Remarks on verbal aspect and the distribution of present and aorist verbal forms in Elean

1. Introduction

The idea that the function or the selection of morphological means denoting verbal aspect could be influenced by syntactic or contextual factors is not something new. There is a great number of studies or remarks on this topic. Concerning Greek, we could suggestively mention Schwyzer (1950: 259-263, 278), Strunk (1971: 197-216), Friedrich (1974), Hettrich (1976) and Duhoux (1992: 158-160, 165-168). Particularly characteristic is Strunk’s remarks about verbal aspect in Homer and Herodot. He observes that the selection between Aorist and Imperfect is affected not only by semantic factors but by syntactic, as well, since: 1) adverbial phrases denoting a certain duration are connected with the use of aorist forms, and 2) by the reference to two actions which take place simultaneously without having started together (Inzidenzschema), aorist forms are used for the action that starts second, and imperfect forms are used for the action being already in progress. Very important is Strunk’s observation that, whenever (1) and (2) co-occur, verbal forms connected with (2) are always preferred, because the position of (2) in a hierarchy of syntactic rules is higher than the position of (1). In other words, we could say that context (2) is “stronger” than context (1). In explaining the difference between “stronger” and “weaker” we could say that, when a “stronger” context [in this case (2)] occurs simultaneously with a “weaker” one [in this case (1)], the “stronger” context enforces the use of the Tense with which is connected.

In this paper we will try, among other things, to show that a similar model with stronger and weaker contexts (or tendencies) could apply also to Elean. We will also try to examine semantic-pragmatic factors that could determine the selection between present and aorist forms. Our corpus (almost in its totality) consists of legal documents: mostly decrees and treaties of alliance, one private agreement concerning the renting of land,
two verdicts in interstate disputes, one manumission list, one text concerning a war-loan. The chronological range of our corpus spans from the (end of) the 6th century B.C. down to the early 2nd century B.C.¹ In total we took into account 149 occurrences of present and aorist forms².

2. Semantic-pragmatics

Generally, it seems that there is a totality presupposition for the use of Aorist, meaning that it is used to denote an event which is seen as an unanalysed whole³ and whose the entire course of development is known to the speaker (from now on I will be using the term “closed development” for this kind of event representation). In contrast, it appears that present forms refer to events the development of which is not already completed and whose the end or a part of their course is not known to the speaker⁴ (from now on I will be using the term “open development” for this kind of event representation). This function of present forms enables the speaker to use them in order to refer to repeatable events: habitual or generic⁵. Why is it like this? Because something that can generically happen, resembles more closely an event with open development, since its ability of unlimited repetition has no end. Something similar holds for the habitual events: a main characteristic of something that can usually happen, is that it can (or it is expected to) be repeated. In this case the speaker usually considers the event as not completed, simply because it is very possible that it will happen again. On the other hand, the present forms are not preferred for the

¹ We examined also an inscription that belongs to the first half of the 6th century B.C. [published by Siewert (1993)] but it is too fragmentary to be used in our analysis.
² See also in Appendix.
³ Cf. Wackernagel (1926: 173-175) and Duhoux (1992: 140-141).
⁴ Cf. Schwyzer (1950: 317) and Duhoux (1992: 139-140).
reference to events that happen (or it is provided to happen) once or at least not habitually (or it is desirable to happen rarely or even never). In these cases aorist forms are used\(^6\).

2.1 Main clauses

The aforementioned different functions of Present and Aorist forms are particularly evident in main clauses\(^7\), for example\(^8,9\)

(concerning Present)

1.\(^*\) (ca 500 B.C.)

K 39.2-3 αἱ δὲ ἀ(λ)λ/omikronβιτρια ποιοῖτο, (πε)ν(τ)ακατίας κα δαρ/omikronχυ(ἀ)ς ἀποτίνου κατὰ Φἐκαστὸν θεθμὸν (=if he appropriates things that do not belong to him, let him pay 500 drachmas for every violation),

2. (ca 450-425 B.C.)

K 44.15 [θυσίαι δὲ κα τὸν θεόν, ἐπεὶ εἴ emissions οὐκ αἱλύνπικ/omikronβις, εὐσα/omikronβις (=every Olympikos, let (the polis) pay reverence to the god by making a sacrifice],

3. (ca 450-425 B.C.)

K 44.18-19 αἱ δὲ ποιέοι, ἐν τοῖ ἡμίστῳ ἐνέχου[τὸ κα ἐπιάρ] (=but if anyone does this, let him be held in the highest penalty),

4. (ca 242 B.C.)

SEG 12.371.36-37 τὰν τε ἐκε[λ]ηρίαν καὶ τὰ θερ/omikronβεν τῶ ᾿Ασκλαπίω τὸ ἐν Κῶι ἀσυλον[ν] ἤμεν (=the polis of Elis shall accept the truce and the temple of Asclepius on Cos shall be inviolable).

\(^{6}\) Cf. Jacobstahl (1907: 22-25) and Wackernagel (1926: 173-175).  
\(^{7}\) Statistical data about the forms concerning main clauses see in Appendix.  
\(^{8}\) In every example of this paper the forms under examination are double-underlined and the contexts that could play a role in the choice of the verbal forms are (single-)underlined. An asterisk (*) after the number of an example denotes that its double-underlined forms belong to a verbal paradigm for which both present and aorist forms are attested in Elean.  
\(^{9}\) The following abbreviations are used: K=Koerner (1993), vE-R=van Effentere & Ruzé (1994-1995).
the double-underlined present forms refer either to generic events [(1, 3, 4)] or to a repeatable one [(2)]: a sacrifice that will take place every month named Olympikos

(concerning Aorist)

