UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek. A study in Polysemy

Allan, R.J.

Publication date
2002

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Allan, R. J. (2002). *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek. A study in Polysemy*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:17 Nov 2026

CHAPTER 4

The Middle and Passive Voices in the Future Stem

4.0 Introduction

The co-existence of middle and passive forms in the future stem has been an issue among classical linguists ever since the 18th century. The controversy focuses on the question of whether or not a semantic distinction between the two exists, and, if so, what exactly the character of this distinction might be.[314] One of the most important hypotheses claims that the formal contrast between middle and passive in the future stem corresponds with the contrast between present stem and aorist stem. The most prominent advocate of this theory was Friedrich Blass (1892), but before his time it had already been defended by G. Hermann and G. Stallbaum. The hypothesis amounts to the following: the middle future expresses a continuing action (*Aktion der Dauer*, as Blass (1892: 290) calls it), whereas the passive future expresses a completed event (*Aktion der Vollendung*). To demonstrate this distinction, Blass takes the pair φανοῦμαι : φανήσομαι (by far the most frequent middle-passive future forms). As illustrative examples he cites (among others):

(1) (...) αἷς [= ταῖς συνθήκαις] ὁ μὲν Λεύκων ἐμμένων **φανεῖται** (Dem. 20.37)
And it will be clear (time and again) that Leucon observes them [the covenants].
(man wird sehen, daß L. stets dem Vertrag treu bleibt [transl. Wackernagel 1920: 202])

(2) [Leucon] (...) οὗτος, ἂν σκοπῆτε, **φανήσεται** συνεχῶς ἡμᾶς εὖ ποιῶν (Dem. 20.30)
(...) he will be found, if you will consider it, to be a perpetual benefactor.
(wenn ihr genau seht, wird sich herausstellen dass er euch gutes erweist [transl. Wackernagel 1920: 202])

According to Blass, the first example involves a continuing appearance ("Dauernden Anschein"). The pillars are mentioned that declare the covenant between Athens and Leucon. The idea is that as long as these pillars remain, it will be clear whether each one of the parties keeps the covenant (Blass 1892: 269). The second example denotes a punctual event. While one is considering the matter (present stem σκοπῆτε), it will become clear at once (cf. Blass: "Ergebnis der Prüfung"). The semantic contrast between middle and passive future is further illustrated by the classic example from Plato's *Republic*:

---

[314] Another interesting issue is the occurrence of middle future forms of - mostly intransitive - active presents (εἰμί - ἔσομαι). From a synchronical point of view, the middle inflection of these futures can be explained by their semantics. All verbs in question involve a physical or mental affectedness of the subject, e.g. *perception* ἀκούσομαι, *motion* βήσομαι, *receiving* λήψομαι, *change of state* θανοῦμαι. Ἔσομαι appears to be the only exception. Historically, these middle futures may be explained as former desideratives. The middle voice, then, expressed the mental involvement of the subject. For further details, I refer to Rijksbaron (2002: 156).

(3) (...) ὁ δίκαιος **μαστιγώσεται, στρεβλώσεται, δεδήσεται, ἐκκαυθήσεται τὠφθαλμώ, τελευτῶν πάντα κακὰ παθὼν ἀνασχινδυλευθήσεται** (...) (Pl. *R.* 361e).

(...) a just person will be whipped, stretched on a rack, chained, blinded with fire, and, at the end, when he has suffered every kind of evil, he'll be impaled (...).[315]

Here the alternation of middles and passives is explained by Blass as follows: the former two actions (μαστιγώσεται, στρεβλώσεται) are necessarily repeated, whereas the latter two (ἐκκαυθήσεται, ἀνασχινδυλευθήσεται) can only be performed once (Blass 1892: 273-4).

Besides the pair φανοῦμαι : φανήσομαι, Blass discusses almost all other futures with alternating middle and passive forms in defence of his aspectual approach. Finally, he comes to the conclusion that the schema of the verbal paradigm as it was printed in Kühner-Blass - for which he was co-responsible as reviser of the first volume - must be altered. The essence of the alteration is that the future is not treated as a distinct stem on a par with the present stem, aorist stem and perfect stem. Instead, it is partly subsumed under the present stem, partly under the aorist stem, and partly under the perfect stem. In other words, middle future ποιήσομαι is considered the future form corresponding with present ποιοῦμαι and imperfect ἐποιούμην; ποιηθήσομαι is the future of the aorist stem (cf. ἐποιήθην); πεποιήσομαι is the future of the passive perfect πεποίημαι and the pluperfect ἐπεποιήμην (Blass 1892: 290).

Blass' aspectual hypothesis is adopted by Gerth, who formulates it thus:

(4) "(...) dass das auf dem passiven Aorist auf -ην, -θην gebildete Futur auf -ήσομαι, -θήσομαι die zukünftige Handlung in aoristischem Sinne also momentan, eintretend, einmalig bezeichnet, dagegen das an dem Präsensstamm sich anschliessende Futur auf -σομαι in präsentischem Sinne als dauernd, sich entwickelnd, sich wiederholend" (K-G, I: 114).

In his *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, Wackernagel (1920: 202-4) qualifies the aspect-hypothesis in some respects. He argues that φανοῦμαι can also be used in an ingressive-aoristic meaning, and φανήσομαι also in a durative meaning.[316] In alliance with Stahl (1907) he states that the "treibende Moment" behind the creation of the morphological distinction middle vs. passive future is the need for specific (semantically unambiguous) middle and passive forms. The aspectual distinction, according to Wackernagel, could have played a secondary role in the development of the distinction. In the process of the development of the passive future form, Wackernagel distinguishes four stages (1920: 203).

[315] The translations of Plato in this chapter are derived, sometimes adjusted, from Cooper (1997).

[316] *Ingressive-aoristic* and *durative* are Wackernagel's terms. These correspond with the current terms *perfective* and *imperfective*, respectively.

Stage (i): The formation φανήσομαι did not yet exist. Φανοῦμαι could be used both with a durative aspect and an aoristic aspect.

Stage (ii): Beside the older form φανοῦμαι, expressing both aspects[317], φανήσομαι is created, which specifically expresses aoristic aspect.

Stage (iii): The aspectual contrast between the two forms fades away. Φανήσομαι is used increasingly to express durative aspect as well.

Stage (iv): The middle future is no longer used in an intransitive or passive meaning.

In sum, according to Wackernagel the aspectual distinction only existed in stage (ii). Moreover, according to Wackernagel, this distinction was not complete since the middle future form could be used in both meanings.[318] Or, to put it in somewhat anachronistic terms, the middle future is the unmarked member in a privative opposition. This stage lasted, according to Wackernagel, from Homer until the 5th century BC.

Now let us consider the state of affairs in Homer. In Homer, only two verbs have a passive future formation: δαήσεαι en μιγήσεσθαι. Both future formations appear to express ingressive meaning, and can therefore be regarded as futures of the aorist stem:

(5) a. ὅσσα δ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισι καθήμενος ἠμετέροισι
πεύθομαι, ἢ θέμις ἐστί, **δαήσεαι**, οὐδέ σε κεύσω (γ 187)
But what tidings I have heard as I abide in our halls you shall hear, as is right, nor will I hide it for you.
b. πῶς γὰρ ἐμεῦ σύ, ξεῖνε, **δαήσεαι**, εἰ (...) (τ 325)
For how shall you learn of me, stranger, whether (...).
c. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τάχ' ἔμελλε **μιγήσεσθαι** φυλάκεσσι (K 365)[319]
But when he was going to mingle with the sentinels (...).

