Cover Page

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20679 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Koier, Elizabeth
Title: Interpreting particles in dead and living languages : a construction grammar approach to the semantics of Dutch *ergens* and Ancient Greek *pou*
Issue Date: 2013-03-28

A comparison between Dutch *ergens* and Ancient Greek
που

If we were to make a dictionary entry for *ergens* and που, the headwords within the lemmata would be comparable. The following may be said for both forms.

1. locative indefinite adverb *(original interpretation)*

   (a) the locative indefinite may be used to express a general applicability of the statement

2. *modal particle*

3. about, around *(with numbers)*[1]

For *ergens* the temporal interpretation and the scalar interpretation would need to be added, but on the whole both forms seem very comparable. However, as has already become implicitly clear in the previous chapters and as will be addressed explicitly in this chapter, the actual characteristics of modal *ergens* and modal που are not in all respects comparable. We saw, for instance, in the previous chapter that, although *ergens* and που seem to have had almost the same starting point and both developed into a modal particle, there is little reason to believe that the development of modal *ergens* and modal που followed exactly the same pathway of semantic change. This suggests that apart from general cognitive principles, language specific characteristics play an important role in the semantic development of comparable forms in different languages.

---

[1]For που this interpretation may have only been present in the Ionic dialect.

Already in chapter 8 it was said that the process of contrasting forms from different languages may shed light on the specific characteristics of a form in a particular language, which would otherwise be taken for granted. This means that one of the advantages of comparing forms from two different languages is that it draws attention to both shared and non-shared characteristics, thus highlighting both the language specific properties of forms that from a distance may seem very similar and their shared properties.

In this chapter, I will compare the contextual characteristics of *ergens* and που to see which characteristics they share and which ones may be different.

I will first address the historical development of *ergens* and που including their contextual properties. Second, I will discuss the contextual features of *ergens* and που.

11.1   Pathways from locative to modal

As was argued in the chapter on the historical development of *ergens*, it seems likely that *ergens* developed its modal interpretations via a metaphorical use of the locative use of *ergens*. The mind was seen as a space in which certain positions could be taken. The development path of που was less clear, but we might ask the question of whether it would be possible that που developed in a comparable way. As was already mentioned in passing in the previous chapter on the development of που, there are a few examples in which a metaphorical interpretation would be possible. However, the occurrence of metaphorical uses of the indefinite locative is not enough for a development like the development of *ergens*. We still need some connection to either different points of view or other connections to the later modal use. Therefore, we will now discuss some of the metaphorical examples in detail.

The following example, which was already briefly discussed above, is one of three examples I could find for που that theoretically could be interpreted as an explicitly metaphorical locative use of που, because of the presence of ἐνὶ φρεσὶ 'in your heart'. The other one we already saw in example (41) in the previous chapter and the third one is mentioned below. In addition, we will see a possibly metaphorical case without ἐνὶ φρεσί in example (2).[2]

(1)   (ὣς Ἀντήνορος υἱὸς ἀγαυοῦ δῖος Ἀγήνωρ
          οὐκ ἔθελεν φεύγειν, πρὶν πειρήσαιτ' Ἀχιλῆος.
          ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἄρ' ἀσπίδα μὲν πρόσθ' ἔσχετο πάντοσ' ἐΐσην,
          ἐγχείη δ' αὐτοῖο τιτύσκετο, καὶ μέγ' ἀΰτει·)

         ἦ   δή   που μάλ' ἔολπας   ἐνὶ   φρεσὶ φαίδιμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ
         ptcl ptcl που very you hope in   heart famous Achilles
         PTCL PTCL που ADV 2SG.PERF PREP DAT.PL VOC.SG VOC.SG

---

[2]The negative locative indefinite οὐδαμοῦ can be used in a metaphorical way as in E. *Hipp.* 1012. However, because of the negation this does not allow for an interpretation involving more than one viewpoint, as was the case with *ergens*.

ἤματι τῷδε πόλιν πέρσειν Τρώων ἀγερώχων
(even so lordly Antenor's son, goodly Agenor, refused to flee till he should make trial of Achilles, but held before him his shield that was well-balanced upon every side, and aimed at Achilles with his spear, and shouted aloud:) Verily, I ween, thou hopest in thy heart, glorious Achilles, on this day to sack the city of the lordly Trojans.

Il. 21.583

Example (1) has the particles ἦ, δή and που. This is the only time in both the synchronic and the diachronic corpus that the particles ἦ, δή and που are found in the same clause, although ἦ δή does occur regularly. Both ἦ and δή point strongly in a modal direction. Also, the French and German translators have chosen translations which we also find in the classical period for δή που. The reason this passage can be interpreted as modal is that it is normal to assume that your enemy hopes to destroy your city and that this enemy also is aware that you know that he wants that. None of the translators has chosen the metaphorically locative option. One of the reasons may be that the presence of locative που would not add much to the overall interpretation of the sentence. In Dutch, however, *ergens* is mostly used to express an internal conflict or dilemma. Such a dilemma does not seem to be an issue in this example, since there is no reason Achilles would not want to destroy the city.

In example (2), already discussed above, the goddess Athena speaks to a warrior Diomedes about the reason he is pulling back. The first explanation is a physical one, although not less shameful, but the second relates to Diomedes' state of mind. It is suggested that he is under the spell of fear. This makes it theoretically possible for που to have a function which is comparable to modal *ergens*.

(2)   ἀλλά σευ ἢ κάματος πολυᾶϊξ γυῖα δέδυκεν

ἦ   νύ   σέ   που δέος   ἴσχει   ἀκήριον:
or   now you   που fear   restrains heartless:
CONJ PTCL ACC.SG που NOM.SG 3SG.PRS   NOM.SG:

yet either hath weariness born of thy many onsets entered into thy limbs, or haply spiritless terror possesseth thee.

Il. 5.812

Example (2) is metaphorical because fear is not an individual who can hold someone somewhere, or be somewhere unless we interpret the sentence in a metaphorical way. It would be possible to interpret this sentence metaphorically as in *heartless fear holds you somewhere (in your mind)*, but this would suggest that in other places in his mind Diomedes would be brave, which is not what seems to be Athena's judgement. Although such an interpretation is not impossible, the absence of an animate agentive subject in this sentence makes the connection between the mind of the addressee and the sentence very weak. Also, there are no (other) indications that we should read this sentence this way.

