

Ezra la Roi*

Insubordination in Archaic and Classical Latin: commands, requests, wishes and assertives

<https://doi.org/10.1515/joll-2022-2008>

Abstract: This paper analyzes subordinate clauses which have gained both syntactic and discursive independence through insubordination, the diachronic conventionalization of main clause usage. First, I introduce the notion of insubordination and discuss its application to a corpus language such as Latin from both a synchronic and a diachronic perspective. Second, cases of insubordination from Archaic and Classical Latin are critically evaluated on the basis of evidence from different grammars and corpus research, yielding insubordinate directives (commands and requests with *ut(ei)* + subjunctive), insubordinate wishes (with *ut, utinam* and *si* + subjunctive) and assertives (with *quasi* + subjunctive). Special attention is paid to the pragmatic and syntactic characteristics of these insubordinate constructions such as (i) syntactic versus pragmatic independence from the linguistic common ground, (ii) main clause syntactic complexity, and (iii) the role of discourse particles of adversativity (*at, sed*) and positive polarity (*quidem*).

Keywords: directives; illocutionary force; insubordination; subjunctive; syntax

1 Insubordination in Archaic and Classical Latin

Insubordination refers to the diachronic conventionalization of the use of formally subordinate clauses as main clauses (Evans 2007: 367). As illustrated by the examples below from modern languages, this historical process is incredibly pervasive across languages. Insubordinate constructions, although formally marked as subordinate clauses (e.g. *que, if, als*), behave like main clauses in that they are not only syntactically independent but also discursively independent (D’Hertefelt 2018: 182–183; la Roi 2021; Sansiñena et al. 2015). In fact, from a

*Corresponding author: Ezra la Roi, Vakgroep Taalkunde (sectie Grieks), Blandijnberg 2, 9000 Gent, Belgium, E-mail: ezra.laroi@ugent.be. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4542-0610>

diachronic perspective they have acquired a pragmatically independent use and therefore have their own illocutionary force rather than inheriting it from their matrix clause, as subordinate clauses prototypically do (see Lehmann [1989: 160] who discusses Latin subordinate clause types along various syntactic and pragmatic dimensions).¹ As discussed in Section 2, there are different paths through which a subordinate clause can extend its dependency and become pragmatically independent. They can, for example, conventionalize the absence of an apodosis in its illocutionary interpretation (e.g. *If you could help, I'd be happy* > request *if you could help*; Evans 2007)² or by extending its dependency in dialogic contexts (i.e. from dependency on immediate linguistic common ground such as the interlocutor's last speech act to independent from it).

- (1) [Spanish] *¡Que te calles!*
'(I insist that you) shut up!' (literally: 'That you shut up!')
(Sansiñena et al. 2015: 13)
- (2) [Spanish] *¡Que sean felices!*
'May you be happy.' [literally: 'That you are happy.']
(Sansiñena et al. 2015: 14)
- (3) [English] *If only I'd listened to my parents.*
(Quirk et al. 1985: 842)
- (4) [Dutch] *Als ik het niet dacht!*
'I knew it!' (literally: 'if I did not think it')
(D'Hertefelt 2018: 119)

While recent linguistic scholarship has yielded much evidence for insubordination cross-linguistically (see the overview and references in Evans and Watanabe [2016], D'Hertefelt [2018], and Beijering et al. [2019b]), the most recent Latin syntactic overviews of Touratier (1994), Pinkster (2015, 2021) and Baños Baños (2009, 2021) make no mention of the phenomenon of insubordination for such clause types. The extensive literature reviews on mood and modality in Latin and its review by Calboli (1966, 1968, 2011, 2013) also do not discuss an insubordination approach.

¹ As discussed in Section 3.2, appositive relative clauses can however have their own illocutionary force (Lehmann 1989: 5) which is why we find insubordinate *utinam* wishes in relative clauses in Latin (as we do with Ancient Greek directives and wishes in relative clauses; Denizot 2011; la Roi 2020: 225–226).

² Lindström et al. (2019), in fact, find that cooperative interlocutors can interpret a *if you could* conditional already as an insubordinate request before the respective apodosis is uttered.

However, there are clause types in Archaic and Classical Latin which I think would benefit from an analysis from the perspective of insubordination. To illustrate briefly, wishes are typically said to be introduced by so-called wish particles such as *utinam* or less often *ut* or *si* (Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 330; Mesa Sanz 1998: 71; Pinkster 2015: 359). In such cases, the wish illocution is thought to be generated by the subjunctive to which the particle is said to be an addition or clarification,³ but this is not the only way to understand their relationship (see Mesa Sanz [1998] for a very detailed study of wishes and their contextual variations). In this article I would like to argue (among other things) that the addition of these so-called wish particles is not arbitrary, but rather represents a different source construction, an insubordinate wish construction (similar to example [1]). So-called insubordinate wishes are wishes expressed by clauses which bear subordinate clause marking (e.g. *ut* or *si*) but have undergone insubordination. As can be the case with well-documented languages, the suggestion that I am advancing here for Latin has at least partially been anticipated by our perceptive grammarians Kühner and Stegmann. For example, as early as a century ago, they suggested that in cases such as example (5) the *ut*-clause is independent as a result of ellipsis: “In der Vorklassischen Zeit findet sich zuweilen, sonst aber nur vereinzelt der Wunschsatz als ein von einem verschwiegenen Verb des Wunsches abhängiger Nebensatz aufzufassen” (Kühner and Stegmann 1912: 183).⁴ As discussed below, the historical process behind the creation of this structure could actually be insubordination.

- (5) (Plaut. *Poen.* 912)
valeas beneque ut sit tibi
 ‘farewell and be well’⁵

In the present paper, I offer an outline of insubordination, a description of how it can be applied to an ancient corpus language such as Latin, and a preliminary analysis of insubordinate constructions in Archaic and Classical Latin. Instead of offering a full-fledged corpus analysis of all potential insubordination candidates in Archaic and Classical Latin, the main goal of this article is to illustrate the utility

³ I suspect that the continued existence of this interpretation is due in part to the strong functional tradition in Latin linguistics where such markers are interpreted as illocutionary operators or modifiers. An exception is Mesa Sanz (1998: 278), who proposes that *ut* must have lost its “original” force already when used from early Archaic Latin texts in wishes.

⁴ Calboli (1966: 271) criticizes the idea about the origin of this usage by Kühner and Stegmann, but interprets *ut* as marking some kind of reinforcement/emphasis, which, as I discuss below, does not truly explain the pragmatic force of *ut* in marking an illocution.

