



BRILL



brill.com/jgl

The impact of insubordination on the history of Greek

Cross-linguistic connections, morphosyntactic innovations and pragmatic spread in the modal system

Ezra la Roi | ORCID: 0000-0002-4542-0610

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

ezra.laroi@ugent.be

Received 24 January 2024 | Accepted 13 August 2024 |

Published online 14 November 2024

Abstract

In this paper, I trace the impact of insubordination and semi-insubordination on the history of Greek, focusing on its impact on the modal system used to express speech acts. Starting from the cross-linguistic connections of insubordinate and semi-insubordinate $\tilde{\nu}\alpha$ and $\nu\alpha$ constructions with those found in other languages, I show that $\tilde{\nu}\alpha$ only had subordinate usages in Classical Greek (including in dyadic syntactic contexts), but developed insubordinate usages for directive and wish speech acts in Post-Classical Greek. In Medieval Greek, insubordinate $\nu\alpha$ spreads pragmatically to other speech acts, e.g. to exclamatives, interrogatives and various assertives (e.g. counterfactual apodoses or double negative declaratives). In Modern Greek, insubordinate $\nu\alpha$ has obtained novel usages in interrogative speech acts too and gained paradigmatic strength as it competes with the imperative and the future. Semi-insubordinate patterns are first developed in Medieval Greek (with $\tilde{\nu}\omega\varsigma \nu\alpha$ + main verb) but spread formally and functionally to other parts of the modal system, expressing epistemic possibility, probability, counterfactuality and avertives.

Keywords

insubordination – semi-insubordination – mood and modality – counterfactuality – avertives – linguistic typology

1 Insubordination and independent (ῖ)να clauses in the history of Greek

One of the more complex linguistic questions which the Modern Greek language poses is how to account for its polyfunctional use of *να*. As shown in (1), this form can, among other things, introduce subordinate complement clauses, viz. *να τον δεις* as an object of *προσπαθήσεις*, as well as independent main clauses, viz. *να προσπαθήσεις* ‘you should try’.

- (1) *Αν θα πας στην Ελλάδα να προσπαθήσεις να τον δεις* (Spyropoulos et al. 2012: 287)
 ‘If you go to Greece you should try to see him’

However, most research on Greek has focused only on the former, the use of *να* in subordinate environments. Many researchers have in particular discussed the *syntactic status* of *να*, with competing results: Agouraki (1991) had for example suggested that *να* is a complementizer, but Philippaki-Warburton (1994) for various reasons had counterargued that it was a “subjunctive mood”¹ marker, whereas Roussou (2000) had suggested that *να* is actually both. Apart from various theoretical and descriptive differences, these proposals have in common that they are made within a theoretical approach of generative grammar, a linguistic paradigm which has been very influential in Greek linguistics (cf. Alexiadou, Horrocks, and Stavrou 1999 for an overview). Though anyone is of course free to choose their own framework, insights from the generative framework cannot always be ‘translated’ easily to other frameworks, such as the functional-typological (cf. Croft 2022). To illustrate briefly, one potentially problematic example is the postulation of Modern Greek *να* as being in “C” or hypothesizing a movement of the verb, since these explanations can only be upheld if one shares the theoretical assumptions about clause structure from generative grammar. Also, the semantics and/or pragmatics of *να* clauses have remained relatively underexplored. Scholars have signalled the importance of features such as control on arguments in subordinate environments (e.g. Joseph 1983; Roussou 2009), proposing a rather general semantics for *να* (e.g. Delveroudi, Tsamadou, & Vassilaki 1994; Philippaki-Warburton 1994) on the “subjunctive” as indicating the speaker’s attitude to the content of the

1 I use quotation marks to refer to this influential classification, because, as pointed out below, this conception of the subjunctive mood is different from how the term is normally used outside of Greek linguistics or in linguistic typology. A partial explanation of these issues can also be found in Haberland (2010: 475).

sentence s/he utters). Similarly with respect to diachrony, most efforts have centered around the complex processes whereby subordinate ($\text{(\acute{i})}\nu\alpha^2$) replaced the infinitive in the history of Greek (esp. Joseph 1983; Philippaki-Warbuton & Spyropoulos 2004; Joseph 2020); for example, scholars have recently argued that other factors such as morphology, language contact and pragmatic restructuring also played a role in this complex process (see Bentein 2018, 83 for an overview).

