Therefore, it is difficult to say whether the lower number of occurrences may explain why εἶωθα has not gone through all the same evolutionary steps as *used to* has, since increase in discourse frequency is an important indicator of increased grammaticalization (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 129–130). Nevertheless, the less collocationally restricted nature of εἶωθα seems to point to a lesser degree of grammaticalization.

### 3 Diachronic collocation shifts and the habitual auxiliaries: φιλέω, ἐθέλω and νομίζω

In this section I will demonstrate that the habitual auxiliaries φιλέω, ἐθέλω and νομίζω, while being slightly less grammaticalized than εἶωθα, can also be fruitfully analyzed using the same criteria that have been applied to the evolution of εἶωθα.

#### 3.1 Habitual φιλέω

According to the LSJ<sup>9</sup>, the use of φιλέω to express what one loves to do, is fond of doing, and so to be wont or used to do is post-Homeric.<sup>34</sup> While, as I will demonstrate below, habitual auxiliary φιλέω ‘be wont to’ does indeed fully come to the fore in Classical Greek, I did find one occurrence of φιλέω in the imperfect with the iterative σκ-suffix expressing a habitual action.<sup>35</sup> In what follows I will analyze this special form of φιλέω and discuss the possible diachronic relation between its iterative and habitual components. Subsequently, I will turn to the analysis of habitual φιλέω proper in Classical Greek.

<sup>34</sup> The earliest example from Archaic Greek that is mentioned in the dictionaries is perhaps Hes. *Op.* 788, but (1) this example is textually uncertain (West 1978: 356–357), (2) it is variously interpreted as ‘take pleasure in’ by Hofinger (1975) and ‘die Eigenschaft haben, pflegen’ by Lfgre (s.v. φιλέω), and (3) the earliest next example of φιλέω with an infinitive is found in Hipponax (late 6<sup>th</sup> BCE), West 1978: 357. Due to these uncertainties I left this example outside of consideration.

<sup>35</sup> For other possible habitual iteratives, see Pagnniello 2007: 109–110. For an explanation of the absence of the augment in Homeric Greek, see Allan 2016: 89.

- (13) Ἄξυλον δ' ἄρ' ἔπεφνε βοήν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης  
 Τευθρανίδην, ὃς ἔναιεν εὐκτιμένη ἐν Ἀρίσβη  
 ἀφνειὸς βιότοιο, φίλος δ' ἦν ἀνθρώποισι.  
 πάντας γὰρ **φιλέσκειν** ὁδῶ ἐπι οἰκία ναίων.

'And Diomedes, good at the war cry, slew Axylus, Teuthras' son, who lived in well-built Arisbe, a man rich in substance, who was beloved of all men; for he dwelt in a house by the highroad and **would show hospitality** to all.'

*Il.* 6.12–15

The difference between iterative and habitual constructions is that iterative constructions refer to repeated actions on the same occasion whereas habitual situations are repeated on different occasions (Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 159). In the current example (13), the display of hospitality to all (πάντας) was a habit of Axylus, which was shown by him repeatedly to all guests. We should not be surprised by the double use of an iterative suffix for a past habitual, since habitual aspect typically entails a degree of iterativity. More importantly, Ancient Greek has many instances of this functional overlap: (1) Homer, Hesiod and Herodotus have σκ- imperfects and aorists for both iterative and habitual situations (Smyth 1920: 162–163, e.g. Hes *Th.* 208), (2) Herodotus has iterative σκ- imperfects and aorists with ἄν for both iterative and habitual situations (Smyth 1920: 403, e.g. Hdt. 4.130), (3) imperfect and aorist with ἄν can be used to express iterative and habitual situations in Classical Greek (Smyth 1920: 403, e.g. Pl. *Ap.* 22b), and imperfects can be both used for iterative and habitual past situations in Homeric and Classical Greek (Monro 1891: 282; Rijksbaron 2006: 14). Moreover, the functional overlap of markers for habituais and iteratives is cross-linguistically well attested (Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 158–159).

Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins (1994) hypothesize that the iterative meaning is the original meaning which by time loses its restriction to occurring on the same occasion to referring to repeated occurrence on different occasions (= habitual). I would agree with this diachronic path<sup>36</sup> since it not only explains the iterative element that is still present in habituais, but also explains why stative habituais can seem to lose their iterative element (cf. *that door used to be white*), since stative habituais are further grammaticalized and further grammaticalized markers may get bleached of meanings of their source construction (= possibly iterative). In the history of Ancient Greek we might possess at least two witnesses to such a development. On the one hand, the iterative suffix σκ- is generally considered to be considerably older than Homeric Greek. For example, Hittite uses it for the

<sup>36</sup> See Allan 2016: 93–94 for a synchronic explanation of iterativity in perfective and imperfective aspect as a choice of construal.

expression of iterativity (Rix 1976: 214) but the suffix also came to be used in Homeric Greek (and other Indo-European languages) for non-iterative verb formation (Schwyzer 1939: 706–712; Rix 1976: 213–214). Thus, the older iterative use of the suffix, which represents the majority of the Homeric Greek occurrences (cf. Pagniniello 2007), would support the idea of extension of its use to the expression of habituality. On the other hand, the fact that Classical Greek comes to use iterative  $\sigma\kappa$ - combined with iterative  $\acute{\alpha}\nu$  for habituality also seems to point in this direction.