5. (ca 475-450 B.C.)
νΕ-Ρ I.51.5-7 αἱ τὸ[ν] ὁρκον παρβιάνοιαν, γνώμαν τὸ ι[α]θομάορ τ’Ολυμπίαι [=if they break the(ir) oath (that they keep to the terms of the covenant), the priests in Olympia will decide on the case]

6. (before 450 B.C.)
van Effentere II.27.2-4 ἀφέξε ἐλευθάρως τὸν ἀπὸ Σφίνγας γόνον (=he let Sphinga’s children free),

7. (ca 365 B.C.)
SEG 36.390.3-4 ἀναγρα[ῆ]ναι αὐτὸς καὶ γενεὰν [αὐτῶν τῶ δάµω τῶ Πισατᾶν προξένως καὶ εὐεργέτας (=they and their families will be registered as proxenoi and benefactors of the damos of Pisa),

8.* (late 4th or 3rd century B.C.)
Kunze (1956) 1-4 Θεοτιμήδην τὸν Εὐδήμο(υ) Μενδαίου προξένον ἑπόησαν τοῖς Φάλειοι (=the Eleans appointed Theotimides son of Eudemos from Mende as a proxenos),

9.* (3rd century B.C.)
Rousset & Katzouros (1992) 2.1-2 τάδε ἔχοντας αὐτῶν τὰς πόλις τῶν Ἀλείων (=the gaiodikai sent by the polis of Eleans came to the following decision),

10.* (299-250 B.C.)
ἸvΟ 39.33-34 τὰν δὲ ἐπιμέλειαν τῷ ἀναθέσιον ποιήσασι Αἰσχίναν [=Aiskhinas will take care of setting up (the decree)].
The aorist forms in (5-10) do not refer to habitual or generic events. On the contrary, they refer to events with closed development [(6-10)] or at least not repeatable [γνώματι in (5) refers to the definite decision or judgement about an event that cannot be viewed as repeatable, meaning that an oath cannot be broken more than once).

Particularly interesting are cases like (11-13), because in these examples present and aorist forms are “side by side” and, thus, the difference in the function of Present and Aorist is even more evident.

In 11.* (ca 450-425 B.C.)

Κ 44.21-22 [δίκας δ' ἔμεν τάς προγενομένας στάσις]ος· ὃς δ' ἔσομεν, κριθέντ ἀνδριθὸν ὀ τοῖς ὑπακούοντις ἄνδρον ὁ δὲ ἐνδαμένως παρεϊέ κα ποτὶ Νικαρχίδαν καὶ Π]λείσταιν[ον καὶ κρίνοιτο (=trials will take place regarding the rebellion that took place: all (the rebels) who (fled the polis), will be convicted as guilty of homicide: but let every (rebel) who remained in the polis, appear in front of Nikarkhidas and Pleistainos and be judged)

the aoristic κριθέντ ἀνδριθὸν is used to refer to the conviction of all the rebels who fled Skillous after the failure of their uprising, as a single and unanalysed whole. Of course, we cannot be sure that all these men will be convicted in a single trial, but for the legislator this is not important at this point. He is basically interested to emphasize that all those rebels (as a bunch of troublemakers, a unity dangerous for the new order in Skillous) will be convicted for such a serious crime that they can never return to the territory of Skillous. Thus, here κριθέντ ἀνδριθὸν refers to an event with closed development (the legislator presents the trial of the fled rebels as something already completed, meaning that the judgement is already pronounced). On the other hand, with κρίνοιτο the legislator wants to emphasize that the new

dialects regarding the use of present forms in texts with sacrificial prescriptions see Jacobstahl (1907: 47-48).

regime will not persecute relentlessly or with preordained judgements (as in the case of the fled rebels) every (possible) participant in the rebellion: thus, in the last sentence of (11) it is provided that every rebel who did not flee, has generally the right to appear before the damiourgoi and be (hopefully fairly) judged depending on the violations for which he is or will be accused. What is relevant here is not any (preordained) result of the trial (as in the case of the fled rebels) but the eventuality of a (hopefully fair) trial open to any result. Thus, here we are dealing with an event with open development (and that’s why a present form is used)\textsuperscript{12}.

In

12. (ca 425-400 B.C.)

DGE 419 18.5-8 φάρεν κριθῶν μανασίας δύο καὶ Φίχατι Ἀλφιόδο κενός αἱ δὲ λίποι, λυσάστο τὸ διυπιόν πεπάστο τὸν πάντα χρόνον [= he will pay 22 measures of barley (every year) on the 20th of Alphioios. If he cannot pay the whole rent, he will be released (from the obligation to keep to the terms of the contract) by paying double rent. (but if he keeps to the terms of the contract) he will exploit the leased land for ever]

the aoristic λυσάστο refers to a definite, a complete release from the obligations concerning a certain leasing contract. In contrast, φάρεν refers to an event with open development, meaning that the obligation of paying

\textsuperscript{12} A similar pattern could also hold for

DGE 424.8-10 (365-335 B.C.) τὸι δὲ ἐπὶ ἄσιστα μὰ ἀποδόσσαι μάτε ἐκπέμψαι ὑν τὰ κρηματα τὸι φυγάδεσσα (= those next of kin shall not sell or send off the property to the exiles),

where in the first main clause aorist forms occur, although the clause refers to something repeatable. In this case it would be possible that the legislator presents the sending off and selling of the properties in a way similar with the conviction of the fled rebels of Skillus. For the legislator the repeatability of the denoted events is not as important as the danger that the whole of the repetitions of these events will cause the (negative for the whole Elean community) loss of a great amount of its members' properties with all the consequences concerning the financials of the community.
the annual rent is something that will apply forever\(^\text{13}\) (at least this is what is desired) and, besides, with a repeatability denoted by the phrase δόο καὶ Φίκατι Ἀλφιώδῳ μὲνόρ.