I would like to argue here that the use of $\nu\alpha$ in subordinate contexts and independent contexts cannot be explained in a uniform way because they underwent distinct diachronic processes. A common diachronic explanation for the genesis of the two uses illustrated in (1) is that there has been a change from purposive $\text{\acute{i}\nu\alpha}$ to “subjunctive particle” in the history of Greek (viz. in its independent and subordinate clause usage), as the result of a grammaticalization process involving reanalysis (Philippaki-Warbuton & Spyropoulos 2004, 800–805). The replacement of the non-finite form of the subordinate infinitive by the finite one of ($\text{(\acute{i})}\nu\alpha$) would actually rather qualify as degrammaticalization, i.e. a weakening of the structural bonds between the verb and the complement (note the increase in finiteness), as suggested by Joseph (2020). In fact, the classification of both usages of $\nu\alpha$ under the heading of the “subjunctive mood” is a highly language-specific ‘solution’ which does not fit well with the cross-linguistic evidence or its descriptive traditions: the subjunctive label is generally used to refer to specific inflectional forms of languages (Mauri & Sansò 2016) and the $\nu\alpha$ to introduce complement clauses in Greek would indeed, as pointed out by Roussou, simply be described as complementizer in other languages (cf. Dixon & Aikhenvald 2006; Noonan 2007). Instead, the independent uses of $\nu\alpha$ can be explained as the result of a process of *insubordination*, a cross-linguistically common diachronic process by which subordinate markers develop independent, so-called insubordinate, uses. More specifically, the process refers to the diachronic conventionalization of independent main clause uses by formally subordinate clauses (Evans 2007: 367). I have recently suggested (2020: 224; 2021) that the independent uses of $\text{\acute{i}\nu\alpha}$ and $\nu\alpha$ qualify as insubordination, a hypothesis which I test diachronically below. Major motivations to conduct such an investigation are that research on independent uses of $\nu\alpha$ is thin on the ground and has often focused on only one particular independent usage (e.g. Rivero 1994; Rouchota 1994 respectively on the imperative and

2 As discussed in section 4, $\text{\acute{i}\nu\alpha}$ underwent phonological changes, first a possibly unexpected shift of the accent giving $\text{\acute{i}\nu\acute{\alpha}}$ and then a regular loss of unaccented initial vowels giving $\nu\acute{\alpha}$. Thus, I use ($\text{(\acute{i})}\nu\alpha$) to refer to both $\text{\acute{i}\nu\alpha}$ and $\nu\alpha$.

interrogative usage of $\nu\alpha$),³ and not paid attention to in subordinate uses in the different stages of the history of Greek, especially with regard to their formal, pragmatic, and diachronic variation.⁴

Therefore, I assess the morphosyntactic, pragmatic, and diachronic variation of these independent uses of $(\acute{i})\nu\alpha$ from Classical to Modern Greek. In particular, I demonstrate that the independent uses of $(\acute{i})\nu\alpha$ are best classified as *in subordinate clause constructions*; this classification not only puts the Greek evidence on a comparable footing with typological descriptions (cf. Haspelmath 2010; 2016, who discusses the benefits of using cross-linguistically valid comparative concepts for linguistic analysis), but it also allows us to highlight the value of cross-linguistic parallels for the morphosyntactic evidence from the history of Greek. In fact, I would like to stress that the corpus evidence from the history of Greek can make an important contribution to cross-linguistic research on in subordination, in particular diachronic research. It has been noted by several authors that we still lack diachronic corpus research on in subordination (cf. Cristofaro 2016: 395), since most researchers infer the diachrony of in subordination from synchronic data (e.g. Evans 2007) and only few provide corpus-based diachronic studies (e.g. Narrog 2016 on Japanese; la Roi 2021, forthc. ab; Ruiz Yamuza 2022 on Ancient Greek and la Roi 2022 on Latin). The evidence from the long history of Greek therefore can make a significant contribution to this area.⁵

Before embarking on the analysis, let us further introduce the concept of in subordination and point out some important parallels from other languages with the in subordinate use of $\nu\alpha$ in Modern Greek. True in subordinate usages are not only syntactically independent of a matrix clause, but also discursively independent (Verstraete & D’Hertefelt 2016; D’Hertefelt 2018); these distinctions can be illustrated well with examples of in subordinate clauses from Spanish that use polyfunctional *que*. In (2), speaker B uses a clause headed by *que* (in bold) which is syntactically as well as discursively ‘incomplete’: syntactically it functions as an object to the question by speaker A whereas the pragmatic force of Speaker B’s answer is dyadically dependent on speaker A’s question (viz. ‘[I think] that they are darlings’). By contrast, in (3), *que* is not dependent on a pre-

3 A notable exception is the thorough descriptive analysis of independent $\nu\alpha$ interrogatives by Pavlidou (1991), who identifies several pragmatic functions for this construction.