In Classical Greek I found 58 occurrences of  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  as a habitual auxiliary, especially in the third person singular and plural. All but one of these occurrences were in the present tense, which contrasts with more heavily grammaticalized habitual auxiliaries which are limited to the past. The single example of past use is an imperfect form with an inanimate subject and a stative infinitive, see ex. (14).

- (14) Ἄρ' οὖν ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὐτ' ἐδέοντο νομοθετῶν οὐτε πω ἐφίλει κατὰ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους γίγνεσθαι τὸ τοιοῦτον;  
 'Shall we suppose that those men had no need of lawgivers, and that in those days **it was** not as yet **usual** to have such a thing?' Pl. Lg. 680a3–4

Ex. (14) constitutes a strong indication that  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  has also turned into a habitual auxiliary, because, as with the evolved forms of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\theta\alpha$ , this example has an inanimate subject and stative infinitive ( $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ).

Also, the distributional facts corroborate a diachronic collocation shift for habitual  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ , since it occurs 31 times (53,45%) with an inanimate subject (ex. 15 and 16) and 10 times (17,41%) with a stative infinitive (ex. 17 and 18).

- (15) οἱ μὲν Μακεδόνες καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν βαρβάρων εὐθύς φοβηθέντες, ὅπερ **φιλεῖ μεγάλα στρατόπεδα** ἀσαφῶς ἐκπλήγνυσθαι  
 'when night came on the Macedonians and the mass of the barbarians immediately took fright, as **large armies are wont to be** smitten with unaccountable panic' Th. 4.125.1
- (16) τῆς αὐρῆς δὲ πέρι, ὅτι οὐκ ἀποπνέει, τήνδε ἔχω γνώμην, ὡς κάρτα ἀπὸ θερμῶν χωρῶν οὐκ οἰκός ἐστι οὐδὲν ἀποπνέειν, **αὐρῆ** δὲ ἀπὸ ψυχροῦ τινος **φιλεῖ** πνέειν.  
 'And for the reason why no air blows from the river, this is my opinion: it is not natural that any air blow from very hot places; **airs usually** come from that which is very cold.' Hdt. 2.27
- (17) βούλομαι σ' εἰπεῖν κακῶς αὖ βραχέα, μὴ λίαν ἄνω βλέφαρα πρὸς τάναιδὲς ἀνάγων, ἀλλὰ σωφρονεστέρως,

ὡς ἀδελφὸν ὄντ'· ἀνὴρ γὰρ χρηστὸς αἰδεῖσθαι  
φιλεῖ.

'I want in my turn to say a few words of criticism to you, not shamelessly raising my glance too high but in a more modest style, as one ought to address a brother: a good man **usually feels inhibition.**' E. IA. 377–380

(18) λαβοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ, τέκνον:

ὡς πᾶσ' ἀπήνη πούς τε πρεσβύτου φιλεῖ  
χειρὸς θυραίας ἀναμένειν κουφίσματα.

'Take his arm, my son. For like a child still unfledged, the step of an old man **usually awaits** the help of another's hand.' E. Ph. 846–848

I found no examples of habitual φιλέω with an anti-present implicature, which perhaps could be taken as evidence for a lesser degree of grammaticalization.

### 3.2 From (generic-)habitual to future ἐθέλω

The grammaticalization of habitual ἐθέλω warrants background knowledge on the development of this auxiliary, because Ancient Greek ἐθέλω grammaticalized as a future auxiliary. In his monograph on the development of the synthetic future and several future auxiliaries from Homeric to Medieval Greek, Markopoulos (2009: 40–45) suggests the following evolutionary sequence for ἐθέλω.<sup>37</sup> First, the volition verb ἐθέλω evolves into a future marker, following the cross-linguistically frequent path of volition > intention > futurity (Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 254). Subsequently, ἐθέλω acquires a generic meaning to express generic truths. According to Markopoulos, the generic meaning presupposes the existence of the future meaning. Therefore the evolution of ἐθέλω into a future marker supposedly must have taken place in the Archaic Greek period somewhere between Homeric and Classical Greek, since Classical Greek has instances of ἐθέλω expressing both future and generic truths. Besides the fact that Markopoulos' proposal cannot be checked, I think that there are several diachronic linguistic reasons for desiring an alternative diachronic sequence. Therefore I will present arguments for a different evolutionary sequence in the following order: (1) establish the existence of habitual ἐθέλω already in Homeric Greek, (2) discuss examples which Markopoulos respectively calls intention and "generic" ἐθέλω but which are volitional and habitual ἐθέλω, and (3) argue, based on diachronic and cross-linguistic evidence, that the

