



Symbolae Osloenses

Norwegian Journal of Greek and Latin Studies

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/sosl20>

The Insubordination of If- and That-Clauses from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek: A Diachronic Constructional Typology

Ezra la Roi

To cite this article: Ezra la Roi (2021) The Insubordination of If- and That-Clauses from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek: A Diachronic Constructional Typology, *Symbolae Osloenses*, 95:1, 2-64, DOI: [10.1080/00397679.2021.1951005](https://doi.org/10.1080/00397679.2021.1951005)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00397679.2021.1951005>



Published online: 25 Aug 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 258



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 4 View citing articles [↗](#)

THE INSUBORDINATION OF IF- AND THAT-CLAUSES FROM ARCHAIC TO POST-CLASSICAL GREEK: A DIACHRONIC CONSTRUCTIONAL TYPOLOGY

EZRA LA ROI 

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS, GHENT UNIVERSITY, BELGIUM

This paper provides the first systematic investigation of the role of insubordination, the diachronic conventionalization of formally subordinate clauses as main clauses, in the syntax and semantics of the Ancient Greek sentence. Since diachronic studies are still a desideratum, this paper details the insubordination of if- and that-clauses from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek. Firstly, a principled diachronic analysis of the insubordination of various if-wishes (with $\epsilon\iota$, $\epsilon\iota/\alpha\tilde{\iota}$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ and $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\theta\epsilon/\alpha\tilde{\iota}\theta\epsilon$ ($\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$)) and that-wishes (with $\omega\varsigma$ and $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$) is performed using both functional (discursive vs syntactic independence) and formal criteria (vocatives, particles, sentence complexity, mood extensions) in order to determine their relative degree of conventionalization of the main clause use. Subsequently, insubordinate directive, assertive and evaluative constructions (with $\epsilon\iota$, $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma$ and $\tilde{\iota}\nu\alpha$) from Archaic, Classical and Post-Classical Greek are analysed before presenting a diachronic constructional typology of insubordination and suggestions for future avenues of research.

Keywords: insubordination; illocutionary force; subordination; syntax; wishes; conditional clauses; archaic; Classical and Post-classical Greek

1. *Insubordination in Ancient Greek*

The examples below illustrate that Ancient Greek, as is cross-linguistically also very well attested (Evans 2007; Evans and Watanabe 2016; D’Hertefelt 2018), used previously subordinate structures to express a range of illocutionary forces that are normally expressed by main clauses. In other words, previously subordinate clauses are used as main clauses. The diachronic process, which gives rise to such syntactic cross-overs, is insubordination: the diachronic conventionalization of

This article has been corrected with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

main clause uses by formally subordinate clauses (Evans 2007, 367). The Ancient Greek evidence for insubordination, though extensive, has not been systematically analysed within a full-fledged insubordination paradigm,¹ although proto-insubordination approaches have been suggested and discussed for insubordinate conditionals (esp. Hettrich 1992; Wakker 1994; Lombardi Vallauri 2005). My aim is therefore to provide the first systematic overview of the insubordination of if- and that-clauses from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek in a comprehensive study of the role of insubordination in the syntax and semantics of the Ancient Greek sentence (see also la Roi, forthcoming c). I first trace the surprisingly varied development of main clause wish uses of previously subordinate clauses from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek. Then, using neglected evidence mined from earlier secondary literature such as our standard grammars and my own searches, I compile a diachronic constructional typology of if- and that-clause insubordination from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek.

Example (1) below, though formally a conditional without an apodosis, expresses a main clause wish. Similarly, examples (2) to (4) contain particles which are commonly traced back to conditional markers (Dunkel [2014b, 348] and compare conditional example (5)) but are used to express wishes similar to main clause wishes with only a wish optative. The wish in example (1) concludes Patroclus' speech to the Ajaxes after the killing of Sarpedon.

- (1) ἄλλ' εἴ μιν ἀεικισσάμεθ' ἐλόντες,
 τεύχεά τ' ὄμοιιν ἀφελοίμεθα, καὶ τιν' ἐταίρων
 αὐτοῦ ἀμυνομένων δαμασάμεθα νηλέϊ χαλκῷ. (*Il.* 16.559–561)
 May we take him, and mangle his body, and strip the armor from his
 shoulders, and vanquish with the pitiless bronze any of his comrades
 who seeks to defend his body.²

The wish in example (2) comes from Agamemnon and functions as a compliment to Nestor's advisory abilities. Interestingly, the wish is followed by a main clause which in the past has been taken as the apodosis³ to this αἶ γὰρ sentence, thus making αἶ γὰρ conditional, even though, as I argue, αἶ γὰρ is no longer used as a conditional in Homer (see section 4).

- (2) αἶ γὰρ Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον
 τοιοῦτοι δέκα μοι συμφράδμονες εἶεν Ἀχαιῶν·
 τῷ κε τάχ' ἠμύσειε πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος

χερσίν ὑφ' ἡμετέρῃσιν ἀλοῦσά τε περθομένη τε. (*Il.* 2.371–374)

I wish, father Zeus and Athene and Apollo, that I had ten such counselors among the Achaeans; then would the city of king Priam immediately bow its head, taken and sacked by our hands.

The wish in example (3) covers 6 of the 9 lines of reproach from Hector to Ajax and is remarkably complex. As I argue in section 4, this wish resembles a main clause use, in that it has its own subordinate clause.

- (3) **εἰ γὰρ** ἐγὼν οὔτω γε Διὸς πάϊς αἰγιόχοιο
εἶην ἦματα πάντα, τέκοι δέ με πότνια Ἥρη,
τιοίμην δ' ὡς τίετ' Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἀπόλλων,
ὡς νῦν ἡμέρη ἦδε κακὸν φέρει Ἀργείοισι (*Il.* 13.825–828)

For my part I would wish that I were all my days as surely the son of Zeus who bears the aegis, and my mother were the queenly Hera, and that I might be honored like Athene and Apollo, as now this day surely brings evil on the Argives.

Example (4) concludes Telemachus' speech at the meeting in Ithaca, whereas the conditional in example (5) is found in the middle of Telemachus' speech.

- (4) **εἴθε** οἱ αὐτῷ Ζεὺς ἀγαθὸν τελέσειεν, ὃ τι φρεσὶν ἦσι μενοινᾶ (*Od.* 2.33–34)
May Zeus fulfill for him some good, whatsoever he desires in his heart.
(5) **εἰ γάρ** πως εἶη αὐτάγρετα πάντα βροτοῖσι,
πρῶτόν κεν τοῦ πατρὸς ἐλοίμεθα νόστιμον ἦμαρ. (*Od.* 16.148–149)
(...) for if somehow it were possible for mortals to have all their wishes, we would choose first of all the day of my father's return

These “conditional” structures have generated an immense amount of scholarly debate for Ancient Greek, since these structures were thought to contain traces of highly archaic usages. Most scholars have argued, with arguments of varying theoretical validity,⁴ that these wishes show that conditionals have developed out of wishes.⁵ Others have suggested the reverse,⁶ pointing, among other things, to the cross-linguistically frequent evolution of conditional subordinate clauses into wish main clauses (e.g. Wakker 1994, 385–386). In fact, these interpretational issues can be shown to originate from Aristarchus, who commented on example (1) by saying that an apodosis like καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι “[then] it would be good” needs to be mentally supplied.⁷ Goodwin, who defended the idea that the wishes with variants of αἰ/εἰ derived from conditionals, used this

comment by Aristarchus to speculate that Aristarchus surely would have explained not only εἰ wishes but all previously conditional wishes as lacking such an apodosis. However, I believe that this goes too far, since Aristarchus must also have observed in Homer that εἴθε and αἶ γάρ never actually occur as dependent on an apodosis. In other words, there seems to be a difference, as I argue in section 3 and 4, in how conventionalized the wish use is for the different originally “conditional” wishes.

In her 1994 dissertation on conditionals, Wakker has extensively discussed the advantages and disadvantages of both approaches to the diachronic relation between conditionals and “conditional” wishes. She concluded that the latter approach has more merits as the evidence is better explained and is not built on the dubious Neo-grammarian assumption that older stages of a language are simpler and consequently lack subordinate structures (Wakker 1994, 386–394).⁸ Instead, she connects the latter approach explicitly with the cross-linguistic trend of conventionally using formally conditional structures for wishes, e.g. Latin (*o*) *si*, French *si* (*seulement*), English *if* (only), German *wenn* (*nur*) and Dutch *als* (*maar*). In conclusion, she already adopts a proto-insubordination approach.⁹

She also concludes that “on a synchronic level wishes introduced by εἰ γάρ etc. can very well be considered conditional clauses without an apodosis” (Wakker 1994, 395–396). This view is more problematic, since, as discussed above, εἴθε and αἶ γάρ actually never are dependent on an apodosis anymore already in Homer. Therefore we should determine how conventionally the apodosis is required for each “conditional” wish, as warranted by a full-fledged insubordination approach. Furthermore, there are several other diachronic aspects which are relevant to tracing the insubordination of wish structures in Ancient Greek, but these are not explicitly dealt with by Wakker. Firstly, the wish optatives without wish particles actually go back to PIE and, as we will see, they are actually more frequent in Archaic Greek than the insubordinated varieties (as is also the case in Classical Greek, la Roi [2020a, 231] *pace* Schwyzler and Debrunner [1950, 321]¹⁰). Secondly, no position is taken with regards to the diachrony of the “conditional” wish particles, although diachronic evidence is available. Thirdly, the semantic and syntactic differences between insubordinated (“conditional”) wishes and actual conditionals are not fleshed out. Examining their differences could help decide, in textually ambiguous contexts such as where εἰ or εἰ γάρ has been edited differently, whether both are subordinate or main clauses.¹¹ For example,

when one compares conditional εἰ γὰρ in example (5) with wish εἰ γὰρ in example (3) their difference in sentential complexity strikes one as being an important factor (see the analysis in section 4). Fourthly, we should try to characterize the differences in conventionalization of the various insubordinated wishes, as suggested above. Finally, the subsequent diachronic development of the insubordinate wish particles should be incorporated into the analysis, since their adoption of other moods presupposes their conventionalization as an insubordinate wish.

To answer these and further questions regarding insubordination, I first introduce the concept of insubordination more fully, define it, discuss its diachronic application and present relevant cross-linguistic parallels to the evolutions found in Ancient Greek (section 2). Subsequently, the diachronic background from Proto-Indo-European to Archaic Greek will be presented, because it is essential to properly evaluate the insubordinate wishes, their relative degree of conventionalization and their differences with wish optatives in Archaic Greek (section 3). Sections 4 and 5 discuss the diachronic evidence from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek for the insubordination of if-wishes (e.g. examples (1) to (5) above) and that-wishes (with ὅς and ἵνα, which before was only used for insubordinate directives). Section 6 extends the scope from insubordinate wishes to if- and that-insubordinate constructions which yield different illocutionary functions and presents a preliminary diachronic constructional typology in order to provide a starting point for future investigations into this underexplored area of Ancient Greek grammar.¹² Importantly, the methodology for sections 4 and 5 differs from that in section 6. In sections 4 and 5, I demonstrate the usefulness of a combined quantitative and qualitative diachronic approach to the insubordination of wishes. Section 6, however, primarily presents a qualitative diachronic overview of the many unexplored insubordination candidates by reinterpreting neglected evidence from our standard grammars and presenting evidence from personal searches. As a result, section 6 can only offer provisional characterizations of the degree of conventionalization of the insubordinate usages under investigation, whereas sections 4 and 5, by virtue of its combined quantitative and qualitative corpus analysis, provides the diachronic evidence necessary to measure the degree of conventionalization of an insubordination candidate. In other words, sections 4 and 5 exemplify the preferred analytic method for future studies on insubordinate constructions that are discussed in section 6.

2. *Insubordination: a diachronic application*

Insubordination is “the conventionalized main clause use of what, on *prima facie* grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses” (Evans 2007, 367). The following examples illustrate how pervasive this process is cross-linguistically¹³ and how various if- and that-subordinate clauses may conventionally introduce a wish: both realizable (examples (6) and (7)) and counterfactual¹⁴ (examples (8) to (10)):

(6) ¡**Que** sean felices! (Spanish, Sansiñena, De Smet, and Cornillie 2015, 14)

“May you be happy.” [lit.: That you are happy.]

(7) **Dass** ihm nur nicht schlecht dabei wird! (German, Verstraete and D’Hertefelt 2016, 66)

“[I hope] that doesn’t make him feel sick!”

(8) **Wenn** doch Italien nur ein Stückchen etwas von der deutschen Effizienz hätte! (German, Lombardi Vallauri 2004, 209)

“If only Italy had the smallest bit of German efficiency!”

(9) **If only** I’d listened to my parents. (English, Quirk et al. 1985, 842)

(10) **Bare** han kommer hjem (Danish, D’Hertefelt 2018, 217)

“If only he comes home.”

Since Evans’ foundational 2007 paper, scholars have largely revised two aspects of Evans’ definition: “conventionalisation” and “formally subordinate”. According to Evans, the diachronic conventionalization of main clause uses by formally subordinate clauses is best conceived as the conventionalization of ellipsis. The more conventional the main clause use of the formally subordinate clause, the more conventionalized the corresponding ellipsis becomes. Diachronically, the conventionalization of the main clause use by the previously subordinate clause is, following Evans (2007, 370–374), divided into four stages:

1. the typical situation where a subordinate clause is accompanied by an overt main clause
2. the main clause is ellipsed [i.e. left unexpressed, *ELR*], but any grammatically compatible main clause can be reconstructed and there “appear to be no grounds for claiming semantic restrictions on the restored materials” (Evans 2007, 371)
3. restriction of interpretation of ellipsed material (e.g adding an ellipsed main clause becomes awkward all together, Evans [2007, 386])

4. the erstwhile subordinate clause has been reanalysed as a main clause in its own right, with a conventionalized meaning and a constructionalized form. In this stage the reconstruction of a main clause may no longer be possible.

It has, however, proven difficult to provide the relevant diachronic data that explains which specific ellipses belong to the insubordinate construction (Traugott 2017) as well as why ellipses seem irrelevant to more formulaic constructions (Evans 2007, 386; Narrog 2016; Traugott 2017, 298–300). More recently, these problems have been explained by either pointing to the illocutionary enriching of (in)subordinate clauses in interactional contexts (Heine, Kaltenböck, and Kuteva 2016; Kaltenböck 2016; Sansiñena, De Smet, and Cornillie 2015; Dwyer 2016) or by distinguishing insubordinate constructions in a more principled diachronic manner in terms of their formulaicity (see the typology by Heine, Kaltenböck and Kuteva [2016, 52–58]) or degree of conventionalization (esp. D’Hertefelt 2018). For example, Dwyer (2016, 184) suggests that spoken discourse is an important source for insubordination as “in spoken discourse, subordinate clauses (a common source of insubordination) frequently cohere syntactically and pragmatically across speaking turns: speakers co-create speaking turns and thus appear to be finishing others’ utterances”.¹⁵ Thus, formally subordinate constructions, which may be used in a *syntactically independent* way, can actually still be *dependent pragmatically*, that is on the pragmatic context (cf. allegedly insubordinate constructions in Germanic languages, D’Hertefelt [2018, 14–16]). As a consequence, in such cases, the understood pragmatic material will be more easily retrieved. Therefore, D’Hertefelt (2018, 182–183) among others¹⁶ has rightly suggested that true insubordinate constructions also need to be *discursively independent*, meaning that their illocutionary force should not depend on co-construction with previous utterances. For example, when a question by speaker A such as “what do you want from me?” is answered by speaker B with “that you would be more helpful”, the answer is a subordinate clause that is syntactically independent, but the illocutionary force of the subordinate clause is co-created with the preceding utterance, viz. I wish that you would be more helpful. Only when such a formally subordinate structure is used independently of such co-creation (i.e. is discursively independent), should the formally subordinate clause be called insubordinate.¹⁷

In other words, I suggest that the *distinguishing factor* between insubordinate clauses and subordinate clauses is that the former have *their own illocutionary force* (independent of co-construction with other speech acts) whereas subordinate clauses characteristically have a *de-activated illocutionary force* (Cristofaro 2003, 29–36). Her and my insistence upon discursive independence as a necessary condition for insubordination aligns with more recent conversational evidence from Swedish and Finnish which revealed that discursive independence is reflected¹⁸ by the addressee’s response speed and supported by multi-modal signals from the speaker which confirm the discursive value (Lindström, Laury, and Lindholm 2019, 71–74). This means that an insubordinate if-request (“if you could/would X”) may already be interpreted as a request by the addressee before the speaker actually utters a corresponding apodosis. Thus, even when an apodosis is produced later, the conventional discursive function of the if-clause may have already been interpreted (Lindström, Laury, and Lindholm 2019, 72).

The other main factor adduced for explaining ellipsis ambiguity is the role of diachrony, since the more discursively independent an insubordinate construction becomes the more formulaic it will also become (see Heine, Kaltenböck, and Kuteva 2016, 56–58; Kaltenböck 2019). For example, English “if only” is such a conventionalized insubordinate construction that it can be used as a communicative shorthand for a wish (see D’Hertefelt 2018, 81). Systematic diachronic investigations of insubordination, however, are still somewhat of a desideratum (Cristofaro 2016; D’Hertefelt 2018, 3), since many authors, starting with Evans (2007), have used synchronic data to infer insubordination diachronically.¹⁹ As convincingly argued by D’Hertefelt (2018, 19–20), this practice has had the unfortunate consequence that many have used an implicit set of semantic and/or pragmatic criteria, both to classify insubordinate constructions and judge their level of diachronic conventionalization without recourse to specific semantic and formal features. She used principled semantic and formal criteria to develop a constructional typology of if- and that-insubordinate clauses based on a micro-typological analysis of Germanic languages. The ensuing diachronic analysis of insubordination in Ancient Greek will especially build on her findings in arriving at a preliminary constructional typology of insubordinate constructions in Ancient Greek. Therefore, my approach differs from both traditional and more recent endeavours to account for insubordinate constructions,

because such approaches have in common that they classify *syntactically* independent usages as insubordinate (*pace* Ruiz Yamuza 2021 and di Bartolo 2021a, 2021b), which, as I argue, are not necessarily insubordinate because insubordinate constructions need to be discursively independent.²⁰

3. *Insubordination: a diachronic application to Ancient Greek*

When applying these cross-linguistic findings on insubordination in Ancient Greek, we should be aware that insubordination is a language-specific conventionalization process. Not only do languages differ in the types of subordinate structures that are utilized for insubordination but they also differ in the range of pragmatic functions that certain structures can acquire (D’Hertefelt 2018, 209–211). By way of explanation, insubordinate if-clauses may have more illocutionary functions in one language than the other. The language-specific nature of the diachronic process of insubordination also has important consequences for which specific linguistic tools are to be used to conventionally mark an insubordinate clause. Linguistic clues that are often mentioned in insubordination studies are the following (e.g. D’Hertefelt [2018, 142–146] for the Germanic languages): (1) subordinator, (2) modals/moods (e.g. subjunctive in languages where relevant), (3) subordinate clause word order (in languages where relevant), (4) collocations with specific particles, (5) independent syntactic use and, more importantly, (6) independent discursive use. Due to the freer word order of Ancient Greek, subordinate clause word order cannot be used as a criterium. More importantly, as Ancient Greek has a richer mood system than those in Germanic languages, moods to a large degree perform the duties which modals perform in Germanic languages.