A second option is that the speaker, the goddess Athena, is merely offering a possible suggestion, as is the choice of the English translator. A third option is to

interpret που as marking that they both know that the last option is in fact the right solution. This is shared information, since this is about the state of mind of the addressee himself and therefore Athena expects Diomedes to agree (positive argumentative orientation). The latter interpretation is largely in line with the interpretation of Bolling (1929, 102), who says that 'The particle then expresses the confidence of the speaker that this time he has hit the truth'. Example (2) is followed by the conclusion and accusation that Diomedes, the addressee, does not live up to his father's standards, which can of course be both about his physical endurance and about his courage, but this implies that there is little room for different viewpoints in Diomedes.

A third example in which a metaphorical interpretation is possible is example (3). It is possible to interpret που as metaphorical because of the mental state predicate ἤλπετο 'he hoped' and the presence of ἐνὶ φρεσί 'in his heart'. In this example, there are two instances of που. The first I would interpret as (generalizing) locative, but we will now be concerned mainly with the second one.

(3)   εἴ τινά που μετ᾽ ὄεσσι λάβοι στείχοντα θύραζε:

οὕτω γάρ   πού μ᾽   ἤλπετ᾽   ἐνὶ   φρεσὶ   νήπιον εἶναι.
thus for   που me   hoped   in   heart   silly   be
ADV   CONJ που ACC.SG 3SG.IMPF PREP DAT.PL ACC.SG INF.PRS.

English: in the hope of catching anyone who sought to go forth with the sheep—so witless, <u>forsooth</u>, he thought in his heart to find me.

Od. 9.418

This example is not completely like the metaphorical examples of *ergens* for several reasons. First, this is part of a story about another person, told from the narrator's viewpoint. Therefore, the narrator does not have access to the thoughts of the characters. This means that there is no connection between the mental space of the character and που. This was, however, one of the prerequisites for the use of modal *ergens.* In addition, there is no need for different viewpoints. Although the lack of different viewpoints and only a weak connection to the mind of the subject does not exclude a metaphorically locative interpretation like *somewhere in his heart*, the connection with modal uses of this metaphor, like in the case of *ergens* is not very strong. Therefore, it seems hard to take this possibly metaphorical example as a bridge context for the development of a viewpoint marker like *ergens.*

A modal interpretation, on the other hand, fits this sentence well, because it is clear from the actions of the Cyclops that he thought that Odysseus would be silly enough to try to escape with the sheep. This makes it possible to present this as a shared inference between the narrator and his audience as in *For, - as you will have inferred - he hoped in his heart that I would be so silly.*

The discussion of the examples above shows that a metaphorically locative interpretation is possible if που is used with phrases like ἐνὶ φρεσί and in example (41) in the previous chapter a metaphorical interpretation even seemed the most fitting interpretation. However, the metaphor does not seem to be used to express different

points of view or a split self like in the case of *ergens*. In most examples, the modal interpretation of accessible information seems to work better than the metaphorically locative interpretation. This suggests that που may have developed its modal meaning in another way.

Another group of examples which is often translated as modal is what we have called the generalizing meaning of locative που. The development of this group of examples shows more resemblance to some uses of *ergens* than the metaphorical examples. For instance the Flemish use of *ergens iets* 'somewhere something' as well as the more general use of *ergens een of andere...* 'somewhere some...', show clear similarities with Greek που τις 'somewhere, some/someone/something/somehow'. In example (4), for instance, the speaker is not talking about a specific gas leak of unknown location, but about the situation in general. In example (5), the speaker is also talking about the general phenomenon of Agamemnon deceiving other people.

(4)   Als er   ergens   een of andere gaslek   of een andere dreiging is denk
        If   there somewhere some   gas leak or an   other   threat   is think

        ik dat ze   wel tot de categorie prioritair   behoren.
        I   that they ptcl to the category allowed to use sirens belong.

        If there is some gas leak somewhere or another threat, I think they do belong
        to the type of institutions that can use a siren.[3]

(5)   τῷ πάντ᾽ ἀγορευέμεν ὡς ἐπιτέλλω
        ἀμφαδόν, ὄφρα καὶ ἄλλοι ἐπισκύζωνται Ἀχαιοὶ

        εἴ   τινά   που Δαναῶν   ἔτι ἔλπεται ἐξαπατήσειν
        if   someone που of the Danaans again he hopes deceive
        CONJ ACC.SG   που GEN.PL   ADV 3SG.PRS INF.FUT

        αἰὲν ἀναιδείην ἐπιειμένος:
        English: To him do ye declare all, even as I bid, openly, to the end that other
        Achaeans also may be wroth, if he hopeth to deceive yet some other of the
        Danaans, seeing he is ever clothed in shamelessness.[4]

                                                                        Il. 9.371

In both examples above, it is still possible to read a locative interpretation, although the function of που seems to be more to express that the details do not matter, because a frequently occurring situation is described. However, the use of *ergens een of andere* in conditional clauses is very rare. On google it is only found 8 times. The connection with a conditional, therefore, seems to be specific to Greek.

What we can conclude is that που probably did not develop into a modal particle in the same way as *ergens* did. There is no evidence that metaphorical extensions

---

[3]http://www.9lives.be/forum/algemene-discussies/854243-je-glimlach-van-vandaag-deel-23-a-191.html.

[4]This translation was slightly modified.

played a role in the development of που although this probably was the case in the development of *ergens*.

However, the development of a more generalizing function of both που and *ergens* may have taken place under the influence of other indefinite markers such as *iets* 'something' or *een of andere* 'some' in the case of *ergens* and forms of τις 'some, someone, something, somehow' in Greek.

In the next section, we will first study the synchronic contextual characteristics of non-modal που and non-modal *ergens* in more detail. After that we will continue with the synchronic comparison of modal που and modal *ergens*.

11.2   Non-modal που versus non-modal *ergens*

In this section, we will discuss the contextual characteristics of non-modal *ergens* and non-modal που, taking the categories distinguished for *ergens* as our starting point. The locative use of both forms is relatively uncontroversial, which may raise the question as to why it would be interesting to study their contextual characteristics. However, there are several reasons we can learn something from studying the locative uses of *ergens* and που as well. First, as became clear from the study of *ergens*, the lack of certain characteristics that usually accompany the locative use of *ergens* may function as an indication for a modal use for the speakers. That is, if speakers are accustomed to other locative markers guiding them in the case of a locative use, the lack of overt locative markers may be an indication for a modal use. This implies that the locative use and the non-locative uses are to a certain extent part of one system of disambiguation in which the absence of something that is usually there may also be an indication.

Second, the historical development of modal interpretations may have started out from a use of which a relict may be preserved in some fixed locative expression. Because it was already a fixed expression during the time of the modal development, it may have resisted reinterpretation as modal. These types of expressions allow us to find out more about the development of the modal interpretations.