However, the middle future, too, could express ingressive meaning. Consider the following example:

(6) ὣς Ὀδυσεὺς κούρῃσιν εὐπλοκάμοισιν ἔμελλε
μίξεσθαι, γυμνός περ ἐών (ζ 136)
Even so Odysseus was going to mingle with the fair-tressed maidens, naked though he was.

Further, the middle form μίξομαι could also be used in an iterative sense (i.e. 'presentic').

(7) θυμὸς δ' ἔτι νῶιν ἐώλπει
μίξεσθαι ξενίῃ ἠδ' ἀγλαὰ δῶρα διδώσειν (ω 314)
And our hearts hoped that we should yet meet as host and guest and give one another glorious gifts.

Notice the coordination with the anomalous future of the present stem διδώσειν. It can be concluded that, as Wackernagel claimed, the middle future is aspectually neutral in

---

[317] The one instance in Homer seems to confirm this: ἔνθεν γάρ μιν ἐδέγμην πρῶτα φανεῖσθαι/ Σκύλλην (μ 230) ('For from there I expected that Scylla would first appear'); φανοῦμαι here is used with an ingressive ('aoristic') meaning.

[318] Wackernagel summarizes it thus: "Also nur bei φανήσεται und nur ganz vorübergehend, bei den ersten, die die Form brauchten, ist eine Spezialbedeutung nachweisbar: darauf reduziert sich in diesem Fall Blassens Theorie" (Wackernagel 1920: 203).

[319] Note that Iliad K (the Doloneia) might be an interpolated episode.

Homer. Note that, from a morphological point of view, the middle formation μίξομαι is also neutral since it neither possesses the present morpheme -σγ- (< *-γ-σκ-), nor the passive aorist morpheme -η-.[320]

Wackernagel states that the distinction was already fading away in Plato (stage iii). To support this claim he cites the following instances:

(8) ἀλλ' ἐγὼ διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου δημοσίᾳ τε εἴ πού τι ἔπραξα τοιοῦτος **φανοῦμαι**, καὶ ἰδίᾳ ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος (...) (Pl. *Ap.* 33a)
Throughout my life, in any public activity I may have engaged in, I will be found to be the same man as I am in private life (...).

(9) a. ἢ τοῦτο μὲν οὔ, αὐτοῦ δὲ τρεφόμενοι σοῦ ζῶντος βέλτιον **θρέψονται** καὶ **παιδεύσονται**, μὴ ξυνόντος σοῦ αὐτοῖς (Pl. *Cri.* 54a)
Or perhaps you will not do that, but if they are brought up here while you are living, will they be better brought up and educated if you are not with them?
b. **θρέψονται** δὲ δὴ ἡμῖν οὗτοι καὶ **παιδευθήσονται** τίνα τρόπον; (Pl. *R.* 376c)
How will they be brought up and educated by us?

Wackernagel paraphrases example (8) by "es wird sich an mir herausstellen", thus interpreting it as ingressive. However, a perfect alternative would be to interpret φανοῦμαι as an event taking place repeatedly, i.e, "each time, I will be found to be, etc.". As for the latter instances, in (9a) θρέψονται corresponds with the present participle τρεφόμενοι. In other words, both θρέψονται and παιδεύσομαι designate non-completed events. As for (9b), it is conceivable that θρέψονται relates to growing up as an ongoing process, while παιδευθήσονται relates to the completion of the education.[321] In sum, it is possible that the aspectual distinction was still present in the 4th century. In the next section (4.1), I will argue that it did indeed exist.

First I would like to note that the aspect hypothesis was not accepted by everyone however. Stahl (1907: 83-7) rejects it, and advocates a diathetical distinction instead: "Daß es sich bei den Futura dieser Art eher um ein Vorwiegen passiver oder medialer Bedeutung als um eine Zeitart handelt, zeigt sich auch bei ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι" (Stahl 1907: 85).[322] Stahl renders passive ἀπαλλαγήσεσθαι with 'befreit werden, etwas los werden' (as examples he cites Hdt. 2.120.3, Th. 4.28.5, Pl. *R.* 445b, Dem. 22.37), and middle ἀπαλλάξεσθαι with 'loskommen, sich einer Sache erledigen' (Th. 4.128.5, 8.2.1, Pl. *Euthphr.* 15e, *R.* 465d). In other words, middle ἀπαλλάξομαι is volitional, whereas

[320] In Homer, we also find a contrast between the active future forms ἕξω and σχήσω. The former corresponds with the present stem ἐχ-, and means, according to Chantraine (1958: 446) 'avoir, garder' (e.g. P 232, Σ 274, ζ 281). The latter corresponds with the aorist stem σχ-, and means 'arrêter, contenir, suspendre' (e.f. Λ 820, N 151, Ξ 100, P 182, Ω 670, χ 70, 248).

[321] In connection with this example, Kühner-Gerth (I: 117n2) plead in defense of the aspect theory: "Wenn in einzelnen Fällen, z. B. Pl. civ. 376, c θρέψονται καὶ παιδευθήσονται der Bedeutungsunterschied der beiden Futura nicht klar zu Tage tritt, so ist zu bedenken, dass auch die entsprechenden Tempora der Vergangenheit, Imperfekt und Aorist, mannigfache zweifelhafte Grenzfälle aufzuweisen haben."

[322] Magnien (1912: 279-80), in his monograph on the Greek future, allies with Stahl. For a rejection of Blass' hypothesis, see also Hartmann (1935).

passive ἀπαλλαγήσομαι is non-volitional. I will return to Stahl's view at the end of this chapter.

According to Schwyzer-Debrunner (II: 265-6), the outcome of the debate seems to be beyond any doubt. They consider the aspectual hypothesis untenable.[323] Amongst others, Wackernagel and Chantraine are mentioned as adversaries of the aspect hypothesis. However, as we have seen above, Wackernagel has a finely tuned judgement on the matter. Chantraine, too, takes an intermediate position (1928: 13-4). Chantraine admits that the passages cited by Blass are not very convincing, but he concludes, "(...) Demosthène n'emploie pas φανοῦμαι et φανήσομαι sans nuance de sens. (...) φανήσομαι indique un résultat obtenu, une conclusion qui apparaît après examen." Schwyzer-Debrunner do not do justice to this intermediate position. Instead, they adduce alternative factors that may explain the choice between the middle and passive future form as, for example, the length of the verb stem (following, in this respect, Wackernagel, who mentions it as a secondary factor), and word rhythm (following Hartmann 1935: 128). Schwyzer-Debrunner do not refer to a diathetical distinction between the two future forms. Could it be that Schwyzer-Debrunner tacitly presuppose the validity of this explanation, and that they use the length of the stem and word rhythm only as secondary explanations? In any event, Schwyzer-Debrunner's treatment of the matter is highly unsatisfactory. When we overlook the battlefield, an analogy with the battle for Thyrea, as described by Herodotus, forces itself onto us. Like Alcenor and Chromios, Schwyzer-Debrunner claim victory prematurely. The aspectual hypothesis has been rejected before it has been refuted adequately.