⁵ The translations for this article were taken from <https://www.loebclassics.com/> and only very infrequently adapted.

of the notion of insubordination for explaining certain syntactic and illocutionary phenomena in Latin. Section 2 introduces the concept of insubordination and discusses how we can apply it to an ancient corpus language such as Latin, Section 3 traces the insubordination of directives (e.g. commands and requests), wishes and assertives, and Section 4 offers some concluding remarks and prospects for insubordination research on Latin.

2 Applying insubordination to Latin

Ever since Evans' (2007) foundational paper, insubordination has received a large amount of studies detailing how constructions which had fallen outside the scope of ordinary syntactic description (i.e. main vs. subordinate clause) could actually be instances of insubordination (cf. Beijering et al. 2019b; D'Hertefelt 2018; Evans and Watanabe 2016).⁶ Evans had argued that the motor behind the creation and conventionalization of insubordinate construction was ellipsis and proposed a neat evolutionary scheme from which a subordinate clause (e.g. *If you could do that, he would be happy*) would develop into an insubordinate clause (e.g. request *If you could open the window*) through a process of conventionalization of ellipsis (e.g. ellipsis of the apodosis). However, more recent work on insubordination has reevaluated this aspect and asked how exactly such ellipsis could have played a role in creating novel syntax diachronically (cf. Brinton [2014] and Traugott [2017] on the lack of confounding diachronic corpus evidence). Accordingly, researchers have suggested that interactional contexts in which subordinate constructions are enriched into insubordinate constructions can provide the missing context of change. The idea behind this is that subordinate constructions which depend pragmatically on a previous utterance by an interlocutor are increasingly interpreted as independent utterances over time (Heine et al. 2016; Kaltenböck 2016; Sansiñena et al. 2015). In other words, what was seen as ellipsis by Evans could constitute dyadic dependence on linguistic common ground in dialogic contexts from both a syntactic and illocutionary perspective, which over time becomes independence from syntactic or illocutionary co-construction with the linguistic common ground (see Beijering et al. 2019a: 9–11; Sansiñena et al. 2015: 5). To illustrate with examples from Spanish (Martínez Caro and Alba-Juez 2021: 3), the Spanish directive in example (7) received its insubordinate use by being

⁶ This study has also generated research on cases which do not fall neatly within the definition of insubordination, for example because they are only syntactically independent but discursively dependent (so-called semi-insubordinate constructions) such as *Funny that you should say that*, for which see Beijering et al. (2019a).

reinterpreted from pragmatically dependent examples such as example (6) into a discursively independent such as example (7), that is, having its own illocutionary force. In (6), the interpretation of *que* not only syntactically depends on the previous utterance in the linguistic common ground (i.e. she said *that* you should shut up), but the pragmatic force of the *que*-clause (i.e. its illocutionary force) also depends on the previous utterance and is, as it were, co-constructed with the previous utterance: “she said that you should shut up” receiving declarative illocutionary force because it factually reports a message. By contrast, in example (7) the *que*-clause is properly insubordinate because it has its own directive illocutionary force independent of co-construction with the linguistic common ground. Dialogic contexts of co-construction thus can provide the context of change from subordinate to insubordinate clause.

- (6) A: ¿*Qué dijo?*
 B: *Que te calles.*
 A: ‘What did she say?’
 B: ‘That you should shut up.’
- (7) (Two people are having a strong argument and one says)
 ¡*Que te calles!*
 ‘(I insist that you) shut up!’ (Literally: ‘That you shut up!’)

While insubordinate clauses thus strongly resemble main clauses, for example in being pragmatically independent, their cross-linguistic evolution betrays that there are important intermediate stages where the illocutionary force of the insubordinate clause is still dependent on the pragmatic context. Therefore, it has been suggested that a more accurate definition of insubordinate constructions is those formally subordinate constructions which are discursively independent, meaning that their illocutionary force should not depend on co-construction with another (previous) utterance (D’Hertefelt 2018: 182–183; la Roi 2021). I illustrate these matters in 3.1, where we find relevant dialogical contexts attesting the gradual extension from subordinate to insubordinate usage.

Consequently, when applying the notion of insubordination to an ancient corpus language such as Latin, we would be able to gather the most information about insubordinate constructions when looking at dialogical texts (esp. Latin comedy and tragedy).⁷ Important reasons for that are, on the one hand, that the

⁷ However, see also below for examples in Classical Latin from reported dialogue in prose. One of the reviewers also suggested that epistolography would provide a valuable source for insubordination research and I wholeheartedly agree with that, as shown by the examples from Cicero’s epistolography referenced below.

linguistic common ground can be traced back in conversation (e.g. is a potentially in subordinate construction actually discursively independent from previous acts?) and, on the other hand, that pragmatic cues by the speaker can reveal the intended illocutionary force of the utterance. Yet, there are also essential caveats to keep in mind when applying the concept of in subordination to an ancient corpus language such as Latin. First, although in subordination is, as discussed above, a cross-linguistically pervasive diachronic process, its outcomes in a language are language-specific. This means that in subordinate wishes might be of conditional origin in one language (e.g. English *if only she were here!*), but a that-clause in other languages (e.g. Spanish above), or both. By the same token, some languages may have in subordinate constructions for more illocutionary functions than others. Second, the syntactic and illocutionary signs of in subordinate status given in in subordination studies should be handled with caution. Typical clues mentioned in such studies are: (i) subordinator (e.g. *if, that*), (ii) modals, or subordinate clause moods (e.g. subjunctive in languages where relevant), (iii) subordinate clause word order (in languages where relevant), (iv) collocations with specific particles (e.g. *If only! Dass nur!*), (v) independent syntactic use and, most importantly, (vi) independent discursive use (D’Hertefeldt 2018: 142–146; la Roi 2021). To take a dangerous example, the ‘subjunctive’ is often mentioned as a sign of in subordinate status (i.e. taking ‘subjunctive’ in the literal sense), but for a language such as Latin this does not make sense because the subjunctive⁸ is found in various inherited main clause usages (e.g. wish or potential/counterfactual declarative).⁹ By contrast, in languages where this ‘subjunctive’ is limited to subordinate clauses, it could be argued that when they are used in a clause that is discursively independent they do reflect in subordinate status. Moreover, although a language may have a rich mood-based illocutionary inventory (such as Latin or Ancient Greek, see la Roi 2021), they may still develop in subordinate constructions to express the same illocutions (*pace* D’Hertefeldt 2018: 217). It is up to us to try and distill the pragmatic and/or sociolinguistic differences (cf. Barrios-Lech 2016) between the uses of the mood-based illocutions and the in subordinate alternatives (see discussion in Section 3 below and the conclusion). Finally, the process of in subordination should not be confused with other diachronic processes that affect subordinators, such as the development of

⁸ For the development of the Latin subjunctive in Archaic and later Latin, see respectively de Melo (2007) and Thomas (1938) and Sabaneeva (1996).