<sup>37</sup> For further references and studies of the future in Ancient Greek, I refer the reader to Lambert, Allan & Markopoulos 2017.

future meaning of ἐθέλω developed out of a (generic-)habitual meaning (*pace* Markopoulos 2009: 40–45).

Contrary to what Markopoulos suggests, Homeric Greek presents several relevant examples of ἐθέλω with a non-volitional meaning: 2 generic habitual and 1 non-generic habitual, but only one example which might perhaps be seen as intentional ἐθέλω but is better seen as volitional.<sup>38</sup> In ex. (19) slaves (generic subject) are characterized as not being inclined to work when their master does not hold sway over them anymore. The semantic shift from being willing (volition) to being inclined to do (habitual) is a subtle one, but it is clear from the immediate context that Homer is referring to current habits of Odysseus' female slaves (γυναῖκες ἀκηδέες = δμῶες). This section is part of the recognition scene of Argos and Odysseus and immediately follows the description of Argos' previously vivacious habits.<sup>39</sup> In ex. (19) below Argos' current state is contrasted with his previous habits and the motif of decay due to Odysseus' absence<sup>40</sup> is extended to the habits of Odysseus' female slaves who also are no longer wont to work.

- (19) νῦν δ' ἔχεται κακότητι, ἄναξ δέ οἱ ἄλλοθι πάτρης  
 ὤλετο, τὸν δὲ γυναῖκες ἀκηδέες οὐ κομέουσι.  
**δμῶες** δ', εὗτ' ἂν μηκέτ' ἐπικρατέωσιν ἄνακτες,  
 οὐκέτ' ἔπειτ' **ἐθέλουσιν** ἐναίσιμα ἐργάζεσθαι  
 'But now he [i.e. Argos] is in evil plight, and his master has perished far  
 from his native land, and the heedless women give him no care. **Slaves**,  
 when their masters cease to direct them, **are** no longer **wont** to do their  
 work properly.' Od. 17.318–321

Similarly in ex. (20), the verb refers to a general habit which characterizes wanderers, that is, the habit of not telling the truth. Eumaeus here introduces his distrust of wanderers, since, as we will learn later on, he has been wronged by wanderers in the past.<sup>41</sup>

- (20) ὦ γέρον, οὗ τις κείνον ἀνὴρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθὼν  
 ἀγγέλλων πείσειε γυναῖκά τε καὶ φίλον υἱόν  
 ἀλλ' ἄλλως, κομιδῆς κεχρημένοι, **ἄνδρες ἀλήται**

<sup>38</sup> Note also that LfgrE (s.v. ἐθέλω) only sums up many different volitional shades of meaning.

<sup>39</sup> See *Od.* 17.313–317 where Eumaeus praises Argos' previous behavior by saying to Odysseus that he should have seen him before. Then he would have witnessed a hunting dog with amazing speed, strength and sense of smell.

<sup>40</sup> See de Jong 2001: 421: "like all Odyssean watchdogs, Argos has a symbolic function: he represents the decline of Odysseus' household during his absence."

<sup>41</sup> See *Od.* 14.372–385 and the explanation of the distrust of Eumaeus in de Jong 2001: 349.

ψεύδοντ' οὐδ' **ἐθέλουσιν** ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι.

'Old man, no wanderer that came and brought tidings of him could persuade his wife and his dear son; on the contrary **wanderers** in need of sustenance tell lies at random, and **are not wont** to tell the truth.' *Od.* 14.122–125

By contrast to the previous two generic habitual examples (19) and (20), one non-generic habitual also exists, see ex. (21).

- (21) ὦ γέρον ἄλλοτε μὲν σε καὶ αἰτιάσθαι ἄνωγα·  
πολλάκι γὰρ μεθειῖ τε καὶ οὐκ **ἐθέλει** πονέεσθαι  
οὔτ' ὄκνω εἴκων οὔτ' ἀφραδίῃσι νόοιο

'Old sir, at another time shall you reproach him even at my command, for he is often slack and not **wont** to toil, yielding neither to sloth nor to heedlessness of mind.' *Il.* 10.120–122

In this context Agamemnon agrees with the wise Nestor that Menelaos' behavior is far from perfect by saying that Menelaos's current behavior fits his characteristic habits of often slacking (πολλάκι γὰρ μεθειῖ). The collocation with πολλάκι 'often' in the same sentence signals that ἐθέλει also is a generalization which only holds in the majority of the occurrences.