4 Cf. Markopoulos (2005) who had rightly noted that the corpus evidence from Medieval Greek is more complex than had been assumed, for example with regard to the distributional freedom and syntactic status of subordinate $\nu\alpha$.

5 Tsangalidis (2004) provides a useful case study for the value of the Greek evidence for diachronic and typological questions of grammaticalization.

vious element or needs contextually accessible pragmatic information to show its interactional function; cf. the sign of its interactive use by the preceding vocative.⁶ Note also the contrast with the second *que* in (3) which introduces a subordinate clause that functions as an argument to the imperative ¡*Mira!* 'Look!'.

- (2) A: ¿Qué opinas tú de los niños?
 'What do you think of children?'
 B: **Que** son unos cielos. Para poco rato, vamos.
 'That they are darlings. For a short while, of course.' (Sansiñena, De Smet & Cornillie 2015: 8)
- (3) Ana, **que** va a llover. Mira el mal día que hace.
 'Ana, [que] it's going to rain. Look what an awful day it is.' (Sansiñena, De Smet & Cornillie 2015: 14)

In fact, the polyfunctionality of Spanish *que* provides solid cross-linguistic comparability for the functional richness of $\nu\alpha$ in Modern Greek, showing that we need not assume a Greek-specific or theory-specific explanation for these usages. What is more, the different independent usages of $\nu\alpha$ in Modern Greek have further typological parallels in other languages too. To illustrate briefly, I give parallels from modern languages for the wish and directive usage of in subordinate constructions and their parallels in Modern Greek usage.

- (4) ¡Que sean felices!
 'May you be happy!' [literally: 'That you are happy.']
 Que te calles! (Spanish: Sansiñena, De Smet and Cornillie 2015: 13–14)
 '(I insist that you) shut up!' (literally: 'That you shut up!')
- (5) $\nu\acute{\alpha}'\sigma\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ (Mackridge 1987: 284)
 'Bless you!'
- (6) $\nu\alpha$ $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron$, $\acute{\omicron}\chi\iota$ $\sigma\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$ (Mackridge 1987: 283)
 'You should leave tomorrow, not today'

6 For the relevance of the vocative in identifying in subordinate structures, see la Roi (2021: 18–20), who uses interactive vocatives as a means to identify in subordinate wishes in Archaic Greek.

- (7) *Da dojdeš!* (Macedonian: Kramer 1986: 32)
 that.MOD come.2SG.PRS
 ‘Come!’

An example such as (7) from Macedonian seems to have been taken as evidence for the independent use of complementizer-headed structures across Balkan languages by Amman & van der Auwera 2004 (cf. the listing of ‘bare subjunctives’ in the reference work by Tomić 2006), who have pointed out that such complementizer-headed structures express directives and wishes in a wide variety of Balkan languages, Southern Italian dialects, and unrelated languages (e.g. Turkish). Yet, Wiemer (2017, 2019) has counterargued that interpreting such structures as insubordination does not work for the Slavic evidence, for example since independent uses of *da* were already present in Old Church Slavonic and the origins of its use as a complementizer are debated. Suffice it to say, these issues lie beyond the scope of the current study, even though there seem to be some striking parallels with Greek.

This paper is structured as follows: in section 2, I discuss the syntactic status of ἴνα in Classical Greek. Then in section 3, I turn to the evidence for insubordinate usages of ἴνα in Post-Classical Greek, while section 4 contributes further evidence for insubordinate and semi-insubordinate uses of να from Medieval Greek, showing that many uses known to us from Modern Greek had already partially been developed in Medieval Greek. Section 5 provides an overview of the insubordinate and semi-insubordinate uses of να in Modern Greek and section 6 concludes the presentation.