⁹ As mentioned by la Roi (2021), it does not help that Evans (2007: 378–388) already made this mistake when he suggested that the main clause uses of the Latin subjunctive derive from in subordination using a very debated and controversial generative account of the moods in Latin by Lakoff (1968). See the extensive rebuttal of this book by Pinkster (1971). Evans also suggests the use of unembedded infinitives in Latin as a case of in subordination, but this matter will not be discussed here.

subordinators into discourse particles (see Baños Baños [2011, 2014] and Bertocchi and Maraldi [2011] on concessive and causal clauses) or the pragmaticalization of subordinate structures (see Fedriani [2021] on *si placet*).

3 Insubordinate strategies in Archaic and Classical Latin

In what follows I offer preliminary evidence for insubordinate directives (commands and requests), wishes and assertives in Archaic and Classical Latin. I discuss the factors relevant for the identification of insubordination synchronically as well as diachronically. It is hoped that future research into insubordination in Latin will not only yield other candidates for insubordination but also increase our understanding of both the synchronic usage and diachronic development of insubordinate constructions (see Section 4).

3.1 *Ut, uti* and *utei* for insubordinate commands and requests

In the works of Archaic Latin authors such as Plautus, we find examples of insubordinate *ut(i)* introducing a directive which are put on an equal level with imperative directives as they are paratactically connected, for which see the *uti* directive in example (8). Mesa Sanz (1998: 334) suggested that this example is one of only three examples (together with example [12] and Pl. *Curc.* 257) from Archaic Latin where *ut* is used in an independent way, whereas Risselada (1993: 148) suggests that only Ter. *Phorm.* 213 is truly independent. As shown by the examples discussed below and further examples referenced, not only is the insubordinate directive usage of *ut(i)* more widespread than these examples but it is also not limited to the 3rd person.

- (8) (Plaut. *Capt.* 114–115)
sinito ambulare, si foris si intus volent, sed uti adserventur magna dilligentia
 ‘Let them walk around outside or inside if they wish, but **they should be watched over** very carefully.’

By contrast, such examples differ from cases where *ut* is still dependent on the previous utterance for its illocutionary force and shows a syntactic dependency on a word from the previous act (cf. also Plaut. *Curc.* 670–674 and *Pseud.* 1155):

- (9) (Plaut. *Aul.* 3–5)
 Staph. *Nam cur me miseram verberas?*
 Euclio *Ut misera sis atque ut te dignam mala malam aetatem exigas.*
 Staph. ‘Why on earth are you hitting me, miserable thing that I am?’
 Euclio ‘So that you’re miserable and lead the wretched life you deserve, you wretch.’

In example (9), much like in example (7) from Spanish discussed above, the *ut*-clause depends on the previous clauses as it answers the question “why?” (*cur*). The answer itself, then, is elliptical in the sense that the main verb can be regarded as left out in the answer due to its presence in the linguistic common ground, in the previous clause (*verberas*). Since the *ut*-clause in the answer does not have its own illocutionary force yet (i.e. the declarative force is co-constructed with the previous question *cur ... verberas*), it cannot be called insubordinate, even though of course it forms an answer to the question by itself (cf. Baños Baños [2011: 217] on such syntactically free but not discursively independent use of causal clauses).

There are other very similar contexts in which linguistic cues are provided that *ut* is better interpreted as marking a main clause structure (i.e. insubordinate to some degree) even though it still has a form of dependence on the previous discourse act, such as example (10).¹⁰ This example occurs in a long directive response to the request for a directive.

- (10) (Plaut. *Men.* 425–429)
 So: *impera quid vis modo*
 Er: *pallam illam quam dudum dederas, ad phrygionem ut deferas, ut reconcinnetur atque ut opera addantur quae volo*
 So: *hercle qui tu recte dicis: eadem <ea> ignorabitur, ne uxor cognoscat te habere, si in uia conspexerit.*
 So: ‘just command me whatever you want’
 Er: ‘**Take** that mantle you gave me earlier **to** the embroiderer so that it can be repaired and so that at the same time the additions that I want can be made.’
 So: ‘How right you are! That way it’ll also become unrecognizable, so that my wife won’t realize that you have it if she spots you in the street.’

Menaechmus has just asked to be commanded (see *impera*) to which Erotium responds with an insubordinate *ut*-command. In such contexts of a reaction to a

¹⁰ I thank one of the reviewers for their critical remarks on this diachronically transitory example which differs from the more clearly dependent and the fully insubordinate examples.

request, not only imperative directives and directive subjunctives can be found but also independent *ut* + subjunctives (e.g. Plaut. *Merc.* 621–622, *Poen.* 410–411; 721). Risselada was, however, ambiguous on how to interpret this long sentence, as her translation (Risselada 1993: 51) interprets the latter two *ut*-clauses as subordinate to the main directive *ut*-clause, as would I with the most recent translation by de Melo (2011), whereas she later summarizes the sentence as containing three separate directives (Risselada 1993: 52). What is striking is the syntactic complexity of the command of example (10),¹¹ as it has three subordinate clauses (see the bold relative clause and two purpose clauses). I interpret this as a sign that the insubordinate directive use of *ut* is already conventionalizing also in contexts of co-construction (cf. la Roi [2021, in prep.] on the syntactic complexity of insubordinate strategies in Ancient Greek). Thus, with regards to what Lehmann (1989) called hierarchical downgrading for subordination in Latin (i.e. the subordinate clause is downgraded to a lower level than parataxis or independent main clauses), we could say that insubordinate constructions create, as it were, hierarchical upgrading, as they start to embed other subordinate clauses.

Another important sign that *ut*-directives can be used in a fully insubordinate fashion with their own illocutionary force is given by the turn-initial particles which introduce them, i.e. *sed* (cf. example [8] above and [11] below) and *at* (see example [12]). In example (11) Antipho closes off the sequence of questions with a request that each should tell separately. By contrast, in example (12) Sannio makes a clarificatory request, where *sed* signals a clarification of how the answering of questions can be done in a relevant way (cf. Kroon 1995: 337). Whereas Syrus promises that Sannio will get paid, Sannio clarifies that he wants to be paid in full, where *at* signals a challenging conversational move (cf. Kroon 1995: 336–340).

- (11) (Plaut. *Stich.* 105–106)
 Antipho *quibus matronas moribus quae optumae sunt esse oportet? **sed** utraque **ut dicat** mihi.*
 Antipho ‘what character should those married women (those who are best) have?
But each of you **must tell** me separately.’
- (12) (Ter. *Ad.* 279–280)
 Syrus *Reddetur: ne time.*
 Sannio ***At ut omne reddat***
 Syrus ‘You’ll be paid. Don’t worry!’
 Sannio ‘**Make sure** I’m paid in full.’