Finally, I found one example that might perhaps qualify as intentional ἐθέλω, referring to the alleged intention of Telemachus to rid his household of the suitors of his mother, but is most probably better interpreted as volitional, see ex. (22).

- (22) ἦ μάλα Τηλέμαχος φόνον ἡμιν μερμηρίζει.  
ἦ τινὰς ἐκ Πύλου ἄξει ἀμύντορας ἡμαθόεντος,  
ἦ ὃ γε καὶ Σπάρτηθεν, ἐπεὶ νῦν περ ἴεται αἰνώς·  
ἦ καὶ εἰς Ἐφύρην **ἐθέλει**, πείραν ἄρουραν,  
**ἐλθεῖν**, ὄφρ' ἔνθεν θυμοφθόρα φάρμακ' ἐνείκη,  
ἐν δὲ βάλῃ κρητῆρι καὶ ἡμέας πάντας ὀλέσσει.

'Telemachus is planning our murder for certain. He will bring men to aid him from sandy Pylos or even from Sparta, so terribly is he set upon it. Or he **wants/(intends) to go** to Ephyre, that rich land, to bring from thence deadly drugs, that he may cast them in the wine bowl and destroy us all.'

*Od.* 2.325–330

The suitors fear that Telemachus might want to secretly plot against them (see lines 325–327). Thus, volitional ἐθέλει here carries the possible implication that Telemachus might intend and eventually actually go to Ephyre as part of his alleged plotting. In other words, they think that, since he is plotting, he might want to go to Ephyre to fetch drugs to kill them.

The existence of habitual ἐθέλω and absence of a clear intentional ἐθέλω in Homeric Greek make Markopoulos' scenario of an absent preexisting intentional

ἐθέλω as source for the future meaning unlikely. Moreover, I could not find intentional ἐθέλω examples in other Archaic Greek texts before Classical Greek, but I did find a generic habitual with an inanimate generic subject, see ex. (23).

- (23) δένδρεά τ' οὐκ ἐθέλει πάσαις ἐτέων περόδοις ἄνθος εὐῶδες φέρειν  
 πλούτῳ ἴσον.  
 'nor in all the circling years **are** trees **wont** to bear fragrant blossoms of  
 equal worth.' Pi. N. 11.40–41

The use of an inanimate subject suggests a subtle diachronic shift of this habitual marker, which testifies to its pre-existing habitual value. This makes the habitual meaning as source for the future use increasingly attractive. Moreover, the change from a habitual present to a future is attested cross-linguistically (Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 156–158). Conceptually, the change from habitual to future is also understandable, since the former involves a speaker's generalization based on characteristic aspects of the world, whereas the latter involves a speaker's prediction based on (characteristic) aspects of the world (cf. Ziegeler 2006: 103 and 108–111). In addition, both habitual *will* and habitual *would* in English also predate their future meanings (Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 156–158). In fact, generic/habitual *will* has recently been argued to have been the source of the future meaning of English *will* (see Ziegeler 2006; 2013). Given the data for Archaic Greek, it is thus more attractive to take habitual ἐθέλω as the source for future ἐθέλω.

Next let us return to the two examples given by Markopoulos to substantiate his diachronic evolutionary path of volition > intention > futurity > generic truths for ἐθέλω. He presents the following examples to demonstrate the acquisition of the intentional (ex. 24), future (ex. 25)<sup>42</sup> and generic truth meanings in Classical Greek (ex. 26), of which I will treat ex. (24) and (26) with some more context than Markopoulos for the purpose of later clarification.

- (24) φέρ' ἐξελίξας περιβολὰς σφραγισμάτων  
 ἴδω τί λέξαι δέλτος ἦδε μοι θέλει.  
 'Come, let me open its sealed wrappings  
 and see what this tablet **wishes/will** to tell me!' E. Hipp. 864–865
- (25) εἴπερ, ὃ μὴ γένοιθ', οὐτός  
 σ' ἐθέλει κρατῆσαι.  
 'If, god forbid, he is **going to** win now.' Ar. V. 536–537

<sup>42</sup> Since I do not aim to question that ἐθέλω could be used as a future auxiliary in Classical Greek, I would only like to mention here that the new edition of Aristophanes' texts by Wilson (2007) does not even print ἐθέλω here but has a synthetic future: εἰ γάρ, ὃ μὴ γένοιθ', οὐτός σε λέγων κρατήσῃ.