In regards to the area of moods and insubordination, one should be aware of potential terminological confusion. Most importantly, a term familiar to us, such as the subjunctive, can be used by linguists working on other languages to describe a form that is only used in a subordinate clause, i.e. subjunctive in its etymological sense.²¹ As a result, for such languages it could be said that the subjunctive in insubordinate clauses is a subordinate clause feature.²² By contrast, in Ancient Greek most moods that are found in subordinate clauses are also found in main clauses: the optative in potential and wish main clauses versus

potential subordinate clauses, the main clause subjunctive versus its many uses in subordinate clauses, and the imperatival and exclamative infinitive versus its use in subordinate clauses. D’Hertefelt (2018, 217) actually suggested that the availability of main clause moods for the same illocutionary functions might explain why some languages do not create that illocutionary function through insubordination. However, as I will show, this factor has not stopped Ancient Greek in creating many expressions for illocutionary functions for which it also had moods available. To sum up, I choose to follow D’Hertefelt (2018, 7) in making formal subordinate marking by subordinating conjunctions an essential criterium for insubordination.²³ We now discuss the relevant diachronic data for insubordination in Archaic Greek.

4. *Wish expressions from Proto-Indo-European to Archaic Greek*

It is generally believed that the mood system of Archaic Greek goes back directly to Proto-Indo-European, meaning that the indicative, optative and the subjunctive from Archaic Greek are inherited (see Kapović 2017, 91–92; Klein, Joseph, and Fritz 2018, 2144–2145; Rix 1986, 13; Strunk 1984,).²⁴ In this scenario the dual function of the optative as potential and wish will have been present, as suggested by earlier comparative evidence from the early Vedic Sanskrit optative (see Dahl 2010). This means that the use of the optative without any particle to express a wish is of great antiquity.²⁵ When it comes to the conditionals and their mood usages, it has been suggested by Hettrich (1992) that Proto-Indo-European already possessed the same distinctions that we find in Archaic Greek based on the conditionals and mood distinctions found in early Sanskrit. Whether or not that was the case, the conditional structures in several daughter languages are strongly different due to renewals of conditional structures, making it impossible to reconstruct a single conditional construction for PIE (Clackson 2007, 164; and the summary by Dunkel 2014a, 225; Meillet 1964, 377). Nevertheless, there are two observations which can be made more confidently. Firstly, both early Vedic and Archaic Greek display independent mood changes in the presentation of counterfactuals (Hettrich 1992): the Vedic specialization of *yád* + optative and *yádi* + optative for a counterfactual and a non-counterfactual condition respectively as opposed to the Archaic Greek takeover by *εἰ* + counterfactual indicative of *εἰ* +

counterfactual optative. The change of mood is different in Archaic Greek, due to the use of counterfactual indicatives in conditionals in Archaic Greek being a more recent independent innovation (cf. Wakker 1994, 210–214).²⁶ Secondly, there is early evidence from Archaic Greek which demonstrates the dialectal diversity of conditional markers: both variants of the conditional particles with northern Greek $\alpha\iota$ and Ionic-Attic $\epsilon\iota$ are attested in Archaic Greek.²⁷ Wishes are therefore only derivable from conditionals when they contain a conditional particle. Importantly, it has not been observed before that these wishes are significantly more infrequent in Archaic Greek than the wish optative as a wish on its own (see Table 1).

Table 1. Diachronic distribution of conditionals and wishes in Archaic Greek.

Historical Layer	Usage	Form	Archaic Greek distribution
1	wish optative (counterfactual and non-counterfactual)	Optative	161
	conditional with optative (counterfactual and non-counterfactual)	$\epsilon\iota$ ($\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$) + optative	172
2	counterfactual indicative conditional	$\epsilon\iota$ + (any) secondary indicative	95
3	insubordinate wish (counterfactual and non-counterfactual)	- $\epsilon\iota$ + optative - $\alpha\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon$ + optative - $\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ + optative - $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon$ + optative - $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ + optative - $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ + optative	11 11 31 14 17 7
4	modal wish without particle (counterfactual)	- $\acute{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda(\lambda)\omicron\nu$	9
	insubordinate indicative wish (counterfactual)	- $\alpha\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon$ + $\acute{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda(\lambda)\omicron\nu$ - $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ + $\acute{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda(\lambda)\omicron\nu$	7 17
	insubordinate infinitive wish (counterfactual)	- $\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ + infinitive	3

In pre-Archaic Greek we can, therefore, reconstruct the following expressions for wishes and conditionals: (1) wish optatives, (2) conditionals εἰ/αἰ (γάρ) and (3) in subordinate wishes with the “conditional” particles εἴθε/αἴθε, αἶ γάρ/εἰ γάρ, εἰ based on the Archaic Greek evidence.²⁸ My corpus for Archaic Greek comprised archaic lyric (Sappho, Archilochus and Theognis), the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Hesiod and the Homeric hymns. The main reason that we can be relatively certain that wishes with conditional particles must have been around before Archaic Greek is that both counterfactual conditionals and subordinate wishes are already found with secondary indicatives in Archaic Greek, the latter only with ὄφελ(λ)ον “would/should have”. The various wish and conditional constructions are therefore best conceived as belonging to various historical layers, as their relative frequency would also suggest.²⁹

As we can see from Table 1, the number of occurrences of the wish optative, by itself, stands in stark contrast with those wishes that are derived from a conditional construction, which is also the case in Classical Greek (la Roi 2020a *pace* Schwyzer and Debrunner 1950, 321). What is more, the numbers for the subordinate wishes are actually slightly higher due to the fact that I counted every optative which occurred in such a wish and more than one optative can occur in such wishes.

Some particles which are used for subordinate wishes are actually not used as conditionals anymore: whereas εἰ and εἰ γάρ are still used as conditionals in Archaic Greek (for 155 and 17 times respectively), εἴθε, αἴθε and αἶ γάρ are so fossilized as wish particles that they do not occur as subordinate clauses anymore. It is probably no coincidence that these three were fossilized, since the latter two are not Ionic forms and therefore do not belong to the main basis for Homeric vocabulary. The fact that εἰ γάρ and αἶ γάρ were selected might be explained through etymology, since it is thought that γάρ still preserves its original positive polarity function in this combination (“gewiss” Schwyzer and Debrunner 1950, 557³⁰) and developed into causal “for” later on (cf. *nam* “truly, for” in the Latin subordinate wish *utinam*³¹ “o dass doch”³² or German “ja” which shows the same two historically related functions). About θε in εἴθε and αἴθε we have less certainty, since it has no clear etymology.³³

For the distinction between independent wish uses and dependent conditional uses, the modern punctuation (which is partly based on

ancient editorial choices, perhaps from Hellenistic times)³⁴ of the text editions in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* was checked and found to be accurate in its punctuation from a pragmatic perspective, meaning that wishes were punctuated as independent main clauses and conditionals as dependent clauses.³⁵ In fact, for previously problematic cases such as εἰ γάρ wishes and εἰ γάρ conditionals, there are various distinctive characteristics (semantic, formal and pragmatic) which may have helped editors to punctuate wishes as wishes and conditionals as conditional, as I discuss in section 4. Furthermore, the presence of new wish alternatives with modal ὄφελ(λ)ον and the infinitive emphasizes how strongly conventionalized the wish uses of certain particles already were in Archaic Greek. Additionally, in Classical Greek, the insubordinate wish particles εἶθε and εἰ γάρ can actually be used with any secondary indicative (e.g. Rijksbaron 2006, 28; van Emde Boas et al. 2019, 486–487).

5. *If-wishes in the history of Ancient Greek*

5.1. *Insubordinate if-wishes in Archaic Greek*

To determine how conventionalized the insubordinate conditional clauses were as wishes in Archaic Greek, I suggest that we need to assess them with at least three formal and functional parameters: (1) the recoverability of the apodosis, (2) the main clause status of the insubordinated clause (in terms of typical main clause features such as discursive independence and complexity) and (3) the diachronic conventionalization of the form-function relationship of the insubordinated markers as wish.³⁶

As mentioned above, εἶθε, αἶθε and αἶ γάρ are highly conventionalized insubordinate wishes, since they no longer occur as dependent on an apodosis in Archaic Greek (see example (11), (12) and (13)). These wishes, for example, clearly fulfil one of the pragmatic functions which wishes fulfil, as described by la Roi (2020a, 226) for Classical Greek wishes: (1) align one's positive psychological commitment with the addressee's (e.g. (emotional) support wishes and conventionalized best wishes), (2) wish for resolution (e.g. for aid, retribution, own demise or as a curse) or (3) strongly declare commitment (provided that the wish also contains a condition). Example (11) wishes for resolution

of the fact that Nestor is unable to compete physically with the other heroes anymore.

- (11) εἶθ' ὡς ἠβώοιμι βίη τέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἶη
 ὡς ὅποτε κρείοντ' Ἀμαρυγκέα θάπτον Ἐπειοὶ
 Βουπρασίῳ, παῖδες δ' ἔθεσαν βασιλῆος ἄεθλα· (Il. 23.629–631)
 I wish that I were as young and my strength were as firm as on the day when
 the Epeians were burying lord Amarynceus at Buprasium, and his sons set
 out prizes in honor of the king.

Examples (12) and (13) present a conventionalized wish for prosperity and a support wish respectively, the former to Eumaeus from Odysseus as thanks for giving him a good piece of meat and the latter as a strong agreement with Apollo's question to Hermes whether he would want to be tied to the bed with Aphrodite like Ares was now. The same function we already saw with example (2) above, which was used by Agamemnon as a compliment to Nestor.

- (12) αἶθ' οὕτως, Εὐμαίε, φίλος Διὶ πατρὶ γένοιο
 ὡς ἐμοί, ὅτι με τοῖον ἐόντ' ἀγαθοῖσι γεραίρεις. (Od. 14.440–441)
 Eumaeus, may you be as dear to father Zeus as you are to me, since miser-
 able as I am you honor me with so good a portion.
 (13) αἶ γὰρ τοῦτο γένοιτο, ἄναξ ἑκατηβόλ' Ἄπολλον. (Od. 8.339)
 Would that this might happen, lord Apollo, far-shooter

These examples show that these wishes can no longer be interpreted as a condition with an ellipsed apodosis, as the sentences are discursively independent like main clause wishes with the optative only.

We note that conventionalized wishes may still be followed by a main clause that speculates on the consequence of the situation wished for, since normal wishes with a wish optative may be followed by such clauses as well. Compare examples (14) and (15):

- (14) τοῖος ἐὼν μνηστήρσιν ὀμιλήσειεν Ὀδυσσεύς·
 πάντες κ' ὀκύμοροί τε γενοίατο πικρόγαμοί τε. (Od. 1.265–266)
 Would, I say, that in such strength Odysseus might come among the
 suitors; then should they all meet with a swift death and a bitter marriage.
 (15) εἶθ' ὡς ἠβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἶη·
 τὴν κε τάχ' ἀντήσειε μάχης κορυθαίολος Ἴκτωρ. (Il. 7.157–158)
 I wish that I were as young and my strength were as firm; then should
 Hector of the flashing helmet soon find his battle.

The presence of a speculating main clause following the wish does not alter its discursive independence. In fact, this comparative evidence underlines the possibility of discursive independence of the insubordinated wish, that is, that they were used as independent main clauses with their own illocutionary force.³⁷ Just as wish optatives may be followed by discursively independent declarative clauses, so may conventionalized insubordinate wishes.

Wishes with $\epsilon\iota$ and $\epsilon\iota$ γάρ, on the other hand, do sometimes have recoverable apodoses since they can still be used as conditional in Archaic Greek. Their higher distribution when combined with the optative mood as conditionals, $\epsilon\iota$ 166 conditional vs 11 wish and $\epsilon\iota$ γάρ 6 conditional vs 17 wish, suggests that they have not been conventionalized as strongly as $\epsilon\iota\theta\epsilon$, $\alpha\iota\theta\epsilon$ and $\alpha\iota$ γάρ wishes. Nevertheless, we find instances of wish $\epsilon\iota$ and $\epsilon\iota$ γάρ that are undoubtedly used as wish, since reconstructing an ellipsed apodosis is made unnecessary due to the illocutionary wish function of the clause:

- (16) Φοῖνιξ ἄττα γεραιῆ παλαιγενές, **εἰ γάρ** Ἀθήνη
 δοίη κάρτος ἐμοί, βελέων δ' ἀπερύκοι ἐρασίην·
 τὼ κεν ἔγωγ' ἐθέλοιμι παρεστάμεναι καὶ ἀμύνειν
 Πατρόκλω· μάλα γάρ με θανῶν ἐσεμάσσατο θυμόν.
 Phoenix, old sire, my father of ancient days, would that Athene would give
 me strength and keep from me the onrush of missiles. So should I be
 minded to stand by Patroclus' side and protect him; for his death has
 touched me to the heart. (*Il.* 17.561–564)

Similarly, the following wish by Zeus to the gods demands no reconstruction of an ellipsed apodosis, since it is clear from the final clause within the wish as to why Zeus wishes for someone to call Thetis to him.³⁸ Thus, the final clause falls within the scope of the wish clause and makes the assumed ellipse of an apodosis unnecessary.

- (17) ἄλλ' **εἴ** τις καλέσειε θεῶν Θέτιν ἄσσον ἐμεῖο,
ὄφρα τί οἱ εἴπω πυκινὸν ἔπος, ὥς κεν Ἀχιλλεὺς
 δῶρων ἐκ Πριάμοιο λάχῃ ἀπὸ θ' Ἑκτορα λύσῃ. (*Il.* 24.74–76)
 But I wish that one of the gods would call Thetis to come to me, so that I
 may speak to her a wise word, so that Achilles may accept gifts from Priam
 and give Hector back.

5.2. *Ancient identification of in subordinate if-wishes*

The main clause status of these in subordinate constructions was already identified in Antiquity. Not only have we seen that Aristarchus, for example, accounted for the main clause status of in subordinate wishes by adding a main clause in thought, but there is also ancient evidence for both (1) editorial identification of in subordinate wishes and (2) for the interpretation of the formally conditional sentences (without apodosis) as a main clause. Firstly, we possess the following scholion to the *Iliad* that can be traced back to Nicanor, the author of a work on punctuation in the 2nd century CE, which now has to be reconstructed from scholia (see Nünlist 2020). This scholion aims to explain the use of εἰ in *Il.* 15.571 to introduce an in subordinate wish³⁹ and by saying that no comma is needed suggests that the clause is independent.⁴⁰

- (18) Ἀντίλοχ' οὐ τις σεῖο νεώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν,
 οὔτε ποσὶν θάσσων οὔτ' ἄλκιμος ὡς σὺ μάχεσθαι
 εἶ τινά που Τρώων ἐξάλμιενος ἄνδρα βάλοισθα. (*Il.* 15.569–571)
 Antilochus, none other of the Achaeans is younger than you, nor swifter of
 foot, nor as strong as you are in fight. May you leap forth and smite some
 man of the Trojans.
- (19) <εἶ:> ὁ σύνδεσμος ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶθε· διόπερ οὐδὲ ὑποστιγμῆ.
 if: the conjunction [is used] instead of 'if (only)'; therefore also no comma
 [is used/needed]⁴¹ (my translation)

Secondly, the scholia to Homer explain not only in subordinate wishes as main clause wishes but also wish optatives by calquing them as in subordinate wishes (see row 4).

Their explanations can be distinguished depending on the scope and the explanation strategy.⁴² The table represents a selection of the examples found in the scholia.⁴³ The scholia to Homer are from later times (Dickey 2007, 18–23), meaning that they *neither* provide us a straightforward contemporaneous view *nor* a view with genuine native speaker judgment. Instead, these scholia provide only estimates by a native speaker of later periods of Greek, Post-Classical and Byzantine, on constructions most of which have actually been replaced by their time (Table 2). Regardless of this, these scholia suggest that they also already considered the problematic in subordinate wishes to be main clauses, since the scholia tell us that their illocutionary force is a main

Table 2. Example strategies of ancient (insubordinate) wish explanation.