Before going into the aspect hypothesis any further, I would like to make some remarks on the morphological aspect of the hypothesis. It is obvious that the passive future form is connected to the passive aorist form since both are formed with a stem in —(θ)η—. Conversely, the morphological relationship between the middle future and the present stem is tenuous. With regard to a large number of verbs, the present and the future stems are different. For example, φαίνομαι contains the stem φαιν- (< *φαν-γε/o-), whereas future φανοῦμαι is formed with the stem φαν(ε)- (< *φανε-σε/o-). This difference in stem form applies to almost all original yod-presents (i.e. also to verbs in -άζω en -ίζω). A difference in stem form is also found with most reduplicated presents (δίδωμι, τίθημι)[324], nasal presents (δείκνυμι, λαμβάνω, τέμνω), presents in -σκ- (εὑρίσκω), and suppletive verbs (ὁράω vs. ὄψομαι). In other words, it is not self-evident to assume a connection between the future middle and the present. It is impossible to determine whether the future stem is derived from the present stem or from the verbal root for thematic presents such as παιδεύω (without yod, -σκ-, etc.) only, because the two are identical.[325]

---

[323] Cf. also Moorhouse (1982: 176-7), who denies the existence of an aspectual distinction in Sophocles.

[324] Interestingly, in Homer the future formation διδώσομεν (ν 358), διδώσειν (ω 314) occurs (see also example (7)), formed on the present stem of δίδωμι. This future form has an iterative ('presentic') meaning. The formation can be regarded as a parallel to the future that is based on the aorist stem, cf. δαήσεαι (γ 187, τ 325), μιγήσεσθαι (Κ 365). The future of the present stem probably vanished, contrary to the thriving 'aorist' future, because it could only yield morphologically transparent forms with few present types (namely the reduplicated present, and potentially also the nasal present).

[325] From a synchronical point of view, the future morpheme -σε/o- is both related to the present morpheme -ε/o- and to the aorist morpheme -σ(α)-.

With respect to the morphological relationship between the future stem and the present and aorist stems one can take two alternative positions: (1) It can be assumed that the middle future has specialized to a 'presentic' meaning under the influence of the semantic opposition with the 'aoristic' passive future, or (2) one might assume a privative opposition. In other words, the middle future is semantically neutral, whereas the passive future is semantically marked with a feature + *perfective*. This is approximately Wackernagel's (1920) view, as we have seen above. Notice that this semantic analysis is reflected in the morphological system in a very natural fashion. The semantically neutral φανοῦμαι is neither formed with the present stem φαιν-, nor with the aorist stems φηνα- (active and middle) or φανη- (passive), but, instead, it contains a separate stem φαν(ε)-. Conversely, the 'aoristic' future φανήσομαι contains the aorist stem φανη-.

In the next section, the oppositional pair φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι will be discussed, and it will be investigated if they, as Blass contends, express an aspectual contrast. In section 4.2, the question will be raised whether this aspectual contrast also occurs with other verbs. Finally, in section 4.3 I will argue that Stahl was not entirely incorrect in his claim that the middle and passive future form expressed middle and passive meaning.

4.1 Aspect Revisited: the case of φανοῦμαι vs. φανήσομαι

The aim of this section will be to revive Blass' aspectual hypothesis. Following Blass, I will start my investigation with the most frequent pair of middle and passive future forms, these being φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι.

An interesting feature of φαίνομαι is that there appears to be a correlation between tense stem (present - aorist) and syntactic complement (infinitive - participle). This correlation is shown in the following Table 1. The instances of the 3rd person singular secondary indicative (i.e. ἐφαίνετο and ἐφάνη) were counted in Sophocles, Euripides, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Plato.

Table 1: Ἐφαίνετο *and* ἐφάνη*: frequency figures of constructions*

	+ inf.	+ part.	ellipsis/abs.	total	+ dat.[326]
ἐφαίνετο	22 (28.2%)	10 (12.8%)	46 (59.0%)	78 (100%)	34 (43.6%)
ἐφάνη	3 (2.7%)	28 (24.8%)	81 (72.6%)	113 (100%)	22 (19.5%)

It is clear from the figures in the table that the imperfect form ἐφαίνετο is construed more frequently with an infinitive complement, whereas ἐφάνη prefers the construction with the participle. This distribution can be explained by the semantics of the two alternative constructions. The construction with infinitive involves a subjective view. The state of affairs denoted by the infinitive *seems* to be true to (a) particular person(s), whereas the speaker is not certain about its truth. In other words, the state of affairs expressed by the infinitive is non-factive. For our present purposes, it is important to note that this subjecti-

[326] The dative complements occurring with *all* constructions are counted: infinitive, participle, ellipsis and absolute.

ve view ('seem to') is inherently stative. The construction with a participle-complement, on the other hand, involves an objective view. The state of affairs expressed by the participle is considered to be true by the speaker (factive value).[327] Additionally, the difference with the former construction is that a change is involved: φαίνομαι construed with a participle refers typically to the moment at which a particular state of affairs is recognized as being objectively true. Since the construction with a participle ('be found out to') involves a change of state, it inherently has a telic aspect.

The objective versus subjective contrast also has consequences for the frequency of a dative constituent. Dative constitutents occur more often with the infinitive construction since, in general, it is of more importance who is the particular holder of the subjective view (e.g. *When I was younger, the world seemed to me a happy place*). The subject of an objective view is more often generic or easily understood on the basis of the context (e.g. *Oedipus turned out to be his wife's son*).

This difference in inherent aspect between the two constructions explains the different frequencies of present and aorist stem. Telic φαίνομαι cum participle tends to occur in the aorist stem, whereas stative (atelic) φαίνομαι with an infinitive prefers the present stem. Now, consider the following table:

Table 2: Φανοῦμαι *and* φανήσομαι*: frequency figures of constructions*

	+ inf.	+ part.	ell/ abs.[328]	total	+ dat.
φανοῦμαι	2 (2.7%)	9 (12.3%)	62 (84.9%)	73 (100%)	16 (21.9%)
φανήσομαι	0 (0%)	8 (21.6%)	29 (78.4%)	37 (100%)	5 (13.5%)

In the table above I have collected all instances of middle and passive futures occurring in the same authors as those of the previous table. A notable difference between the figures of the two tables is the lower frequency of the construction with an infinitive. From this we may infer that it is generally more relevant for something *to be found* to be the truth at some time in the future, than that something will *seem* to be so. There are, however, also some important similarities between the two tables. First, φανοῦμαι occurs more often with the infinitive construction than φανήσομαι does (2.7% vs. 0%), although, obviously, these low numbers do not provide definite proof. Second, φανήσομαι more often occurs with the participle-construction than φανοῦμαι does. The percentages, furthermore, are very similar to those of ἐφαίνετο and ἐφάνην: 12.3% vs. 12.8%, and 21.6% vs. 25.0%. The third and final similarity is that dative constituents occur more often with φανοῦμαι than with φανήσομαι (likewise ἐφαίνετο vs. ἐφάνη). These three similarities suggest that φανοῦμαι corresponds with ἐφαίνετο, whereas φανήσομαι corresponds with ἐφάνη.