- (26) Ἐπὶ δὲ θάτερα καθήκει εἰς τὸ μεταξύ τοῦ πλεύμονος, εἴτ' ἀπὸ τούτου σχίζεται εἰς ἑκάτερον τῶν μερῶν τοῦ πλεύμονος. **Θέλει** γὰρ **εἶναι** διμερῆς ὁ πλεύμων ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἔχουσιν αὐτόν· ἀλλ' ἐν μὲν τοῖς ζωοτόκοις οὐχ ὁμοίως ἢ διάστασις φανερά, ἤκιστα δ' ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ. Ἔστι δ' οὐ πολυσχιδῆς ὁ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὥσπερ ἐνίων ζωοτόκων, οὐδὲ λείος, ἀλλ' ἔχει ἀνωμαλίαν. 'At the other end the windpipe extends to the region between the lungs, and therefrom branches into two, into each of the two parts of the lung. The lung, of course, in all animals where it is present **has a tendency to be double**; but in viviparous animals this duplication is not very plainly discernible, and least so in man; though in man it is not divided into numerous parts, as in some Vivipara, nor is it smooth, but it exhibits some unevenness.'
- Arist. *HA* 495a30–b2

First of all, I do not agree with Markopoulos that ex. (24) displays an ambiguous context of volition/intention where the intention would be applied to the letter in a metaphorical fashion from the sender. I could see the sense of referring to a letter as the metaphorical extension of a sender's desired message in a similar way as one would attribute the wish to winds of blowing in certain directions. Nevertheless, I do not think that the intentional interpretation can be available in this context because intention is only ascribed to animate beings. What is more, a future interpretation of the verb would work better in this context (than both options), since the message of the letter (τί) will be told (λέξει) after reading it, meaning that it lies in the future.

Ex. (26) is said to express a generic truth by Markopoulos, but in my view the expression does not represent a law-like generic truth. It rather presents a characterizing habitual situation which applies to most of the occasions. This is why Aristotle qualifies the situation of having two lungs as applying only to those animals that have it (ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἔχουσιν αὐτόν), meaning that some do not even have it. Also, Aristotle tones down this generalizing characterization in the subsequent sentences by saying that the division into two parts is not even that clear-cut.

When incorporating the diachronic evidence above, I think that the diachronic evolution of ἐθέλω should be reconstructed as follows:

The evolution of ἐθέλω: volition > (generic-)habitual > intention > futurity.

There are three cross-linguistic pieces of evidence that support the diachronic path that I reconstruct for ἐθέλω. First, the evolution of a present into a future marker is cross-linguistically attested (Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 153 and 156–158). Second, recent reevaluations of the grammaticalization of English *will* have yielded a highly similar evolutionary sequence:

The evolution of *will*: volition > proclivity > probability > prediction.

Generic habitual uses (= proclivity) turned out to be the source for future meanings in Old English rather than the intentional meanings which were long assumed to be the last stage before futurity (see Ziegeler 2006; 2013). This reevaluation has led to the revised diachronic sequence above which actually leaves out the layer of intention for lack of independent examples from the history of English. The proclivity meaning corresponds to habitual ἐθέλω from Archaic Greek and the probability meaning to intentional ἐθέλω from Classical Greek. Third, habitual uses of English *would* predate the future uses of future *would*, since only the former already occur in Old English (Bybee, Pagliuca & Perkins 1994: 156–158). The same applies to Ancient Greek ἐθέλω where habitual ἐθέλω predates intentional ἐθέλω.

Despite occurring only 14 times in total, habitual ἐθέλω also witnesses a gradual grammaticalization on the basis of a diachronic shift in collocations. In Homeric Greek, habitual ἐθέλω only had animate subjects, whereas the example from Pindar had an inanimate subject and of the 11 Classical Greek examples 10 were inanimate (see ex. 27). The shift to stative infinitives, however, was found in only 2 instances (see ex. 28). There were no instances of habitual ἐθέλω with an anti-present implicature.

- (27) τῷ δὲ εὖ βουλευθέντι πρήγματι τελευτῇ ὡς τὸ ἐπίπαν χρηστὴ ἐθέλει ἐπιγίνεσθαι.  
 ‘a well-laid plan **commonly leads** to a happy issue’ Hdt. 7.157.3

Note that ὡς τὸ ἐπίπαν betrays that the statement is not generic truth but a characterizing generalization that only holds in the majority of situations.

- (28) ἀναμνησκῶ δ’ αὖ ὑμᾶς ὅτι νενικήκατε αὐτῶν τοὺς πολλοὺς ἡσσημένων δὲ ἀνδρῶν οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν αἱ γνῶμαι πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς κινδύνους ὁμοῖαι εἶναι.  
 ‘Once more I remind you that you have beaten most of them already; and when men have once suffered defeat, **their spirit usually is** not the same as before if they are called upon to face the same dangers.’ Th. 2.89.11

### 3.3 Habitual νομίζω

Habitual νομίζω in its use as a habitual auxiliary occurs about 54 times (see fn. 14), but only in Classical Greek. It means ‘(use) customarily’ (see ex. 29 and 30) which is semantically a habitual in referring to repeated customary practice.<sup>43</sup>

- (29) οἱ δὲ **νομίζουσι** Διὶ μὲν ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψηλότατα τῶν ὀρέων ἀναβαίνοντες **θυσίας ἔρδειν**, τὸν κύκλον πάντα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Δία καλέοντες.