Scope	Strategy 1 X: wish particle Y	Strategy 2 X: wish clause	Strategy 3 X: wish particle Y, is adverb of wish
Optative insubordinated wish	αἶ] ἄμποτε / εἶθε (<i>Od.</i> 6.244e) <εἶ:> τὸ εἶ ἀντι τοῦ εἶθε· (<i>Il.</i> 24.74b) εἰ γάρ: εἶθε γάρ (<i>Od.</i> 1.255b)	<αἶ γὰρ δὴ μοι> ἀπ' οὐατος <ὄδε γένοιτο>: εἶθε δὴ τοῦτο οὐχ ὅπως μὴ ἴδοιμι, ἀλλὰ μὴδὲ ἀκούσομαι. (<i>Il.</i> 18.272)	[αἶ γὰρ] ἀντι τοῦ εἶθε. καὶ ἔστιν ἐπίρρημα εὐχῆς σημαντικόν. (<i>Il.</i> 22.454) [αἶ] ἰστέον ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ εἰ, τοῦ εὐκτικοῦ ἐπιρρήματος, γέγονεν· ἔστι γὰρ καὶ εὐκτικὸν ἐπίρρημα εἰ, ὃ σημαίνει τὸ εἶθε· (<i>Il.</i> 4.189)
Indicative insubordinated wish	<ὡς:> τὸ ὡς ἀντι τοῦ εἶθε. (<i>Il.</i> 3.428b)	Ἦς ὄφελέν μοι] Εἶθε ὄφειλέ μοι. (<i>Il.</i> 3.173) ὄφελον] τὸ ὄφελον ἀντι τοῦ εἶθε, ὡς δὴ ἔγωγ' ὄφελον. (<i>Od.</i> 1.217)	Αἶθ' ὄφελες] Εἶθε ὄφελες. ἔστιν ἐπίρρημα εὐκτικόν (<i>Il.</i> 1.415)
Wish optative	ὀμιλήσειεν] εἶθε (<i>Od.</i> 1.265 g)	–	–
Modal wishes	–	ὄφελον] τὸ ὄφελον ἀντι τοῦ εἶθε, ὡς δὴ ἔγωγ' ὄφελον. ἠύχομην ἐγὼ εἶναί τινος υἱὸς μάκαρος ἄνδρος, ὄν ὁ θάνατος κατέλαβεν ἐν τοῖς ἰδίαις κτῆμασι καὶ μὴ ἐν πλάνῃ καὶ ξένοις τόποις (<i>Od.</i> 1.217) ^a	–

^aOf course, when it was not used as wish the scholia also recognized that, see the scholion on the use in a question *Il.*18.367: οὐκ ὄφελον: οὐκ ἔμελλον. ὑπερωθηματικὸς δὲ ἔστιν ὁ λόγος.

clause wish. First of all, the in subordinate wishes are most often explained by recourse to a circumlocution with εἴθε (see esp. row 2 and 3), a structure which was, as discussed above, always discursively independent. The difference between column 1 and 2 is that in the latter, εἴθε replaces the other in subordinate wish marker to signal its grammatical function in the clause context, thus providing a more complete paraphrase of its meaning. Secondly, by also explaining wish optatives as in subordinate wishes (see row 4) the scholia foreshadow the formalistic explanations by our standard grammars of, on the one hand, in subordinated wish clauses as mere wishes with a wish particle, and, on the other hand, falsely suggesting that wishes are most often introduced by particles such as εἴθε whereas they are in fact from a different construction altogether.⁴⁴ Finally, the explanations in the scholia betray their later date by calquing wish structures from Archaic Greek with wish structures which only became available after Archaic Greek: εἴθε γάρ, ἄμποτε and ἠὺρόμην.⁴⁵

5.3. *Distinguishing in subordinate wishes in Ancient Greek*

There are two formal criteria which we can use to distinguish in subordinate wishes from their conditional variants in Archaic Greek. The first distinguishing factor is that in subordinate wishes occur considerably more often with a vocative than, for example, a conditional εἰ γάρ. Whereas 21 out of 31 (αἶ γάρ), 8 out of 18 (εἰ γάρ), 8 out of 14 (εἴθε) and 8 out of 11 (αἴθε) in subordinate wishes have vocatives, conditional εἰ γάρ clauses do not occur with a vocative. This distribution can be explained pragmatically, since wishes serve interactive illocutionary functions, whereas conditional εἰ γάρ mainly serves the illocutionary function of its main clause, because it is illocutionary de-activated. Thus, the presence of vocatives in examples (2), (14) and (15) can be explained from their conventionalized use as interactive wish. The second criterium which can help distinguish in subordinate wishes from their conditional variants is their degree of syntactic complexity. The more syntactically complex a clause, the more it resembles a main clause since main clauses usually host various types of subordinate clauses (cf. the complex wish in example (3)). To measure the relative complexity of in subordinate wishes I counted the average amount of finite subordinate clauses per optative in a wish and in the εἰ γάρ conditional, see Table 3.⁴⁶

Table 3. the distinctive syntactic complexity of wishes.

	αἴθε wish	εἴθε wish	εἶ wish	αἶ γάρ wish	εἶ γάρ wish	Wish optative	εἶ γάρ conditional
Average complexity	1.18	1.07	0.64	1.13	1.27	0.84	0.28

The data in the table strongly suggest that wishes (both insubordinated and wish optative wishes) often contain a subordinate clause due to their main clause status.⁴⁷ However, it could be that this complexity factor is relative, meaning that the complexity of the main clause counterpart of the insubordinate construction affects the complexity of the insubordinate construction. For example, one might expect directive insubordinate constructions to be less complex (as they seem to be in section 5) than insubordinate wish constructions, because main clause directives could be expected to be less complex whereas main clause wishes with wish optatives are relatively complex (see Table 3). More comparative analyses are needed to refine our understanding of the relation between complexity and discursive in/dependence.

Next we consider the diachronic dimension, in order to properly evaluate the conventionalization of the form-function relationship of the insubordinated markers as wish. As mentioned before, Archaic Greek presents several insubordinated wishes which differ in their degree of conventionalization. In Archaic Greek, εἴθε, αἴθε and αἶ γάρ are highly conventionalized as an insubordinate wish, whereas εἶ γάρ and εἶ are less conventionalized. Nevertheless, the wish uses of εἶ γάρ and εἶ are distinguishable through their contextual independence, collocation with vocatives and their syntactic complexity resembling main clause wishes with the optative. Furthermore, εἶ γάρ displays a degree of formulaicity as only εἶ γάρ can be a wish particle, εἶ μὲν γάρ (*Il.* 9.515) or εἶ περ γάρ (*Il.* 2.123), for example, can not. In addition, Archaic Greek insubordinate wishes reveal two recent innovative constructions with different moods which presuppose a conventionalized form-function relationship of several insubordinate particles. These new alternatives provide an important advantage to the mood system: they unambiguously produce counterfactual wishes. Whereas counterfactual conditions (limited to the counterfactual past in Archaic Greek) could already be introduced

unambiguously through the innovative use of the counterfactual indicative conditional,⁴⁸ the new insubordinate constructions with ὄφελ(λ)ον and with the infinitive,⁴⁹ unambiguously introduce counterfactual wishes. See examples (20), the reproach to Paris by Hector, and (21), the wish by Alcinoos that Odysseus would have decided to stay, for their counterfactual meaning.

(20) αἴθ' ὄφελεις ἄγονός τ' ἔμηναι ἄγαμός τ' ἀπολέσθαι. (*Il.* 3.40)

I wish that you had never been born and had died unwed.

(21) αἶ γάρ, Ζεῦ τε πάτερ καὶ Ἀθηναίη καὶ Ἄπολλον,
τοῖος ἐόν, οἷός ἐσσι, τά τε φρονέων ἅ τ' ἐγώ περ,
παῖδά τ' ἐμὴν ἐχέμεν καὶ ἐμός γαμβρὸς καλέεσθαι,
αὖθι μένων (*Od.* 7.311–314)

I would, father Zeus, and Athene and Apollo, that you, being the kind of man you are, and like-minded with me, would have my daughter to wife, and be called my son, and remain here.

These innovative constructions underline the conventionalization of the wish particles αἴθε and αἶ γάρ, since the adoption of new moods requires them to be conventionalized insubordinate wishes. Also, these innovations show that analogy also plays a role in diachronic insubordination, as these constructions are created through analogy, with, for example, the infinitive form being copied from the ὄφελ(λ)ον + infinitive wish (Chantaine 1963, 228; Wakker 1994, 391–392).⁵⁰

5.4. *Insubordinate if-wishes in Classical Greek*

Analogy can also be observed in Classical Greek, where the class of counterfactual insubordinate wishes is opened up to other secondary indicatives. Compare the following examples from Classical Greek: the first by the servant to the old Iolaos preparing for battle and the second by Orestes to his deceased father Agamemnon.

(22) εἴθ' ἦσθα δυνατὸς δρᾶν ὅσον πρόθυμος εἶ. (*E. Heracl.* 731)

How I wish you were able to do all you long to do!

(23) εἰ γάρ ὑπ' Ἰλίῳ

πρὸς τινος Λυκίων, πάτερ,

δορίτμητος κατηναρίσθης (*A. Cho.* 345–347)

If only, father, you had been cut down and slain with the spear at Ilium, by the hand of some Lycian!

Table 4. Insubordinate wishes in Classical Greek.

Wish construction	εἰ + opt	εἴθε + opt	εἰ γάρ + opt	εἴθε + ὄφελ-(λ)ον	εἰ γάρ + ὄφελ(λ)ον	εἴθε + ind	εἰ γάρ + ind
Frequency	2	41	15	8	4	15	12

Notice the increasing role played by the new formation with the indicatives compared to the older ones in Table 4. The special status of these wishes becomes even more apparent when one compares them to wish optatives, since wish optatives occur at least 372 times in Aristophanes and Euripides alone (la Roi 2020a, 231) whereas the total number of insubordinate wishes in Classical Greek from the table is drastically lower.

Also, an example such as (24) where εἰ γάρ + ὄφελ(λ)ον is used as an elliptic formula for a wish and aligns with the insubordination evidence for English “if only!”, which as a highly conventionalized insubordinate wish is also used as a communicative shorthand for a wish (D’Herrefelt 2018, 81). In this example Orestes responds to Menelaos’ questions whether he denies having slain Helen and says that he wish he had (for a Post-classical example see Men. *Epit.* 954).

(24) λυπράν γε τὴν ἄρνησιν· εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον ... (E. *Or.* 1582)

Yes, and an unwelcome denial it is: if only I would have ...

5.5. *Insubordinate if-wishes in early and middle Post-Classical Greek*

In early and middle Post-Classical Greek, the insubordinate wish structures reveal further changes. We will discuss three:⁵¹ fusion of the wish particles, formulaic use and renewal of their counterfactuality.⁵² In early Post-Classical Greek (III to I BCE) the new formations αἴθε/εἴθε γάρ join the ranks of the previous wish particles and can be used with both the optative (as realizable wish, examples (25) and (27) and the indicative) (as counterfactual wish, example (26)).

(25) αἴθε γὰρ εἶην ἀπροφάτως τότε σοῖσιν ἐφέστιος ἐν μεγάροισιν. (Ap.Rhod. 3.1116)

Then may I appear unexpectedly at the hearth in your palace.

(26) **εἶθε γὰρ** αὐτόν βλητὸν ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνος ἐμαὶ χέρες ἐκτερεῖζαν (Call. *Hymn* 6.100–101)

Would that he had been smitten by Apollo and that my hands had buried him!

(27) **Εἶθε γὰρ** τις πείσειε νησιώτας σὺν ἵπποις παρατάξασθαι Λυδοῖς. (Diod.Sic. 9.25.1)

Would that someone could persuade the islanders to fight against the Lydians on horseback!

In these cases there appears to be more than just diachrony at work, since the earliest occurrences of these fused particles occur in poetic texts and may have been influenced by the various insubordinate wish structures in Homer. Interestingly, the use of Post-Classical Greek εἶθε γὰρ in example (29) is ascribed by the historian to the 6th century BCE Lydian king Croesus. However, Croesus could not have known the construction. Its use could have sounded archaic to his audience, which would explain the usage of it here, especially since Herodotus originally used an archaic αἶ γὰρ + optative wish when describing the same words (see Hdt. 1.27 αἶ γὰρ τοῦτο θεοὶ ποιήσειαν ἐπὶ νόον νησιώτησι, ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ Λυδῶν παῖδας σὺν ἵπποισι).

We also find εἶθε γὰρ in middle Post-Classical Greek used in a formulaic manner as a shorthand for a wish, e.g. when Flavius records the response by Valerius Asiaticus in an uproar

(28) ἐπεὶ προθύμως πάντες αὐτὸν ἤροντο, τίς ὁ πράξας τυγχάνει, “**εἶθε γὰρ** ἔγωγε” φησί. (Joseph. *AJ* 19.159)

When everybody urgently demanded to be told who had done the deed, [Valerius Asiaticus] replied, “Would that it had been I.”

This example not only shows how εἶθε γὰρ was used as a formula for a counterfactual wish (as εἰ γὰρ ὄφελον in example (24)), but also that the distinctively poetic pedigree of εἶθε γὰρ is not fully retained through time. That would also explain why we find it later on in middle Post-Classical Greek in Christian writers such as Gregory of Nyssa and Eusebius and once even in the papyri.⁵³

In middle Post-Classical Greek (I CE–III CE), the wish particles undergo renewal of their counterfactuality as witnessed by the introduction of ἄν to the insubordinate indicative combinations, see example (31).

(29) ὥς **εἶθε** ἡ τοῦ θανάτου βία εἰλήφει ἄν σε, καὶ κατεψηφισάμην βασιλεῦσιν καὶ ἐξάρχουσιν (A. *Thom.* 100.7–10)

Would that the violence of death had taken you, and that I would have reckoned myself among kings and nobles. (My translation.)

The explanation for this renovation must, I think, be sought in the system internal ecology of Post-Classical Greek wishes.⁵⁴ As convincingly described by Revuelta Puigdollers (2017, 182–183), the counterfactual wish particle ὄφελον extends in Post-Classical Greek to realizable wishes and adopts non-counterfactual moods such as the optative, future indicative and subjunctive. As a result, they may have felt that an unambiguous counterfactual wish was needed, which in my opinion would explain the addition of ὄν to the already counterfactual wish.⁵⁵ An additional factor which has not been considered is that εἴθε also extended its scope to other moods, other than the optative or indicative, as witnessed by this fourth century example where a combination with the subjunctive yields a realizable wish:

(30) ἀλλ' εἴθε κἄν ἀκούσης, ἵνα καὶ σὺ πεισθῆς ὡς ὁ ἅγιος Παῦλος. (Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum* 39.4)

I wish you could hear [X], so that you might obey as the holy Paul did. (My translation.)

6. *That-wishes in the history of Ancient Greek*

This section investigates two candidates for that-clause insubordinate wishes, first ὡς (from Archaic Greek onwards) and subsequently ἵνα (from middle Post-Classical Greek onwards, including its precursor directive ἵνα). Contrary to the previous section, I discuss the insubordination of these wish structures separately because they concern different diachronic periods. I, however, pay attention to (1) their synchronic polyfunctionality, (2) their independence as main clause and (3) their diachronic evolution, from subordinator to insubordinate clause and the analogical extension in mood, in a similar way to the previous section.

6.1. *Insubordinate that-wishes with ὡς in Ancient Greek diachrony*

The wish particle ὡς has thus far been treated stepmotherly as a poetic feature (together with wish εἰ, Smyth 1920, 406)⁵⁶ or a pleonastic feature of wishes (Chantraine 1963, 228)⁵⁷ and its wish use has sometimes been misrepresented as “so” (e.g. Kühner and Gerth 1904, 228)

or as an exclamation “how” (Smyth 1920, 406). Goodwin (1889, 109) has rightly observed how polyfunctional ὥς was used in Archaic Greek. It could be used in various different ways, both in independent sentences (e.g. exclamative “how” (*Il.* 21.441) and wish “o that” (ex. 33 below)) and dependent sentences (e.g. final “so that/in order that” (*Il.* 16.84),⁵⁸ indirect interrogative “how” (*Il.* 2.3) and indirect discourse “that” (*Il.* 7.402)). Its polyfunctionality is an important factor that enables the insubordination of subordinate ὥς “that” to insubordinate “(o) that”, since cross-linguistic evidence for the insubordination of that-clauses strongly suggests that polyfunctional that-subordinators are selected for illocutionary enrichment through insubordination. As parallel evolutions one could compare the insubordination of que-wishes in Spanish (example (6)) and dass-wishes in German (example (7)), since these subordinators share various other functions (e.g. exclamative and interrogative) with Archaic Greek ὥς.⁵⁹ A clear example of independent wish ὥς is the following wish from Achilles where one could translate the ὥς wish in a literal fashion as “that strife would perish ... !”

- (31) ὥς ἔρις ἔκ τε θεῶν ἔκ τ' ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλοιτο
καὶ χόλος, ὅς τ' ἐφέηκε πολύφρονά περ χαλεπήναι,
ὅς τε πολὺ γλυκίων μέλιτος καταλειβομένοιο
ἀνδρῶν ἐν στήθεσσιν ἀέξεται ἦῤτε καπνός;
ὥς ἐμὲ νῦν ἐχόλωσεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων. (*Il.* 18.107–111)

may strife **perish** from among gods and men, and anger that sets a man on to rage, though he be very wise, and that, sweeter far than trickling honey, increases like smoke in the breasts of men; just as but now the lord of men, Agamemnon, moved me to rage.

The main clause status of this wish becomes clear from its independent illocutionary force and the finite subordinate clauses that it hosts.⁶⁰ Furthermore, just as both insubordinate wishes and wish optatives in Archaic Greek, ὥς wishes may also be followed by other independent consequence clauses, as in example (32) where Hector addresses Achilles, during their fight.⁶¹ Such examples suggest that the discursive independence of the ὥς wish is the same as wish optative wishes and highly conventionalized insubordinate wishes.

- (32) (...) νῦν αὖτ' ἐμὸν ἔγχος ἄλευαι
χάλακρον· ὥς δὴ μιν σῶ ἐν χροῖ πᾶν κομίσαιο.

καί κεν ἐλαφρότερος πόλεμος Τρώεσσι γένοιτο
σεῖο καταφθιμένοιο· σὺ γάρ σφισι πῆμα μέγιστον. (*Il.* 22.285–288)

Now in your turn avoid my spear of bronze. **I pray that** you will take all of it in your flesh! So would war be lighter for the Trojans, if you were dead; for you are their greatest bane.

Actually, the Archaic Greek inventory of ὥς wishes also contains an example (by Eumaios to Odysseus in disguise about his master Odysseus) which offers us a glimpse into which context the evolution from subordinate ὥς to insubordinate wish ὥς will have taken place.

- (33) “Ζεῦ πάτερ, **αἶ γὰρ** τοῦτο τελευτήσειας **ἐέλδωρ**,
ὥς ἔλθοι μὲν κείνος ἀνὴρ, ἀγάγοι δέ ἐ δαίμων
γνοίης χ’, οἷη ἐμὴ δύναμις καὶ χεῖρες ἔπονται.” (*Od.* 21.199–202)
Father Zeus, may you fulfil this wish! Grant that that man may come back,
and that some god may guide him. Then should you know what my
strength is like, and how my hands obey it.