In

13. (299-250 B.C.)
IVO 39.26-29 τάν τε θυσιάν καὶ τιμάν πασάν μετέχην, καθὼρ καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ θεαροδόκοι καὶ εὐεργέται μετέχοντι δόμεν δὲ αὐτοῖ καὶ Δαμιοχάτη τὸν ταμίαν ξένια (=he will sit in every sacrifice and be awarded with every honour that is provided for thearodokoi and benefactors and the treasurer Damokrates will supply him with sustenance)

the present form μετέχην refers to honours paid to a (certain) proxenos, every time he visits Elis. In contrast, δόμεν does not denote a generic event: the last clause of (13) refers to certain sustenance that will be supplied to a certain proxenos on a certain stay in Elis.

Up to now, we saw that some differences in form can be related in meaning or pragmatics. However, this is not the case for

14.\(^*\) \(\text{14}\) (early 5th century B.C.)
νΕ-Ρ Ι.36. 1, 2, 6-8 Τιμοχάτη Μάλεξος . . . τὰ δίκαια ἐνα κ’ ἀποτίνοι . . . . .
. τὰ δίκαια . . . κ’ ἀπό το βομιδό ἀποφέλεσται ὑπὸ τὸν προξένον καὶ τὸ ἰα(ρμ)ά(ο) [. . . α’ κα] δόξε καὶ τοῦ δάμοι (=let Timocrates son of Malex pay the fine and he will be kept away from the sacred precinct by the proxenoi and the priest, under the condition that damos also agree).

The present forms ἀποτίνοι and ἀποφέλεσται do not refer to something habitual or generic. In contrast, they refer to a decision already taken and dealing with the penalizing of a certain Timokrates. In this case we should take into account that at the end of (14) a presupposition for the punishment

\(^{13}\) Also, look at the last sentence of (12), where it is provided the infinite right of the lessor to exploit the leased land (provided that he keeps to the leasing terms).

\(^{14}\) \(\ast\) in (14) concerns only ἀποτίνοι.
of Timokrates is added: with αἱ καὶ δόξει καὶ τοῖ δάμοι it seems to be decreed that the *damos* has the final authority to approve the punishment\(^{15}\). Thus, the penalizing of Timokrates or the fine that will be imposed (which is a part of the punishment) is not already completely decided, but it is viewed as an event with open development.

2.2 Conditional sentences\(^{16}\)

In this section we will explore the possible connections between form and syntax or inter-clausal relationships. We will examine the conditional sentences, and we will make some remarks concerning the relationship between protasis and apodosis.

In cases like

15. (ca 475-450 B.C.)

\[\nu E-R \ I.51.5-7 \ \alpha\iota \ \tau\omicron\nu \ \delta\omicron\kappa\omicron\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\nu \ \pi\omicron\alpha\beta\iota\alpha\nu\iota\nu\alpha\nu, \ \gamma\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\nu \ \tau\omicron\ \iota\alpha\[\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\omicron \ \tau\omicron\'\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\omicron\nu\omicron\iota \ \Omega\omicron\nu\iota\pi\omicron\nu \ \{=\text{if they break the(ir) oath (that they keep to the terms of the covenant), the priests in Olympia will decide the case}\},\]

16. (ca 450-425 B.C.)

\[\mathrm{K} \ 44.2-3 \ \alpha\iota \ \tau\iota \ \Sigma\kappa\iota\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\nu \ \alpha\pi\nu\iota\theta\omicron\omicron\iota, \ \kappa\alpha\iota\iota\nu\iota\iota\iota\iota \ \iota\alpha\nu \ \delta\alpha\mu\omicron\rho\omicron\gamma\iota\iota \ \varepsilon\omicron\tau\omicron\alpha\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron \ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\nu \ \{=\text{if a Skillountine does not obey, let the body of damiourgoi prosecute him with the charge of rebellion}\}\]

and

17.* (ca 450-425 B.C.)

\[\mathrm{K} \ 44.9-12 \ \alpha\iota \ \delta\iota \ \tau\iota \ \pi\omicron\acute{\iota}\omicron\acute{\iota} \ \tau\omicron\nu \ \Sigma\kappa\iota\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\nu, \ \cdots \ \kappa\alpha\kappa\iota\nu\iota\iota\iota\iota \ \tau\omicron\nu \ \Sigma\kappa\iota\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\iota\omicron\nu \ \theta\omicron\iota\omicron\iota\iota\iota \ \Theta\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu \ \kappa\alpha\kappa\iota\nu\iota\iota\iota\iota \ \[\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\omicron\nu\omicron\nu \ \\\ \ \{=\text{if a Skillountine revolts,}\}\]

\(^{15}\) In case that αἱ καὶ δόξει καὶ τοῖ δάμοι refers only to the prohibition to Timokrates to enter the district of the altar, we could restore ἀποτειατῶ to an aoristic ἀποτειείμαι (attested in IPArk 25.9) referring to an event with closed development (since the enforcement of the fine to Timokrates does not depends on the *damos*’ assent).

\(^{16}\) Statistical data about the forms concerning conditionals see in Appendix.
Nikarkhidas and Pleistainos will judge him with the help of Skillountines who will take an oath to Olympian Zeus),
where apodosis refers only to how will be judged if a violation of a covenant or law actually happened, present forms are used in protasis. In other words, we observe that in conditionals where apodosis refers to the procedure (or part of it) by which the event denoted in protasis will be managed, present forms are preferred in protasis.