‘**They customarily offer sacrifice** to Zeus on the highest peaks of the mountains, calling the whole circle of heaven Zeus.’ Hdt. 1.131

- (30) ἡμέρην δὲ ἀπασέων μάλιστα ἐκείνην **τιμᾶν νομίζουσι** τῇ ἑκάστος ἐγένετο.

‘The day which every man **customarily honours** most is his own birthday.’ Hdt. 1.133

Habitual νομίζω also shows a gradual diachronic collocation shift to inanimate subjects and stative infinitives in Classical Greek. It is especially used in the middle with an inanimate impersonal subject meaning ‘to be customary’ (see ex. 31 and 32). The impersonal usage betrays an expansion to use with inanimate subjects (22 out of at least 54 habituais).

- (31) ἡδίκηκά τι;  
οὐκ, ἀλλὰ γυμνοὺς εἰσιέναι **νομίζεται**.

‘Strepsiadēs: ‘Have I done something wrong?’

Socrates: ‘No, **it’s customary** to go inside undressed.’ Ar. Nu. 497–498

- (32) καὶ τῇ κρήνῃ τῇ νῦν μὲν τῶν τυράννων οὕτω σκευασάντων Ἐννεακρούνῳ καλουμένην, τὸ δὲ πάλαι φανερῶν τῶν πηγῶν οὐσῶν Καλλιρρόῃ ὠνομασμένην, ἐκεῖνοί τε ἐγγὺς οὕση τὰ πλείστου ἄξια ἐχρῶντο, καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχαίου πρό τε γαμικῶν καὶ ἐς ἄλλα τῶν ἱερῶν **νομίζεται** τῷ ὕδατι χρῆσθαι

‘And the fountain now called Enneacrunus, from the fashion given it by the tyrants, but which anciently, when the springs were uncovered, was named Callirrhoe, was used by people of those days, because it was close by, for the most important ceremonials; and even now, in accordance with the ancient practice, it **is** still **customary** to use its waters in the rites preliminary to marriages and other sacred ceremonies.’ Th. 2.15.5

There is also an increase in collocation with stative infinitives: 5 out of at least 54, as exemplified in (33). However, as with the other habitual auxiliaries that were grammaticalized to a lesser extent than habitual εἶωθα, no occurrences of an anti-present use occurred.

<sup>43</sup> Another verb which can be used for the same purpose is ἐθίζω ‘become accustomed to/used to’, but this verb is considerably more infrequent than νομίζω, which is why I leave it out here.

- (33) οἱ δὲ μηδὲν ἀπολαύουσιν ἀγαθὸν τῆς πόλεως, οἷον ἄλλοι ἀγρούς τε κεκτημένοι καὶ οἰκίας οἰκοδομούμενοι καλὰς καὶ μεγάλας, καὶ ταύταις πρέπουσαν κατασκευὴν κτώμενοι, καὶ θυσίας θεοῖς ἰδίας θύοντες, καὶ ξενοδοκοῦντες, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἅ νυνδὴ σὺ ἔλεγες, χρυσόν τε καὶ ἄργυρον κεκτημένοι καὶ πάντα ὅσα **νομίζεται** τοῖς μέλλουσιν μακαριοὶς **εἶναι**;  
 ‘They enjoy nothing of the benefits of the state, as others do who have purchased land and built grand houses and are in the process of acquiring furnishings fit for them; who make private sacrifices to the gods and entertain guests. And not only that: as you were saying just now, they have amassed gold and silver and everything that **customarily belongs** to those who are destined to be happy.’  
 Pl. R. 419a4–10

## 4 Conclusions

This paper has traced the evolution of the habitual auxiliaries εἴωθα, φιλέω, ἐθέλω and νομίζω in an effort to provide a fuller understanding of the workings of habitual aspect in the history of Ancient Greek. I have argued that habitual auxiliaries are not dependent on contextual signals such as iterative or generic clauses, adverbials or generic subjects, even though habituais are sometimes lumped together with generic truths. Instead I proposed that habituais differ from generic truths in implying that what is expressed in the sentence applies only in the majority of its occurrences and that habituais can take generic subjects to characterize the habits of a kind/group. Subsequently I have used the grammaticalization criteria to demonstrate the gradual grammaticalization of the habitual auxiliaries εἴωθα, φιλέω, ἐθέλω and νομίζω. A schematic summary of the findings of this paper is provided in Table 3 (p. 160). The three columns under Classical Greek represent the diachronic stages of change, i.e. the gradual changes in collocations which can be observed.