As suggested by punctuation added later by modern editors and the literature (e.g. Stahl 1907, 238), the ὥς clause here is generally taken to be an explication of the wish (ἐέλδωρ⁶²) and treated as a subordinate clause. However, one could argue, from the existence of ὥς wishes in Archaic Greek, that punctuation should show that the ὥς clause is an independent wish here as well (as also suggested by Ameis and Hentze [1880, 72]). I would suggest combining both scenarios and view this example as a so-called bridging context for independent wish ὥς: in such a context a new target meaning provides a more likely interpretation of the marker than the older source meaning but the structural properties of the older meaning have not fully faded away yet.⁶³ Thus, although the linguistic context provides an antecedent of which the ὥς clause was pragmatically dependent before and which is reflected in the conservative punctuation, the pragmatic context shows that the ὥς clause is more fruitfully interpreted as an independent wish clause. Therefore, the punctuation ought to reflect this, for example by printing a high dot or perhaps even a full stop. Summarizing, this example shows how a previously embedded wish (ἐέλδωρ) may change into an independent wish, viz. from discursive dependence (on ἐέλδωρ) to discursive independence.

Another example in which punctuation does not tell the whole story is the following wish by Athena during the meeting of the gods:

- (34) ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη, ὕπατε κρειόντων,
καὶ λίην κείνός γε εὐικότι κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ,
ὥς ἀπόλοιτο καὶ ἄλλος ὅτις τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι. (*Od.* 1.45–47)
Father of us all, son of Cronus, high above all lords, clearly that man lies low
in a destruction that is his due; let also any other be destroyed who does
such deeds.

In this context it is actually impossible to make the ὥς clause dependent upon the previous declarative clause, since it is used as a discursively independent wish.⁶⁴ It would therefore be better if punctuation accurately reflected the discursive independence of these clauses.

As αἶθε, Archaic Greek ὥς also reveals the innovation of adopting indicative ὄφελ(λ)ον (see example (35)) in the reproach to Paris by Helen), thus confirming its conventionalized use as a wish particle.

- (35) ἦλυθες ἐκ πολέμου· ὥς ὄφελες αὐτόθ' ὀλέσθαι
ἀνδρὶ δαμεις κρατερῷ, ὃς ἐμὸς πρότερος πόσις ἦεν. (*Il.* 3.427–428)
You have come back from the war; **I wish you** had died there, vanquished
by a mighty man who was my former husband.

In fact, the amount of such occurrences in Archaic Greek outweigh those with αἶθε (17 to 7, see [Table 1](#)). By contrast, in Classical Greek ὥς wishes are rather infrequent occurring only 9 times in Classical Greek (5 with optative vs 4 with ὄφελ(λ)ον), as in examples (36) and (37).

- (36) ὥς δὴ 'π' ἀληθεία σὺ μετὰ τοῦ μάρτυρος
διαρραγείης (*Ar. Plut.* 891–892)
I hope you literally bust a gut, and your witness too.
(37) ὥς πρὶν διδάξαι γ' ὄφελες μέσος διαρραγῆναι. (*Ar. Ran.* 955)
If only you'd split in two before you had the chance to teach [sc. the people
to speak up]!

Unlike the insubordinated conditionals, the insubordination of ὥς does not extend to other secondary indicatives. A reason for this may have been that ὥς in general, is in decline in Classical Greek (Kühner and Gerth 1904, 377) and even more so in Post-Classical Greek (Cristofaro 1998, 75), since many of its functions are being taken over by other subordinators such as ἵνα. These factors would explain why I have only found one example of a ὥς wish in early Post-Classical Greek, *Men. Epit.* 425 ὥς τὸν φράσαντα ταῦτά μοι κακὸν κακῶς ὁ Ζεὺς ἀπολέσαι, “May Zeus smash that blasted blabbermouth to bits!”

6.2. *Insubordinate that-directives with ἵνα in Post-Classical Greek*

In recent years, much attention has been paid to the changes in the complementation system in Post-Classical Greek, especially to the gradual loss of the rich infinitival and participial system that we know from Classical Greek (see most recently Bentein [2017 and 2018]) and its replacement by finite alternatives such as ἵνα (Clarysse 2010, 40–45; De Boel 1999; Joseph 1983). In addition to locative and purposive ἵνα, Post-Classical Greek ἵνα could be used for complements after non-factive verbs of ordering, psychology or effort, thereby competing with the accusative with the infinitive (Bentein 2015, 115–118; Burguière 1960, 152). Moreover, as is well known, Post-Classical Greek reveals an increased use of ἵνα in independent sentences to express a directive (Hult 1990, 86 and for its Classical Greek origins; Labiano Ilundain 2008; Kalén 1941; Mandilaras 1973, 263; Moorhouse 1982, 289–290) from as early as the third century BCE, PSI IV 412 1 (middle 3rd BCE, Philadelphia, Mayser [1926, 231]). Since that-clauses frequently insubordinate to directive main clauses cross-linguistically (e.g. in the Germanic languages, D’Hertefeldt [2018, 38–49], or the Romance languages, Sansiñena [2017]), this directive usage of ἵνα should, I think, be explained through insubordination as well.

However, only discursively independent ἵνα clauses are true directive alternatives to the imperative and many early examples in the literature are not discursively independent but only syntactically independent⁶⁵ as they, for example, function as replies to questions (e.g. in the New Testament, see Sim [2006, 54–68]) or as illocutionary modification of the main clause (of the type “(just) so you know”, [declarative main clause], Kühner and Gerth [1904, 371]).⁶⁶ In the following example from the first century CE directive ἵνα is discursively independent from the previous clause and paratactically connected to an imperative.⁶⁷ A linguistic clue to the independent directive use of ἵνα is the scope of the negation. The negator precedes ἵνα just as negation precedes directive imperatives, making the ἵνα clause an alternative similar to the directive imperative.⁶⁸ We have parallels for this co-evolution of negation with a change of illocutionary force in the adoption of μή by ὄφελον when it changed from declarative to wish illocution (Chantraine 1963, 228; Revuelta Puigdollers 2017, 179–180). In the following example, Sarapion

instructs Heracleides what to say to Ptolario in order to receive some help with solving his economic problems.

(38) οὐκ οἶδα

τί μ[ε ὁ] πάτρων ποιήσει,

πολλοὺς δανειστάς ἔχο-

μεν. **μὴ ἵνα ἀναστατώ-**

σης ἡμᾶς, ἐρώτα αὐτὸ ὕ-

καθ' ἡμέραν· τάχα δύνου-

ταί σε ἐλεῆσαι. (BGU IV 1079 (I CE), ll. 17–23)

I don't know what the patron will do for me; we have many money-lenders.

Don't unsettle us; ask him every day. He may soon pity you. (My translation.)

Note that the insubordinate use as a directive foreshadows the Modern Greek situation where the construction is also used as a directive alternative (Tsangalidis 2004, 198–199).

6.3. *Insubordinate that-wishes with ἵνα in Post-Classical Greek*

It has, so far, gone unobserved that insubordinate ἵνα had already acquired a wish function in middle to late Post-Classical Greek (as opposed to Medieval Greek, Horrocks [2020, 1881]). In example (39), Theon first orders Chairemon not to pay (μὴ δίδου) and subsequently ends his letter with a variation on that order, a wish that literally translates as “that you not pay the fee” but functions as a wish “I wish that you would not pay”.⁶⁹ It is, I think, no coincidence that the wish is found at the end of the letter, since wishes are typically found at the start or close of a letter (see Exler [1923, 103–124] and for later periods Luiselli [2008, 692–707]).

(39) μὴ ἀμελήσης τῆς μεταφορᾶς

τοῦ ἀχύρου τῆς Θώλθεως. ἄρτι δὲ

μισθὸν μὴ δίδου κτήσι [sic!] χάριν κόπρου

ἄχρι τῆς ἀναβάσεως. **ἵνα μὴ μισθὸν**

διδῶς. (P.Oxy. XLI 2985 (II–III CE), ll. 9–13)

Don't neglect the transport of Tholthis' chaff. Don't pay the wage just now for the sake of manure for the cattle until the ascent [of the river, i.e the inundation]. **I wish that you would not pay the wage.** (My translation.)⁷⁰

Similarly in the following example from late Post-Classical Greek, the insubordinated ἵνα wish is a variation on the earlier directive imperative (βοήθησον). It closes the letter by Judas to his wife in a request for her brother with a friendly reminder (see οὖν καὶ σὺ) to please help, as he is unable to take care of things by himself due to poor health after falling from a horse.

- (40) βοήθησον οὖν, κυρία μου ἀδελφή. σπουδαῖόν σοι
γενέσθω ὅπως τὸ τάχος πέμψης μοι, ὡς
προεῖπον, τὸν ἀδελφόν σου. εἰς τὰς τοιαύτας
γὰρ ἀνάγκας εὐρίσκονται οἱ ἴδιοι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
ἵνα οὖν καὶ σὺ παραβοηθήσης μοι τῷ ὄντι
ἐπὶ ξένης καὶ ἐν νόσῳ ὄντι. (P.Oxy. XLVI 3314 (IV CE), ll. 12–17)
So help, my lady wife. Make it a matter of urgency to send me your brother
quickly, as I mentioned earlier. One’s relatives are there for such urgent situ-
ations of need. **So please help me**, being in a foreign country and ill. (My
translation.)

Evidence for the early insubordination as a wish might be observed from the novel combinations with εἴθε that we find in late Post-Classical Greek. In the following example from Pseudo-Macarius (IV CE) insubordinate ἵνα is combined with the insubordinate wish particle and preceded in the context by a wish optative, thus signalling the close semantic connection of ἵνα with wish. The collocation shows a conservative compromise: instead of using more recent novel wish forms the author has chosen to combine these novel forms with a wish particle εἴθε with a distinct Attic pedigree.⁷¹ The preferred wish expression in the Post-Classical papyri⁷² is ἡβουλόμην and εἴθε and is very infrequent in late post-Classical Greek, with a meagre 6 occurrences⁷³ in the papyri, but is here combined with an innovative syntactic element, wish ἵνα.

- (41) **Γένοιτο, ἵνα** οὕτως ἀγωνιζόμενος καὶ προσέχων ἑαυτῷ πάντοτε, ἦτοι ἐν
εὐχῇ ἦτοι ἐν ὑπακοῇ ἦτοι ἐν ἔργῳ οἰωδύποτε ἐντολῆς κατὰ θεὸν γινομένης
εἴη ὁ νοῦς, τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἐρεῦνης καὶ τῆς πρὸς κύριον ζητήσεως ἐκτὸς μὴ γενό-
μενος. καὶ **εἴθε ἵνα** οὕτω δυναθῇ διαπεράσαι τὸ σκότος τῶν πονηρῶν δυνάμεων
(Pseudo-Macarius *Serm.* 64.15.2.2.1-4)

May it come to pass, that following God’s command your mind would
always contend this way and fully commit to, either prayer or obedience or
action, not straying from the exploration of yourself and the search/quest

for god. **May you be able to** cross/penetrate the darkness of painful powers this way. (My translation.)

Although these insubordinate wishes seem to occur rather infrequently in Post-Classical Greek, they provide welcome insight into the diachrony of ἵνα's main clause uses, since they foreshadow the functional richness of ἵνα which we know from Medieval Greek. As most recently described by Horrocks (2019, 1868–1881), Medieval Greek ἵνα/νά had several conventionalized main clause uses (which I suggest are insubordinate): as a directive, a future declarative,⁷⁴ an exclamative and as a wish. Most importantly, other wish particles “such as ἄμποτε(ς) or μακάρι(ον) may be prefixed for clarity” (Horrocks 2019, 1881). Thus, the example from Pseudo-Macarius foreshadows a linguistic practice common in later Greek. Also, past indicatives are found with wish ἵνα/νά in Medieval Greek, showing that the wish particle was conventionalized to such a degree, that it adopted counterfactual moods. Furthermore, the non-wish and non-directive Medieval Greek main clause uses of ἵνα/νά could very well be the consequence of insubordination, since there is abundant cross-linguistic evidence for the acquisition of such main clause functions by that-clauses.⁷⁵ An additional advantage of explaining the evolution of such constructions with insubordination would be that an answer could be provided to the problems that the history of ἵνα has generated (see the summary by Tsangalidis [2004, 198–200] and further references there). The fact that ἵνα started as a subordinating subjunctive clause and developed main clause uses later on contradicts the reverse prediction from grammaticalization studies (Bybee, Pagliuca, and Perkins 1994, 213). By contrast, in an insubordination paradigm the development of main clause uses by subordinate ἵνα is predicted.⁷⁶ Moreover, the frequent discussions in the literature of the categorial status of ἵνα (either as mood marker (see most recently Sampanis 2011, 82) or as both (see Joseph 2020; Markopoulos 2005; la Roi 2020b)), throughout the history of Greek, could then be explained by acknowledging that ἵνα changes from a subordinator into a conventionalized main clause particle through insubordination in a similar fashion to the other previously discussed wish particles.

7. *Insubordination in Ancient Greek: a diachronic constructional typology*

Before summarizing the evidence that we have found for insubordination in Ancient Greek, we need to extend our scope from wishes to other illocutionary values that can be expressed by insubordinate clauses. As mentioned in the introduction, I therefore examine, in a primarily qualitative diachronic fashion, the neglected insubordination evidence which thus far has been dealt with under headers such as “independent uses of X” in our standard grammars and try to characterize the degree of conventionalization of these insubordinate constructions. Future full-fledged quantitative and qualitative analyses, such as the ones in sections 4 and 5, will have to provide further clarifications of their specific evolutions.

7.1. *Insubordinate conditional directives in Archaic Greek*

In Archaic Greek there are three further independent uses of conditional structures. The first independent use is $\epsilon\iota + \acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ for offers (cf. Chantaine 1963, 275).⁷⁷ In example (42) Hera is reproaching Artemis for her arrogance and offers to let her know what war feels like and strips Artemis of her powers by taking her characteristic bow and arrow. This use does not seem to be very strongly conventionalized, since its function to some degree, still resembles the illocutionary use of conditionals. Illocutionary conditionals specify the appropriateness of the main speech act. In this context there is, however, no main speech act but only the action of taking away Artemis’ bow and arrow, for which $\epsilon\iota + \acute{\epsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ could be said to specify the appropriateness. Nevertheless, the conditional clause is formally a subordinate clause which is pragmatically independent from the linguistic context. Therefore, the interpretation as an insubordinate clause with offer function would seem to also have more explanatory power, because the insubordinate clause hosts several finite clauses which explicate the consequences of the offer.

- (42) ἦτοι βέλτερόν ἐστι κατ’ οὔρεα θήρας ἐναίρειν
 ἀγροτέρας τ’ ἐλάφους ἢ κρείσσοσιν ἴφι μάχεσθαι.
εἰ δ’ ἐθέλεις πολέμοιο δαήμεναι, ὄφρ’ εὖ εἰδῆς
 ὄσσον φερτέρη εἴμ’, ὅτι μοι μένος ἀντιφερίζεις.
 Ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἀμφοτέρας ἐπὶ καρπῷ χεῖρας ἔμαρπτε
 σκατῆ, δεξιτερῆ δ’ ἄρ’ ἀπ’ ὤμων αἶνυτο τόξα,

αὐτοῖσιν δ' ἄρ' ἔθεινε παρ' οὐατα μειδιώσα
 ἐντροπαλιζομένην· ταχέες δ' ἔκπιπτον ὄιστοί. (*Il.* 21.485–492)

Surely it is better on the mountains to be slaying beasts and wild deer than to do battle in strength with those mightier than you. **If you would like** to learn of war, so that you may well know how much superior I am, since you vie with me in strength ... She spoke and caught both the other's hands by the wrist with her left hand, and with her right took the bow and its arrows from her shoulders, and with these same weapons, smiling the while, she beat her about the ears, as she turned this way and that; and the swift arrows fell out of the quiver.

The second insubordinate structure is the use of αἶ + subjunctive for a command in Homeric Greek.⁷⁸

- (43) νῦν δ' ἴδεν ὃς μέγ' ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν εὐχεται εἶναι·
 ἀλλ' ἄγετ' αἶ κέν πως θωρήσομεν υἱας Ἀχαιῶν. (*Il.* 2.82–83)
 ... but now he has seen it [sc. the dream] who declares himself to be far the best of the Achaeans. But come, **let us see if** somehow we can arm the sons of the Achaeans.

As suggested by Denizot (2011, 89–90), there is no need to assume an ellipsis of a main clause adhortative subjunctive as suggested by a scholiast. Instead, we should appreciate the paratactic placement of two commands next to each other: “come on (ἄγετ') and let's arm the sons of the Achaeans in some way (αἶ κέν πως θωρήσομεν υἱας Ἀχαιῶν)”. Such placements of commands next to ἄγετ' occur more often in Homer, for example *Il.* 5.469 or 17.634 next to an adhortative subjunctive or *Il.* 22.174 next to an imperative. It is also clear from the context that Nestor uses the construction to command the members of the assembly, since these are his final words which conclude the meeting, immediately prior to the arming the Achaeans. This use, therefore, seems to be more conventionalized than the insubordinate use of εἰ + ἐθέλεις for offers, since there is less dependence on the pragmatic context.

The third insubordinate use is the conditional εἰ + subjunctive to convey a suggestion. In the following example Agenor is engrossed in an internal monologue where he suggests to himself that he should confront Achilles in front of the city. Agenor is weighing up his options, as suggested by the question in line 560 ἀλλὰ τί ἦ μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός; “But why does my heart debate these things with me?” To capture

the force of the *εἰ* clause one could perhaps translate the clause with a question: what if X would Y? (lit. “if X would Y”).

- (44) **εἰ δέ κέ** οἱ προπάροιθε πόλεος κατεναντίον ἔλθω·
καὶ γάρ θην τούτῳ τρωτὸς χρώς ὄξει χαλκῶ,
ἐν δὲ ἴα ψυχὴ, θνητὸν δὲ ἔφασ’ ἄνθρωποι
ἔμμεναι· αὐτάρ οἱ Κρονίδης Ζεὺς κῦδος ὀπάζει. (*Il.* 21.565–570)

What on the other hand if in front of the city I go out to meet him? His flesh, too, I suspect, may be pierced with the sharp sword, and in him is but one life, and men say he is mortal; but Zeus, son of Cronos, gives him glory.

Another example is the following where Hephaestus within his advice, tries to stop the fight between Hera and Zeus:

- (45) μητρὶ δ’ ἐγὼ παράφημι καὶ αὐτῇ περ νοεοῦση
πατρὶ φίλῳ ἐπίηρα φέρειν Δί, ὄφρα μὴ αὐτε
νεικείησι πατῆρ, σὺν δ’ ἡμῖν δαῖτα ταραΐζη.
εἴ περ γάρ κ’ **ἐθέλησιν** Ὀλύμπιος ἀστεροπητῆς
ἐξ ἐδέων στυφελίξαι· ὃ γὰρ πολὺ φέρτατός ἐστιν. (*Il.* 1.577–582)

And I advise my mother, though she understands this herself, to show favor to our dear father Zeus, so that the father may not upbraid her again and bring confusion to our feast. **What if** the Olympian, the lord of the lightning, were minded to dash us from our seats! For he is mightiest by far.