On the contrary, in cases like
18. (middle of 4th century B.C.)
DGE 424.12-13 αἰ δὲ τῷ ἀδελτώθαιε τὰ στάλαν, ὥρ ἀγαλματοφώραν ἐόντα πάσχην (=if any one defaces the stele, he shall be punished like one guilty of sacrilege)
19.* (ca 450-425 B.C.)
K 44.2-6 κατιστα(ί)ε <κ> ἀ δαµι/omikronργία ἐστά[σις] δίκαν, αἰ δὲ µὲ κατασταίε, µνᾶς τὰς ἀ(µ)έρας, αὶ µᾶν λεοίταν, ὀσίαν, αὶ δὲ ἢ[αρὰν λεοίταν, κατθυτὰν τοί Δί Ὀλυµπίου αἱ δ]ὲ µὲ ταύτας ποταµοξάίτο, πέντε µνᾶ[ς ἀποτινώτο τὰς ἀμέρας κατθυτάς τοί Δί Ὀλυµπίοι αἱ δὲ µὲ ταύταν ποταµοξάι[το, - - µνᾶς τὰς ἀµέρας ἀποτι[νώτο κα(τ)θυτάς τοί Δί αὶ δ'[αξιόσυλος γένο[το, ἀλλύοιτο κα έ - - συναλλύοιτο δὲ κ' αὶ πόλις [=let the body of damiouregoi prosecute (the lawbreaker) with the charge of rebellion. If he does not appear to the court, he will pay one mina for each day (that he does not appear) and the fine will be paid either to the public purse or will be dedicated to Olympian Zeus, according to what the body of damiouregoi will decide. If he does not comply with this, he will pay five minae for every day (that he does not appear), dedicated to Olympian Zeus. If he does not comply, he will pay X minae for every day (that he does not appear) dedicated to Zeus; but if (because of being unable to pay the fine) he becomes liable to seizure, let him be relieved of the obligation to pay... and

---

* in (19) concerns only κατασταίε.
let the *polis* be considered co-responsible for the reimbursement of the debit],

20. (early 5th century B.C.)

K 37.1-2 Πατρίαν θαρρὲν καὶ γενεὰν καὶ ταύτῶν ἂν τίς κατιμισάσει, Φάρους ὁ Φαλεῖος [=Patris and his family and his property shall be immune; if anyone imprecates against them, he shall be exiled as in the case of a citizen of Elis]

and

21. (early 5th century B.C.)

K 37.2-5 Φάρους ὁ Φαλεῖος ἂν μὴ πιθεῖσθαι τὰ τέλεια ὁ μέγιστος τέλος ἔχοι καὶ τοῖς βασιλέασι. ζέκα μιναίς καὶ ἀποτίνοι Φέκαστος τὸν μὴ πιστοεύντον καὶ τὸν Ἱλεντιὸς ἐπένθετο τῇ ὠλυντικῷ =he shall be exiled as in the case of a citizen of Elis. If he who holds the highest office and the *basileis* do not impose the fines, let each of them pay a penalty of ten minae dedicated to Olympian Zeus, and let the *hellanodica* enforce this),

where apodosis refers only to the punishment of a lawbreaker and does not refer to any judicial resolution concerning the event denoted in protasis, aorist forms are preferred in the latter. Besides, in (19-21) we see that aorist forms are preferred in conditional clauses referring to the violation of the previous regulation.

Thus, concerning conditional sentences in Elean we could say that the following ‘tendency’ is observed:

**Tendency (A)**

In conditional sentences:

a) present forms are preferred in protasis, when apodosis refers to the procedure by which the event denoted in protasis will be managed, and

b) aorist forms are preferred in protasis:
1) when apodosis refers only to the consequences which a lawbreaker will suffer\textsuperscript{18}, or
2) when protasis refers to the violation of a previously mentioned regulation\textsuperscript{19}.

In an attempt to explain the distribution of Present and Aorist, we could say that the aorist forms denote a definite violation of the law. That is why apodosis refers to the punishment and not to the judicial resolution of the case. From a pragmatic point of view it is like the legislator saying to every (possible) lawbreaker: “All right, there is no doubt that you have done your delinquency. Now it is time for you to be punished!”. It could also be the case that the legislator wants to present the lawbreakings as events that should not habitually happen. Another possible explanation for the distribution of Aorist in the conditional sentences, could be given by correlating this distribution with aoristic functions like punctuality or holistic view, meaning that the event mentioned in the protasis is viewed as something already done: the judges have examined and decided about. Thus, we are dealing with something for which we do not care any more about the details of its development. We do not need to view this event as something in progress, something that we have to observe how it happens or how it is developing. In the case of present forms, the violation denoted in protasis is presented as open to question if it was actually committed. That is why in apodosis it is provided that somebody will first judge (or examine) and then decide if a violation of the law actually took place. It sounds more logical that something that is presented as not certain to have been done, is more

\textsuperscript{18} Concerning tendencies Aa and Ab1 a similar pattern is also attested in Cretan and Cyrenaean [Τσολακιδης (2002a: 57-63)], Heraclean [Τσολακιδης (2003: 454-455)], Thessalian [Τσολακιδης (2004a: 720-721)] and Boeotian [Τσολακιδης (2004b: 3-4)].

\textsuperscript{19} A similar pattern is also attested in Cretan, Arcadian, Delphian, Corcyrean, Central Ionic [Jacobstahl (1907: 22-24)], Cretan, Rhodian, Western Argolic, Cyrenaean [Τσολακιδης (2002a: 77-81)], Ionic of Cyclades and Asia Minor [Τσολακιδης (2002b: 676-677)].
similar with something with open development than with something considered as completed. Of course, the explanation for the distribution of present forms could be simpler: present forms could simply be used in order to state the opposite of what Aorist states, meaning that present forms could be used here in order to state that it is not sure that a lawbreaking took place. From this point of view we could also take into account

and what Koerner (1993: 122-123) states about the absence of any mention of the punishment of a judge who pronounces a judgement contrary to the legal regulations [he believes that the absence of any mention to punishment means that in (22) we have to do with a violation of the law that was possibly committed because of ignorance of law or at least not deliberately]. It is interesting that in Elean conditional sentences present forms are always preferred in protasis, whenever a phrase is added, with which it is provided or at least implied that there is also the case that someone did not actually or deliberately broke the law. For example, in