I especially emphasized how diachronic collocation shifts, first to inanimate subjects and then to stative infinitives, can measure the degree of ongoing grammaticalization of the habitual auxiliaries. The number of past uses, for example, demonstrated that εἴωθα was more grammaticalized than the other auxiliaries. In the process of reconstructing the evolution of these habitual auxiliaries, I have delved into the possible diachronic relation between iterative and habitual markers (Section 3.1) and the role of habitual meanings as source for the development of the future auxiliary ἐθέλω (Section 3.2).

**Table 3:** The grammaticalization of habitual auxiliaries in Ancient Greek

|        | Archaic Greek  | Classical Greek  |   |   |
|--------|--|--|---|---|
| εἶωθα  | +ANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+NON-STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES                | +INANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+NON-STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES                            | +(IN)ANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES | +ANTI-PRESENT<br>IMPLICATURE<br>(due to pragmatic<br>factors) |
| φιλέω  | +ANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+NON-STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES<br>(φιλέεσκεν) | +INANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+NON-STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES                            | +(IN)ANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES | –   |
| ἐθέλω  | +ANIMATE<br>(GENERIC)<br>SUBJECTS<br>+NON-STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES   | +INANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+NON-STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES<br>(and futurity<br>ἐθέλω) | +(IN)ANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES | –   |
| νομίζω | +ANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+NON-STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES                | +INANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+NON-STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES                            | +(IN)ANIMATE<br>SUBJECTS<br>+STATIVE<br>INFINITIVES | –   |

By way of looking ahead I would like to discuss the findings for Ancient Greek habituais against the backdrop of the following complaint about habituais by an eminent typologist (Thieroff 2000: 295–296):

However, with regard to the expression of habituality, it seems to be more difficult to decide 1) whether a given expression has to be regarded as a fully grammaticalized morphosyntactic category obligatory in the appropriate contexts, and hence as a form belonging to the verbal paradigm; 2) whether it is a weakly grammaticalized category, optional in the appropriate contexts but consisting of a construction whose meaning is not predictable from its elements (like the progressives in most Germanic and Romance languages); or 3) whether we simply are dealing with a lexical expression.

I hope to have shown that Ancient Greek (1) is of the language type which can express habituais in many different tenses, (2) possessed both a group of tense/aspect habituais and grammaticalized auxiliaries which are optional, and (3) diachronic collocation shifts can help measure the degree of grammaticalization of habitual meanings. What opportunities, for example, remain for the future is to contrast the distribution of habitual auxiliaries and habitual tense-aspects or find out whether

Post-Classical Greek reveals important grammaticalization processes with regard to these habitual markers.

**Acknowledgment:** I wish to thank Rutger Allan for some valuable comments and for providing a draft version of forthcoming work. I also thank the anonymous reviewer for several important improvements. All errors that remain are, of course, my own. This research was supported by funding from an aspirant fundamental research grant from the Scientific Research Foundation of Flanders FWO, 1122620N.

## Abbreviations

- LfgrE Bruno Snell et al., eds. (1955–2010). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- LSJ<sup>9</sup> Henry G. Liddell, Robert Scott, Henry S. Jones & Roderick McKenzie (1996). *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- TLG Maria Pantelia, ed. (n.d.). *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literature*. URL: <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>.