Third, we can use the study of the contextual characteristics of locative *ergens* and locative που as a simple case which may show us whether the approach to the context which was chosen in this dissertation seems to work and what kind of contextual features may play a role in interpretation. This will give us an indication of what we may want to look for in the more complicated, modal cases.

Locative που and locative ergens

The non-modal interpretations of *ergens* can be divided into the following groups: the locative, temporal, scalar and *about/around* interpretations. The characteristics of locative *ergens* and locative που are alike in the sense that locative verbs, adverbs and prepositions are frequently found in the direct environment of both locative *ergens* and locative που. The generalizing function of locative που is comparable to some uses of *ergens* as already mentioned in footnote 16 above. In Dutch it would,

for instance, be possible to say *een of ander bedrijf ergens* 'some company somewhere' meaning *some company, it does not really matter which one/where this company is from*. This use is also found for που, especially when it is combined with a conditional and an indefinite pronoun.

However, this frequent occurrence in conditional clauses is confined to που. *Ergens* is rarely found in conditional clauses in the CGN (only 5 times out of 2757) and in all those cases it was found directly next to a locative marker. The difference between Dutch and Greek in this respect may be due to differences in the use of conditional clauses. Dutch, for example, does not use conditionals to form purpose clauses and Dutch conditional clauses do not express general validity as in example (6).

(6)   Τῷ δ' ἐπιόντι ἔτει [ἐπὶ Ἀρχύτα μὲν ἐφορεύοντος, ἄρχοντος δ' ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀλεξίου,] Λύσανδρος ἀφικόμενος εἰς Ἔφεσον μετεπέμψατο Ἐτεόνικον ἐκ Χίου σὺν ταῖς ναυσί, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας πάσας συνήθροισεν,

εἴ	πού	τις	ἦν,
if	somewhere	some	was
COND PTCL		NOM.SG	3.SG.IMPF

καὶ ταύτας τ' ἐπεσκεύαζε καὶ ἄλλας ἐν Ἀντάνδρῳ ἐναυπηγεῖτο.
In the following year—Archytas being now ephor, and Alexias archon at Athens—Lysander arrived at Ephesus and sent for Eteonicus to come thither from Chios with the ships, while he also gathered together all the other ships <u>that were anywhere to be found</u>; then he occupied himself with refitting these vessels and building more at Antandrus.

X. *HG.* 2.1.10

A sentence like 'he gathered all other ships if (idiomatic English: whenever) he could find some somewhere and refitted them' is often expressed by means of relative clauses in Dutch as in *alle schepen die hij maar ergens kon vinden* 'all ships that he could find anywhere'. These differences may explain why that although it is possible to use *ergens* for purposes of generalization, we do not find this use in conditional clauses as frequently as is the case in Greek.[5]

Temporal interpretations

The temporal interpretation of *ergens* is generally marked by temporal expressions. In the case of που, we do not really have clearly temporal examples, although there are several instances in which a temporal interpretation cannot be excluded and the specialized dictionary on Sophocles (Ellendt and Genthe, 1872) suggests that που may have had a temporal interpretation. The indefinite relative which is derived from που, ὅπου, did develop a temporal interpretation and sometimes translators used a temporal interpretation for που. Therefore, there is a chance that που had a temporal interpretation in Ancient Greek.

---

[5]For a more elaborate discussion of conditionals that presuppose that the content of the conditional clause has been (sometimes) realized, as is the case in (6), see Wakker (1994, 276).

In example (7), a description is given of the way the Theban horsemen acted. As I will argue below, there are several reasons to interpret που as temporal in this example.

(7)   οἱ   μέντοι τῶν   Θηβαίων ἱππεῖς   ἐῴκεσαν
      the   ptcl   the   Theban horsemen were like
      NOM.PL PTCL   ART.GEN.PL GEN.PL   NOM.PL   3PL.PLUP

      ὑποπεπωκόσι   που ἐν   μεσημβρίᾳ·
      men who have drunk a little που in   midday.
      PTC.PERF.DAT.PL   που PREP DAT.SG.

      The Theban horsemen, however, acted like men who had drunk a little που at midday;

                                                                    X. *HG.* 5.4.40

In example (7), the temporal expression ἐν μεσημβρίᾳ 'on midday' introduces a temporal dimension, which uses, just like in Dutch, a locative preposition (ἐν 'in') to refer to a moment in time. The interpretation of που as *at some point* on midday is also an explanation for the unusual position of που in the clause (i.e. not in the second position in the clause, but after the participle and before the temporal phrase). Although a modal interpretation within the participle phrase is possible as well (the horsemen looked like how we all know people look who have had a little to drink at midday), a temporal interpretation cannot be excluded.

In example (8), που is followed by a noun which sometimes has a temporal interpretation. This makes it possible to interpret the subordinate clause as *if at some moment the right time would be there*. However, due to the variety of uses of καιρός it is also possible to interpret this as *when somewhere there would be an opportunity*, which would result in a generalizing locative interpretation.

(8)   ὡς τάχιστα δὲ ἐκέλευε τούς τε τραυματίας ἀναλαβόντας καὶ τὸν πεζὸν καὶ τῶν
      σκευῶν ὅσα ἦλθον ἔχοντες, ἃ δ' ἐκ τῆς πολεμίας εἰλήφασι καταλιπόντας ὅπως
      κοῦφαι ὦσιν αἱ νῆες, ἀποπλεῖν ἐς Σάμον, κἀκεῖθεν ἤδη ξυναγαγόντας πάσας
      τὰς ναῦς τοὺς ἐπίπλους,

      ἤν   που καιρὸς   ᾖ,   ποιεῖσθαι.
      if   που critical time would be,   make (the naval attack)
      CONJ=PTCL που NOM.SG   3SG.PRS.SUBJ, INF.PRS.

      He told them to take up their wounded as quickly as they could and the troops and stores which they had brought with them, and leaving behind what they had taken from the enemy's country, in order to lighten the ships, to sail off to Samos, and there concentrating all their ships to attack when που the right time would be there.   Th. 8.27.4

There are many examples in which a temporal reading for που would not be impossible. However, I haven't been able to find contexts in which this interpretation is really the only sensible reading, although for the last example mentioned above a

temporal interpretation seems the most likely.[6] However, this is too little evidence to assume a temporal reading for που. Therefore, I do not think που had a temporal meaning in Ancient Greek, although many examples are compatible with such an interpretation. Because of this compatibility, we cannot completely exclude the possibility of a temporal meaning.

The about/around *interpretation*

According to dictionaries and grammars, που can, just like *ergens*, also mean *about/ around*. This is in line with the same interpretation of *ergens.* However, this use of που is very rare or perhaps even non existent in the classical period except for in Herodotus, in whose work it occurs several times. Herodotus also uses the combination of μάλιστα που 'about, around', which in other classical authors is not used with this meaning. The only places in which we find comparable uses is in later authors like Pausanias (ca. 115-180 AD). There may be several explanations. It may be that this was a dialectal (i.e. Ionic) use of που or this may be a coincidence which is due to restricted corpus of texts available in terms of genres and number of words.