¹¹ For a similar example, see Plaut. *Mil.* 187 *ut eum, qui se hic vidit, verbis vincat ne is se viderit.*

Furthermore, the spread of this construction to different persons demonstrates the pervasiveness of its insubordinate usage. As illustrated by the examples above, these insubordinate directives can occur in both the 3rd and 2nd person, but they also occur with the 1st person (see examples and further examples referenced below). As illustrated by example (13) and (14), such 1st-person insubordinate directives typically function as requests. In example (13), Dordalus requests to know how much money will be asked for the girl, a request he modifies with the particle *modo*, which is used to play down the effect of a directive on an addressee (Risselada 1993: 86, 1994).

- (13) (Plaut. *Persa* 574–575)
 Toxilus *i sane tu . . . hanc eme; ausculta mihi.*
 Dordalus ***modo ut sciam quanti indicet.***
 Toxilus ‘No, you go . . . and buy her; listen to me.’
 Dordalus ‘**At least let me know** what price he’s setting for her.’

In example (14), Charinus requests to let him marry her (note the use of *at* and *tamen* combined with the vocative which signal the pragmatically independent use of the directive as a challenge).

- (14) (Ter. *Andr.* 711–712)
 Charinus *Dave, at tamen–*
 Davus *quid ergo?*
 Charinus ***ut ducam.***
 Charinus ‘Yes, Davus, but’
 Davus ‘What?’
 Charinus ‘**Help me to marry her.**’

Note also the presence of vocatives in insubordinate *ut* directives in the 2nd person singular, underlining the independent pragmatic usage.¹²

- (15) (Plaut. *Bacch.* 738–741)
 Mnesilochus *loquere. hoc scriptum est.*
 Chrysalus “*nunc, **pater mi**, proin tu ab eo **ut caueas tibi:** sycophantias componit, aurum ut aps ted auferat; et profecto se ablaturum dixit.” plane ascribito.*
 Mnesilochus ‘Speak. That’s written.’
 Chrysalus ‘Now, **my father**, you **should be careful** of him. He’s coming up with tricks in order to take the money away from you. And he said that he really would take it.” Write that down explicitly. (*Mnesilochus complies*)’

¹² For further examples of insubordinate *ut*-directives in the 2nd person singular, see Plaut. *Curc.* 130, Ter. *Phorm.* 212, *Haut.* 470, 572, *Eun.* 339 and *Ad.* 741.

The origin of such insubordinate directives could very well be similar to the dyadic origin described for *que*-directives in Spanish. In fact, when we take another look at example (14), one might want to suggest that Charinus' request is not fully pragmatically independent as if it responds to Davus' (vague) question, that is, interpret it as 'that I will marry her', i.e. as pragmatically dependent. However, in addition to being a quite short answer to a vague question, the presence of the adversative particles and the vocative to my mind makes this suggestion less likely, as Charinus makes an effort to signal the independence of his request from previous discourse acts. Still, such examples provide useful clues to the likely dyadic origin of independent directive usages (cf. la Roi [2021, in prep.], who discusses a similar dyadic origin of the ὄπως + future indicative as directive in Classical Greek dialogue).

In fact, Risselada (1993: 141–152) had already made some pertinent remarks about subjunctive prohibitions which need revision in light of the corpus evidence presented here. In her discussion of the differences of subjunctive directives with imperative directives, she suggested that subjunctive directives (with or without *ut*) show a greater pragmatic dependency on the previous context (esp. the previous discourse act). For example, she points to how an *ut ducas* directive subjunctive depends on the imperative directive in the previous discourse act in Ter. *Haut.* 1055–1056, as she argues that the pragmatic dependency is “even stronger in the case of subjunctive directives containing *ut*” (Risselada 1993: 149). As I have illustrated with the examples above (e.g. examples [8], [13] and [15]), this does not apply to all insubordinate directives because there are transitional cases where *ut* shows a form of dependency (syntactic or pragmatic) (contrast examples [9] and [10]) as well as fully insubordinate uses. Instead, as suggested by recent work on dependency change for insubordinate constructions, I would interpret the different degrees of dependencies (both syntactically and pragmatically) as a diachronic sign that the insubordinate directive usages of *ut(i)* have only partially gained full insubordinate status (as reflected by the uses with adversative particles, vocatives and subordinate clauses in insubordinate usages).¹³ Finally, whereas Risselada (1993: 141–142) suggested that subjunctive directives are predominantly prohibitions, we have seen that insubordinate subjunctive directives can actually be positive commands and requests.

13 The lack of an insubordination interpretation can also be seen in punctuational disputes. As suggested by Bennett (1966: 165 note 2), Plaut. *Trin.* 347 *ut potius pudeat, si non feceris* had been punctuated wrongly taking *ut* as dependent, which it clearly is not here. For similar remarks on insubordination and punctuation for Ancient Greek examples, see la Roi (2021). For a study on a problem in mood usage where syntactic and illocutionary dependence also features, see Álvarez Huerta (2001).

After all, the textual evidence from Archaic Latin also offers other evidence for the early creation of in subordinate *ut(i)* directives in Cato's works. As noted by Kühner and Stegmann (1912: 187) we find directive usages of *ut(i)* in Archaic Latin especially in Cato's works.¹⁴ Following his first suggestions as to what to keep in mind when tending to a farm, Cato uses the following construction represented in example (16). Courtney (1999: 53) did not know what to make of *uti*, as it does not correspond with the idea found in grammars that *uti* is an indefinite adverb (see Bennett 1966: 165; Pinkster 2015: 500) or some kind of adverbial (Handford 1947: 42), a view which is not helpful in this example to explain its role for the marking of illocutionary force. I would argue that this example is an early in subordinate use of *uti* as command. The linguistic clues for this interpretation are that (i) the command has its own subordinate clause like other in subordinate directives discussed above, (ii) the command has a directive force (go and keep your eyes open!) and (iii) is connected (through *et*) to previously made commands (which would provide clues to the directive interpretation of this in subordinating structure).¹⁵

(16) (Cato *Agr.* 1.2)

Et uti eo introeas et circumspicias, uti inde exire possis.

'Go in and keep your eyes open, so that you may be able to find your way out.'

In fact, in their history of Latin, Clackson and Horrocks (2007: 154–155) point to a potential parallelism in usage in Classical Greek of ὄρωσ + future as independent directive. They tentatively suggest that the use of *utei* + subjunctive may either be an independent directive or that a verb of ordering would have to be understood. Also, this usage is actually a characteristic of official Latin (as confirmed by its use in a *Senatus Consultum* and its translation with the in subordinate ὄρωσ + future in a Greek version). See the use of the construction in example (17) from the *Senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* 22–23 which is discussed by Courtney (1999: 93–99) and has its own subordinate clause. I would therefore argue that these instances are undergoing in subordination.