## Bibliography

- Allan, Rutger J. (2016). “Tense and aspect in Greek. Two historical developments; augment and perfect”. In: *The Greek Verb Revisited*. Ed. by Steven E. Runge & Christopher J. Fresch. Bellingham: Lexham, 81–121.
- Allan, Rutger J. (2019). “Aspect and construal. A cognitive linguistic approach to iterativity, habituality and genericity in Greek”. In: *Toward a Cognitive Classical Linguistics*. Ed. by Egle Mocciaro & William M. Short. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter, 16–41.
- Bentein, Klaas (2016). *Verbal Periphrasis. Have- and Be-Constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Binnick, Robert I. (2005). “The markers of habitual aspect in English”. In: *Journal of English Linguistics* 33.4, 339–369.
- Bybee, Joan, William Pagliuca & Revere Perkins (1994). *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Comrie, Bernard (1976). *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunliffe, Richard J. (1963). *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*. Norman: Oklahoma Press.
- Dahl, Östen (1985). *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dahl, Östen (1995). “Marking of the episodic/generic distinction”. In: *The Generic Book*. Ed. by Gregory N. Carlson & Francis N. Pelletier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 412–425.
- Fanning, Buist M. (1990). *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- George, Coulter H. (2014). *Expressions of Time in Ancient Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Heine, Bernd (1993). *Auxiliaries. Cognitive Forces and Grammaticalization*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hellman, Matias (2005). *Znati and Um(j)eti in Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian. Grammaticalization of Habitual Auxiliaries*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Hilpert, Martin (2006). “Distinctive collexeme analysis and diachrony”. In: *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 2.2, 243–257.
- Hilpert, Martin (2008). *Germanic Future Constructions. A Usage-Based Approach to Language Change*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Hofinger, Marcel (1975). *Lexicon Hesiodicum*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth C. Traugott (2003). *Grammaticalization*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- de Jong, Irene F. (2001). *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krifka, Maria, Francis J. Pelletier, Gregory N. Carlson, Alice ter Meulen, Gennaro Chierchia & Godehard Link (1995). “Genericity. An introduction”. In: *The Generic Book*. Ed. by Gregory N. Carlson & Francis N. Pelletier. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1–115.
- Kühner, Raphael & Bernhard Gerth (1904). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Vol. 2: *Satzlehre*. Part 2. Hannover & Leipzig: Hahn.
- Lambert, Frédéric, Rutger J. Allan & Theodore Markopoulos (2017). *The Greek Future and its History. Le Futur grec et son histoire*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Langacker, Ronald (2000). *Grammar and Conceptualization*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Lavidas, Nikolaos & Gaberell Drachmann (2012). “On the verbal complements of aspectual verbs”. In: *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12.2, 305–333.
- Lehmann, Christian (2015). *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. 3rd ed. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Markopoulos, Theodore (2009). *The Future in Greek. From Ancient to Medieval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mendez Dosuna, Julián V. (2017). “Syntactic variation with verbs of perception and the ‘oblique imperfect’. Once again on aspect, relative time reference and purported tense backshifting in Ancient Greek”. In: *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*. Ed. by Klaas Bentein, Jorie Soltic & Mark Janse. Leiden: Brill, 56–83.
- Monro, David B. (1891). *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Neels, Jakob (2015). “The history of the quasi-auxiliary *use(d) to*. A usage-based account”. In: *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 5.2, 177–234.
- Norde, Muriel (2009). *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pagniello, Frederick J. (2007). “The past-iterative and the augment in Homer”. In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 112, 105–123.
- Rijksbaron, Albert (2006). *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Rix, Helmut (1976). *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- la Roi, Ezra (2019). “Epistemic modality, particles and the potential optative in Classical Greek”. In: *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 19.1, 58–89.
- la Roi, Ezra (forthc.). “The variation of Classical Greek wishes. A functional discourse grammar and Common Ground approach”. In: *Glotta*.

- Schwyzler, Eduard (1939). *Griechische Grammatik*. Auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik. Vol. 1: *Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. München: Beck.
- Schwyzler, Eduard & Albert Debrunner (1950). *Griechische Grammatik*. Vol. 2: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. München: Beck.
- Smyth, Herbert W. (1920). *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Stork, Peter (1982). *The Aspectual Usage of the Dynamic Infinitive in Herodotus*. Groningen: Bouma's boekhuis.
- Sturm, Laura (2019). *Die Verbalperiphrase im Altgriechischen. Synchronie und Diachronie*. Hamburg: Kovač.
- Tagliamonte, Sali & Helen Lawrence (2000). "I used to dance, but I don't dance now. The habitual past in English". In: *Journal of English Linguistics* 28.4, 324–353.
- Thieroff, Rolf (2000). "On the areal distribution of tense-aspect categories in Europe". In: *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Ed. by Östen Dahl. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 265–305.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Graeme Trousdale (2010). "Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization. How do they intersect?" In: *Gradience, Gradualness and Grammaticalization*. Ed. by Elizabeth C. Traugott & Graeme Trousdale. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 19–44.
- Tsutahara, Ryo (2013). "On the compatibility of the Spanish future form and habitual adverbs". In: *Procedia* 95, 203–210.
- de la Villa, Jesús (2014). "Tense/aspect". In: *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Ed. by Georgios K. Giannakis et al. Vol. 3. Leiden, Boston & New York: Nijhoff & Brill, 382–389. URL: <http://www.brill.com/encyclopedia-ancient-greek-language-and-linguistics>.
- West, Martin L. (1978). *Hesiod. Works & Days*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Nigel G. (2007). *Aristophanis Fabulae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ziegeler, Debra (2006). "Omnitemporal will". In: *Language Sciences* 28, 76–119.
- Ziegeler, Debra (2013). "On the generic argument for the modality of will". In: *English Modality. Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Ed. by Juana I. Marin-Arrese, Marta Carretero, Jorge Arus Híta & Johan van der Auwera. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter, 221–250.