Hephaestus suggests to Hera that she should not enrage Zeus too much since he is very powerful. This suggestion is part of the gentle advising technique which Hephaestus has announced with the performative verb *παράφημι* “I advise”.⁷⁹ To sum up, the illocutionary force of this insubordinate construction is still co-constructed with the pragmatic context to some degree and not as independent as other insubordinate constructions.

7.2. *Directive, assertive and evaluative insubordinate that-clauses in Classical Greek*

In Classical Greek there are several independent that-clauses with ὅπως which reveal insubordination. Importantly, the discursively independent uses of ὅπως serve various illocutionary functions: as command, suggestion, assertion and evaluation. As we know from our standard grammar, Classical Greek ὅπως with a future can be used to express a

command (see esp. Goodwin 1889, 94–97), a type of command which is especially frequent in the comedies of Aristophanes.

- | | | |
|------|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (46) | Strepsiades | ἀμέλει, καλῶς. |
| | Socrates | ἄγε νυν ὅπως, ὅταν τι προβάλωμαι σοφὸν περὶ τῶν μετεώρων, εὐθέως ὑφαρπάσει. (Ar. <i>Nub.</i> 488–490) |
| | Strepsiades | Don't worry, I'll do fine. |
| | Socrates | Very well, whatever sage bit of cosmology I toss you, try to snap it up at once. |

The equal placement next to a grammaticalized imperative (see Zakowski 2018; la Roi, forthcoming d) and the presence of the finite subordinate clause in the example⁸⁰ reveals that this use is already conventionalized to a great degree.⁸¹

Nevertheless, we also find examples where the ὅπως clause has pragmatic dependence on the previous linguistic context, as in the following example.

- | | | |
|------|---------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| (47) | Oedipus | οἴσθ' ἐφ' οἷς οὖν εἶμι; |
| | Creon | λέξεις, καὶ τότε εἴσομαι κλύων. |
| | Oedipus | γῆς μ' ὅπως πέμψεις ἄποικον. (S. <i>OT</i> 1516–1518) |
| | Oedipus | Do you know, then, on what conditions I will go? |
| | Creon | You will tell me, and when I have heard you I shall know. |
| | Oedipus | That you shall send me out of the country. |

Preceding the command in the example, Creon stipulates that he has conditions which must be met before agreeing to allow Oedipus to wait for his verdict inside the house. Creon emphasizes that Oedipus needs to tell him this condition (λέξεις), after which Oedipus commands to let him leave and go into exile. Thus, even though the ὅπως clause has the pragmatic implication of a command, it is not fully discursively independent in this context, since its illocutionary force depends on the condition from the linguistic common ground.⁸² It is not surprising that we find such a transitional example in stichomythia, since such cases of “borrowed syntax” are particularly frequent in these cases, due to the fact that speakers strongly anchor what they say to what has just been said.⁸³ This example, or bridging context, thus provides us with insight into the evolutionary trajectory of the illocutionary force of such insubordinate uses, as their new illocutionary force is first co-created with the pragmatic

context and subsequently conventionalized as fully-fledged main clause use, as we saw, for example, with insubordinate wishes. Also, such an example shows us that even more acknowledged cases of insubordination such as directive ὅπως would benefit from an extensive corpus-based analysis (see la Roi, in preparation b).

Independent ὅπως μή + future is also used for a weaker type of directive, that is, to make *warning suggestions*.⁸⁴ In the example, ὅπως μή clearly introduces the main clause of the complex clause (with several finite subordinate clauses), since there are no other main clause candidates. The ὅπως μή clause presents a suggestion of the type “[X] should not/let [X] not”.

(48) εἰ δὲ τῶν νυνὶ διωκόντων καὶ κατακαινόντων τοὺς ἡμετέρους πολεμίους καὶ μαχομένων, εἴ τις ἐναντιοῦται, τούτων δόξομεν οὕτως ἀμελεῖν ὥστε καὶ πρὶν εἰδέναι πῶς πράττουσιν ἥρισθηκότες φαίνεσθαι, ὅπως μὴ αἰσχροὶ μὲν φανούμεθα, ἀσθενεῖς δ' ἐσόμεθα συμμάχων ἀποροῦντες. (X. *Cyr.* 4.2.39)

But if *we* show ourselves to be so neglectful of them that we are found to have broken our fast even before we know how they are faring, while *they* are pursuing and slaying our enemies and fighting any one that opposes them, **let us beware lest** we be disgraced in their eyes and lest we find ourselves crippled by the loss of our allies.

Cyrus here uses the ὅπως μή to caution the captains by suggesting that eating before the fighting comrades are back will lower their confidence in their leaders. The fact that this insubordinate use has its own subclauses would suggest a greater degree of conventionalization, but further corpus-based research would be necessary to corroborate such a view.

Finally, ὅπως μή can be used for assertive speech acts to suggest that something might be the case, i.e. a *cautious assertion*, as in example (49) from Plato's *Cratylus*. At this point in their discussion of the value of assigning qualities, Cratylus suggests that the incorrect assignment of names is impossible (since they refer to real world subjects) whereas this is not the case for paintings which merely depict reality.

(49) I call that kind of assignment in the case of both imitations—paintings and names—correct, and in the case of names not only correct, but true; and the other kind, which gives and applies the unlike imitation, I call incorrect and, in the case of names, false.

ἀλλ' ὅπως μή, ὃ Σώκρατες, ἐν μὲν τοῖς ζωγραφήμασιν ἦ τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ ὀρθῶς διανέμειν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν οὐ, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖον ἦ ἀεὶ ὀρθῶς. (Pl. *Cra.* 430d9-e2)

But **it may be**, Socrates, that this incorrect assignment is possible in the case of paintings, and not in the case of names, which must be always correctly assigned.

The insubordinate ὅπως μή clause resembles a cautious declarative clause, as also witnessed by its resemblance to a main clause in length.⁸⁵ More specifically, this insubordinate clause seems to be built on the model of cautious main clause assertions with μή οὐ + subjunctive. Evidence of this is the fact that μή does not function as a negation in the first part of the clause, just as μή does not in μή οὐ + subjunctive main clauses (Rijksbaron 2006, 59 note 3).

The last discursively independent use of ὅπως is *evaluative*, to express whether the speaker evaluates a state of affairs as expected or unexpected. To start with the former, Electra uses οὐχ ὅπως σὲ παύσομεν to express that she will not stop Clytaemnestra, as she expected. As Goodwin (1889, 284) suggested, its sense could be grasped by the following paraphrase: we have been stopped ourselves (see the perfect); there is no talk of our stopping you. More biting and thus more fitting to the context of verbal abuse from Clytaemnestra, the clause could be translated as “not that we will stop you!”.

- | | | |
|------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| (50) | Clytaemnestra | Οὐκ οὐκ ὄρεσθης καὶ σὺ παύσετον τάδε. |
| | Electra | Πεπαύμεθ' ἡμεῖς, οὐχ ὅπως σὲ παύσομεν. (<i>S. El.</i> 795–796) |
| | Clytaemnestra | Then Orestes and you should stop this. |
| | Electra | We have been stopped, far from our stopping you! |

Thus, the οὐχ ὅπως evaluates Electra and Orestes as not stopping Clytaemnestra, a scenario suggested by Clytaemnestra, which is expected given our understanding of Clytaemnestra's unstoppable behaviour.

Note that a very similar use is found with μή ὅτι which evaluates something as *expected* given what is contextually known. The μή ὅτι clause, in the following example, is syntactically equivalent to a main clause and expresses the scalar implication of the fact that winter has made sailing impossible. Thus, picking up the men by ship was out of the question. In other words, the fact that Theramenes could not pick up the men may be expected given that sailing was altogether impossible.

(51) φησὶ γάρ με τοὺς στρατηγούς ἀποκτεῖναι κατηγοροῦντα. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἦρχον δῆπου τοῦ κατ' ἐκείνων λόγου, ἀλλ' ἐκείνοι ἔφασαν προσαχθέν μοι ὑφ' ἐαυτῶν οὐκ ἀνελέσθαι τοὺς δυστυχοῦντας ἐν τῇ περὶ Λέσβου ναυμαχίᾳ. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπολογούμενος ὡς διὰ τὸν χειμῶνα οὐδὲ πλεῖν, **μη̅ ὅτι** ἀναιρεῖσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας δυνατὸν ἦν, ἔδοξα τῇ πόλει εἰκότα λέγειν, ἐκείνοι δ' ἐαυτῶν κατηγορεῖν ἐφάινοντο. (X. *Hell.* 2.3.35.4–9)

He [sc. Theramenes] says that I brought about the death of the generals by my accusation. But it was not I, as you know, who began the matter by accusing them; on the contrary, it was they who accused me, by stating that although that duty was assigned me by them, I failed to pick up the unfortunates in the battle off Lesbos. I said in my defence that on account of the storm it was not possible even to sail, **much less to** pick up the men, and it was decided by the state that my plea was a reasonable one, while the generals were clearly accusing themselves.

The unexpected evaluative uses differ linguistically. They all occur in coordinated main clauses with scalar markers, but their commonality with the expectedness usages is the utilization of the same formally subordinate markers. We find various combinations to express that a state of affairs is *evaluated as unexpected*: οὐχ ὅπως, μη̅ ὅπως, οὐχ ὅτι and μη̅ ὅτι.⁸⁶ How unexpected the state of affairs is can be deduced from its relation to the scalar alternative which is presented in the sentence (see the underlined scalar markers).⁸⁷ Importantly, however, not all these uses are quite insubordinate (yet), which is why I discuss an example of the more clearly insubordinate ones.⁸⁸ In example (53), the οὐχ ὅπως clause evaluates that it is unexpected that the Athenians will not hinder their enemies by contrasting it to an even more unexpected alternative that they will even (ἀλλὰ καὶ) let their enemies take away power from them. In this example, the οὐχ ὅπως clause is clearly insubordinate as it is coordinated with the other main clause ἀλλὰ καὶ.

(52) πολὺ δὲ ἐν πλέονι αἰτία ἡμεῖς μη̅ πείσαντες ὑμᾶς ἔξομεν· ἡμᾶς μὲν γὰρ κινδυνεύοντας καὶ οὐκ ἐχθροὺς ὄντας ἀπόσεσθε, τῶνδε δὲ οὐχ ὅπως κωλυταὶ ἐχθρῶν ὄντων καὶ ἐπιόντων γενήσεσθε, **ἀλλὰ καὶ** ἀπὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀρχῆς δύναμιν προσλαβεῖν περιόψεσθε· ἦν οὐ δίκαιον, ἀλλ' ἢ κάκεινων κωλύειν τοὺς ἐκ τῆς ὑμετέρας μισθοφόρους ἢ καὶ ἡμῖν πέμπειν καθ' ὅτι ἂν πεισθῆτε ὠφελίαν, μάλιστα δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ προφανοῦς δεξαμένους βοηθεῖν. (Th. 1.35.4)

Far more shall we hold you at fault if we fail to win your consent; for you will be repulsing us who are in peril and are not your enemies, while as regards these men, who are enemies and aggressors, you will **not only not** be thwarting them, **but** will **even** be allowing them to get fresh forces from your own dominions. To that they have no right; but it is right that you should either prevent them from raising mercenaries in places under your control, or else send aid to us also, on whatever terms you may be induced to make; but it would be best of all for you openly to receive and help us.

7.3. *Post-Classical Greek insubordination: commands, offers and assertives*

Since less systematic syntactic overviews are available for Post-Classical Greek than for Classical Greek,⁸⁹ the insubordination evidence is rather scant and has to be gleaned from older standard grammars which focus on subsections such as the Ptolemaic papyri, the Septuagint or the New Testament.

A first new insubordinate use in Post-Classical Greek is one which seems to be influenced by the insubordinate use of similar constructions, as we sometimes find the directive use of ὅπως with the subjunctive in parallel to the Post-Classical directive use of ἵνα with the subjunctive.⁹⁰ As shown within example (38) of directive ἵνα + subjunctive, the directive use of ὅπως with the subjunctive is paratactically connected to a previous independent clause.

(53) ἡ ληνες (l. ληνις) τοῦ

Ἀγαθανγέλου ἐστίν, ὅπως τοῖς π-

αιδίο<ι>ς δοθῆ. (P. Tebt. II 414 (II CE), 31–33)

The trough belongs to Agathangelos, so let it be given to the children.

(Translation in ed. pr.)

Since this usage of ὅπως with a subjunctive seems absent from Classical Greek, it appears to be built on ὅπως with a future which is already available in Classical Greek. Evidence for this analogical extension would be, on the one hand, that we not only find ὅπως with a subjunctive for an insubordinate command, but also with a subjunctive with ἄν,⁹¹ and on the other hand, that interchange of the subjunctive and future is common in Post-Classical Greek.

Another new insubordinate use is found at the close of contracts to make the *suggestion* to the other party to complete the contract. The

form of this phrase is conditional (ἐάν) and has the verb φαίνεται with an infinitive specifying the desired action from the other party, e.g. to pay (μισθῶσαι, P.Ryl. II 97.15 (139 CE, unknown provenance) or SB XIV 11718.23 (141 CE, Tebtynis)) or redeem (ἀπολύσαι, P.Mil.Vogl. III 196.24 (140 CE, Tebtynis), P.Mil.Vogl. III 196.15 (140 CE, Tebtynis) or P.Kron. 56.15 (150 CE, Tebtynis)).

(54) ὑφίσταμαι τελέσιν (l. τελέσειν) συ (l. σοι) φάρον (l. φόρον)
 ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς δεκάξ ἐμ (l. ἐν) μη-
 νὶ Μεσορῆ τοῦ αὐτοῦ (ἔτους). ἐάν
 οὖν συ (l. σοι) φαίνεται ἐπιχωρῆ-
 σαί μοι ἐπὶ τοῖς προκειμ<έν>οις
 (SB 20 14314.11–15 (26 CE))

I promise to pay you rent of sixteen silver drachmas in the month of Mesore of the same year. So if you would agree to sublet to me [the crop of acanthus] according to the aforementioned terms (...) (My translation.)

The origin of this construction can be adequately observed, as the construction occurred in the papyri in its subordinate use after future referring expressions (e.g. directives or commissive future indicatives) specifying what the writing party will offer *if* the other party will consent to do their part.⁹² The more formulaic character of such offers to lease will surely have played a facilitating role in creating such constructions, but this matter lies outside of the scope of this paper.⁹³

The last Post-Classical Greek construction which merits our attention is the use of a conditional to perform an assertive speech act. We first encounter such assertive conditionals in the Septuagint, as suggested by Conybeare and Stock, who suspect this construction to be “a sheer Hebraism”.⁹⁴ Nevertheless, this construction could be explained very well as an assertive insubordinate if-clause. In those examples, as in example (56) below, a verb of swearing typically precedes the insubordinate if-clause (εἰ/ἐάν) with a future/subjunctive⁹⁵ and provides the contextual cue that the if-clause functions as an assertive speech act. The if-clause also displays polarity reversal. Even though the clause lacks a negative clause, the assertive force of the insubordinate clause is negative.⁹⁶

(55) ὄμοσα τῷ οἴκῳ Ἡλι Εἰ ἐξίλασθήσεται ἀδικία οἴκου Ἡλι ἐν θυμιάματι καὶ ἐν
 θυσίαις ἕως αἰῶνος. (LXX III Ki. 3.14.1)

I have sworn to the house of Eli, the injustice from the house of Eli will never be atoned for with incense or sacrifice. (My translation.)

This construction is used by God to strongly assert that something will *not* be the case, that is that he would never let the house of Eli (because of Eli's sinful sons) atone. The same construction occurs in the New Testament,⁹⁷ for example in Mark where it is used by Jesus in an assertive speech act to the Pharisees. They demanded a sign from heaven but Jesus asserts that no sign will be given.

(56) καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει, Τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον; ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον. (NT *Ev.Marc.* 8.12)
 And he sighed in his spirit and said 'Why does this generation look for a sign? Truly, I tell you, no sign will be given to this generation.' (My translation.)

For a similar polarity reversal, we could compare the negative import of assertively used wishes (la Roi 2020a, 223–229). La Roi presents examples of wishes preceded and followed by conditionals which are used by speakers to declare their strong commitment, the types “May I die if I ever ...” = “I would never ...!” and “If I ever ... , may I die” = “I would never ...!”.

The negated counterpart of this construction is also found, but with the reverse outcome of the polarity reversal. In the example below the εἰ μὴ clause functions as the main clause, as indicated by the conditional clause which is dependent of it, and has reversed polarity.

(57) Καὶ οἱ παῖδες βασιλέως Συρίας εἶπον Θεὸς ὁρέων θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ οὐ θεὸς κοιλάδων, διὰ τοῦτο ἐκραταίωσεν ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς· ἐὰν δὲ πολεμήσωμεν αὐτούς κατ' εὐθύ, εἰ μὴ κραταιώσωμεν ὑπὲρ αὐτούς. (LXX III *Ki.* 21.23)
 The servants of the king of Syria said: “the God of Israel is a God of mountains, not a God of valleys; therefore he prevailed against us. But if we should fight against them in the plain, we will definitely prevail against them.” (My translation.)

Conybeare and Stock provide further examples of this construction, but these examples were edited out in Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint and read as assertive ἦ μὴν instead. In my view, such a solution would be unnecessary given that Rahlfs does allow this insubordinate use in his text and there is a counterpart to this negated assertive construction (as discussed above).⁹⁸

7.4. *A diachronic constructional typology of Ancient Greek insubordination*

Let us now synthesize the diachronic evidence for insubordination in Ancient Greek. In the table below I have summarized the diachronic evidence for insubordination that has been discussed thus far. The structure of the table is based on the constructional typologies that D’Hertefelt has made for the insubordination of *if*- and *that*-clauses in the Germanic languages. However, this table only includes those labels for which we have found evidence thus far, meaning that I, for example, had to omit the semantic type of “threats”.⁹⁹ I divided D’Hertefelt’s broad category of deontic which comprised both wishes and directive expressions into optatives and directives, on the grounds that wishes are not deontic but epistemic (la Roi 2020a).¹⁰⁰ Lastly, I only distinguish between counterfactual and realizable wishes contrary to D’Hertefelt’s distinction between potential, improbable and impossible.