(17) *haice utei in couentionid exdeicatis ne minus noundinum.*

'You shall publish these decrees in public assembly for not less than three market days'

Judging by the absence of remarks on *ut(i)* directives by grammars for later Latin, they seem to have lost out to other directive strategies in Classical Latin. The

¹⁴ They state "am häufigsten bei Cato, sonst selten", but as shown in the preceding discussion, this qualification is not in line with the available corpus evidence.

¹⁵ For additional examples from Cato, see Cato *Agr.* 2.6, cited by Pinkster (2015: 502).

archaic status of it could perhaps be reflected by its use in a will which is cited by Cicero (Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 664).¹⁶

- (18) (Cic. *de orat.* 2.141)
cum scriptum ita sit: SI MIHI FILIVS GENITVR IS QVE PRIVS MORITVR et cetera, TVM VT MIHI ILLE SIT HERES
 ‘the words in the will being “If a son is born to me, and such son dies before, etc., then **let** So-and-so **be** my heir”’

Note the presence of a subordinate clause preceding the main clause with *ut*, which – interestingly enough – is edited out in the Loeb text (i.e. *cum scriptum ita sit Si mihi filius genitur, isque prius moritur, et cetera, tum mihi ille sit heres*).

To sum up, the insubordination hypothesis suggested here follows the corpus evidence more closely than suggestions that *ut(i)* is something else such as an indefinite adverb/adverbial or that it developed from the main clause subjunctive (contra Handford 1947: 49–50).¹⁷

3.2 *Ut, utinam* and *si* for insubordinate wishes

The uses of the bare subjunctive for wishes are very widespread and therefore relatively well-known (Bennett 1966: 192; Hofmann and Szantyr 1965: 330–333; Kühner and Stegmann 1912: 183). An important reason for this is that as early as Archaic Latin, a part of them were formulaic variants which occur very frequently: *di te perdant/ament/dent/faciant, bene/male sit, salvos sis, valeas* (cf. Berger 2020). Still, the insubordinate wishes from Archaic Latin which were introduced by *ut* and *utinam* differ from these formulaic usages of the wish subjunctive in several respects. First of all, the diachronic origins of these wish strategies are different, as the wish usage of the subjunctive was inherited (Clackson 2007: 120; Weiss 2009: 416–418) whereas the insubordinate wish usage must have been created later but before early Archaic Latin, because *utinam* is attested already in an insubordinate way in early Archaic Latin texts. We witness a similar process in the early history of Ancient Greek, where insubordinate wishes were created from subordinate if- and that- clauses before

¹⁶ One of the reviewers, however, rightfully suggests that this construction is also found elsewhere in Cicero in informal contexts, such as Cic. *Fam.* 14.20 *Ibi ut sint parata omnia*. Further corpus research is needed on the sociolinguistic dimensions of insubordinate directive strategies.
¹⁷ This hypothesis probably rests upon the received Neogrammarian hypothesis that subordinate clause usage developed out of main clause usage, as their idea was that the proto language would have been only paratactic due to its alleged simplicity. This idea is generally not entertained anymore, cf. la Roi (2021).

Archaic Greek (εἰ, εἰ/αἴθε, εἰ/αἴ γάρ, εἴθε/αἴθε as ‘if [only]’ and ὡς as ‘that’) in addition to existing bare wish optatives which were used more frequently (la Roi 2021). Also, some are only attested insubordinately in Archaic Greek, similar to *utinam*. There is etymological evidence to support a similar analysis for Archaic Latin from wishes with *utinam* (usefully calqued as ‘o dass doch’ by Kühner and Stegmann [1912: 183]).¹⁸ The particle *nam* is a discourse particle with originally a positive polarity function ‘truly’¹⁹ (as German *doch*, which is also used in insubordinate wishes and the calque by Kühner and Stegmann²⁰) and is attached to many different items in Latin, such as interrogative pronouns (e.g. *ubinam* or *quisnam*), or forms new particles, e.g. *namque* ‘certainly’.²¹ Later on, *nam* by itself more often has causal force ‘for’ connecting independent sentences. Similarly, in Ancient Greek an originally positive polarity particle (γάρ) was added to create an insubordinate wish εἰ/αἴ γάρ (la Roi 2021). With *utinam*, *-nam* was attached to *uti*, which is the archaic written form of the complementizer *ut*. This also suggests that *utinam* must be a relatively archaic formation, which would explain why we find *utinam* used only for wishes from the very start of our textual transmission (i.e. not as subordinate usage anymore) and *utinam* wishes are conventionalized as main clause up to a degree that they have their own subordinate clauses and a vocative, as shown by the next example from Archaic Latin.

(19) (Plaut. *Capt.* 537–538)

Utinam te di prius perderent quam periisti e patria tua Aristophontes, qui ex parata re imparatam omnem facis.

‘**I wish** the gods had destroyed you **before** you disappeared from home, **Aristophontes, you who** turns the whole thing from settled back to unsettled.’

Furthermore, we not only find similar usages of insubordinate *ut*-wishes with a positive polarity particle *quidem*²² in Archaic Latin (see example [20]) but also insubordinate *utinam* wishes which have a similar positive polarity particle in the same clause (see example [21]), demonstrating that originally positive polarity *nam* had fossilized already with the insubordinate clause marker.

¹⁸ Pace Mesa Sanz (1998: 287), who denies significance to the components of this particle, but only points to lexicalization as general explanation.

¹⁹ Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 504–505). According to Kroon (1995: 150–152), however, the particle had lost this function synchronically already, but I would argue that its more archaic usage is still reflected in these old compounds.

²⁰ See D’Hertefelt (2018: 34) with references.

²¹ See de Vaan (2008: 399).

²² See Danckaert (2014) for the uses and history of this particle, with references to other literature.

- (20) (Plaut. *Aul.* 154)
ut quidem *emoriar prius quam ducam.*
 ‘**May I truly die** before I marry!’
- (21) (Plaut. *Aul.* 50–51)
utinam *me diui adaxint ad suspendium potius quidem quam hoc pacto apud te seruiam.*
 ‘**If only** the gods would drive me to hang myself instead of being your servant in this way.’

Also, as *only* in English or *nur* in German insubordinate wishes (D’Hertefeldt 2018: 30–37), *modo* may be added to insubordinate wishes, e.g. Ter. *Phorm.* 773 *modo ut hoc consilio possiet discedi* or Plaut. *Aul.* 433 *utinam mea modo auferam* (cf. Bennett 1966: 194).