23. (early 5th century B.C.)

and

24. (500-475 B.C.)
dispossesses him (of the aforementioned land) without *damos’ approval*, he will suffer Zeus’ revenge]

present forms occur in protasis, although apodosis refers to punishment and not to a procedure. However, what is denoted in the first protasis of (23) is maybe not viewed as an intentional violation of the law, because by the addition of one more presupposition for the punishment (at the end of the example), it is provided that there is also the case that the subject of ἱµάσκοι did not deliberately broke the law. In (24), by the addition (at the end of the example) of the restriction αἰ δὲ δάµοι δοξέοι, it is provided that there is also the case that the subject of συλαιε did not illegally acted but (on the contrary!) implemented a decision taken by the *damos*. It is interesting that present forms are used in Cretan in protasis concerning actions that are not to be punished [Τσολακίδης (2002a:86)].

Hence, judging by what we have noticed up to now about the distribution pattern of present and aorist forms in protasis, we could reformulate tendency A as follows:

**Tendency A (reformulated)**

In conditional sentences:

a) present forms are preferred in protasis, when it is denoted that it is not sure if a lawbreaking could actually or intentionally took place, and

b) aorist forms are preferred in protasis, when it is denoted that there would be no doubt that a punishable lawbreaking took place.

Tendency Aa also seems to hold for

25.* (ca 500 B.C.)

Κ 39.2-5 αἴ δ’ἀ(λ)λΒς τρία π/οιοίτο, (πε)ντακατίας καὶ δαρκὶ αὶ ἀπότινοι κατὰ Φέκαστον θεθτµ, ὁτι ἀδίκης ἔχοι καὶ πο(ι)οίτο, ἀδίκης γα’ γνόμα δὲ κ’ἐξὶ τίσομα (=if he appropriates things that does not belong to him, let

---

20 Koerner (1993: 110)
21 Statistical data about the forms concerning this tendency see in Appendix.
him be held to a fine of 500 drachmas for each violation, for everything that possesses and appropriates contrary to the law: let the priest decide the case) and

26. (ca 450-425 B.C.)

K 44.19-20 [αἱ δὲ τις μανύκιν τινα δοξά] τὸ γράφος τὸ δὲ καζι(λ)έμενον, γνοίαν κα - - καὶ ἐν τ’ἐπιάροι κα] ἐνέχοιτο τῷ τῇ ἔδε γεγραμ(μ)ένοι (=if someone reports someone who has injured this text, let the . . . decide the case and let the highest penalty be imposed on the lawbreaker).

In both cases the context in which protasis occurs, refers not only to the punishment but also to the deciding if a just mentioned lawbreaking actually took place²². Taking that into account we could suppose that tendency Aa is stronger²³ than tendency Ab. In the next chapter we will examine some more cases of tendencies stronger than tendency Ab.

2.3 Stronger and weaker tendencies

In cases like

27. (ca 500 B.C.)

vE-R I.52.4-6 συνέαν κ’,ἀλάλις τὰ τ’ἄλ(α) καὶ πάρ πολέμοι. αἱ δὲ μᾶ συνέαν, τάλαντον ἄργυρον ἀποτίνοιαν τοῦ Δι Ὁλυμπία τοῦ καδαλέμενοι λατριμένον [=let them stand by each other in all matters and especially in war and if they stand not by each other, those who do the wrong, will pay a talent of silver to Olympian Zeus to be used in his service],

28. (early 5th century B.C.)

K 37.5-7 τάλλα ζίκαα ἐπενεπτό ἡ ζαμιοφία: αἱ τ᾿ ἔννοι, ζήφιον ἀποτινέτο ἐν μαστράαι (=the body of damiourgoi shall enforce the other

---

²² Concerning the last clause of (21) it should be taken into account that it does not refer to any trial or decision taking but just to the enforcement of a regulation concerning the punishment of magistrates who were found guilty of neglecting one of their duties [cf. Veligianni-Terzi (1977: 21), Koerner (1993: 107)].

²³ as we defined “stronger” and “weaker” contexts on page 1
fines: if they do not enforce this, let them pay double the penalty in their accounting),

29. (ca 450-425 B.C.)

K 44.7-9 συναλλύωιτο δὲ κ' ἀ πόλις: αἱ δὲ μὲ συναλλύσωιτο - - - τὸ χρεός
κ' ἐμ' ὑολίζοι ἀ πόλις τοῦ Διὸ Ὀλυμπίοι ἐκάστοι Φέ[τεος - - - ] (=let the polis
contribute to the reimbursement of the debit: if it does not contribute to the
reimbursement, it shall pay back the whole debit to the temple of Olympian
Zeus with an annual increment of 50%)

and

30.*24 (365-335 B.C.)

DGE 424.1-5 ταὶρ δὲ γενεαὶρ µὰ φυγαδείη µαδὲ κατ' ὁποῖον τρόπον, µάτε
ἐρσενέταιραν µάτε θηλυτέραν, µάτε τὰ χρήµατα δαµισιῶµεν: αἱ δὲ τῷ
φυγαδείη αἴτε τὰ χρήµατα δαµισιώτα, φευγέτῳ πῶ τῶ ∆ιὸρ τὸλυμπίω
ἀµατόρ [=one shall not exile the children (of an exile) either male or
female, under any circumstances, nor confiscate their property: if one exiles
them or confiscates the property, he shall be exiled as guilty of murder in the
name of Olympian Zeus],

we notice that in the preceding main clause and in the conditional clause
verbal forms belonging to the same paradigm and having the same meaning
are used.