The table reveals how varied the insubordinate constructions are, not only with respect to the subordinate marker but also its mood and tense variation. Due to the large degree of variation it is difficult to make higher-level generalization about the degree of insubordination of all these constructions (Cf. D’Hertefelt 2018, 198). Nevertheless, the in-depth diachronic analysis of insubordinate wishes generated several useful insights into the diachrony of insubordination. Most importantly, the quantitative diachronic analysis revealed distinct phases in the evolution of insubordinate wishes, which a synchronic research would not have discovered. First of all, most *if*- and *that*-markers that were illocutionary enriched through insubordination were already polyfunctional, which suggests that pragmatic polyfunctionality facilitates insubordination. Secondly, the rich mood system of Ancient Greek makes it possible to trace the distinct evolutionary steps of insubordinate markers, from wishes aspecific in terms of counterfactuality (with the optative) to specifically counterfactual wishes (first by ὄφελ(λ)ον in Archaic Greek, then by other secondary indicatives in Classical Greek). Thirdly, it was demonstrated that different evolutionary processes come into play in later stages of insubordinate wish constructions, since (1) wish functions were copied to combinations with infinitives and indicatives through analogy and (2) highly conventionalized insubordinate constructions underwent renewal in Post-Classical Greek, both in form (αἴθε/εἴθε

γὰρ) and their counterfactuality (the addition of ἄν). We can conclude that highly conventionalized in subordinate constructions open themselves up to other evolutionary processes which are typically associated with grammaticalization, analogy and renewal (Hopper and Traugott 2003, 9 and 63–68). We should also not forget that other evolutions into wish constructions may run parallel to the insubordination of wishes, as Archaic Greek ὄφελ(λ)ον on its own acquired a wish function (Allan 2013; Revuelta Puigdollers 2017; la Roi, *in preparation a*) and in Classical and Post-Classical Greek performative counterfactual modal wishes come into being such as ἐβουλόμην (see la Roi, *in preparation c*; Revuelta Puigdollers 2017, 165–166). Finally, systematic quantitative and qualitative findings as discussed for the wish domain might similarly be made for the many other illocutionary domains that are present in Table 5. A good starting point would be the directive domain (see la Roi, *in preparation b*), since we possess rich pragmatic studies of directives in Ancient Greek (Denizot 2011; Dickey 2016). As in subordinate wishes were alternatives to wish optatives, it would be essential in such future endeavours to also consider possible main clause mood alternatives (see the dashes in the table). The history of Ancient Greek has already revealed that in subordinate wishes and directives, among others, were created for illocutionary main clause functions for which illocutionary mood usages were already available.

By virtue of the diachronic analysis chosen in this paper many promising research questions have been left unaddressed. First of all, there could be more candidates for insubordination than has been possible to discuss here. Such research should begin with the two caveats (made in section 2), that only *formally subordinate markers* would qualify for insubordination and that *discursive independence* is essential to determine the main clause status of an in subordinate clause. Secondly, given the rich amount of conversational data that we possess from Classical Greek, we could provide welcome insight into the diachronic origins of insubordination, since, as we have seen above, an interactional enrichment account seems to provide a more satisfactory explanation for the evolutionary steps in a subordinate marker's insubordination (see la Roi, *in preparation b*).¹⁰¹ Thirdly, it would be worthwhile to investigate the differences between insubordination and its reverse process, the change from main to subordinate clauses (e.g. the use of the imperative for a conditional (Denizot 2011, 255–258; Mandilaras 1973, 306)).

Table 5. Constructional typology of if- and that-clause insubordination in Ancient Greek.

Illocutionary type	Semantic type	Archaic Greek marking	Classical Greek marking	Post-Classical Greek marking
Wish	Realizable wish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – εἰ + optative – αἶθε + optative – αἶ γάρ + optative – εἶθε + optative – εἰ γάρ + optative – ὥς + optative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – εἰ + optative – εἶθε + optative – εἰ γάρ + optative – ὥς + optative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – εἶθε + optative – εἰ γάρ + optative – αἶθε + optative – ὥς + optative – εἶθε γάρ + optative – αἶθε γάρ + optative – εἶθε ἵνα + subjunctive – ἵνα + subjunctive
	Counterfactual wish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – αἶθε + optative – αἶ γάρ + optative – εἶθε + optative – εἰ γάρ + optative – αἶθε + ὄφελ(λ)ον – ὥς + ὄφελ(λ)ον – αἶ γάρ + infinitive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – εἶθε + ὄφελ(λ)ον – εἰ γάρ + ὄφελ(λ)ον – ὥς + ὄφελ(λ)ον – εἶθε + past indicative – εἰ γάρ + past indicative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – εἶθε + past indicative – εἰ γάρ + past indicative – (ὥς) εἶθε ἄν + past indicative
Directive	Suggestion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – εἰ + subjunctive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – ὅπως μὴ + future indicative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – ἐὰν φαίνεται + infinitive
	Command	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – αἶ + subjunctive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – ὅπως + future indicative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – (μὴ) ἵνα (μὴ) + subjunctive – ὅπως + future/subjunctive
Assertive	Offer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – εἰ + ἐθέλεις 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> –
	Cautious assertion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – ὅπως μὴ + subjunctive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> –
	Strong assertion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – εἰ/ἐάν (μὴ) + future/subjunctive

(Continued)

Table 5. Continued.

Illocutionary type	Semantic type	Archaic Greek marking	Classical Greek marking	Post-Classical Greek marking
Evaluative	Evaluation as expected	–	– οὐχ ὅπως + future – μή ὅτι + past	–
	Evaluation as unexpected	–	– οὐχ ὅπως + future/past – μή ὅπως + infinitive – οὐχ ὅτι + past – μή ὅτι + infinitive	–

Besides diachronic questions, insubordination in Ancient Greek also lends itself well for sociolinguistic investigations. Potentially, it could be that the choice of illocutionary strategy, either mood or insubordinate mood, is sociolinguistically motivated. A prime candidate for such an investigation would be the alternation between imperative commands and insubordinate ὄπως commands that is found in Aristophanes, an author who is frequently used for sociolinguistic investigations.¹⁰² Similarly, one could ask whether the insubordinate wish variants are more polite than their wish optative alternatives¹⁰³ and how their diachronic conventionalization would affect such a politeness distinction. Caution is needed here, however, since insubordinate constructions do not simply put the face-threatening act off the record (D’Hertefelt 2018, 187) but can actually provide the more face-threatening alternative (see also Evans 2007, 393). The sociolinguistic dimensions of register and orality might also prove relevant to explaining the distribution of insubordinate constructions. With regards to wishes, we should, for example, be critical of remarks such as Smyth’s that ὄς and εἰ as insubordinate wishes are poetic. After all, the large amount of conversation in Homer will have been a more important factor, since the conventional presence of ellipsis in conversation works as a motor for insubordination (Dwyer 2016, 184) and explains the rich amount of insubordinate constructions that are found in Homer. Also, the diachronic distribution of these wish particles contradicts a poetic value, since they are also found in texts with a significant amount of dialogue from a lower register such as Euripides (*Hec.* 836, *El.* 394), Aristophanes (*Ran.* 954) and Menander (*Epit.* 425).¹⁰⁴ By contrast, in the Germanic languages insubordinate that-wishes are only found in higher registers, whereas insubordinate if-wishes are also found in lower registers (D’Hertefelt 2018, 218–219). Most likely the distribution across registers will therefore be language-specifically motivated.

8. Conclusion

The insubordination of formally subordinate constructions is a promising research area of Ancient Greek sentence syntax. As I hopefully have shown in this paper, such research would benefit mostly by in-depth

diachronic analyses with principled formal and functional criteria in order to trace the conventionalization of discursively independent in subordinate constructions. I have demonstrated how in subordinate wishes have come into being around the time of Archaic Greek as an alternative to the much older wish optatives and in their later adoption of indicative moods provide the Archaic Greek mood system with a new unambiguous way to introduce counterfactual wishes. In contrast to previous studies which have downplayed the relevance of such in subordinate wishes, this paper brings the relevance of these wishes back to our attention, as they comprise a varied inventory of conventionalized in subordinate constructions which continue to develop and exist parallel to wish optatives and modal wish alternatives all the way from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek. I have also suggested that many other illocutionary forces such as directive commands, suggestions, assertives and evaluatives were expressed by a variety of formally subordinate constructions in Ancient Greek, but these in subordinate constructions have been treated in our standard grammars as idiomatic usages or simple oddities. Importantly, the degree of conventionalization of these constructions differed, as revealed by pragmatic dependence on the context and other contextual cues which underlined the illocutionary force of the in subordinate construction. To synthesize these findings on in subordination in Ancient Greek and outline future research possibilities, I have drawn up a diachronic constructional typology. Lastly, I discussed alternative research agendas, in particular a combined diachronic-sociolinguistic and synchronic pragmatic-sociolinguistic approach to yet unanswered distributional questions with regards to in subordination in Ancient Greek.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the reviewers, the editor, my supervisors Prof. Dr. Klaas Bentein, Dr. Rutger Allan, and Prof. Dr. Gerry Wakker for their many very valuable comments on my paper. I also would like to thank my colleagues Geert de Mol, Dr. Yasmine Amory and Dr. Joanne Vera Stolk for some helpful suggestions in gathering the papyrological evidence. Finally, I thank Allison Folkett for checking my English. Any remaining errors are, of course, my own.

Notes

1. The exception here is the recently published work by Ruiz Yamuza (2021) on independent $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ clauses where she tentatively suggests that some main clause uses of

- ὄστε “so/thus” might be explained via insubordination of ὄστε result clauses “so that”. The current paper was submitted and accepted before the author could consult that work. See section 2 for how my approach differs from her approach.
2. The literary texts for this paper are all from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. For Homer, to which I have limited the examples that I discuss, these are von der Mühl (1962) for the *Odyssey* and Allen (1931) for the *Iliad*. The examples from papyri come from papyri.info. For obvious reasons of scope and expertise, I was unable to also incorporate potential evidence from inscriptions, which would be a further worthwhile research subject (cf. the insubordinate example in an inscription given recently by García Ramón [2021]). The translations are the most recent Loeb translations unless mentioned otherwise. In some rare cases where the translator had opted for a freer translation which did not take into account the subordinator, I was forced to adapt those translations to reflect the presence of the subordinator.
 3. See the discussion of Lange’s view on this example by Tabachovitz (1951, 60).
 4. See for a critical discussion Wakker (1994, 386–394). Already before, Gonda (1956, 149–150) criticizes previous psychological explanations of these constructions and their evolution. However, he admittedly is also still highly influenced by the Neo-grammarians idea that the ancestral language of Ancient Greek would have been very primitive both in nature and structure. See his remark that the optative was a welcome addition to the psychology of the primitive man, since it offers him the tool to view events as contingent, Gonda (1956, 51). For a similar sentiment, see Stahl (1907, 222–223).
 5. Lange (1872), Kühner and Gerth (1904), van Pottelbergh (1939), Schwyzer and Debrunner (1950), Humbert (1960), Chantraine (1963), Ruijgh (1971) and Brunel (1980).
 6. Monro (1891), Goodwin (1889), Tabachovitz (1951), Hettrich (1992), Wakker (1994) herself and Lombardi Vallauri (2005).
 7. See on *Il.* 16.559 the scholion by Aristonichus which transmits the work of Aristarchus (Schironi 2018, 15 and 26): Schol. A. ὅτι ἐξῶθεν προσυπακουστέον τὸ καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι. ‘εἰ αὐτὸν ἀνελόντες ἀεικισαίμεθα, καλῶς ἂν ἔχοι’ “that that would be good must be supplied in thought; ‘if we would leap forth and smite him, that would be good’” (my translation) and the discussion by (Wakker 1994, 394). For scholia that mention Aristarchus explicitly when transmitting this idea, see Schol. T 559 b2 and the addition to Schol. A, 559b1.
 8. For an example of how this evolutionary theory has been applied to the evolution of conditionals in the modern language of Swedish, see Rosenkvist (2004, 78).
 9. See note 6 for those who had also made such a connection, albeit with less attention to the diachronic evidence as I discuss later on.
 10. la Roi (2020a, 231) reports that in Aristophanes and Euripides wishes with εἶθε or εἰ γάρ occur at least 10 times less often than those without.
 11. For an example, see Wakker (1994, 389–390), and for further discussion, see section 4.
 12. For the different case of occurrences of main clause moods such as the imperative in subordinate clauses, see Denizot (2011, 110–115).

13. For the most recent summaries of cross-linguistic work on insubordination, see D’Hertefelt (2018, 2) and Beijering, Kaltenböck, and Sansiñena (2019, 4).
14. I define counterfactual state of affairs as state of affairs in the past, present or future for which the condition for realization is deemed unrealizable, see la Roi ([forthcoming a](#), [forthcoming b](#)).
15. See for relevant case-studies on this issue Sansiñena, De Smet, and Cornillie (2015), Lombardi Vallauri (2016), Schwenter (2016) and Sansiñena (2019).
16. Cf. Kaltenböck (2016; 2019).
17. Discursive independence is also what distinguishes insubordinate constructions from so-called semi-insubordinate constructions, which are syntactically independent but not discursively independent and therefore will not feature in this paper. See Beijering and Norde (2019) for the most recent insights into semi-insubordinate constructions.
18. Another feature which has been shown to distinguish insubordinate constructions is their intonation contour, e.g. in Spanish Elvira-García (2019) and Sánchez López (2019), but such evidence is not readily accessible for Ancient Greek.
19. As D’Hertefelt (2018, 4–6) notes, there are even diachronic descriptive gaps for a well-researched language family such as the Germanic language family.
20. Note, however, that Ruiz Yamuza (2021, 395–398) is in fact more careful, because she (1) openly discusses whether ὄσπε uses in *syntactically* independent sentences are cases of insubordination, and (2) suggests that some of them only belong to the first stage of insubordination. As those examples (from type 5 in her typology) occur in dyadic contexts with pragmatic dependency I would say that these examples are indeed not insubordinate yet.
21. For these issues and further literature, see Mauri and Sansò (2016).
22. Evans (2007, 378–388) wrongly applies such reasoning to the Latin subjunctive in main clauses. Using only a very dated generative account of moods in Latin by Lakoff (1968), he suggests that the main clause uses of the Latin subjunctive derive from their use in the subordinate clause. For a rebuttal of Lakoff’s work, see Pinkster (1971). Cristofaro (2016) is in my view more careful when she discusses several main clause mood markers which might have been derived from their subordinate clause variant, but leaves such matters to empirical diachronic research. For a comparable point to mine but on the use of independent infinitives in main clauses in Slavic languages with several illocutionary functions, see Wiemer (2019). He argues with several pieces of historical data that the main clause infinitive cannot have been derived from its subordinate clause uses.
23. Recently, more attention is paid to superficially similar constructions which may actually stem from different developmental paths, see Narrog (2016, 278) on “pseudo-insubordination” and on the different developmental paths Cristofaro (2016), Comrie (2016), Mithun (2008) and Wiemer (2019).
24. Others have suggested that either the optative has been independently developed later on after the Anatolian languages split off from PIE or that Greek and Indo-Iranian have extended their mood inventory to an optative after a PIE stage with as many moods as in the Anatolian languages, see the discussion in Clackson

- (2007, 115–138). For a discussion of how to incorporate the Anatolian evidence but keep the presence of the optative, see Strunk (1984).
25. I will not go into the matter of which function would have originated first, the potential or the wish, but refer the reader for further speculations to the summary on the subject by Tichy (2002).
 26. As noted above, I follow Klein, Joseph, and Fritz (2018, 2144–2145) (among others) and do not reconstruct a so-called injunctive mood for PIE which Ancient Greek would have inherited, since the injunctive was primarily a category from Old Indic grammar. Since this matter lies outside the scope of this paper, I discuss it in full detail in *la Roi* (in preparation a).
 27. Schwyzler and Debrunner (1950, 683).
 28. Pace Wakker (1994, 10) who presents a theoretically plausible example where $\epsilon\iota$ itself may also be used with the indicative to indicate a counterfactual wish, but this example does not occur in Archaic or Classical Greek.
 29. Since this paper focuses on insubordination and not counterfactuality, I refer the reader to *la Roi* (in preparation a) for a detailed analysis of the changes in counterfactual mood from Archaic to Classical Greek.
 30. Note, however, that Schwyzler and Debrunner subscribe to an interjectional origin of these insubordinate wishes, which I do not.
 31. Hofmann and Szantyr (1965, 504–505).
 32. Kühner and Stegman ([1914], 1976, 183).
 33. See Beekes (2010, 360) and Chantraine (1968, 316).
 34. It is still debated to which extent punctuation was used in different periods in Antiquity. Pfeiffer (1968, 178–181) suggests that Aristophanes of Byzantium will have already used the comma and the full stop. For further references to the issue, see Reynolds and Wilson (1991, 245).
 35. The only exception is *Il.* 17.136 where von der Mühl does not keep the $\alpha\tilde{\iota} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ wish separated by punctuation, which it should as $\alpha\tilde{\iota} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ is not used for conditionals in Archaic Greek anymore. For $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ wishes I did find problematically punctuated examples, which I discuss in section 5. Cf. for the importance of punctuation for insubordinate construction also Ruiz Yamuza (2021, 384).
 36. See D’Hertefeldt (2018, 205–212) for a critical discussion of the relation of the diachronic evidence from the Germanic languages to the four stages distinguished by Evans (2007).
 37. For more discursively independent wishes which are followed by such a speculating main clause, see Monro (1891, 290–291), but be aware that he could not use the text edition used in this paper.
 38. Monro (1891, 285) falsely suggests that wishes with $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ do not occur in the *Odyssey*; see *Od.* 18.371.
 39. Cf. Ameis and Hentze (1885, 119).
 40. A roughly contemporary view can be observed in one of Plutarch’s *de E apud Delphos*. This dialogue puts forth various solutions to the meaning of the Delphic inscription of just one letter: E. One of the suggestions is that it stands for $\epsilon\iota$ (see 386d) and is used to signify the wish that those consulting the oracle