In example (9) it would be possible to read που as *about* since it is followed by a number. However, the list of values of slaves suggests that these are examples which do not really require the speaker to indicate how precise he is by means of a form like *about/around.* In addition, the other numbers are not accompanied by που.

Apart from the fact that this example contains numbers, it is very comparable to the other examples of που in clauses that express obvious information. Also, που is found before the number, whereas in Herodotus, in whose works we do find the *about/around* interpretation, που is always placed after the number. Therefore, it is hard to decide whether this is a case of *about/around* or a case of modal που and this example cannot be used to show that the interpretation *about/around* also occurred outside of Herodotus.

(9)   (Ἆρ᾽, ἔφη, ὦ Ἀντίσθενες, εἰσί τινες ἀξίαι φίλων, ὥσπερ οἰκετῶν;)

τῶν	γὰρ	οἰκετῶν	ὁ	μέν	που	δυοῖν	μναῖν
the	for	slaves	the		που	two	mina
ART.GEN.PL	CONJ	GEN.PL	ART.NOM.SG	PTCL	που	NUM.GEN.DU	GEN.DU

ἄξιός	ἐστιν,
worth	is,
NOM.SG	3SG.PRS

(ὁ δὲ οὐδ᾽ ἡμιμναίου, ὁ δὲ πέντε μνῶν, ὁ δὲ καὶ δέκα·)
(Antisthenes," he said, "have friends like servants their own values?) For one

---

[6]In many modern languages, temporal interpretations of locative indefinites are accepted with months, seasons, years, weeks etcetera, even though in other contexts a temporal use is not (yet) accepted. Therefore, I checked whether these types of expressions were found in Greek, but in classical Greek που does not seem to be used in this way. This is another indication that που probably did not have a temporal reading in this period.

servant is worth two minas, (another less than half a mina, another five minas, another no less than ten.)[7]

X. *Mem.* 2.5.2.3

(10)   Ὑστάσπεϊ δὲ τῷ Ἀρσάμεος ἐόντι ἀνδρὶ Ἀχαιμενίδῃ ἦν τῶν παίδων Δαρεῖος πρεσβύτατος,

ἐὼν	τότε	ἡλικίην	ἐς	εἴκοσί	κου	μάλιστα	ἔτεα,
being	then	age	to	twenty	που	about	years,
PTC.PRS.NOM.SG	ADV	ACC.SG	PREP	NUMBER	που	ADV	ACC.PL,

Hystaspes son of Arsames was an Achaemenid, and Darius was the eldest of his sons, then <u>about</u> twenty years old;[8]

Hdt. 1.209

In (10) there are several things apart from που (=κου) itself that point in the direction of *about/around*. There is the use of the preposition ἐς 'to' and the use of μάλιστα. This last adverb means literally *most*, which suggests that originally it may have meant something like *at most*. This would result in an interpretation like *somewhere in the direction of 20 years at most*. This seems plausible, but although the combination of μάλιστα and κου occurs three times in Herodotus, it is not present with this meaning in other authors up to the classical period. In most other authors μάλιστα is used for this purpose, but it is not combined with που.

(11) | Ἀπὸ | δὲ | τούτου | διὰ | εἴκοσί | κου | σταδίων | ἄλλος | ποταμὸς | τῷ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| from | and | this | across | twenty | που | stades | other | river | to which |
| PREP | CONJ | GEN.SG | PREP | NUM | που | GEN.PL | NOM.PL | NOM.PL | DAT.SG |

οὔνομα	κεῖται	Δύρας
name	lies	Dyras
NOM.SG	3SG.PRS	NOM.SG

About twenty furlongs from that river is another named Dyras,

Hdt. 7.198

In example (11) που is found within a prepositional phrase, but without any other marker of imprecision. This shows that in Herodotus at least που had developed a special interpretation *about/around*.

I have not been able to find explicitly scalar examples of που neither in the synchronic prose corpus nor the diachronic corpus.

Summarizing, we may say that although it cannot be excluded that Ancient Greek had the same variety of interpretations of non-modal που as Dutch *ergens*, the temporal, scalar and *about/around* interpretations cannot be shown with certainty to exist in the corpora used in this study. The *about/around* interpretation is found

---

[7]This translation was slightly modified.
[8]κου is Ionic for που.

in Herodotus. This may have been a dialect specific development or just an effect of a relatively small and unbalanced corpus. The locative interpretation, however, showed the same general characteristics as locative *ergens*, although the frequent presence of the particle in conditional clauses seems to be confined to που.

11.3   Modal *ergens* versus modal που

As we saw in the chapters on *ergens* above, modal *ergens* can have the following interpretations. They are characterized by a preference for particular contexts which are also presented here.

- *feelings* interpretations are often connected to first person pronouns, mental state predicates and subjective predicates

- *point of view* interpretations are often connected to impersonal copula constructions, but they do have subjective predicate complements. In addition, they are often combined with adversative markers

- the *somehow* interpretation is frequently found with third person action verbs

In the previous chapter on που we found the following contextual characteristics for modal που:

- modal particles like 'evidently' or with an affirmative function

- mental state predicates, especially verbs of knowing

- frequent use of the copula, mostly with factual predicative complements

- verbs of saying.

The contextual characteristics of modal *ergens* and modal που show a certain amount of overlap, like, for instance, mental state predicates and frequent use of the copula. However, in this list of possibly overlapping features some of the clearest characteristics of modal *ergens*, the use of first persons and adversative markers, are not present. This suggests that there may be some differences between modal *ergens* and που. Also, we need to make the comparison more specific in order to see whether the overlapping characteristics really point in the direction of a comparable function.