Thus, we could say that the following tendency holds:

Tendency (B)25

If verbal forms belonging to the same paradigm and having the same
meaning26 are used both in a main clause and in the following conditional
clause that refers to the violation of the regulation denoted in the main one,

24 * in (30) does not concern δαµισιωτά.
25 It holds for 5 (3 preserved and 2 restored) present forms.
26 Concerning ἑπεννετό and ἑνποι in (28) see Danielsson (1898-1899: 95-96).
then the Tense of the conditional clause will be the same with that of the main one.\textsuperscript{27}

Taking into account that, except from (28)\textsuperscript{28}, present forms are always preferred in every other case of the context relating with tendency B, we could come to the conclusion that tendency B is stronger than tendency Ab.

Another tendency stronger than Ab is \textbf{Tendency C}\textsuperscript{29}

If a conditional clause co-exists with others denoting alternative presuppositions of practicing the law, present forms will be preferred in the basic conditional clause.

For example, in 31. (ca 500 B.C.)

\begin{verbatim}
νΕ-Ρ I.52.7-10 οἱ δὲ τῷ τὰ γράφεα τοῖς καδαλέοιτο, αἴτε Φέτας αἴτε τελεστὰ αἴτε δᾶμος, ἐν τ'ἐπιάρ κ'ἐνέταυτ'ἐγραμένι (=if any one injures this text, whether private citizen, official, or the state, let him be held in the penalty here written)
\end{verbatim}

we are dealing with either something that is more similar to a repeatable event, since there are potentially more than one (different) occurrences of the event denoted in the first protasis or we have to do with something for which we do not know the exact course of development, since there are more than one possible subjects of καδαλέοιτο (and, of course, in this case the way that a damos injures a text could not be possibly the same with that of a single citizen).

As for the conditional clauses denoting additional presuppositions or presuppositions that are not considered to be important enough to be

\textsuperscript{27} Maybe the same tendency could be observed for Ionic of Asia Minor and Cyclades but concerning the aorist forms {cf. Τοολακίδης [2002b: 677, examples (17-18)]}.

\textsuperscript{28} where tendency Ab2 applies, too

\textsuperscript{29} It holds for 1 preserved present form and 1 restored one.
located in the beginning of the conditional sentence, the same semantic-pragmatic rules that apply to the main clauses, apply in this case too. For example

32. *(500-475 B.C.)*

νΕ-Ρ I.21 τὰν δὲ γὰ[ν] ἔχεν τὰν ἐν Πίσαι· αἱ δὲ τὶς συλαίει, Fé(ο)φὲν αὐτὸν πὸτ τὸν Δία, αἱ μὲ δάμοι δοξέοι [=he shall owe land in Pisa. if someone dispossesses him (of the aforementioned land) without *damos’ approval*, he will suffer Zeus’ revenge],

33.* (early 5th century B.C.)

Κ 37.8-9 Πατρίας ὁ γροφεὺς ταῦτα καὶ πάσχοι, [αἱ τ]ιν[ῇ]ξέοι (=let Patrias the public secretary suffer the same penalty, if he *wrong* anyone),

34.* (399-369 B.C.)

SEG 35.389 3-8 αἱ δὲ τῷ συλαία τῷ πολιτείαν, αἵτε ἐκ τελέων ἀποστέλλοι δικαῖον πολιτειομένου καὶ κατ τὸν (νόμον), ἀσεβήτω πὸτ τῷ Ἄθανάρ (=everyone registered on this plaque, will be a citizen of Makistos. If someone deprives them of their rights of citizenship or *removes* them from their office, although they act fairly and according to the law, he will be guilty of sacrilege against Athena),

35.* (early 5th century B.C.)

νΕ-Ρ I.36. 1, 2, 6-8 Τιµκράτει Μάλκος . . . τὰ δίκαια .ἐνα κ’ἀπό τίνοι . . . . . . Τὰ δίκαια . . . . κ’ἀπό τὸν βομβὸ ἀποφέ[λεσται ὑπὸ τόν] προξένον καὶ τὸ ἱαρ(ομμ)ά(ο) [. . . αἱ καὶ] δόξε καὶ τοῖ δάμοι (=let Timocrates son of Malex pay the fine and he will be kept away from the sacred precinct by the *proxenoi* and the priest, under the condition that the *damos* also *agree*).

If we compare (32) with (35), we observe that δοξέοι in (32) refers generically to the *damos’* right to decide that Deukalion should no longer be a citizen of Pisa, whereas in (35) the aoristic δόξε is preferred, maybe because we are dealing with a single event, not a repeatable one: the *damos*

---

30 In total 7 cases like that are attested.
will decide only once whether they approve the punishment of a certain Timokrates.

A possible reason for this distribution pattern could be that the aforementioned conditional clauses, by denoting a secondary presupposition, are not considered to be so close connected with apodosis that they would be affected by it.

Another tendency stronger than Ab is:

Tendency D 31

In conditional clauses referring to the violation of more than one regulations, present forms are preferred 32. For example, in

36.* (365-335 B.C.)

DGE 424.9-12 τ/omikronὶρ δὲ ἐπ’ ἄσιστα μὰ ἀποδόσας μάτε ἐκπέμψαι τὰ γράμματα τοῦ λαγόδεσσιν αἱ δὲ τι ταύτων πάρ τὸ γράμμα ποιέοι, ἀποτινέτω διπλ[ά]σιν τῶ καὶ ἐκπέμπα καὶ τῶ καὶ ἀποδόται (=those next of kin shall not sell or send off the property of the exiles: and if anyone does any of these things contrary to this regulation, he shall pay double the amount taken with or sent abroad)

the present form ποιέοι refers to the violation of more than one just mentioned regulations, it refers to one or both of the regulations mentioned in the first semicolon.