---

[327] For an analysis of the factive and non-factive values of the respective constructions with participles and infinitives, see Rijksbaron (1986).

[328] When no predicative noun is present, it is hard to distinguish the auxiliary φαίνομαι with ellipsis of the participle or the infinitive from the non-auxiliary usage of φαίνομαι ('become visible'). When the subject is a concrete noun, an interpretation 'become visible, appear' is more likely. In the case of an impersonal subject, ellipsis of participle or infinitive is the more probable interpretation ('it appears that'). The cases with an abstract noun are highly ambiguous, e.g. E. *Ion* 1063 ἐλπίς (*Hope will appear* vs. *There will appear to be hope*), Th. 3.20.1 σωτηρία. The same holds for metaphorically used nouns, e.g. Hdt. 3.156.2 πόρος.

In the following section I will corroborate the evidence provided by these figures by an examination of a number of passages, taken from Sophocles, Euripides and Plato. No orators were chosen because, as will be shown below, they have an overwhelming preference for the passive future. Apparently, the passive future form was selected by them in a more or less routinized manner. This can be considered an indication that, at least in oratorical prose, the semantic contrast between the middle and the passive future was already fading away in the 4th century.

Let us first consider some typical instances of φανήσομαι in the meaning 'be found, turn out'. Oedipus will be found out to be a born Theban and, moreover, the brother of his own children.

(10) εἶτα δ' ἐγγενὴς
φανήσεται Θηβαῖος (S. *OT* 453)
But later he will turn out to be a native Theban (...).

(11) **φανήσεται** δὲ παισὶ τοῖς αὑτοῦ ξυνὼν
ἀδελφὸς αὐτὸς καὶ πατήρ (S. *OT* 457)
And he will turn out to live together with his own children, as both a brother and a father (...).

In Plato, φανήσομαι is often used in anticipation of the conclusion of an argument. In *Lg.* 892c, for example, the Athenian anticipates the final conclusion that the soul is one of the first creations. As an intermediate step in the argument it must be proven that the soul is older than matter (σῶμα). This is the starting-point of the investigation.

(3) ΑΘ. (...) εἰ δὲ **φανήσεται** ψυχὴ πρῶτον, οὐ πῦρ οὐδὲ ἀήρ, ψυχὴ δ' ἐν πρώτοις γεγενημένη, σχεδὸν ὀρθότατα λέγοιτ' ἂν εἶναι διαφερόντως φύσει. Ταῦτ' ἔσθ' οὕτως ἔχοντα, ἂν ψυχήν τις ἐπιδείξῃ πρεσβυτέραν οὖσαν σώματος, ἄλλως δὲ οὐδαμῶς.
ΚΛ. Ἀληθέστατα λέγεις.
ΑΘ. Οὐκοῦν τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπ' αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο στελλώμεθα; (Pl. *Lg.* 892c)
ATHENIAN: If it will be found that soul came first, not fire or air, and it was one of the first things to be created, it will be quite correct to say that soul is preeminently natural. This is true provided you can demonstrate that soul is older than matter, but not otherwise.
CLINIAS: Very true
ATHENIAN: So this is precisely the point we have to tackle next?

Eventually, in 896b Clinias concludes that the soul is indeed the oldest thing there is.

Besides the construction, the semantic property of *iterativity* or *genericity* is relevant to the distribution of the future forms at issue. Iterativity and genericity may be indicated by the nature of the subject of the clause. In Sophocles, Euripides and Plato, there are 6 instances of φανοῦμαι with a clausal subject which point to an iterative or generic interpretation, these being ὅστις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ χρηστός (S. *Ant.* 662), πάντα ἄνδρα (Pl. *Lg.* 738e), τίς ἕκαστος (Pl. *R.* 537b), ὅσοι ... πάντες (Pl. *Tht.* 206e), πάντα (Pl. *Chrm.* 172b), and ἄλλα μυρία (Pl. *Sph.* 245e). Significantly, no subjects of this type were found in combination with the passive form φανήσομαι. In two cases (*Lg.* 738e, *Chrm.* 172b), φανοῦμαι has the subjective meaning 'seem'; the three other instances involve φαίνομαι in the objective meaning 'turn out, be found'. For example,

(12) ἐν τοῖς γὰρ οἰκείοισιν ὅστις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ
χρηστός, **φανεῖται** κἀν πόλει δίκαιος ὤν (S. *Ant.* 662)
The man who acts rightly in family matters will be seen to be righteous in the city also.

(13) καὶ οὕτως ὅσοι τι ὀρθὸν δοξάζουσι, πάντες αὐτὸ μετὰ λόγου **φανοῦνται** ἔχοντες (...) (Pl. *Tht.* 206e)
And that being so, anyone at all who makes a correct judgement will turn out to have it 'together with an account' (...).

As was mentioned aboved, in general, φαίνομαι construed with a participle ('be found out') tends to have a passive future φανήσομαι. In these generic contexts, however, φανοῦμαι is found. We may conclude that the 'presentic' future φανοῦμαι can also be used to express the meaning 'will be repeatedly/always found out' (*objective* plus *iterative/generic* meaning).

Other indications of iterativity or genericity are the use of particular adverbs or the occurrence of a negation. In our corpus, φανοῦμαι occurs 4 times accompanied by an adverb with iterative or generic value. These are ἀεί [2x] (Pl. *R.* 591d, *Lg.* 871a), ἑκάστοτε (Pl. *Lg.* 689e), and τοτὲ μέν ... τοτὲ δέ (Pl. *Lg.* 860b). The former three cases involve the objective φαίνομαι 'turn out, be found'.[329] For example,

(14) ὁ γὰρ νόμος ἀπαγορεύει καὶ ἀπαγορεύων ὑπὲρ πάσης τῆς πόλεως ἀεὶ φαίνεται καὶ **φανεῖται** (Pl. *Lg.* 871a)
The reason is that the law itself makes the proclamation, and it is always seen to make a proclamation on behalf of the state, and it will always be.

Once again, even though we are dealing with the objective meaning of φαίνομαι (cf. part. ἀπαγορεύων), we find the future form φανεῖται due to its iterative/generic meaning (ἀεί). Notice also the correspondence with the present φαίνεται.

A typical kind of generic expression are γνῶμαι. The following one is from Heraclitus, quoted by Plato:

(15) ἀνθρώπων ὁ σοφώτατος πρὸς θεὸν πίθηκος **φανεῖται** καὶ σοφίᾳ καὶ κάλλει καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσιν (Pl. *Hi. Ma.* 289b)
The wisest of men will be seen to be a monkey compared to god in wisdom and fineness and everything else.

Here too, it can be seen that the 'presentic' future form occurs with a generic value.[330]

There appears to be a tendency for negations to occur with φανοῦμαι, rather than with φανήσομαι. Of all the instances with a negation, 13 occur with φανοῦμαι, whereas 4

[329] These kind of adverbs are not found in combination with φανήσομαι. The occurrence in the *Republic* (591d) will be discussed below.