11.3.1   Comparing modal *ergens* to modal που

Mental state predicates

We will start the comparison of the contextual characteristics of modal *ergens* and modal που with mental state predicates (MSPs). In general, modal *ergens* is found with mental state predicates more frequently than modal που. Within the category

modal the co-occurrence of *ergens* with MSPs is 37% (52 out of 139) and the co-occurrence of που with MSPs is 18% (54 out of 304). The most frequently found MSP with *ergens* is the verb *vinden* 'to be of the opinion'. This verb is the main verb of the *ergens* clause in 17 out of 139 modal cases of *ergens* (12%), followed by *voelen* 'feel' (3 times) and *het gevoel hebben* 'have the feeling' (4 times). This may of course be due to the general frequency of *vinden* in the CGN. In order to exclude that possibility we will look at the verb *zeggen* 'to say' and see whether its co-occurrence with *ergens* shows the same distribution as its general frequency in the corpus. That is, if *vinden* is much more frequent than *zeggen* in the corpus as a whole, we would expect the same proportions in the cases in which they are combined with *ergens*. Because *vinden* can be interpreted both as 'to find' and 'to be of the opinion', it is impossible to count the instances of *vinden* 'to be of the opinion' separately from *vinden* 'to find'. This means that we cannot calculate what the chance is that this frequency is the effect of the general frequency of *vinden* in the corpus. What we can do though, is compare the total of both interpretations of *vinden* with the verb *zeggen* 'to say'. The latter is 2 times as frequent as *vinden* in the whole corpus (respectively 50297 versus 23669), but verbs of saying are found only 16 times within a five word window around *ergens*. The verb *vinden*, however, is found 37 times within a five word window around *ergens*, which shows that it is far more frequent than we would expect.

The most frequent MSP found in που-clauses is the verb οἶδα 'to know' which occurs 10 times in the synchronic prose corpus (381 instances of που). The second most frequent MSP is another verb of knowing γιγνώσκω, which occurs 6 times. Since in Ancient Greek verbs of saying are also used to express opinions it would be interesting to investigate these verbs as well. The verb λέγω 'to say' occurs 16 times in 304 instances of non-locative που (5.3%). This verb is followed in frequency by the other verb of saying φημί, which occurs 10 times, which is just as frequent as οἶδα 'to know'. For these verbs we could calculate the chance that they would occur randomly together with που, which showed that they were significantly more frequently found with που than we would expect on the basis of chance.[9] However, if we compare the general frequencies of the verbs of saying with the verbs of knowing, we see that in the synchronic prose corpus as a whole verbs of saying are 2 (φημί)-4 (λέγω) times as frequent as verbs of knowing.[10] We can conclude that verbs of knowing are relatively much more frequent in που clauses than verbs of saying.

The verb *weten* 'to know' occurs only once together with *ergens*.[11] This suggests that there is a difference in the type of MSPs *ergens* and που prefer. It may be, however, that the verbs of saying in Greek are comparable to the verbs expressing opinions and feelings in Dutch. For this reason, we will compare the characteristics of these verbs.

In Dutch, all instances of *vinden* 'to be of the opinion' are combined with a first person singular pronoun. In Greek, there are only 2 cases (out of 26) in which verbs

---

[9] Fisher exact tests had the following values: οἶδα: p < 0.0001, γιγνώσκω p < 0.001 λέγω: p < 0.0001; φημί: p < 0.001.

[10] According to a TLG lemma search λέγω occurs 4469 times in the synchronic prose corpus, φημί 2707 times, οἶδα 1151 times and γιγνώσκω 887 times.

[11] The example is as follows: *nou ik had 't 'm ook al uitgelegd in die discussie hoor dus hij wist dat ergens al.* 'I had already explained this to him in that discussion, so he knew that *ergens* already'.

of saying are combined with first person singulars. In most cases the verbs of saying are in the first person plural or in the third person. If we now zoom in on the first person singular, we see that verbs of saying in the first person singular are never used in their function of opinion verbs as can be seen in example (12). The interpretation of που seems to be modal, since both speaker and addressee know what has been said before, which makes the που-clause shared information and therefore accessible to the addressee.

(12)   (ΞΕ. Τρίτον τοίνυν ἔτι σε σμικρόν τι παραιτήσομαι.
        ΘΕΑΙ. Λέγε μόνον.)

        ΞΕ. Εἶπόν   που νυνδὴ   λέγων
            I said   που just now saying
            1SG.AOR που PTCL   PTC.PRS.NOM.SG

        (ὡς πρὸς τὸν περὶ ταῦτ' ἔλεγχον ἀεί τε ἀπειρηκὼς ἐγὼ τυγχάνω καὶ δὴ καὶ τὰ νῦν.
        ΘΕΑΙ. Εἶπες.)
        (Stranger: Then I have a third little request to make of you.
        Theaetetus: You have only to utter it.)
        Stranger: I said a while ago (that I always have been too faint-hearted for the refutation of this theory, and so I am now.
        Theaetetus: Yes, so you did.)

<div align="right">Pl. *Sph.* 242a</div>

Therefore, we may conclude that the strong subjectification that we noted in the *feelings* interpretation of *ergens* does not seem to be present in Ancient Greek for the verbs of saying. However, there are some cases in which που is found with other MSPs in Greek, such as verbs of thinking. There are three types of verbs found with modal που: ἡγέομαι (3 times), οἶμαι (3 times), and δόκεω (1) time. Only in one example is the verb in the first person and 6 of these 7 examples are also accompanied by δή or ἦ. In example (13) the main verb is οἶμαι 'I think'. However, the rest of the sentence is a subordinate clause. This raises the question of whether δήπου belongs to the main clause or to the subordinate clause. Since δήπου normally expresses that the information given is evident and accessible ('of course'), δήπου would fit better in the subordinate clause in which it is suggested that all people know something, but the combination of οἶμαι and δήπου is hard to interpret.

(13)   Οἶμαι   γὰρ δήπου τοῦτό γε   πάντας γιγνώσκειν,
        I think for δήπου this   all   know,
        1SG.PRS CONJ δήπου ACC.SG FOC.PTCL ACC.PL INF.PRS,
        (ὅτι σοφιστῇ μισθὸς κάλλιστός ἐστιν καὶ μέγιστος, ἢν τῶν μαθητῶν τινες καλοὶ κἀγαθοὶ καὶ φρόνιμοι γένωνται καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πολίταις εὐδοκιμοῦντες·)
        for I think, δήπου, all men are aware (that a sophist reaps his finest and his largest reward when his pupils prove to be honorable and intelligent and

highly esteemed by their fellow-citizens,)[12]

<div align="right">Isoc. 15.220.1</div>

This lack of connection of the Greek MSPs with the speaker suggests that also in these cases, the mental state predicates do not fulfill the same function as the most frequent MSPs in the case of *ergens*. The connection with the mental space of the speaker, which is found in *ergens*, does not seem to be there for Ancient Greek που.

First person verbs

The second characteristic of the interpretation *in someone's feelings or thoughts* of *ergens* was its frequent combination with 1st person pronouns. In 28% (39 out of 139) of all cases of modal *ergens*, *ergens* was found in a clause with a first person pronoun. If we now look at the first person verbs in modal που, this is 14% (43 out of 304). In the category of first person verbs, there are cases in which που is combined with δή, ἦ and mental state predicates, but also verbs of saying and action verbs. Therefore, it seems that που has less connection with the speaker than Dutch *ergens* for most subcategories of modal που we have distinguished. This suggests that it is less likely for που to be interpreted as *in someone's feelings or thoughts*.