2.4 Additional remarks

Firstly, one could observe that sometimes more than one contexts that are connected with present forms, co-occur. In all these cases what we previously mentioned about stronger and weaker tendencies applies, too. For example, in

37. (ca 500 B.C.)

31 It holds for 3 (1 preserved and 2 restored) present forms.
32 A similar pattern is attested in Thessalian [Τουλαξίδης (2004b: 721-722)]
vE-R I.52.3-5 αἰ δὲ τι δέοι, αἴτε Φέπος αἴτε Φάργον, συνέαν κ’ ἀλάλοις τὰ τ’ ἀλ(α) καὶ πάρ πολέμῳ (=if there shall be any need of word or act, they shall combine with one another in other matters and in war)

the whole conditional does not refer to any violation of the law (tendency Aa) and αἴτε Φέπος αἴτε Φάργον denote multiple presuppositions for practicing what said in apodosis (tendency C).

In

38.* (ca 450-425 B.C.)

K 44.17-19 τὰρ δὲ [Φράτορας ἑναντία μεθέτερος αὐτόν καὶ το]Fέον αἰ δὲ ποιέων, ἐν τοῖς μεγίστοι ἐνέχοι[το κα ἐπιάροι] (=none of them should act contrary to this law; if he does, let him be held in the highest penalty)

and

39. (399-369 B.C.)

SEG 35.389.1-8 ὅσοι ἐν τοῖς πίνακι ἑνηγράφενται. Μακιστίῳ ἦµεν αἰ δὲ τῷ συλαίᾳ τῇ πολιτείᾳ, αἴτε ἐκ τελέων ἀποστέλλοι δικαίωρ πολιτειομένῳ καὶ κατ τὸν (νόμον), ἀσεβήτω πὸτ τὰρ ᾿Αθανάρ [=the Triphylioi decided: everyone registered on this plaque, will be a citizen of Makistos. If someone deprives them of their rights of citizenship or removes them from their office, although they (as citizens) act fairly and according to the law, he will be guilty of sacrilege against Athena], although apodosis refers to punishment (tendency Ab), present forms (ποιέων, συλαίᾳ) are used in protasis, not only because they refer to the violation of (any regulation of) a whole of regulations (tendency D) but also for the reason that [in (38)] ποιέων is the same with the verb of the preceding main clause (tendency B) and [in (39)] αἴτε ἐκ τελέων ἀποστέλλοι δικαίωρ πολιτειομένῳ καὶ κατ τὸν (νόμον) denotes one more presupposition of ἀσεβήτω πὸτ τὰρ ᾿Αθανάρ (tendency C) - in chapter 2.3 we saw that tendencies B, C and D are stronger than tendency Ab.
2.5 Some particular cases

In some cases the distribution pattern of present and aorist looks contrary to the tendencies that we mentioned.

In 40. (ca 450-425 B.C.)

Κ 44.19-20 [αὶ δὲ τις μανύῳ τινα ὄς] τὸ γράφος τὸγε καζα(λ)έμενον, γνο党校γ να - - καὶ ἐν τ’ἐπιάρῳ καὶ ἐνέχοιτο τὸ[ι τ]ἐδε γεγραμ(µ)ένοι (=if someone brings a charge against someone who violates this text, let the . . . decide about this and let the lawbreaker be held in the highest penalty)

the aoristic γνο党校αν is used, although the author refers to a generic event. Maybe in this case it is important that the reference to the event of the judgement goes with the reference to the event of punishment. Maybe with γνο党校αν the author refers to something with “close development”, since he refers not only to the event of the trial but also to its result. Generally, it seems that unites consisting of the reference to the trial and the reference to the imposing of the fines, trigger the use of aorist forms33. Let us recall (11), where there is also a connection between the reference to the fine and the use of aorist. Besides, if we take a look at the context where (40) occurs,

(40b)

vE-R I.51 ἀ Φράτρα τῶς Ἀναίτο[ς] καὶ τῶς Μεταπίος· φιλίαν πεντάκοντα Φέτεα· χ’ὀπόταροι μένπεδέοιαν, ἀπὸ τὸ βόμο ἀποΦελέοιαν κα τὶ προξένοι καὶ τὶ μάντιερ· αἱ τὸ[ν] ὄρχον παρβαύνοιαν, γνόμαν τὸρ il[a]θομάρο τ’Ὀλυμπία [=the covenant of the Anaitians and the Metapians: there shall be an alliance for 50 years. And if either party violates it, it shall be prevented by the proxenoi and the manteis from sharing in the sacrifices if they break the(ir) oath (to keep to the terms of the covenant), the priests in Olympia will decide on the case].

33 A similar pattern is also attested in Cretan [Jacobstahl (1907: 38-41), Wackernagel (1926: 174-175), Τσαλακίδης (2002a: 66, 82)].
we notice that in fact the same pattern is repeated. In other words, the previous [to (40)] sentence refers to the fine that will be imposed to whoever breaks the covenant. Thus, in effect, we have here the same pattern: trial and fine. So, in these two cases we can again see the importance of the text organisation, of the context (in a broader sense) where the verbal forms occur, always in combination with the pragmatic-semantic factor. The same pattern maybe appears in

41. (ca 500 B.C.)

K 39.2-5 αἱ δ’ ἀλλ/omikronβτρια ποιοῦτο, (πε)ν(τ)ακατίας καὶ δαρ/omikronχ/omikronῆς ἀποτίνοι 
κατὰ Φέκαστον θεθημόν, ὅτι ἀδίκος ἔχοι καὶ πο(τ)οῖτο, ἀδίκος γὰρ γν/omikronόμα 
δὲ χ’ ἐτ/omikronομᾶδ. τ(α) ἐτ/omikronὸν θεθτµ/omikronβν, /omikronλενιςβτι ἄδικ ἔκ/omikronὶ καὶ π/omikron(ι)/omikronῖτ/omikron, ἄδικ ἔκ/omikronὶ γν/omikronίμα 
δὲ κ’ εἴ/omikronτιρµά. τ(α) δὲ δίκαια δί/omikronψια (=if he appropriates things that 
do not belong to him, let him pay 500 drachmas for every violation, for 
everything that posseses and appropriates contrary to the law. let the priest 
decide the case and the fine will be the double).