[330] For use of the future tense in gnomic expressions, see Magnien (1912: 169-70). One of his examples corroborates our point: μισῶ πολίτην ὅστις ὠφελεῖν πάτραν/ βραδὺς φανεῖται μεγάλα δὲ βλάπτειν ταχύς (Ar. *Ra.* 1427) ('I hate any citizens who will turn out to be slow to aid, and swift to hurt, his town'). There is, however, for φανεῖται a variant reading πέφυκε.

occur with φανήσομαι.[331] This tendency can be explained by the link between negation and iterativity.[332] Furthermore, in a number of instances of φανοῦμαι, the negation is combined with the adverb ποτέ, which reinforces the iterative or generic interpretation meaning (cf. its positive counterpart ἀεί).[333]

Φαίνομαι can also have the (original) concrete meaning 'become visible, appear' (without complement). Here, the 'aoristic' passive future form predominates. It occurs 8 times in our corpus; the middle future is used only twice. This can be explained by the inherent telic aspect of φαίνομαι in the meaning 'become visible, appear' (an accomplishment).[334] For example,[335]

(16) **φανήσομαι** γάρ (...)
δούλης ποδῶν πάροιθεν ἐν κλυδωνίῳ (E. *Hec.* 47)
I shall appear (...) in the sea swell before the feet of a slave girl.

(17) ἢ γάρ τις ἀροτὴρ ἥ τις οἰκέτις γυνὴ
φανήσεται νῷν (...) (E. *El.* 105)
Some farmer or slave woman will appear to us (...).

(18) καίτοι ἐγὼ ᾤμην ἐνταῦθά που **φανήσεσθαι** τὴν ἐπιστήμην, ἣν δὴ πάλαι ζητοῦμεν (Pl. *Euthd.* 289d)
And yet it was in this connection that I expected that the knowledge we have been seeking all this time would appear.

---

[331] The instances of φανοῦμαι with negation are the following: S. *OC* 51, 804; E. *Heracl.* 769, *Ph.* 1623 [μή], *Hipp.* 332; Pl. *Lg.* 738e [μή], 744a, 770d [μή], *Hi. Ma.* 289b, 291d [μή], *Prm.* 131d, 132a, *Alc.* 1 109a, *Sph.* 245b; φανήσομαι with negation: Pl. *R.* 479a, *Tht.* 190e [μή], *Sph.* 216b, *Mx.* 248a.

[332] The phenomenon that the presence of a negation may bring about an iterative interpretation has also been noted by Rijksbaron (1994²: 15). An illustrative example is: ἐὰν γὰρ τί σε φανῶ κακὸν πεποιηκώς, ὁμολογῶ ἀδικεῖν· ἐὰν μέντοι μηδὲν φαίνωμαι κακὸν πεποιηκὼς μηδὲ βουληθείς, οὐ καὶ σὺ αὖ ὁμολογήσεις μηδὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι; (Xen. *Cyr.* 5.5.13) ('If it will be found that I have done you harm, I confess that I am in the wrong; but if it turns out that I have done you no harm and I intended none, will you then on your part confess that you have suffered no wrong at my hands?'). The aorist φανῶ denotes a punctual event, whereas the present stem φαίνωμαι in combination with the negation (μηδὲν) denotes an iterative event ('it will turn out, time and again, that ...)

[333] These instances are: S. *OC* 804, E. *Heracl.* 769, Pl. *Lg.* 738e, *Hi. Ma.* 291d. There is, however, one exception: καὶ πέρας (...) οὐδὲν φανήσεταί ποτε (Pl. *Sph.* 261b) ('And no limit (...) will ever appear').

[334] As might be expected, φαίνομαι in the meaning 'become visible' occurs more frequently in the aorist stem than in the present stem. Of instances of the 3rd sg. *imperfect* ἐφαίνετο counted in Table 1, there were no cases with the meaning 'become visible', except when a negation was present. In this case, the clause often has an iterative interpretation (cf. Rijksbaron 1994: 15), for example, Hdt. 2.118.17, 3.156.11, e.a.; Th. 5.7.5, 8.8.4. Furthermore, it is significant that the compound ἀναφαίνομαι, which is mostly used in the concrete meaning 'become visible', shows a clear preference for the passive future form (see Blass 1892: 271).

[335] Other examples are E. *Supp.* 605, *Hipp.* 479, *Phaëth.* 275, Pl. *Plt.* 209b, *Sph.* 261b. Exceptions are: S. *El.* 1155, *Ph.* 1064.

To sum up the discussion so far, it is possible to schematize the main features of the distribution of φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι as follows:

Table 3: *Distribution of* φανοῦμαι *and* φανήσομαι

	abs./ + part. 'become visible, become clear'	+ inf. 'seem'
iterative/generic	φανοῦμαι	φανοῦμαι
non-iterative/generic	φανήσομαι	φανοῦμαι

In order to verify the conclusions stated above, I will now discuss, in more detail, the nine cases (I-X) of the middle and passive futures φανοῦμαι [4x] and φανήσομαι [5x] that occur in Plato's *Republic*. The first instance is:

(I) νῦν δέ γ', ἔφην, εἴπερ σοφία τε καὶ ἀρετή ἐστιν δικαιοσύνη, ῥᾳδίως οἶμαι **φανήσεται** καὶ ἰσχυρότερον ἀδικίας (...) (Pl. *R.* 351a)
But, now, if justice is indeed wisdom and virtue, it will easily be shown to be stronger than injustice (...).

The previous step in the argument is recapitulated in the εἰ-clause preceding the main clause. The future φανήσεται 'will be shown' introduces the issue that is to be dealt with next, which results finally in the conclusion in 352b: ὅτι μὲν γὰρ καὶ σοφώτεροι καὶ ἀμείνους καὶ δυνατώτεροι πράττειν οἱ δίκαιοι φαίνονται (...) ('Now that the just are found to be wiser and better and more capable of doing things (...)').

(II) Τούτων γὰρ δή, ὦ ἄριστε, φήσομεν, τῶν πολλῶν καλῶν μῶν τι ἔστιν ὃ οὐκ αἰσχρὸν **φανήσεται**; (...).
οὔκ, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη, ἔφη, καὶ καλά πως αὐτὰ καὶ αἰσχρὰ φανῆναι (...) (Pl. *R.* 479a)
SOCRATES: "My dear fellow", we'll say, "of all the many beautiful things, is there one that will not also be found to be ugly? (...)"
GLAUCON: There isn't one, for it is necessary that they are found to be beautiful in a way and also ugly in a way (...).

Socrates presupposes the truth of the idea that all beautiful things are, in a way, also ugly. On closer inspection, the beautiful things will indeed be found to be ugly. Thus, φανήσεται is used here in the objective sense 'be found'. Glaucon then confirms Socrates' μῶν-question. Note that the aorist φανῆναι in Glaucon's answer corresponds with the passive future in the question. It is worthy to note that the future tense is used here in a special sense. It does not refer to an event in the future. Rather, it appears to have a modal, or more specifically, an epistemic value (see Palmer 1986: 61-2). By using the future, the speaker asserts that the truth of the proposition at issue is the logical consequence of an hypothesis that has been accepted earlier in the discourse.[336] The future

[336] This special use of the future tense has noticed been observed by Magnien (1912, II: 168-169). For a recent discussion of this special future type, see Bakker (2002). This use of the future tense in Greek may be compared to the use of the auxiliary *will* in English as in *That'll be the postman.* According to Langacker,

tense, used thus, occurs quite frequently in Plato's dialogues (see also examples III, VII, and IX below).