The copula

Now we will compare the use of the copula in Dutch *ergens* sentences with the Greek που sentences. In total, the copula is the main verb in 38 instances of modal *ergens* (24% of 139) and 68 instances of που (22% of 304). This seems quite comparable. If we look at the subjective predicative complements, however, 82% (31 out of 38) of the cases of *ergens* have a subjective predicative complement, whereas only 46% (31 out of 68) of the instances of που have a subjective predicative complement. Of the subjective complements of που, 11 cases are of an epistemic modal type like *it is impossible* (ἀδύνατον), or *it is clear* (δῆλον). These adjectives are absent from the complements of *ergens*. However, they are in accordance with the frequent use of δεῖ and the positive argumentative direction that was found for the translations of που in the previous chapter and the frequent presence of verbs of knowing in που sentences. The use of these adjectives with που also suggests that the speaker is presenting his views as facts, instead of as subjective opinions as is generally the case in *ergens*-clauses.

The somehow *interpretation and third person non-subjective verbs*

The last group of characteristics of *ergens* which we mentioned above was that of the third person non-subjective verbs. This is a large group for που. However, the mere presence of third person non-subjective verbs is not specific enough to draw conclusions. In the case of *ergens*, these characteristics distinguished the *somehow* group from the *feelings* and the *point of view* groups partly by means of the absence of other characteristics. In the case of που, however, we have not found a reason to

---

[12]This translation was slightly modified.

assume these groups of interpretations existed in Greek, which makes this category large and ill-defined.

However, a *somehow* interpretation has been proposed for που (Slater, 1969; Scolnicov, 2003; Schwyzer and Debrunner, 1966). This raises the question as to whether an interpretation comparable to the *somehow* interpretation for *ergens* existed in Ancient Greek.

The first question that arises when considering this option, is why the translators do not use this option more frequently if this was an important interpretation. As was already mentioned in passing, the lexicon on Pindar by Slater gives *somehow* as the only interpretation of που and also in some commentaries (e.g. Scolnicov, 2003, 81) it is said that *somehow* would be the best interpretation for που. However, generally, translators do not choose this type of translation very frequently and if they do, they do not do so for the same passages. This inconsistency may have to do with the compatibility of this form with many contexts. This can be illustrated with example (14) below.

(14)   a.   Somehow the cup fell on my shoe instead of on the floor.
       b.   A cup fell out of the cupboard straight on the floor, because it somehow had been put on top of another cup in an unstable way.

The Oxford English Dictionary describes *somehow* as *in some manner or by some means not understood or defined; one way or another; someway*. If we now compare example (14-a) with example (14-b), however, we see that in the latter the manner and cause of the cup's fall is already described. The use of *somehow* in the causal clause makes the interpretation of *somehow* just move one step further to the fact that the person responsible for putting the cup there is not known. If we now add the person by saying *because Ann somehow had put it on top of another cup in an unstable way*, the interpretation moves up another level to the interpretation that it is Ann's motivation is unknown. In other words, the expression *somehow* in English is not restricted to a specific level of interpretation and, because of that, it is compatible with many situations and sentences.

The fact that the English word *somehow* is highly compatible with many situations and sentences implies that it is very hard to prove or disprove whether που may have had a comparable use. This also means that if *somehow* is compatible with που-clauses, that does not imply that the interpretation of που was *somehow*. However, there are some examples in the corpus that really do not seem to be compatible with a *somehow* interpretation, as in example (15) below.

(15)   ὦ φίλοι Ἀργείων ὅς τ' ἔξοχος ὅς τε μεσήεις
       ὅς τε χερειότερος, ἐπεὶ οὔ πω πάντες ὁμοῖοι
       ἀνέρες ἐν πολέμῳ, νῦν ἔπλετο ἔργον ἅπασι·

       καὶ δ'   αὐτοὶ   τόδε   που γιγνώσκετε.
       also and self   this   που you know
       PTCL CONJ NOM.PL ACC.SG που 2PL.PRS.

       Friends, whoso is pre-eminent among the Danaans, whoso holds a middle

> place, or whoso is lesser, for in nowise are all men equal in war, now is there a work for all, and this ye know even of yourselves.

Il. 12.272

In example (15), the speaker is making an encouraging speech. This context makes it unlikely that he would add that he does not know by what means his addressees know what he suggests they know, because that would weaken his argument. As we have seen above, που is regularly found in this kind of argumentative context. That makes it less likely that in these cases που was interpreted as *somehow*. This means that not all cases of modal που can be interpreted as *somehow*. In certain groups of cases, like the cases in which που is combined with τις, it is often possible to interpret που as *somehow*, though not always. The generalizing function of locative που, which was described above, clearly has some overlap with the *somehow* interpretation. However, as we saw in the previous chapters, in many cases of που and τις there are locative markers in the context, which makes it less likely that που was interpreted as *somehow*. Therefore, we have to conclude that although it is certainly possible for a subset of the instances of που to be interpreted as *somehow*, there is a lack of consistent positive evidence for this interpretation.

11.3.2   Comparing modal που to modal *ergens*

If we now turn the question around and take the features of που as our starting point of the comparison with *ergens*, we see that there are several characteristics of που that were not yet discussed. We discussed the occurrence of που with conditionals and the indefinite pronoun, which was only partly comparable with *ergens*, as well as verbs of knowing, but the presence of particles and the more general features of που contexts have not been discussed yet. We will discuss these two characteristics of που now.

The presence of affirmative particles or 'evidently'

One of the clearest collocations of που was the particle δή, which was present directly next to που in up to 40% of the cases in the synchronic prose corpus. As was said above, δή is mostly described as meaning 'evidently'. Although there were other descriptions as well, it seems that in the classical period δήπου is, just as Denniston says, generally interpreted as 'of course', which fits the description of δή well.

We also found particles in the context of *ergens*. The particles that were mostly found in the context of *ergens* were combinations of *ook, maar, wel, toch* 'also, but, *focal particle, adversative marker*'.[13] None of these particles have an evidential function, but if we specifically search for markers like *evident* 'evidently' or *natuurlijk* 'of course', we find that of all modal instances of *ergens* in the CGN (139) there are only 7 instances in which, for instance, *natuurlijk* is found in the same sentence as *ergens*, which is about 5%.

---

[13] Although που is quite frequently found with the focal particle γε, there seems to be little resemblance in the use of γε with the functions of the Dutch focal particles mentioned here.

If we now take an example of δήπου, we see that there is no way that δήπου could be translated with modal *ergens* in a sentence like the Greek δήπου-sentence in (16).