Second, there are considerable distributional differences between the bare wish subjunctives and their insubordinate alternatives. In a way similar to conventionalized insubordinate wishes in other languages such as English or Ancient Greek, insubordinate *utinam* may function as a shorthand for a wish without a subjunctive already in Archaic Latin (see Mesa Sanz [1998: 291–292] for further examples, also from Classical Latin texts), as shown in example (22). In English, insubordinate *if only!* can be used in this way (D’Hertefeldt 2018: 81) and in Classical Greek εἰ γὰρ ὤφελον ‘if only would (have)’ (la Roi 2021). Interpreting *utinam* as an indefinite adverbial according to traditional doctrine would render the example senseless, whereas the wish interpretation would make the usage of *utinam* in an elliptical wish understandable.²³ The fact that *utinam* is also found in some relative clauses (e.g. Cic. *Prov.* 18) would not be a counterargument, as it is known that relative clauses can maintain their own illocutionary force (see note 1 above and Lehmann 1989: 160).

- (22) (Ter. *Ad.* 518)
Utinam quidem!
 ‘**I only hope he is.**’

Furthermore, according to some grammars (Bennett 1966: 193; Handford 1947: 87), insubordinate wishes still had a greater freedom of predicate types at their disposal than the formulaic bare subjunctives. To illustrate, in Archaic Latin one finds the conventional best wishes formulas only as a bare subjunctive *valeas salvos sis* or *di ament*, not as *ut(inam) valeas/salvos sis/ament*, because insubordinate wishes are

²³ See Calboli (1966: 273–276) for a thorough discussion of older literature on the topic.

typically found with other predicates (cf. the long list of examples given by Bennett [1966: 193–197]), as in example (23).²⁴

- (23) (Plaut. *Men.* 328)
Ut eas maximam malam crucem
 ‘Yes, **go** and be hanged.’

Even when a predicate is used that is also found in formulaic bare subjunctives such as the archaic *perduint*, the insubordinate alternative is not as formulaic, but rather directly aimed at someone, as in example (24), or part of a syntactically complex wish, as in example (25).

- (24) (Plaut. *Merc.* 709–710)
equidem hercle oppido perii miser! uident. ut te omnes, Demipho, di
perduint.
 ‘(aside) And I am completely dead! She’s seen her. **May** all the gods **ruin you**, Demipho!’
- (25) (Plaut. *Aul.* 785–786)
ut illum di immortales omnes deaque quantum est perduint, quem propter
hodie auri tantum perdidit infelix, miser.
 ‘**May** all the immortal gods and goddesses **confound him**, the whole lot of them, because of whom I lost such a large amount of gold today.’

Finally, similar to the insubordinate directive alternatives, insubordinate *utinam* wishes are not limited to the 2nd and 3rd person, but also occur in the 1st person as wishes directed to the speaker.²⁵

- (26) (Plaut. *Epid.* 196)
di immortales, utinam conueniam domi Periphanem
 ‘Immortal gods! **I hope I can find** Periphanes at home.’
- (27) (Plaut. *Asin.* 615)
 Arg. *facio lubens.*
 Phil. *utinam sic efferamur.*
 Arg. ‘I do so with pleasure. (embraces her)’
 Phil. ‘**I wish we could be carried to the grave like this.**’

²⁴ One exception may be *bene sit*, which occurs as bare subjunctive wish Plaut. *Merc.* 327 or as insubordinate wish, as shown in example (1).

²⁵ In Classical Greek, wishes (both insubordinate and bare wish optative) also spread across the persons, as revealed by the counts provided by la Roi (2020: 227).

In Classical Latin, the insubordinate *ut*-wishes become rarer (Pinkster 2015: 504–508), as *utinam* becomes the standard insubordinate wish marker (cf. the 159 occurrences I found in Cicero and 29 in Seneca). This does not mean, however, that insubordinate *ut*-wishes are completely obsolete, for which see example (28), although we should note the archaic use of *uti* here which might indicate that *uti* as insubordinate wish marker was an intentional archaic linguistic representation, as the intentional archaic translation would also suggest.²⁶

(28) (Liv. 1.18.9)

precatus ita est: Iuppiter pater, si est fas hunc Numam Pompilius, cuius ego caput teneo, regem Romae esse, uti tu signa nobis certa adclarassis inter eos fines, quos feci.

‘he uttered the following prayer: “Father Jupiter, if it is Heaven’s will that this man Numa Pompilius, whose head I am touching, be king in Rome, **do thou exhibit** to us unmistakable signs within those limits which I have set.”’

Yet, as mentioned by the grammars (e.g. Pinkster 2015: 504), insubordinate *utinam* is frequent across the periods of Latin,²⁷ which cannot be said for *ut(i)*-wishes nor for insubordinate *si*-wishes.

Insubordinate *si*-wishes, in much the same way as in languages such as English (*if only!*) or German (*wenn...!*), receive independence through ellipsis of the matrix clause (cf. Hofmann and Szantyr [1965: 456] who speak about “versällb-standigten abhängigen Sätzen”). These structures are still comparatively rare (e.g. Mesa Sanz [1998: 282–284] records no examples in his corpus), but are sometimes found already in Plautus, for which see example (29) or Plaut. *Cas.* 743. Note the similar use of *modo* as discussed above.

(29) (Plaut. *Capt.* 996)

quod male feci crucior; Modo si infectum fieri posset

‘I’m in agony because I treated him badly; **if only it could be** undone!’

(30) (Sen. *Contr.* 1.6.7)

o si scires, quam dives et haec fuisset!

‘**if only you knew** how rich this one would have been!’

²⁶ Incidentally, the Greek historian Diodorus Siculus lets Croesus say the Post-Classical wish Εἴθε γάρ τις πείσειε νησιώτας σὺν ἵπποις παρατάξασθαι Λυδοῖς. (Diod.Sic. 9.25.1), but Εἴθε γάρ is a new formation from Post-Classical Greek fusing εἴθε and εἰ γάρ and therefore is something which he could not have said but is meant to give it an archaic tinge (la Roi 2021).

²⁷ A functional motivation for this might be that *utinam* was the way to introduce counterfactual wishes according to Pinkster (2015: 508).

Later on the wish value is also signaled by the interjection *o* (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.6.8 and example [30]) and, according to Hofmann and Szantyr (1965: 331) the conditional wish becomes more frequent in Late Latin.