(III) οὔτε γάρ που σκοτωδέστερα μὴ ὄντος πρὸς τὸ μᾶλλον μὴ εἶναι **φανήσεται**, οὔτε φανότερα ὄντος πρὸς τὸ μᾶλλον εἶναι (Pl. *R.* 479d)
Surely, they will not be found to *be* more than what is or *not be* more than what is not, for apparently nothing is darker than what is not, or clearer than what is.

It is appropriate, according to Socrates, to place the beautiful things (as well as other things) intermediate between being and not being (479c). To support this claim, he puts forward the argument that is cited here (οὔτε γάρ κτλ.) as he considers it a self-evident truth. Thus, φανήσεται can here be interpreted as 'be found' (objective meaning). As in example (II), the future tense is used with an epistemic value.

(IV) Λαβοῦ τοίνυν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ὅλου αὐτοῦ ὀρθῶς, καί σοι εὔδηλόν τε **φανεῖται** καὶ οὐκ ἄτοπα δόξει τὰ προειρημένα περὶ αὐτῶν (Pl. *R.* 491c)
If you correctly grasp the general point I'm after, it will be clear to you, and what I've said before won't seem so strange.

Socrates suggests that if Adimantus grasps the point wholly and in the right fashion the issue will indeed become clear (not: *seem* clear) to him. Φανεῖται is used here in the objective meaning. The question now is why the 'presentic' *middle* future occurs as, after all, we are not dealing with an iterative or generic meaning. I would suggest that the explanation may be found in the immediative meaning of φανεῖται.[337] The case will *immediately* become clear to Adimantus once he looks into it in the right manner. The first event is presented as a necessary condition for the realization of the second. The use of καί expresses the continuity between the two events (λαβοῦ AND φανεῖται 'grasp and it will be clear straight away'). A comparable turn is found at S. *OC* 51:

(19) σήμαινε, κοὐκ ἄτιμος ἔκ γ' ἐμοῦ **φανῇ** (S. *OC* 51)
Tell me what it is, and no refusal shall come from me.

---

there is difference between this use of *will* and the use of *must*. Whereas *must* conveys a sense of epistemic immediacy, *will* suggests a certain epistemic distance: "(...) *will* implies that confirmation requires a non-negligible expansion of present knowledge (so that new information might alter the prediction), wheras *must* (...) indicates that confirmation is regarded as virtually inevitable" (Langacker 1991a: 280). This semantic distinction explains the following judgments: (a) *They {will/*must} quite possibly be there now.*; (b) *Since you saw it with your own eyes, it {must/*will} exist.* This subtle distinction may also be detectable in our example (II). Socrates, by using the future, leaves open - or pretends to leave open - the possibility that his logical conclusion might be altered by new information or a new argument from Glaucon. In this way, he involves Glaucon in his argument. Glaucon, subsequently, confirms that Socrates' conclusion is inevitable by using the word ἀνάγκη.

[337] For a description of the immediative use of the present stem I refer to Ruijgh 1996: 535-95 (who uses the term *inceptive*), and Rijksbaron (2002[3]: 17f.).

Again, the middle future appears to have an immediative value.[338]

(V) καὶ ἅμα μία καὶ αὕτη τῶν βασάνων οὐκ ἐλαχίστη, τίς ἕκαστος ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις **φανεῖται** (Pl. *R.* 537b)
At the same time, this is also not the least of the tests, how each one of them turns out to be in this physical training.

Socrates is speaking about the nature of one of the tests by means of which future philosophers can be selected. Φανεῖται can be interpreted as iterative-distributive (cf. ἕκαστος).

(VI) Ἆρ' οὖν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ὃς ἂν φαίνηται πονηρότατος, καὶ ἀθλιώτατος **φανήσεται**; καὶ ὃς ἂν πλεῖστον χρόνον καὶ μάλιστα τυραννεύσῃ, μάλιστά τε καὶ πλεῖστον χρόνον τοιοῦτος γεγονὼς τῇ ἀληθείᾳ; (Pl. *R.* 576c)
Well, then, I said, won't the man who will be clearly most vicious, also turn out to be most wretched? And won't the one who for the longest time has been most of all a tyrant, turn out to be most wretched for the longest time?

With the predicative construction ἀθλιώτατος φανήσεται a participle can be understood - compare γεγονώς in the next sentence. As stated before, the objective meaning favours the use of the 'aoristic' passive future form. The present stem of φαίνηται in the relative clause can be interpreted as expressing a state ('will be clearly'), or, alternatively, as iterative ('time and again will be found to be'). The 'aoristic' value of φανήσεται expresses that, while the state of being vicious lasts (present stem φαίνηται), it will, at a certain point in time, become clear ('aoristic' φανήσεται) that he is also wretched.

(VII) (...) ἀλλ' ἀεὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ σώματι ἁρμονίαν τῆς ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἕνεκα συμφωνίας ἁρμοττόμενος **φανεῖται** (Pl. *R.* 591d)
Rather he will always be found to cultivate the harmony of his body for the sake of the consonance in his soul.

Φανεῖται can be interpreted generically (cf. ἀεί). Here, the issue is the appropriate way of living of ὁ νοῦν ἔχων - a generic subject.

(VIII/IX) Μὰ Δι', ἦ δ' ὅς, οὐκ ἄρα πάνδεινον **φανεῖται** ἡ ἀδικία, εἰ θανάσιμον ἔσται τῷ λαμβάνοντι· ἀπαλλαγὴ γὰρ ἂν εἴη κακῶν· ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον οἶμαι αὐτὴν **φανήσεσθαι** πᾶν τοὐναντίον τοὺς ἄλλους ἀποκτεινῦσαν (...) (Pl. *R.* 610d)
By god, if injustice were actually fatal to those who contracted it, it wouldn't seem so terrible, for it would be an escape from their troubles. But I rather think that it will be found to be quite the opposite, something that kills other people (...).

---

[338] Another example of the immediative use (cf. αὐτίκα) of the middle future φανοῦμαι is εἴτε καταλείψομέν τινας ἡμῶν αὐτῶν φύλακας ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐφ' ἡμῖν γιγνομένοις, αὐτίκα οὐδεμίαν ἰσχὺν ἔχοντες ἀναφανούμεθα (Xen. *Cyr.* 4.5.15). ('and if we leave some of our own men to guard what falls into our possession, it will immediately be found out that we have no strength'). Although the verb has the objective meaning 'be found' (cf. the participle) the middle future form is used with an immediative value.