(16) (ἃ δὲ βουλόμενοί τινες ἀποτρέπειν τὴν εἰρήνην διαβάλλουσιν, ὡς ἡμεῖς οὐ φιλίας δεόμενοι, ἀλλὰ φοβούμενοι μὴ Ἀνταλκίδας ἔλθῃ ἔχων παρὰ βασιλέως χρήματα, διὰ τοῦθ’ ἥκομεν, ἐνθυμήθητε ὡς φλυαροῦσι.)

βασιλεὺς μὲν γὰρ δήπου ἔγραψε πάσας τὰς ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι
king ptcl for δήπου wrote all the in the Greek
NOM.SG PTCL PTCL δήπου 3SG.AOR ACC.PL ACC.PL PREP ART.DAT.SG DAT.SG

πόλεις αὐτονόμους εἶναι·
states autonomic be
ACC.PL ACC.PL INF.PRS

(Now touching the slanderous allegations of certain people who wish to defeat the peace, to the effect that we have come here, not because we desire friendship, but rather because we fear that Antalcidas may arrive with money from the King, consider how foolishly they are talking.) For the King directed, <u>as you know</u>, that all the cities in Greece were to be independent;

<div align="right">X. HG. 6.3.12</div>

The Dutch translation of this sentence *Want de koning heeft ergens verordonneerd dat alle Griekse steden onafhankelijk moesten zijn* would at best get a locative reading referring to the place in which the decision was written down, but a modal interpretation is not really an option. The reason is that the content of the clause is too factual. There are no possible viewpoints involved. However, forms like 'evidently' are at home in this kind of statements, as well as που. This shows that που probably had a different function from *ergens* and as we saw in the study above, the main difference may be that που is not a viewpoint marker, but manages the expectations of the addressee with respect to the information that is presented.

The same problem is found with the use of ἦ που. According to my intuition (I have not been able to find a corpus example) the use of *ergens* in *à fortiori* arguments may not be impossible, but it would be impossible in the context of a defense speech (in which we find most instances in Greek). The reason is that the use of *ergens* would suggest that the speaker himself does not completely believe in his own *a fortiori* argument. In a defense speech one cannot afford to give such an impression, unless one is using strong sarcasm, which is clearly not the case in the Greek contexts. A made up example of an *a fortiori* sentence with *ergens* in Dutch is given in (17).

(17) ?Als Jan die kans krijgt, zou Piet die ergens zeker moeten krijgen.
      If Jan gets that chance, Piet should *ergens* certainly get it.

Another context in which we frequently found modal που was in (fatalistic) statements about the gods. Since this kind of statement is also made in other religions it is easy to find comparable sentences in Dutch like *God heeft het zo gewild* 'It was

God's wish'. However, on google I have not been able to find this type of sentences with modal *ergens*. Neither **Ergens heeft God het zo gewild* nor **God heeft het ergens zo gewild* are found on the internet. What does exist is the non-agentive version *Ergens heeft het zo moeten zijn* 'Somehow it had to be this way'. This complies with the idea that the speaker either needs access to the mental space of the subject or is referring to his own mental space to be able to use modal *ergens.*

In tragedy and comedy, we frequently found που in incredulous or reluctant questions. It is hard to check this, but I have not been able to find or think of examples of this type of questions with modal *ergens.*

Summarizing we can say that contextual characteristics which did not come up in the comparison of *ergens* with που, did not come up because they indicate that there are some fundamental differences between the types of contexts in which *ergens* and που are found and the particles with which they are combined.

11.4   *Ergens* and που compared

In the previous sections we carefully compared the contextual characteristics of *ergens* and που. In this section we will zoom out and discuss why these contextual characteristics may be linked to the interpretations of *ergens* and που.

The relationship between the contextual characteristics of locative *ergens* and που and their interpretations is relatively clear. Most indicators are part of the same semantic field as locative *ergens* and που in that they denote locations or conceptually have a locative complement. This is true for both Dutch and Greek.

However, what is the relationship between mental state predicates, (subjective) copula constructions, first persons, adversative markers, third person action verbs and the interpretations of *ergens*? And what can the contextual properties of modal που tell us about the functions of the particle?

Apart from the explicitly metaphorical instances of *ergens*, the clearest connection between the modal interpretation of *ergens* and its contextual characteristics is subjectivity. There is a clear link with the subject, which is exemplified by the use of first person pronouns in combination with subjective verbs like *vinden* 'be of the opinion' as well as subjective predicates. These verbal forms seem to connect *ergens* to the subjective evaluation of the situation described. The use of adversative markers is an indication for a split or contrast, in this case in the person himself (the split-self function of modal *ergens*). The combination with third person action verbs does not fit that picture completely. However, *ergens* may have incorporated its subjectifying function in such a way that if the context does not allow for a locative interpretation or one of the other modal interpretations, *ergens* may subjectify the sentence by itself, indicating that the situation may be seen from a different viewpoint than the speaker has presented. This, however, would only work because locative *ergens* and the other modal options have relatively clear contextual characteristics.

If we now compare the characteristics of *ergens* to those of που, we see a different picture. In the context of που we often find the results of reasoning and references to knowledge of the world. Both the particles δή 'evidently' and ἦ *affirmative/inferential*

particle as well as verbs of knowing connect the content of the proposition to factual or accessible information. There is no special connection to the subject or to strictly personal subjective views. The reason for this lack of subjectivity is probably that personal subjective views are not generally presented as accessible information, because they cannot be assumed to be shared. This may be seen from the subjective adjectives that are found in the copula constructions in που clauses. These adjectives express in most cases conclusions that are presented as known facts or shared values like *it is impossible, clear, necessary*. If we do find subjective statements they generally refer to a shared set of moral or cultural values e.g. *just* (δίκαιον) or statements about the gods, as was already observed by Wackernagel (1885). An example of this last type is given below. This example was also mentioned in section 8.3 above.

(18) εἰ   μάλα καρτερός ἐσσι,   θεός   που σοὶ   τό   γ’   ἔδωκεν
      if   very strong you are, god   που you   the   ptcl has given
      CONJ ADV NOM.SG 2SG.PRS, NOM.SG που DAT.SG ACC.SG PTCL 3SG.AOR
      If you are very strong, it was a god who gave you this gift.[14]

  Il. 1.178 The information provided in example (18) is commonly held to be true in Greek society and the subjective value of this sentence is only in the choice of the moment of saying it (in a personal row with Achilles, suggesting that he is not more important than others because he is stronger).