3.3 Quasi for insubordinate assertives

Archaic Latin also provides evidence for insubordinate assertives. As in English *As if he didn't know!* or even *As if!*, the subordinator *quasi* is used by speakers in Archaic Latin to introduce an assertive speech act (Bennett [1966: 285–286] provides a list of examples which he considers ‘abnormal’ because the main clause is missing). Thus, in example (31) Simo refutes Davus’ presupposition that he asked Davus to go long ago. Similarly in example (32), Menaechmus’ wife does not believe that Menaechmus does not know what is wrong. The subjunctive in these insubordinate assertives is used counterfactually (see Blase [1888], Sabaneeva [1996] for the history of the counterfactual subjunctive), as the speakers imply that the event expressed by the verb in the subjunctive is counterfactual, in (31) that Simo asked Davus long ago (*rogem*) and in (32) that Menaechmus does not know. In other words, the insubordinate counterfactuals have the polarity reversal which is typical of counterfactuals (cf. *he should have known* = he did not know).²⁸

- (31) (Ter *And.* 850)
 Dav. *mihin? Sim. tibi ergo. Dav. modo introii. Sim. quasi ego quam dudum rogem.*
 ‘Dav. (evasively) Me? Sim. Yes, you. Dav. I went in just now– Sim. **As if I asked** you how long ago!’
- (32) (Plaut. *Men.* 638–639)
 Menaechmus *quid hoc est, uxor? quidnam hic narravit tibi? quid id est? quid taces? quin dicis quid sit?*
 Men.’s wife *quasi tu nescias.*
 Menaechmus ‘What’s this, my wife? What on earth did he tell you? What is it? What are you silent for? Why don’t you tell me what it is?’
 Men.’s wife ‘**As if you didn’t know.**’

In Classical Latin, this construction is also found, as shown by the following examples from Caesar and Cicero,²⁹ where the particle *vero* underlines the counter

²⁸ See Van linden and Verstraete (2008).

²⁹ Cf. Cic. *Phil.* 1.22, 10.15, 11.6, 13.23.

presuppositional function of the speech act (cf. Kroon [1995: 327] on *vero* as emphasizing the veracity of a statement). Note also the choice of the translator of the example from Cicero to translate with a negated declarative clause to signal the counter presuppositional function.

- (33) (Caes. *Gall.* 7.38.6)
conclamant Haedui et Litaviccum obsecrant, ut sibi consulat. 'quasi vero' inquit ille 'consilii sit res ac non necesse sit nobis Gergoviam contendere et cum Arvernīs nosmet coniungere.

'The Aedui shouted with one accord and entreated Litaviccus to take counsel for their safety. "As if," quoth he, "this were a matter of counsel, and it were not necessary for us to make speed to Gergovia and join ourselves to the Arverni!'

- (34) (Cic. *Verr.* II.5.169)
Sed quid ego plura de Gaudio? quasi tu Gaudio tum fueris infestus, ac non nomini, generi, iuri civium hostis

'But I need say no more about Gavius. As if you had then been pernicious for Gavius and not an enemy for the name, the race and the rights of the citizens.'

Like other insubordinate clauses, this construction confirms its main clause status in examples which have their own subordinate clause. This example also underlines the workings of the polarity reversal, as the negation present in the clause reverses the polarity again, meaning: (actually) I *could* do it!

- (35) (Cic. *Phil.* 8.11)
quasi uero, si laudanda pax esset, ego id aequè commode facere non possem.

'as though, if peace needed praising, I could not do it as well as himself.'

4 Concluding remarks and prospects

I hope to have shown that Latin provides corpus evidence for insubordination which thus far has been relatively neglected³⁰ because these clause types did not fit within the bounds of traditional syntactic description. As summarized by Table 1, at least

³⁰ This, for example, cannot be said about subordination in Latin, as testified by the many chapters in Touratier (1985) and Calboli (1989) or the chapters on specific subordinate clause types in the *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax* books.

Table 1: Insubordination strategies in Archaic and Classical Latin.

Illocutionary type		Archaic Latin form	Classical Latin form
<i>Wish</i>		<i>ut</i> + subjunctive	<i>ut</i> + subjunctive
		<i>utinam</i> + subjunctive	<i>utinam</i> + subjunctive
		<i>si</i> + subjunctive	<i>si</i> + subjunctive
<i>Directive</i>	Command	<i>ut((e)i)</i> + subjunctive	<i>ut(i)</i> + subjunctive
	Request	<i>ut</i> + subjunctive	
<i>Assertive</i>		<i>quasi</i> + subjunctive	<i>quasi</i> + subjunctive

three functional types of in subordinate constructions were used in Archaic and Classical Latin: wishes, directives and assertive in subordinate constructions.

These constructions constitute alternatives to existing illocutions which are based on other factors (e.g. a modal verb or a bare subjunctive). Their in subordinate nature is reflected across several dimensions: (i) conventionalizing discursive independence diachronically (from previous [dyadic] dependence) as shown by increasing usage independent from pragmatic context in the linguistic common ground; (ii) growing main clause syntactic complexity with subordinate clauses and coordination with other illocutions; and (iii) pragmatic signaling of the illocutionary force with discourse particles, e.g. adversative *at* or *sed* to demarcate the scope of the directive or positive polarity *quidem* to underline the expressive force of the wish.

Due to the limited scope of this paper, there are many research questions left unaddressed which I think could prove worthwhile to answer in future research. First of all, corpus research on the potential pragmatic differences between in subordinate constructions and other ways of formulating directive, wish or assertive illocutionary force would be needed. Second, while this paper has focused on Archaic and Classical Latin, research on Late Latin could assess how such in subordinate constructions survive, are lost or change (cf. la Roi [2021] who observes that Classical Greek in subordinate strategies are changed in Post-Classical Greek in various ways). Finally, since in subordinate research has not paid much attention to the role of in subordinate constructions in language contact situations, research on in subordinate constructions in the history of Latin could yield relevant new findings (e.g. potential interference or polysemy copying from Ancient Greek).

References

- Álvarez Huerta, María Olga. 2001. Sur le subjonctif de citation en latin. In Claude Moussy (ed.), *De lingua Latina novae quaestiones, Actes du Xè Colloque International de Linguistique Latine*, 171–183. Louvain-Paris: Peeters.