In this passage, the semantic contrast between φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι becomes especially clear. Socrates postulates, for the sake of the argument, that injustice is as deadly to unjust people as a disease (610c). Glaucon's exclamation μὰ Δι' ... οὐκ ἄρα πάνδεινον φανεῖται ἡ ἀδικία is the surprising (ἄρα) conclusion that would have to be drawn[339], if indeed it were the case that injustice is fatal to those who contract it. Note that the future tense in the protasis (ἔσται) appears to convey Glaucon's scepticism regarding the truth of the condition. In fact, according to Glaucon, the opposite is true (φανήσεσθαι πᾶν τοὐναντίον).[340] The subjective view ('injustice *seems* not so terrible') and the objective view ('the opposite, however, is true') are also contrasted by the use of ἀλλά.

I would like to discuss one final issue here. As was set forth in section 4.0, Wackernagel maintained that the aspectual distinction existed during a particular stage in the history of Greek. This stage lasted from Homer to the 5th century. We have seen above that, in Homer, the semantically neutral middle future could express both aspects. In this section, it was argued that, in Sophocles, Euripides and Plato, φανοῦμαι had an imperfective value, whereas φανήσομαι had a perfective ('aoristic') value. As the aspectual distinction can also be found in Plato, Wackernagel's boundary cannot be entirely correct. The question is now whether or not we can determine more precisely in which classical authors the aspectual distinction can be found. A glance at the frequency with which the two future forms occur in a larger corpus might be enlightening.

Table 4: Φανοῦμαι *vs.* φανήσομαι*: frequency of occurrence*[341]

	φανοῦμαι	φανήσομαι
Aeschylus	**2**	1
Sophocles	**17**	4
Euripides	**12**	9
Herodotus	2	**6**
Thucydides	**5**	1
Lysias	1	**10**
Aristophanes	**8**	5
Isocrates	3	**43**
Xenophon	**6**	3
Plato	**42**	30
Aeschines	1	**6**
Demosthenes	17	**62**

The authors are set in order of their (assumed) date of birth. It can be observed that no significant shift takes place during the 5th and 4th centuries. Rather, there appears to be a

[339] Note the epistemic use of the future φανεῖται.

[340] By the epistemic use of the future φανήσεσθαι, the statement is presented as a reasonable conclusion.

[341] The data are derived from the TLG on CD-ROM, and from Magnien (1912, I: 281, 342). Included are the compounds of φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι. Not included are the instances of φανοῦμαι (esp. in the compound ἀπο-) with an indirect reflexive meaning.

division according to genre. In the orators Lysias, Isocrates, Aeschines and Demosthenes the use of the passive form predominates overwhelmingly, whereas in the remaining authors the middle form is preferred. Only Herodotus shows a different picture. This may, however, not be significant due to the low numbers. It may be concluded from these figures that the orators selected the passive form more automatically than the other authors.[342] This would mean that, in the orators, the semantic distinction between the two forms began to fade away.[343] It appears that, in this respect, the language of the orators was less conservative than the language of the other authors.[344]

In conclusion, in this section I have attempted to revive Blass' hypothesis by arguing that the middle future form φανοῦμαι differs from the passive future form φανήσομαι with regard to aspect. Φανοῦμαι, like the present stem, has an imperfective meaning, whereas φανήσομαι, like the aorist stem, has a perfective meaning. In practice, φανοῦμαι has the stative meaning 'seem' (subjective view), and φανήσομαι the telic meaning 'turn out, be found, become clear' (objective view). Φανοῦμαι may also express the iterative or generic meaning 'be found repeatedly/generally found to be'. Finally, we saw that this semantic contrast may have been fading away in the language of the orators.

4.2 Other Verbs with an Aspectual Distinction

The question now remains whether the distinction between φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι can also be found with other verbs. There is a large number of verbs that show a

---

[342] I have found the same general tendency with the other verbs that have an opposition between middle and passive future that is similar to φανοῦμαι vs. φανήσομαι (e.g. λείψομαι - λειφθήσομαι). Again, the orators show a general preference for the passive future: *Lys.* 24x [passive] : 4x [middle], *Isocr.* 57x [p]: 9x [m], *Aeschin.* 21x [p] : 4x [m], *Dem.* 92x [p] : 47x [m]. Note that Demosthenes - as in the case of φανοῦμαι : φανήσομαι - uses the middle forms relatively often. The 'non-orators', conversely, have a predilection for the middle future form: *A.* 11x [m] : 4x [p], *S.* 29x [m] : 10 [p], *E.* 37x [m] : 24x [p], *Hdt.* 39x [m] : 11x [p], *Th.* 30x [m] : 23x [p], *Ar.* 20x [m] : 15x [p], *Xen.* 59x [m] : 16x [p], *Pl.* 101x [m] : 82x [p].

[343] Only Demosthenes has a considerable number of middle future forms (17x). Possibly, he still knew the semantic distinction. An interesting passage can be found at Dem. 20.80-1: (...) πανθ' ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν φανήσεται πράξας Χαβρίας (...). ἄξιον (...) σκοπεῖν, ὅπως μὴ φανούμεθα φαυλότεροι Χίων περὶ τοὺς εὐεργέτας γεγενημένοι. (...) εἰ (...) τῶν (...) τι δοθέντων ἀφῃρημένοι φανήσεσθε. ('It will be seen that Chabrias did everything on your behalf (...). It is worth while to see that we do not prove to be less generous than the Chians with regard to our benefactors. If (...) we turn out to rob him of part of the reward (...).') Even Blass (1892: 269) admits, be it reluctantly, that Demosthenes employs the middle and the passive form without semantic distinction, for the sake of variation. However, I would maintain that there is a semantic difference since φανούμεθα is used in a generic sense, whereas the two passive futures refer to single events. Furthermore, in this speech Demosthenes uses comparable phrases twice: ἀφῃρημένοι φανούμεθα (20.46), and ἀφῃρημένοι φανεῖσθε (20.120). Contrary to ἀφῃρημένοι φανήσεσθε in the passage above, these two middle cases can be interpreted as iterative (cf. the plural παῖδας at 20.46), and as generic (20.120).

[344] Note that in the Koine, which stems from vernacular Attic, the use of the middle forms almost completely disappeared. Thus, in Polybius and the papyri, there are no more verbs that have both the middle form and the passive form with passive meaning (see Mayser 1926-34, II[1]: 212, Blass & Debrunner 1979[15]: 62). By contrast, in the highly conservative epic language only middle futures occur. Thus, Hesiod, the Homeric hymns, Apollonius Rhodius, Theocritus, Babrius, Oppian, Quintus Smyrnaeus, Colluthus, Tryphiodorus, and Nonnus only use the middle future forms.

morphological contrast in the future stem that is similar to the contrast between φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι.[345] An example is κινέω, which has the passive aorist form ἐκινήθην 'I moved (intr.), I was moved (pass.)', but two variant future forms, κινήσομαι 'I will move, I will be moved' and κινηθήσομαι 'id.'. Again, at first glance, there seems to be no semantic distinction between the middle and the passive future forms. However, the two variant future forms may differ in aspect. Consider the following examples:

(20) ΣΩ. κινεῖται καὶ ῥεῖ, ὥς φατε, τὰ πάντα; ἦ γάρ;
ΘΕΟ. Ναί.
ΣΩ. Οὐκοῦν ἀμφοτέρας ἃς διειλόμεθα κινήσεις, φερόμενα τε καὶ ἀλλοιούμενα;
ΘΕΟ. Πῶς δ' οὔ; εἴπερ γε δὴ τελέως **κινήσεται** (Pl. *Tht.* 182c)
SOCRATES: According to you, all things move and flow; isn't that so?
THEODORUS: Yes.
SOCRATES: And they have both the motions that we distinguished, that is to say, they both move and alter?
THEODORUS: That must be so, if they are to be wholly and completely in motion.