  As we have seen above, locative and modal readings are not always easy to distinguish. For instance in cases in which a text of a famous author is cited it is often unclear whether the speaker is referring to an indefinite place in the text or whether he is expressing that the other person knows the text, which we may assume was often the case if, for instance, Homer was cited.

  In the following example, part of which was already discussed above, the author possibly wanted to disambiguate between a modal and a locative reading by adding δή to the first instance of που and ἄλλοθι to the second. In other examples of this type, like the one in (20), we generally find που without any indication whether the speaker wants to refer to some place in a text or is just marking that the text is probably known to the addressee.

(19) μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ τοὔνομα αὐτοῦ· ἔστι μὲν γὰρ δήπου καὶ Ὁμήρῳ “γάνυται δέ
      τ’ ἀκούων.” τοῦτο δὲ φράζει ὅτι ἥδεται δέ τ’ ἀκούων.

      ἔστι   δὲ   καὶ ἄλλοθί που
      is   and   ptcl else   somewhere
      3.SG.PRS PTCL PTCL ADV   PTCL

      “πυκινὰ φρεσὶ μήδεα εἰδώς.”
      This is confirmed by his very name. Homer, you remember, has the words, “He joys to hear;” that is to say, ‘he rejoices to hear;’ and in another place, “harbouring shrewd devices in his heart.”

                                                                  X. *Smp.* 8.30

---

[14]This translation was slightly modified to adapt it to our new findings.

It may even be that especially in those cases in which the information provided was already known, the speaker could afford not to be very precise about the location, inviting the inference that he knew that the addressee already knew where to find the passage. This might be an explanation of how the inference from an indefinite place to known information came about.

(20)   Socrates: Τὸν Ἡράκλειτόν μοι δοκῶ καθορᾶν παλαί᾽ ἄττα σοφὰ λέγοντα, ἀτεχνῶς τὰ ἐπὶ Κρόνου καὶ Ῥέας, ἃ καὶ Ὅμηρος ἔλεγεν.
Hermogenes: Πῶς τοῦτο λέγεις;

Socrates: Λέγει   που Ἡράκλειτος
          says   που Heracleitus
          3SG.PRS που NOM.SG

ὅτι "πάντα χωρεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν μένει," καὶ ποταμοῦ ῥοῇ ἀπεικάζων τὰ ὄντα λέγει ὡς "δὶς ἐς τὸν αὐτὸν ποταμὸν οὐκ ἂν ἐμβαίης."
EPM. Ἔστι ταῦτα.
(Socrates: I seem to have a vision of Heracleitus saying some ancient words of wisdom as old as the reign of Cronus and Rhea, which Homer said too.
Hermogenes: What do you mean by that?)
Socrates: Heracleitus says, you know(/somewhere *EK*), (that all things move and nothing remains still, and he likens the universe to the current of a river, saying that you cannot step twice into the same stream.
Hermogenes: True.)

Pl. *Cra.* 402a

In example (20), we may interpret που both as a reference to a place in a text of Heracleitus, and as an acknowledgement that Hermogenes probably knows this quote from Heracleitus. If we were to take this one step further, we may even assume that the reason Socrates does not need to specify where Heracleitus says this, is that he knows that the passage is known to Hermogenes, which may have given rise to the inference that που marked the information status instead of the location.

Summarizing, we have seen that the contextual characteristics of *ergens* and που allow us to draw quite a clear picture of the information that is important for the interpretation of these forms. For *ergens* we find, apart from the explicitly metaphorical examples, several indications of subjectivity, such as a connection to the agentive subject of the clause, first person pronouns, mental state predicates expressing personal views and opinions and subjective adjectives, but also indications of a split in the form of adversative markers and focus particles.

The contexts of modal που lack these subjective markers in most cases, but they do link που to interpretations like 'evidently' or 'of course' (δή που), inferential information (ἦ που) and shared information (verbs of knowing, truisms).

In the case of *ergens* we still find some indications of its probable origin in explicitly metaphorical expressions. In the case of που these indications are harder to find, but what may have contributed to the change from locative to modal is the implication that one can be imprecise if the information is already known.

11.5   Conclusion

The comparison of the contextual characteristics of *ergens* and που shows that the two particles may have been comparable in the locative domain, but were probably not very comparable in the modal domain. With respect to the locative interpretation, they seem to be quite alike. This interpretation of both forms seems to be triggered by locative verbs, adverbs and prepositions. Also, the generalizing function of the locative interpretation seems to be shared, although the frequent use in conditional clauses is confined to που. The *about/around* interpretation of που may have existed only in the Ionian dialect. That is, there is no compelling evidence to suggest that it also existed in the Attic dialect. There is also not enough evidence to assume a temporal interpretation of *ergens* or a *somehow* interpretation for που. There are instances in which it would be possible to interpret που in this way, but there is no compelling evidence that που really had this interpretation.

The comparison between modal *ergens* and modal που has shown that although both particles have the same origin and both developed a modal use, this modal use is probably not the same. The Greek particle που is less frequently combined with mental state predicates, first person verbs and subjective copula constructions. In other words, που seems much less connected to the mental space of the speaker than is the case for modal *ergens*. On the other hand, *ergens* is not frequently found together with adverbs like 'evidently' or in (*a fortiori*) arguments, conclusions, factual statements, truisms and (fatalistic) statements about the gods.

Historically, there also seem to be differences. In the older Greek texts we do not find many instances of metaphorically locative uses of που. And if we do find them, the type of modal inferences that can be made in the case of *ergens* do not seem to be possible. The lack of metaphorical uses of locative που and the differences in the contextual characteristics between modal *ergens* and modal που strongly suggest that Dutch *ergens* and Ancient Greek που developed different modal functions from a very comparable starting point.

It seems that a careful study of the contexts of forms like *ergens* and που may yield quite a precise picture of which components of the context are important for the interpretation of that form. The contextual characteristics of *ergens* showed, apart from a clearly marked locative use, strong indications that its meaning was related to preferably a first person's subjective view of the world while it also allowed for different views marked by adversative markers.

The context of που showed us that apart from its clearcut locative function, που feels at home in generalizing, indefinite contexts with εἰ and τις, which indicates that it may have had a generalizing function. In addition, known information from all kinds of sources (inference, knowledge of the world, shared moral values) may have played an important role in the use of που, as became clear from combinations with the particles δή and ἦ, as well as verbs of knowing. A recurring feature of που-contexts was also, as observed by Sicking, the presence of the particle in truisms, which is a clear contrast with the contexts in which we found *ergens*.

It was suggested that the origin of the development of the locative indefinite

to modal που might have been the assumption that an indefinite locative expressed that there was no need to be precise because the addressee already had access to the information. However, there is very little evidence with respect to the development of modal που, because this development already took place before the historic period began.