- Baños Baños, José Miguel (ed.). 2009. *Sintaxis del latín clásico*. Madrid: Liceus.
- Baños Baños, José Miguel. 2011. Causal clauses. In Pierluigi Cuzzolin & Philip Baldi (eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax: Complex sentences, grammaticalization, typology*, vol. 4, 195–234. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baños Baños, José Miguel. 2014. *Las oraciones causales en latín: su evolución diacrónica*. Madrid: Escolar y Mayo.
- Baños Baños, José Miguel (ed.). 2021. *Sintaxis Latina*. Madrid: CSIC.
- Barrios-Lech, Peter. 2016. *Linguistic interaction in Roman comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beijering, Karin, Gunther Kaltenböck & María Sol Sansiñena. 2019a. Insubordination: Central issues and open questions. In Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck & María Sol Sansiñena (eds.), *Insubordination: Theoretical and empirical issues*, 1–28. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Beijering, Karin, Gunther Kaltenböck & María Sol Sansiñena (eds.). 2019b. *Insubordination: Theoretical and empirical issues*. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bennett, Charles E. 1966. *Syntax of early Latin*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Berger, Łukasz. 2020. Greeting in Roman comedy: Register and (im)politeness. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 19(2). 145–178.
- Bertocchi, Alessandra & Mirka Maraldi. 2011. Conditionals and concessives. In Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax: Complex sentences, grammaticalization, typology*, vol. 4, 93–194. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blase, Heinrich. 1888. *Geschichte des Irrealis im Lateinischen: zugleich ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss des afrikanischen Lateins*. Erlangen: A. Diechert.
- Brinton, Laurel J. 2014. The extremes of insubordination: Exclamatory as if! *Journal of English Linguistics* 42(2). 93–113.
- Calboli, Gualtiero. 1966. I modi del verbo greco e latino: 1903–1966. *Lustrum: internationale Forschungsberichte aus dem Bereich des klassischen Altertums* 11. 173–349.
- Calboli, Gualtiero. 1968. I modi del verbo greco e latino: 1903–1966. *Lustrum: internationale Forschungsberichte aus dem Bereich des klassischen Altertums* 13. 405–511.
- Calboli, Gualtiero. 1989. *Subordination and other topics in Latin*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Calboli, Gualtiero. 2011. Die Modi des griechischen und lateinischen Verbums 1966–2010. *Lustrum: internationale Forschungsberichte aus dem Bereich des klassischen Altertums* 53. 9–150.
- Calboli, Gualtiero. 2013. Die Modi des griechischen und lateinischen Verbums 1966–2010 (Schluss). *Lustrum: internationale Forschungsberichte aus dem Bereich des klassischen Altertums* 54. 7–202.
- Clackson, James 2007. *Indo-European linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clackson, James & Geoffrey C. Horrocks. 2007. *The Blackwell history of the Latin language*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Courtney, Edward. 1999. *Archaic Latin prose*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Danckaert, Lieven. 2014. *Quidem* as a marker of emphatic polarity. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 112(1). 97–138.
- de Vaan, Michiel Arnoud Cor. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Denizot, Camille. 2011. *Donner des Ordres en Grec Ancien: Etude linguistique des formes de l'injonction*. Rouen: Presses universitaires de Rouen et du Havre.

- D'Hertefelt, Sarah. 2018. *Insubordination in Germanic: A typology of complement and conditional constructions*. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 366–431. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Nicholas & Honoré Watanabe. 2016. *Insubordination*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Fedriani, Chiara. 2021. Conditional clauses as polite modifiers in Latin: *si placet* between pragmaticalization and language contact. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 119(3). 346–370.
- Handford, Stanley A. 1947. *The Latin subjunctive: Its usage and development from Plautus to Tacitus*. London: Methuen.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck & Tania Kuteva. 2016. Chapter 2. On insubordination and cooptation. In Nicholas Evans & Honoré Watanabe (eds.), *Typological studies in language*, vol. 115, 39–64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hofmann, Johan B. & Anton Szantyr. 1965. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: Beck.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2016. On the grammatical status of insubordinate if-clauses. In Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer & Arne Lohmann (eds.), *Studies in language companion series*, vol. 178, 341–378. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kroon, Caroline. 1995. *Discourse particles in Latin: A study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Kühner, Raphael & Carl Stegmann. 1912. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, vol. 1. Hannover: Hahn.
- Lakoff, Robin T. 1968. *Abstract syntax and Latin complementation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1989. Latin subordination in typological perspective. In Gualtiero Calboli (ed.), *Subordination and other topics in Latin*, 153–179. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lindström, Jan, Ritva Laury & Camilla Lindholm. 2019. Insubordination and the contextually sensitive emergence of if-requests in Swedish and Finnish institutional talk-in-interaction. In Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck & María Sol Sansiñena (eds.), *Insubordination: Theoretical and empirical issues*, 55–78. Berlin & Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Martínez Caro, Elena & Laura Alba-Juez. 2021. The expressive function of the *ni que* insubordinate construction in Spanish. *Languages* 6(4). 161.
- Melo, Wolfgang David Cirilo de. 2007. *The early Latin verb system: Archaic forms in Plautus, Terence, and beyond*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Melo, Wolfgang David Cirilo de. 2011. *Plautus, Vol II: Casina; The Casket Comedy; Curculio; Epidicus; The Two Menaechmuses*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mesa Sanz, Juan Francisco. 1998. *El deseo y el subjuntivo: análisis de los actos de habla y el valor optativo en lengua latina*. Alicante: Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alicante.
- Pinkster, Harm. 1971. Abstract syntax and Latin complementation. *Lingua* 26(4). 383–421.
- Pinkster, Harm. 2015. *Oxford Latin syntax: Volume 1: The simple clause*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pinkster, Harm. 2021. *The Oxford Latin syntax: Volume II: The complex sentence and discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Risselada, Rodie. 1993. *Imperatives and other directive expressions in Latin: A study in the pragmatics of a dead language*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

- Risselada, Rodie. 1994. *Modo and sane, or what to do with particles in Latin directives*. In József Herman (ed.), *Linguistic studies on Latin: Selected papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Budapest, 23–27 March 1991)*, 319–343. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2020. The variation of Classical Greek wishes: A functional discourse grammar and common ground approach. *Glotta* 96(1). 213–245.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2021. The insubordination of if- and that-clauses from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek: A diachronic constructional typology. *Symbolae Osloenses* 95. 1–63.
- la Roi, Ezra. In prep. Between dialogic and diachronic syntax: The insubordination of directive ὅπως in Classical Greek drama. In Rodrigo Verano Liaño (ed.), *Conversation analysis and classics. Talk-in-interaction in Greek and Latin literature*.
- Sabaneeva, Margarita Konstantinova. 1996. *Essai sur l'évolution du subjonctif latin: problèmes de la modalité verbale*. Louvain: Peeters.
- Sansiñena, María Sol, Hendrik De Smet & Bert Cornillie. 2015. Between subordinate and insubordinate. Paths toward complementizer-initial main clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 77. 3–19.
- Thomas, François. 1938. *Recherches sur le subjonctif latin: histoire et valeur des formes*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Touratier, Christian. 1994. *Syntaxe latine*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Touratier, Christian (ed.). 1985. *Syntaxe et latin: actes du 11ème Congrès international de linguistique latine, Aix-en-Provence, 28–31 mars 1983*. Aix-en-Provence & Marseille: Université de Provence.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2017. 'Insubordination' in the light of the Uniformitarian Principle. *English Language and Linguistics* 21(2). 289–310.
- Van linden, An & Jean-Christophe Verstraete. 2008. The nature and origins of counterfactuality in simple clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(11). 1865–1895.
- Weiss, Michael L. 2009. *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor, MI: Beech Stave Press.