(21) ΞΕ. Κίνησίς τε στήσεται καὶ στάσις αὖ **κινηθήσεται**· περὶ γὰρ ἀμφότερα θάτερον ὁποτερονοῦν γιγνόμενον αὐτοῖν ἀναγκάσει μεταβάλλειν αὖ θάτερον ἐπι τοὐναντίον τῆς αὐτοῦ φύσεως, ἅτε μετασχὸν τοῦ ἐναντίου (Pl. *Sph.* 255a)
VISITOR: Then change would rest and rest would change. In both cases, if either change or rest comes to be either the same or different, then it will force the other to change to the contrary of its own nature, since it will share in its contrary.

In (20), the middle future κινήσεται is imperfective. All things are in constant motion (compare present stem κινεῖται ... τὰ πάντα). In (21), however, the transition from rest to motion is meant. This can be inferred from the coordination of κινηθήσεται with its opposite στήσεται 'will stand still, halt'. This means that κινηθήσεται has an ingressive (i.e. 'aoristic') value. It can be concluded that the aspectual contrast of the type φανοῦμαι vs. φανήσομαι may also be found with other verbs.[346]

4.3 Middle is Middle and Passive is Passive

Recall that, according to Stahl, the middle future form has a middle meaning, and the passive future form has a passive meaning. In other words, he advocated a *diathetical* view. Does this consequently lead us to the conclusion that Stahl was simply wrong? The situation appears to be more complicated than that. With many verbs, the middle future does, indeed, have a middle meaning, whereas the passive future has a passive meaning. The opposition is therefore comparable to the opposition between the sigmatic middle aorist and the passive aorist form. This situation is presented in the following schema:

[345] The verbs that display this type of contrast are enumerated and discussed by Blass (1892: 273ff.).

[346] Compare also examples (3), (5), (6), (7), (9), given in section 4.0.

Table 5: *Middle and passive aorists and futures*: σῴζω and -σκευάζω[347]

	Aorist		Future	
Active transitive	-εσκεύασα	ἔσωσα	-σκευάσω	σώσω
Indirect reflexive	-εσκευασάμην	ἐσωσάμην	-σκευάσομαι	σώσομαι
Direct reflexive	-εσκευασάμην	-	-σκευάσομαι	-
Body Motion	-	ἐσώθην	-	σωθήσομαι
Passive	-εσκευάσθην	ἐσώθην	-σκευασθήσομαι	σωθήσομαι

Here we can observe a neat pattern. The middle future forms correspond with sigmatic middle aorist forms, and the passive future forms correspond with passive aorist forms.-[348] In other words, this system of diathetical distinctions leaves no room for an aspectual distinction. The importance of diathetical distinctions is even clear in a form like φανοῦμαι since it can also be used as an indirect reflexive (albeit only in the compound ἀπο-). In sum, both aspectual and diathetical distinctions are relevant to the middle-passive future. Blass and Stahl, we have to conclude, were both correct in their assertions.[349] The contrast between the middle and the passive future is to be explained differently for each individual verb. The contrast may involve an aspectual distinction, as in the case of κινήσομαι vs. κινηθήσομαι, or it may involve a diathetical distinction, as in -σκευάσομαι vs. -σκευασθήσομαι.[350] The contrast between φανοῦμαι and φανήσομαι has elements

[347] This verb only occurs in the compounds κατασκευάζω and παρασκευάζω.

[348] In some cases, the opposition between middle and passive future forms does not correspond with that in the aorist stem completely. For instance, the passive aorist ἐπείσθην 'I was persuaded' corresponds, as we would expect, with the passive future form πεισθήσομαι 'I will be persuaded'. However, the form ἐπείσθην in the meaning 'I obeyed, believed' corresponds with the *middle* future form πείσομαι 'I will obey, believe'. This pattern probably reflects an earlier stage of the language, in which ἐπείσθην and πεισθήσομαι were only used with a passive meaning, whereas ἐπιθόμην and πείσομαι had an intransitive meaning. This older pattern was disturbed by the replacement of the thematic aorist by the passive aorist form (see section 3.2.4). A similar mismatch between future and aorist is exhibited by the pair βουλήσομαι vs. ἐβουλήθην (βουληθήσομαι appears late).

[349] Recall that Stahl mentioned ἀπαλλάττομαι as an example of a diathetical contrast. According to Stahl, ἀπαλλάξεται had a volitional, middle meaning 'loskommen, sich einer Sache erledigen', whereas ἀπαλλαγήσομαι had a non-volitional, passive-like meaning 'befreit werden, etwas los werden'. Stahl's distinction is probably correct. However, it is remarkable that he did not take into consideration the more frequent meaning 'depart' since it appears to confirm Stahl's claim. The middle ἀπαλλάξομαι is used 11 times with the volitional meaning 'depart' (Hdt. 5.67.2, 7.222, E. *Ion* 524, *Hel.* 437, Th. 8.83.3, Pl. *R.* 496e; Xen. *An.* 5.1.15, 7.1.4, 7.1.6, 7.6.2, Dem. 24.85), whereas passive future ἀπαλλαγήσομαι/-χθήσομαι occurs only 2 times with this meaning (Ar. *Av.* 940, Pl. *Lg.* 642e). The metaphorical sense 'depart from life' is not taken into account here since it is non-volitional (E. *Ion* 847, E. *Hipp.* 356, *Med.* 878).

[350] Derived verbs in -άζω, -ίζω, -ύνω almost never have middle future forms with passive or intransitive meaning. The reason for this rule may be that the so-called 'Attic futures' are morphologically less transparent. There are only three exceptions (out of several dozens of instances): ἀνασκολοπιοῦμαι (Hdt. 3.132.2, 4.43.2), and ὀνειδιοῦμαι (S. *OT* 1500). Of the verbs in -αίνω, however, both -ανοῦμαι (5 tokens) and -ανθήσομαι (9 tokens) occur. In some cases, word length might be a factor that determines the

of both since φανοῦμαι can express the indirect reflexive meaning - which is never expressed by φανήσομαι -, and it can have an imperfective intransitive meaning. These two meanings differ from the perfective intransitive φανήσομαι with regard to *diathesis*, and with regard to *aspect*, respectively.

occurrence of -σομαι and -θήσομαι (Wackernagel 1920: 204, Hartmann 1935: 128). Forms with monosyllabic stems such as δοθήσομαι, ἡσθήσομαι, ῥηθήσομαι do not have middle variants with passive meaning, whereas polysyllabic stems such as ἀδικήσομαι, βουλεύσομαι, πορεύσομαι, φυλάξομαι do not have variant forms in -θήσομαι. For a collection of data, I refer to Magnien (1912), and Hauri (1975).