However, instead of an aoristic form, the author uses the phrase γνόμα εἴ ὑπὸ τιρµά, which, although it contains a present form, is maybe equivalent to an aoristic form because of γνόμα (=“decision”. a decision is an achievement and in 
that way is more similar to event with closed development).

In

42. (ca 500 B.C.)

vE-R I.52.2 συν/omikronψια χ’ ἐκατ/omikronβέν ἀρ/omikronὶ δέ κα τ/omikronί (=there shall be 
an alliance for 100 years, beginning with the present year), 
we are only seemingly dealing with an event with closed development, an 
alliance with a certain duration (ἐκατόν Φέτεα), because the phrase ἐκατόν 
Φέτεα actually means “for ever”, since a century’s alliance was regarded as 
practically unlimited. See also that its starting point is not precisely dated.35

34 Virgilio (1972: 73-74) notices that logically the last conditional sentence 
should precede the third colon, because, before imposing a fine, someone 
should decide that there is a violation of the covenant.

Thus, in effect, we have to do with something that will never end, with something whose development is open.

2.6 Some exemptions

In 43. (ca 500 B.C.)

\[ \begin{align*} 
\text{K 41} & \quad \kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \alpha \rho \omega \zeta \varepsilon \iota \varepsilon \alpha \iota \delta \varepsilon \beta \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \iota \nu \tau \alpha \rho \theta \omega \iota \varepsilon \iota, \quad \beta \omega \iota \kappa \alpha \theta \delta \alpha \delta \omega \iota \kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \alpha \rho \omega \iota \tau \iota \varepsilon \iota, \quad \kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \alpha \rho \omega \iota \tau \iota \varepsilon, \quad \kappa \alpha \theta \varepsilon \alpha \rho \omega \iota \tau \iota \varepsilon, \\
\text{\quad (=he should be thearos if he (someone previously mentioned) commits fornication in the sacred precinct, one shall make him expiate it by the sacrifice of an ox and by complete purification, and the thearos in the same way)}
\end{align*} \]

the Present \( \beta \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \iota \) occurs in protasis, although rule Ab1 should apply, since in apodosis only the consequences of a violation of the law are mentioned.

In 44. (244-219 B.C.)

\[ \text{IPArk 25.9} \quad \alpha \delta \acute{i} \kappa \alpha \hat{\alpha} \tau \varepsilon \lambda \mathrm{\ddot{i}} \theta \acute{\rho} \acute{\varepsilon} \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \omega \ldots \ldots \] (\( = \)the judgment shall be void).

A present form is used, although we have to do with the judgment or trial about a certain lawbreaking and not anyone.\(^\text{36}\)

3. Conclusion

What we sought to show or to even partially describe in the present paper, is some of the various factors that in a pragmatic-semantic and in syntactic-contextual level play a role in determining the choice between present and aorist forms. We saw that we could correlate the aspectual categories denoted by the verbal forms with their function concerning the above mentioned factors. It is important that in the syntactic-contextual level and

\(^{36}\) Concerning \( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \chi \rho \alpha \alpha \acute{\alpha} \acute{\sigma} \tau \omicron \omega \) in IPArk 25.11, if it is a present form, then it could be one more exemption to what we have said. But maybe we could examine the case that this form is an aoristic one \( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \chi \rho \alpha \alpha \acute{\alpha} \acute{\sigma} \tau \omicron \omega < \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \chi \rho \alpha \alpha \acute{\alpha} \acute{\sigma} \acute{\sigma} \acute{\sigma} \acute{\sigma} \omicron \omega \) with loss of intervocalic \( \sigma \) referring to a non habitual event.
concerning the conditional sentences (especially their protasis) we can talk about stronger and weaker tendencies (or contexts) and we can even do so with such a regularity that we can achieve almost absolute predictability concerning the distribution pattern of present and aorist forms in protasis\(^{37}\). This is particularly important, because in that way, we can reduce the cases where, in order to explain the occurrence of present and aorist forms in similar contexts, we must attribute it to the neutralisation of the distinction between Present and Aorist.

\(^{37}\) Of course, the fact that we are referring especially to possible relationships between aspectual functions and interclausal relationships, does not mean that we underestimate the importance of the semantic-pragmatic factor [for example it is undisputable that in (17) the legislator, by using the present form ποιέω in protasis, refers generically to the case that a Skillountine revolts]. However, we believe that, since every form carries meanings in the certain context it every time occurs, the examination of the interclausal relationships could be a very useful tool for comprehending aspectual usage more clearly, for better understanding why, for example, in cases like (18), where also protasis refers generically to an event, an aoristic form (ἀδελτώσαμε) - and not a present one - is preferred. In cases like this, we think that the contextual factor (always in combination with the semantic-pragmatic one) is very important.
Appendix
Statistical data

Table 1: Forms examined in this paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>preserved</th>
<th>restored</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above verbal forms belong to 70 paradigms. For 9 of them both present and aorist forms are attested in Elean. In total we examined 30 present forms belonging to paradigms for which both present and aorist forms are attested, and 13 aoristic ones.

Number of forms examined concerning main clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>preserved</th>
<th>restored</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of forms examined concerning conditional clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>preserved</th>
<th>restored</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of forms examined concerning tendency A (reformulated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>preserved</th>
<th>restored</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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