- customarily utter. It then goes on to explain that *ei* has the force of a wish just as *ei* γάρ and εἶθε (for which an example is given), since “with *ei* the wish is sufficiently made clear” ἐν δὲ τῷ “εἶ” τὸ εὐκτικὸν καὶ ἀποχρόντως δηλοῦσθαι (386d10, my translation).
41. For the meaning of this word, see the glossary by Dickey (2007, 264) and see Nünlist (2020, 128–130) for specific variants of the ὑποστιγμὴ in Nicanor’s punctuation system.
 42. Cf. Schironi (2018, 76–90) who presents a related approach to the use of explanatory paraphrases by Aristarchus and distinguishes between a loose and close paraphrase strategy which Aristarchus used, for example, to explain the meaning of a passage, difficult Homeric Greek or lost Homeric forms through contemporary Koine Greek counterparts.
 43. As explained below, the scholia are of various later historical origins and therefore I chose to represent the scholia only by text reference, not by noting to which manuscript groups they belong. For the various manuscript groups, see Dickey (2007, 18–23).
 44. An important factor here must have been the consistent description by the much appraised grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus of wishes in formal terms with εἶθε the “adverb of wish”, e.g. *Synt.* 3.94.
 45. The development of εἶθε γάρ will be treated below, but for the others I refer to Horrocks (2019, 1881–1883).
 46. I chose to count finite subordinate clauses to keep the numbers as clean and simple as possible, since, of course, syntactic complexity can be broken down in lower levels such as non-finite subordinate clauses.
 47. Almost no attention seems to have been paid to the role of syntactic complexity in the cross-linguistic literature on insubordination, whereas it seems that, at least for Ancient Greek, this is a relevant parameter to look into. The only exception is Kaltenböck (2019, 177–178) who observes that conventionalized insubordinated wishes in English may contain finite and non-finite clauses which are a complement in the syntax of the main clause. As such, these differ from the finite subordinated clauses counted above, since they are not syntactically necessary additions.
 48. Thus, I follow the communis opinio in seeing this use of the secondary indicative as an innovation (*pace* Willmott 2007, 49), for which see Wakker (1994, 210) and Hettrich (1998) and the references cited there. In la Roi (in preparation a) I investigate how this and other innovations have shaped the mood system of Archaic and Classical Greek.
 49. This construction should not be confused with the independent exclamative uses of the accusative with infinitive construction, for which see Goodwin (1889, 314).
 50. In fact, the innovative use of these wish particles with ὄφελον gives rise to the important question what the diachronic relation is between wish ὄφελον without and with wish particles. Allan (2013) treats both as on a par. Revuelta Puigdollers (2017) says that their cooccurrence in the earliest stage of Greek makes it more likely that the wish particles hyper-characterize the constructions. I think that it would be better to distinguish between these different constructions as we

- have seen that the role of these wish particles have generally been downplayed thus far. Be that as it may, this diachronic matter lies outside the scope of this paper and therefore I refer the reader to la Roi (in preparation a) for a full analysis.
51. Note that I follow the temporal division of Post-Classical Greek suggested by Lee (2007, 113) and which is applied by Bentein (2016): early Post-Classical III–I BCE, middle Post-Classical I–III CE, late Post-Classical IV–VI CE, and early Byzantine VII–VIII CE.
 52. As limited space prevents me to fully flesh out the changes in the wish system in Post-Classical Greek, I refer the reader to la Roi (in preparation c) for a unified analysis of the reorganisation of the wish system in Post-Classical Greek.
 53. Note that the Atticist Moeris from the second century CE evaluates this construction as typical of the Koiné: (ε 6ο) εἰ γάρ Ἀττικοί· εἶθε γάρ κοινόν, but εἶθε γάρ occurs only very infrequently in early and middle Post-Classical Greek: around 20 times in literary texts (not counting fragmentary or spurious texts) and once in the papyri. See la Roi (in preparation c) for a full analysis of the examples. For the interpretation of the labels in the Atticist, see Strobel (2009, 102).
 54. I treat the evolution of counterfactual Post-Classical Greek wishes in la Roi (in preparation c).
 55. In addition, the extension to other moods also provides a context for examples from the 4th century CE where we find εἶθε combined with a ἵνα + subjunctive wish since, as I discuss in section 5, ἵνα + subjunctive starts to be used as wish in late Post-Classical Greek. Thus, the adoption of ἵνα + subjunctive into the scope of εἶθε betrays the ongoing conventionalisation of ἵνα wishes (la Roi, in preparation c).
 56. I argue against this classification in section 6.
 57. As a matter of fact, the view that these wish particles are a pleonastic feature hypercharacterizing wishes goes all the way back to Apollonius Dyscolus, see la Roi (2020a, 230–231). For a recent formulation of this idea for combinations with ὄφελον, see Revuelta Puigdollers (2017, 181–182).
 58. Goodwin (1889, 109) suggests how to derive the final sense from its original relative adverb sense “in such a way” by offering the comparison with Homeric relative clauses which actually have final force: ἡγεμόν’ ἐσθλὸν ὄπασσον, ὃς κέ με κεῖσ’ ἀγάγη (*Od.* 15.310–311), send me a good guide who will lead me there/so that he will lead me there.
 59. See for the parallels from Spanish Sansiñena, De Smet, and Cornillie (2015) and for the Germanic languages D’Hertefelt (2018, 23–65).
 60. Chantraine (1963, 277) suggests that the problematic occurrences of κε in ὡς wishes strengthen the parallel form with main clauses. However, since κε also occurs in subordinate clauses, for example in final ὡς clauses (e.g. *Il.* 1.30), I would rather view κε as an archaism which has been retained in only some ὡς wishes, viz. those earlier ones with the optative not with the secondary indicative.
 61. Other examples are *Od.* 17.243 and 21.201. Ameis and Hentze (1888, 22) compare the use of ὡς to Latin *utinam* and call the following declarative clause “der parataktische Nachsatz zum vorgehenden Wunschsatz”.

62. ἐέλωρ combines with a subordinate clause four times in Homer: thrice with ὡς (*Il.* 15.74, *Od.* 17.242, 21.200) and once with a purpose clause (*Od.* 3.418).
63. For the concept of the bridging context I refer to Heine (2002, 83–101). For the application of the concept of bridging context to the evolution of Ancient Greek complementation, see la Roi (2020c).
64. Pace Ameis and Hentze (1874, 5) who read it as “wie” with an “angeschlossenem Wunschsatz”.
65. Di Bartolo (2021a, 111–112) sees uses of ἵνα that occur after verba rogandi as independent although they can just as well be interpreted as dependent on the verba rogandi. Similarly, Mandilaras (1973, 263) follows older suggestions (e.g. by Moulton) who view independent iussive ἵνα as primarily syntactically independent. Kalén (1941, 22–27), on the other hand, suggested that the subjunctive in independent commands replaces the infinitive in commands because ἵνα had replaced the infinitive after verbs of communication.
66. For an example, see P.Mich. III 206 (II CE, unknown provenance), 13–18, Bentein (2015, 109). I use illocutionary modification in Wakker’s sense as to applied illocutionary conditionals (1994, 85), that is, those uses which specify the appropriateness of the main speech act. The distinction between syntactic and discursive independence could prove helpful in establishing the exact relative chronology of the insubordinated uses of ἵνα, since this has yet to be done. Nevertheless, this matter lies outside of the scope of this paper.
67. For the increased role of parataxis in Post-Classical Greek syntax, see Bentein (2015, 107–110).
68. For other such examples, see P.Oxy. LXVII 4624 15 (I CE, Oxyrhynchos), P.Ryl. II 230 9 (40 CE, Arsinoites), PSI XIV 1404 15 (41–42 CE, unknown provenance) and PSI IV 317 6 (95 CE, unknown provenance). Di Bartolo (2021a, 113–114) provides further examples.
69. Another example from the third century CE is P. Oxy. XIV 1675.14–15 (III CE, Oxyrhynchos) ἵνα οὖν καὶ σὺ ἐπιμελῶς χρῆσῃ “may you as well then use [...] carefully”. This example however does not seem to be found at the closing of a letter, as too much of the papyrus is missing for it to be the end. For literary examples from late Post-Classical Greek, see Jannaris (1897, 450).
70. Shelton, the editor of this papyrus, suggests as alternative to cattle that κτήσι could refer to a personal name Ctesis (n. to l. 11). Since we have no evidence for such a name, I follow the cattle reading, even though it should technically have a grave accent on the iota of the ultima: κτησί. Secondly, Shelton translates the wish as “See that you don’t pay it”, which according to me does not correctly represent the wish value of the clause.
71. Such a choice brings to mind what Horrocks (2020, 1) calls the creative use of syntax which we encounter in High-register Byzantine Greek:

High-register Byzantine Greek, in other words, was in a very real sense a living language, used creatively by its practitioners and developing in the process its own internal peculiarities and conventions. It would not be entirely unreasonable to compare it, for example, with the highly specialised literary language of the early Greek epic tradition (the Homeric poems), which similarly retained

many archaisms but also allowed their ‘original’ usage to evolve alongside the steady incorporation of linguistic innovations.

72. Mayser (1926, 227) wrongly suggests that ἡβουλόμην is the only counterfactual wish expression that is used in the papyri, since we, for example, also find εἶθε γὰρ ἡδυνάμην “if only I was able” PSI X 1103.15 (192–194 CE, Arsinoites) in a declaration of physical disability) and ὄφελον (see P.Ross.Georg. III 12.8–9 (before 566 CE, unknown provenance). I discuss the history and distribution of these constructions in la Roi (in preparation c).
73. Interestingly, in four of them εἶθε is used in a formulaic manner without a finite verb in a comparative clause: ὡς εἶθε μήποτε “as I wish I would never”. See the occurrences in P.Sakaon 48.4–5 (petition, 343 CE, Theadelphia), P.Strasb. VI 578.8 (petition, 505 CE, Hermopolis) and P.Cair.Masp. II 67153.6. (contract, 568 CE, Antinoopolis). I discuss this matter in la Roi (in preparation c).
74. This construction goes back to Post-Classical Greek according to Horrocks, but he provides no examples. See Jannaris (1897, 450) for fifth century examples of future declarative ἴνα in Callinicos and Eusebius. For its use with the Medieval Greek future auxiliary ἔχω see the discussion by Markopoulos (2009, 149–155).
75. The same functions appear, for example, in the Romance languages (e.g. Spanish que) and the Germanic languages (e.g. German dass or Dutch dat), for which see Sansiñena (2019) and D’Hertefeldt (2018) respectively. Cf. also Archaic Greek ὡς which could be used for exclamatives and wishes.
76. Di Bartolo (2021a, 26–27) falsely suggested that the use of final ἴνα + present indicative in papyri from the Roman period (see already Mayser 1926, 245) foreshadows Modern Greek main clause uses of νά + present indicative as “s/he should X”. As discussed above and by la Roi (2020b, 219), such comparisons can only be made when both uses are at least to some degree discursively independent also in earlier stages of Greek (instead of discursively dependent subordinate uses such as final ἴνα + present indicative).
77. The other examples not discussed here are *Il.* 6.150, 20.213 and *Od.* 15.80.
78. The other example is *Il.* 2.72.
79. This example is mentioned by Kühner and Gerth (1904, 484) and Lombardi Valauri (2005, 3), but as a rhetorical figure. Another example is *Od.* 21.260, see Wakker (1994, 394 note 59).
80. This combination occurs four times in Classical Greek and only in Euripides and Aristophanes: *E. Cyc.* 630, *Ar. Eq.* 1011, *Nub.* 489, *Ec.* 149.
81. Cf. van Emde Boas et al. (2019, 485) who says that ὅπως + second/third person future indicative “can be used independently to express an emphatic exhortation/warning. ὅπως is not a conjunction in these cases”.
82. Apart from linguistic common ground, there is communal (e.g. shared cultural knowledge) and personal physical (e.g. joint experience of the physical setting) common ground, see la Roi (forthcoming c).
83. I owe the useful term “borrowed syntax” to one of the reviewers.
84. Goodwin (1889, 95), for example, mentions this use and examples and see p. 96 for those examples that he classifies as warnings. He also suggests that there are also

- similar occurrences which are followed by the subjunctive, but I leave that matter for further investigation.
85. See for further examples Goodwin (1889, 95–96).
 86. Understandably, Goodwin (1889, 284) discussed these examples under a completely different header, as elliptical constructions of indirect quotation. More importantly, he did not discriminate between their different usage functions. Smyth (1920, 629–630) discusses these expressions as negative phrases and suggests that they might have developed from an ellipsed main clause with a verb of saying.
 87. As such, they differ from those unexpected evaluative uses of structures which do not have scalar markers, for which see D’Hertefeldt (2018, 51–56).
 88. Unexpected evaluative uses of *μη ὅπως*, *οὐχ ὅτι* and *μη ὅτι* with less pragmatic dependence are the following. X. *Cyr.* 1.3.10.10–14: πάντες μὲν γὰρ ἅμα ἐκεκράγειτε, ἐμανθάνετε δὲ οὐδὲν ἀλλήλων, ἦδετε δὲ καὶ μάλα γελοίως, οὐκ ἀκροώμενοι δὲ τοῦ ἄδοντος ὠμνύετε ἄριστα ἄδειν· λέγων δὲ ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ῥώμην, ἔπειτ’ εἰ ἀνασταίητε ὀρχησόμενοι, **μη ὅπως** ὀρχεῖσθαι ἐν ῥυθμῷ, **ἀλλ’ οὐδ’** ὀρθοῦσθαι ἐδύνασθε. “for instance, you kept shouting, all at the same time, and none of you heard anything that the others were saying; and you fell to singing in a most ridiculous manner at that, and though you did not hear the singer, you swore that he sang most excellently and though each one of you kept telling stories of his own strength, yet if you stood up to dance, **to say nothing of** dancing in time, why, you could **not even** stand up straight.” Two other examples are D. 24.7.4 and D. 34.14.5.
 89. However, there is a recent growth in research on the syntax of the Post-Classical Greek sentence. See, for example, Bentein (2015, 2017, 2018), and di Bartolo (2020, 2021a).
 90. See Moulton (1908, 177 note 1) and Mayser (1926, 229–232) for further examples, *contra* di Bartolo (2021a, 111) who denies the existence of insubordinate ὅπως in Post-Classical Greek altogether.
 91. Mayser (1926, 231).
 92. E.g. P.Mich. XII 631.9–13 (185 CE, unknown provenance): τὴν δὲ ἀπόδοσιν τοῦ φόρου ποιησόμεθα ἐν μηνὶ Φαῶφι καὶ Ἀθύρ ἐξ ἴσου ἐὰν φαίνητ(αι) μισθ(ῶσα). “We will make rent payment in the months of Phaophi and Hathyr in equal instalments, if you agree to lease” (my translation). Interestingly, the insubordinate construction here was already abbreviated which underlines its formulaic character. The formulation has to do with the format of the lease as they were formulated as offers from those wishing to lease to the owner which the latter could agree or not agree to. I thank the editor for this remark.
 93. But see Heine, Kaltenböck, and Kuteva (2016) for the role of formulaicity in insubordinate constructions.
 94. See Conybeare and Stock (1905, 90–91) and Muraoka (2016, 766–768) who provide more examples there than I discuss. See also Muraoka (2016, 766–767) who considers it a Hebraistic oath formula. My discussion is from the perspective of diachronic insubordination, but it may of course be possible that language contact has played a role here. However, this matter lies outside of the scope of

this paper and would require extensive corpus-based analysis of the construction in Post-Classical Greek texts.

95. For more examples, see Muraoka (2016, 766–768).
96. Cf. Conybeare and Stock (1905, 90): “The negative force imported into εἰ is due to the suppression of the apodosis, which the reader may supply as his own sense of reverence suggests”.
97. See for more examples Burton (1894, 110).
98. An additional issue that may have played a role is that the Septuagint also has a supposedly Hebraistic construction with εἰ μήν, which, as mentioned by Conybeare and Stock (1905, 91), might be a mix of ἤ μήν and εἰ μή. However, this construction is also attested in the papyri and inscriptions, see Moulton (1908, 46 note 4).
99. There are two possible explanations for this. Either the evidence was missed but is genuinely available in Ancient Greek, or Ancient Greek uses different structures for such expressions, thus underlining the language-specific nature of insubordination paths taken.
100. D’Hertefelt (2018, 26) reveals that she is aware that others prefer the term optative or wish, but sticks with a broader use of deontic than is usual.
101. Cf. also D’Hertefelt (2018, 212) who suggests that insubordination takes place in particularized contexts.
102. For a parallel investigation from Spanish of the distributional difference between directive imperatives and directive *que*-in subordinate clauses and the role of conventionalisation, see Sansiñena (2017). For a discussion of the differences between Classical Greek imperatives and ἵνα commands, see Labiano Ilundain (2008, 66–69) and la Roi (in preparation b).
103. A scholion to *Il.* 4.313 suggests that sometimes an in subordinate wish was seen as a more polite variant. ὦ γέρον, εἴθ’ ὡς θυμός: ἀρμόζουσσαν τῷ γήρῳ ποιεῖ τὴν εὐχὴν. τιμᾶ οὖν αὐτὸν εὐχῆ. “Old man, may as the heart...: he [sc. the poet] makes the wish in accordance with the [addressee’s] old age. So he honours him by using the wish.” Thus, the use of the in subordinate wish fits the address of old wise Nestor by Agamemnon.
104. Lombardi Vallauri (2005) suggests that these Ancient Greek texts mimic spoken language features, which could make their use of in subordinate constructions more understandable. For a modern day parallel from Spanish see Schwenter (2016, 93) who argues that certain in subordinate conditionals with *si* are marked spoken language features.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Funding

This research was supported by funding from an aspirant fundamental research grant from the Scientific Research Foundation of Flanders FWO [1122620N].

ORCID

Ezra la Roi  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4542-0610>

References

- Allan, Rutger J. 2013. "Exploring Modality's Semantic Space: Grammaticalisation, Subjectification and the Case of ὀφείλω." *Glotta; Zeitschrift Fur Griechische Und Lateinische Sprache*. 89: 1–46.
- Allen, Thomas W. 1931. *Homeri Ilias*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ameis, Karl Friedrich, and Carl Hentze. 1874. *Homers Odyssee für den Schulgebrauch erklärt (Gesang I–IV)*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Ameis, Karl Friedrich, and Carl Hentze. 1880. *Homers Odyssee für den Schulgebrauch erklärt (Gesang XIX–XXIV)*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Ameis, Karl Friedrich, and Carl Hentze. 1885. *Homers Ilias für den Schulgebrauch erklärt (Gesang XIII–XV)*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Ameis, Karl Friedrich, and Carl Hentze. 1888. *Homers Ilias für den Schulgebrauch erklärt (Gesang XXII–XIV)*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- di Bartolo, Giuseppina. 2020. "Purpose and Result Clauses: ἵνα-hína and ὅστε-hō'ste in the Greek Documentary Papyri of the Roman Period." In *Post-Classical Greek: Contemporary Approaches to Philology and Linguistics*, edited by Dariya Rafiyenko, and Ilja A. Seržant, 19–38. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- di Bartolo, Giuseppina. 2021a. *Studien zur griechischen Syntax dokumentarischer Papyri der römischen Zeit*. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- di Bartolo, Giuseppina. 2021b. "Independent ἵνα Sentences and the Case of μὴ ἵνα in Greek Documentary Papyri." Paper presented at the first Post-Classical Greek Conference, Cologne.
- Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Beijering, Karin, Gunther Kaltenböck, and María Sol Sansiñena. 2019. "Insubordination: Central Issues and Open Questions." In *Insubordination: Theoretical and Empirical Issues*, edited by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, and María Sol Sansiñena, 1–28. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Beijering, Karin, and Muriel Norde. 2019. "Adverbial Semi-Insubordination in Swedish: Synchrony and Diachrony." In *Insubordination: Theoretical and Empirical Issues*, edited by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, and María Sol Sansiñena, 79–106. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2015. "Minor Complementation Patterns in Post-Classical Greek (I–VI AD): a Socio Historical Analysis of a Corpus of Documentary Papyri." *Symbolae Osloenses* 89 (1): 104–147.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2016. *Verbal Periphrasis in Ancient Greek. Have- and Be- Constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2017. "Finite vs. Non-Finite Complementation in Post-Classical and Early Byzantine Greek. Towards a Pragmatic Restructuring of the Complementation System?" *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 17: 3–36.

- Bentein, Klaas. 2018. "The Decline of Infinitival Complementation in Ancient Greek." *Glotta; Zeitschrift Fur Griechische Und Lateinische Sprache*. 94: 82–108.
- De Boel, Gunnar. 1999. "La concurrence entre l'infinitif et la subordonnée par ὅπως/ὅτι en attique classique et en grec neotestamentaire." In *Les complementives en grec ancien*, edited by Bernard Jacquino, 265–276. Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne.
- Brunel, Jean. 1980. "Les périodes conditionnelles du grec et le problème de l'optatif." *BSL* 75: 227–266.
- Burguière, Paul. 1960. *Histoire de l'infinitif en grec*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Burton, Ernest D. 1894. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Bybee, Joan L., William Pagliuca, and Revere Perkins. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1963. *Grammaire homérique, Tome II: Syntaxe*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologie de la langue grec. Histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Clackson, James. 2007. *Indo-European Linguistics: an Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarisse, Willy. 2010. "Linguistic Diversity in the Archive of the Engineers Kleon and Theodoros." In *The Language of the Papyri*, edited by T. V. Evans, and D. D. Obbink, 35–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 2016. "Insubordination in the Tsezic Languages." In *Insubordination*, edited by Nicholas Evans, and Honoré Watanabe, 171–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Conybeare, Frederick C., and St. George Stock. 1905. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek. With Selected Readings from the Septuagint According to the Text of Swete*. Boston: Ginn and Company.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 1998. "Grammaticalization and Clause Linkage Strategies: A Typological Approach with Particular Reference to Ancient Greek." In *The Limits of Grammaticalization*, edited by A. Giacalone Ramat, and Paul Hopper, 59–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2016. "Routes to Insubordination: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective." In *Insubordination*, edited by Nicholas Evans and Honoré Watanabe, 393–422. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dahl, Eystein. 2010. *Time, Tense and Aspect in Early Vedic Grammar*. Leiden: Brill.
- Denizot, Camille. 2011. *Donner des Ordres en Grec Ancien*. Rouen: Publications des universités de Rouen et du Havre.
- D'Hertefeldt, Sarah. 2018. *Insubordination in Germanic: A Typology of Complement and Conditional Constructions*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dickey, Eleanor. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Dickey, Eleanor. 2016. "Emotional Language and Formula of Persuasion in Greek Papyrus Letters." In *Emotion and Persuasion in Classical Antiquity*, edited by Ed Sanders and Matthew Johncock, 237–262. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Dunkel, George E. 2014a. *Lexikon der indo-germanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*, vol. 1. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Dunkel, George E. 2014b. *Lexikon der indo-germanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*, vol. 2. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Dwyer, Arienne. 2016. "Ordinary Insubordination as Transient Discourse." In *Insubordination*, edited by Nicholas Evans and Honoré Watanabe, 183–208. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Elvira-García, Wendy. 2019. "Two Constructions, one Syntactic Form: Perceptual Prosodic Differences Between Elliptical and Independent < si + V Indicative > Clauses in Spanish." In *Insubordination: Theoretical and Empirical Issues*, edited by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, and María Sol Sansiñena, 240–264. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Emde Boas, Evert van, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink, and Mathieu de Bakker. 2019. *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. "Insubordination and Its Uses." In *Finiteness: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations*, edited by Irina Nikolaeva, 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Nicholas, and Honoré Watanabe. 2016. "The Dynamics of Insubordination: An Overview." In *Insubordination*, edited by Nicholas Evans and Honoré Watanabe, 1–38. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- (1923)
- García Ramón, José Luis. 2021. "Local Dialects vs Koiné and Literary Patterns in Post-Classical Greek: Syntax and Formulaic Phraseology." Paper presented at the First Post-Classical Greek Conference, Cologne.
- Gonda, Jan. 1956. *The Character of the Indo-European Moods, with Special Regard to Greek and Sanskrit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Goodwin, William W. 1889. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. London: Macmillan and co.
- Heine, Bernd. 2002. "On the Role of Context in Grammaticalization." In *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, edited by Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald, 83–101. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, and Tania Kuteva. 2016. "On Insubordination and Cooption." In *Insubordination*, edited by Nicholas Evans, and Honoré Watanabe, 39–64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hettrich, Heinrich. 1992. "Lateinische Konditionalsätze in sprachvergleichender Sicht." In *Latein und Indogermanisch*, edited by Oswald Panagl, 263–284. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Hofmann, Johann B., and Anton Szantyr. 1965. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. München: Beck.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Elizabeth C. Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Horrocks, Geoffrey C. 2019. "Syntax." In *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*, edited by David Holton, Geoffrey Horrocks, Marjolijne Janssen, Tina Lendari, Io Manolessou, and Notis Toufexis, 1859–2093. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey C. 2020. "Byzantine Literature in 'Classical' Genres: Some Grammatical Realities." In *Varieties of Post-Classical and Byzantine Greek*, edited by Klaas Bentein and Mark Janse, 163–178. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110614404007
- Hult, Karin. 1990. *Syntactic Variation in the Greek of the 5th Century A.D.* Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Humbert, Jean. 1960. *Syntaxe Grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Jannaris, Antonios. 1897. *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2020. "Greek Infinitive-Retreat Versus Grammaticalization: An Assessment." In *Post-Classical Greek: Contemporary Approaches to Philology and Linguistics*, edited by Dariya Rafiyenko and Ilja A. Seržant, 145–162. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kalén, Ture. 1941. *Selbständige Finalsätze und imperativische Infinitive im Griechischen*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell/Harrassowitz.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2016. "On the Grammatical Status of Insubordinate *if*-Clauses." In *Outside the Clause: Form and Function of Extra-Clausal Constituents*, edited by Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer, and Arne Lohmann, 341–377. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2019. "Delimiting the Class: A Typology of English Insubordination." In *Insubordination: Theoretical and Empirical Issues*, edited by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, and María Sol Sansiñena, 167–198. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kapović, Mate. 2017. *The Indo-European Languages*. London: Routledge.
- Klein, Jared, Brian Joseph, and Matthias Fritz. 2018. *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, vol 3. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kühner, Raphael, and Bernhard Gerth. 1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Vol. 2: Satzlehre. Part 2*. Hannover: Hahn.
- Kühner, Raphael, and Carl Stegmann. (1914) 1976. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Vol 2: Satzlehre*. Hannover: Hahn.
- Labiano Ilundain, Juan Miguel. 2008. "La cronología de ἵνα con subjuntivo en expresión de mandato: La lengua de Sófocles, Eurípides y Jenofonte." *Estudios griegos e indoeuropeos* 18: 55–72.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1968. *Abstract Syntax and Latin Complementation*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Lange, Ludwig. 1872. *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel ei*. Leipzig: Abhandlungen der phil. hist. Classe der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2020a. "The Variation of Classical Greek Wishes: A Functional Discourse Grammar and Common Ground Approach." *Glotta; Zeitschrift Fur Griechische Und Lateinische Sprache*. 96: 213–245.

- la Roi, Ezra. 2020b. "A Rephilologized Diachronic Analysis of 'Post-Classical Greek'. Pitfalls and Principles for Progress." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 20 (2): 213–238. doi:10.1163/1569984602002002.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2020c. "The Development of εὐρίσκω 'Find' as Evidence Towards a Diachronic Solution of the Matching-Problem in Ancient Greek Complementation." *Philologia Classica* 15 (2): 191–207. doi:10.21638/spbu20.2020.202.
- la Roi, Ezra. Forthcoming a. Counterfactuals from Archaic to Classical Greek. *Encyclopedia of Greek Language and Linguistics (EGLL)*.
- la Roi, Ezra. Forthcoming b. Counterfactuals in Post-classical Greek. *Encyclopedia of Greek Language and Linguistics (EGLL)*.
- la Roi, Ezra. Forthcoming c. Insubordination from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek. *Encyclopedia of Greek language and Linguistics (EGLL)*.
- la Roi, Ezra. Forthcoming d. Weaving Together the Diverse Threads of Category Change: Intersubjective ἀμέλει "Of Course" and Imperative Particles in Ancient Greek. *Diachronica*.
- la Roi, Ezra. In preparation a. Interlocking Life-cycles of Counterfactual Mood from Archaic to Classical Greek.
- la Roi, Ezra. In preparation b. Between Dialogic and Diachronic Syntax: Insubordinate ὅπως in Classical Greek Drama.
- la Roi, Ezra. In preparation c. Post-classical Greek Wishes and the Reorganisation of the Wish System.
- Lee, John A. L. 2007. "Ἐξαποστέλλω." In *Voces biblicae: Septuagint Greek and Its Significance for the New Testament*, edited by Jan Joosten and Peter J. Tomson, 99–113. Leuven: Peeters.
- Lindström, Jan, Ritva Laury, and Camilla Lindholm. 2019. "Insubordination and the Contextually Sensitive Emergence of if-Requests in Swedish and Finnish Institutional Talk-in-Interaction." In *Insubordination: Theoretical and Empirical Issues*, edited by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, and María Sol Sansiñena, 55–78. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lombardi Vallauri, Edoardo. 2004. "Grammaticalization of Syntactic Incompleteness: Free Conditionals in Italian and Other Languages." *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 17: 189–215.
- Lombardi Vallauri, Edoardo. 2005. "Come era il parlato di lingue antiche: le ipotetiche libere." *SILTA* 2: 225–255.
- Lombardi Vallauri, Edoardo. 2016. "Insubordinated Conditionals in Spoken and Non-Spoken Italian." In *Insubordination*, edited by Nicholas Evans, and Honore Watanabe, 145–169. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Luiselli, Raffaele. 2008. "Greek Letters on Papyrus First to Eight Centuries: A Survey." *Asiatische Studien* 62: 677–737.
- Mandilaras, B. G. 1973. *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri*. Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences.
- Markopoulos, Theodore. 2005. "Categorial Features and Grammaticalization: The Case of Medieval Greek 'na'." Paper presented at the 7th International Conference on Greek Linguistics, York.

- Markopoulos, Theodore. 2009. *The Future in Greek. from Ancient to Medieval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mauri, Catarina, and Andrea Sansò. 2016. "The Linguistic Marking of (Ir)Realis and Subjunctive." In *The Oxford Handbook of Modality and Mood*, edited by Jan Nuyts and Johan van der Auwera, 166–195. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maysers, E. 1926. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, Band II.1: Satzlehre*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1964. *Introduction à l'étude comparatif des langues indo-européennes*. University of Alabama: Alabama University Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2008. "The Extension of Dependency Beyond the Sentence." *Language* 84 (1): 69–119.
- Monro, David B. 1891. *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Moorhouse, Alfred. C. 1982. *The Syntax of Sophocles*. Leiden: Brill.
- Moulton, James Hope. 1908. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. vol 1: Prolegomena*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 2016. *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Mühlh, Peter von der. 1962. *Homeri Odyssea*. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2016. "Insubordination in Japanese Diachronically." In *Insubordination*, edited by Nicholas Evans and Honoré Watanabe, 247–282. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nünlist, René. 2020. "Nicanor's System of Punctuation." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 60: 124–138.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolph. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the end of the Hellenistic age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pinkster, Harm. 1971. "Review Article on R. T. Lakoff, *Abstract Syntax and Latin Complementation*." *Lingua. International Review of General Linguistics. Revue internationale De Linguistique Generale* 26: 383–421.
- Pottelbergh, Robert van. 1939. *Over de geschiedenis en de betekenis van de ei-zin in het Grieksch*. Gent: Universiteit Gent.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Revuelta Puigdollers, Antonio. 2017. "Ὠφέλ(λ)οῦν in Ancient Greek Counterfactual Desiderative Sentences: From Verb to Modal Particle." In *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*, edited by Klaas Bentein, Mark Janse, and Jorie Soltic, 158–188. Leiden: Brill.
- Reynolds, Leighton, and Nigel G. Wilson. 1991. *Scribes and Scholars. A Guide to the Transmission of Greek & Latin Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rijksbaron, Albert. 2006. *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*. Gieben: Amsterdam.
- Rix, Helmut. 1986. *Zur entstehung des urindogermanischen Modusystems*. Innsbruck: Universität Innsbruck Institut für Sprachwissenschaft: .
- Rosenkvist, Henrik. 2004. *The Emergence of Conditional Subordinators in Swedish: A Study in Grammaticalization*. Lund: Department of Scandinavian languages Lund University.

- Ruijgh, Cees J. 1971. *Autour de “τὴ ἐπίκουρη”. Etudes sur le Syntaxe Grecque*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Ruiz Yamuza, Emilia Reyes. 2021. “Insubordination in Ancient Greek? The Case of Hoste Sentences.” In *Papers on Ancient Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the Ninth International Colloquium on Ancient Greek Linguistics (ICAGL9) 30 August–1 September 2018, Helsinki*, edited by Marja Vierros, Martti Leiwo, and Sonja A.K. Dahlgren, 383–402. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Sampanis, Konstantinos. 2011. “A Diachronic and Typological Approach to the Modern Greek Subjunctive Complementation.” Unpublished PhD diss., University of Salzburg.
- Sansiñena, María Sol. 2017. “Eliciting Evidence of Functional Differences: The Imperative vs. Free-Standing Que-Clauses in Spanish.” In *Imperatives and Directive Strategies*, edited by Daniël Van Olmen and Simone Heinold, 265–290. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sansiñena, María Sol. 2019. “Insubordination: Theoretical and Empirical Issues.” In *Patterns of (in)Dependence*, edited by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, and María Sol Sansiñena, 199–239. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sansiñena, María Sol, Hendrik De Smet, and Bert Cornillie. 2015. “Between Subordinate and Insubordinate. Paths Towards Complementizer-Initial Main Clauses.” *Journal of Pragmatics* 77: 3–19.
- Sánchez López, Cristina. 2019. “Optative and Evaluative Que ‘that’ Sentences in Spanish.” In *Insubordination: Theoretical and Empirical Issues*, edited by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, and María Sol Sansiñena, 291–391. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schironi, Francesca. 2018. *The Best of the Grammarians. Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Schwenter, Scott. 2016. “Independent si-Clauses in Spanish: Functions and Consequences for Insubordination.” In *Insubordination*, edited by Nicholas Evans and Honoré Watanabe, 89–112. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schwyzler, Eduard, and Albert Debrunner. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik*. 2 Band. Munich: C.H. Beck.
- Sim, Margaretha Gavin. 2006. “A Relevance Theoretic Approach to the Particle ἵνα in Koine Greek.” Unpublished doctoral diss., University of Edinburgh.
- Smyth, Herbert W. 1920. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stahl, Johann. M. 1907. *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbuns*. Hildesheim: George Olms.
- Strobel, Claudia. 2009. “The Lexica of the Second Sophistic: Safeguarding Atticism.” In *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present*, edited by Alexandra Georgakopoulou, and Michael Silk, 93–107. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Strunk, Klaus. 1984. “Probleme der Sprachrekonstruktion und das Fehlen Zweier Modi im Hethitischen.” *Incontri Linguistici* 9: 135–152.
- Tabachovitz, David. 1951. *Homerische ei-Sätze*. Lund: Gleerup.
- Tichy, Eva. 2002. “Zur Funktion und Vorgeschichte der indoermanischen Modi.” In *Indogermanische Syntax-Fragen und Perspektiven*, edited by Heinrich Hettrich, 189–206. Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2017. "‘Insubordination’ in the Light of the Uniformitarian Principle." *English Language and Linguistics* 21 (2): 289–310.
- Tsangalidis, Anastasios. 2004. "Unidirectionality in the Grammaticalization of Modality in Greek." In *Up and Down the Cline: The Nature of Grammaticalization*, edited by Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde, and Harry Perridon, 193–209. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Verstraete, Jean-Christophe, and Sarah D’Hertefelt. 2016. "Running in the Family. Patterns of Complement Insubordination in Germanic." In *Insubordination*, edited by Nicholas Evans, and Honoré Watanabe, 65–87. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wakker, Gerry C. 1994. *Conditions and Conditionals. An Investigation of Ancient Greek*. Gieben: Amsterdam.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2019. "On Illusory Insubordination and Semi-Insubordination in Slavic: Independent Infinitives, Clause-Initial Particles and Predicatives put to the Test." In *Insubordination: Theoretical and Empirical Issues*, edited by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, and María Sol Sansiñena, 107–166. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Willmott, Jo. 2007. *Moods of Homeric Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zakowski, Samuel. 2018. "The Evolution of the Ancient Greek Deverbal Pragmatic Markers áge, íthi and phére." *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 19 (1): 55–91.