2 Subordinate ἴνα in Classical Greek

In Classical Greek, ἴνα does not seem to have developed insubordinate usages yet, despite claims to the contrary in earlier literature (esp. Kalén 1941: 93; Moorhouse 1982: 289; Labiano Ilundain 2008). Kalén and Labiano Ilundain had for example suggested that an independent usage of ἴνα as directive had already been there in Homeric Greek, but such an interpretation does not seem to fit the actual usage context of the adduced examples, such as (8). Nausicaa wishes Odysseus well, in the original meaning of $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon$ ‘fare well’, and attaches the remembrance motif given by hosts (De Jong 2001: 213) in a subordinate purpose clause; in other words, she suggests that only if he fares well will he be able to remember Nausicaa (rather than explicitly formulating a wish as well as a directive).

- (8) “χαίρει, ξεῖν’, ἵνα καὶ ποτ’ ἐὼν ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ
μνήσῃ ἐμεῦ, ὅτι μοι πρώτη ζωάγρι’ ὀφέλλεις.” (Hom. *Od.* 8.461–462)
‘May you fare well, stranger, **so that** even once you are in your own native
land you may be remember me, because to me first you owe the price of
your life.’⁷

Similarly, Moorhouse argued that the emotional address of Oedipus by the chorus in (10) also presents an in subordinate usage, but the ἵνα clause can be interpreted as an illocutionary usage of the subordinate clause. As noted in la Roi (2021: 27), subordinate ἵνα clauses in Classical Greek are not limited to expressing the future purpose of an earlier event (e.g. Soph. *Ant.* 1087–1088: ὦ παῖ, σὺ δ’ ἡμᾶς ἄπαγε πρὸς δόμους, ἵνα τὸν θυμὸν οὗτος ἐς νεωτέρους ἀφῆ “Boy, lead me home, **so that** this man may discharge his anger against younger persons”) but also often express the condition for appropriateness or relevance under which the speech act of the matrix clause may be carried out, e.g. *Just so you know, there is beer in the fridge*. A clear parallel of this usage in Classical Greek is given in (9). The information in the ἵνα clause is semantically irrelevant, but pragmatically relevant as a signal to the chorus why they may appropriately tell this information to the old man.

- (9) φροῦδος δ’ ἴν’ εἰδήεις πάντα τὰπ’ ἐμοῦ, γέρον,
παιδὸς προθύσων ξένια καὶ γενέθλια
σκηναὶς ἐς ἱεράς τῆσδε λαθραίως πόσις,
κοινὴν ξυνάψων δαίτα παιδὶ τῶι νέωι. (E. *Ion* 804–807)
‘**Just so you know all I know**, old man, about this woman’s husband, he
has gone off without telling her to the sacred tent to make a sacrifice in
honor of their friendship and his birth.’

Such illocutionary usages of subordinate clauses have been studied in-depth for Classical Greek conditionals (Wakker 1994: 236–256). Note also how such illocutionary conditionals may be an alternative formulation of this illocutionary *just so you know*-clause, e.g. *If you’re thirsty/Just so you know, there is beer in the fridge*. I would argue that the ἵνα clause in (10), where “//” indicates line breaks, thus serves to express the conditions under which the chorus may appropriately command Oedipus (see the imperatives in the matrix clause), that is, for his own protection (i.e. the negative purpose clause).

7 The Loeb translation is also misleading here, as it translates the subordinate clause as a separate wish: “Farewell, stranger, and hereafter even in your own native land may you remember me, for to me first you owe the price of your life.”

- (10) ἀλλ' οὐ μὲν ἔν γ' ἐμοὶ // προσθήσεις τάσδ' ἀράς. περᾶς γάρ,
 περᾶς· ἀλλ' ἴνα τῶδ' ἐν ἄ- // φθέγκτω μὴ προπέσης νάπει
 ποιᾶεντι, κάθυδρος οὖ. // κρατήρ μειλιχίων ποτῶν
 ῥεύματι συντρέχει, // τῶν, ξένη πάμμορ'—εὖ φύλαξαι—
 μετάσταθ', ἀπόβῃθι. πολ- // λά κέλευθος ἐρατύοι· (Soph. OC. 154–164)
 'But you shall not bring down these curses upon me! For you go too far,
 too far! **But so that** you do not burst into this grassy glade, where no word
 must be spoken, where the bowl of water runs together with the stream
 of liquid honey ... from there, hapless stranger—take care!—**stand away,**
depart! Let a great distance separate you!'

Finally, I point out that ἴνα clauses may be *dyadically dependent*, completing a previous turn by another speaker, as illustrated by (11). This example might be thought to be formally insubordinate, but it syntactically and pragmatically actually depends completely on the previous question (see Sansiñena, De Smet, & Cornillie 2015 for similar examples from Spanish; see la Roi 2022 for similar examples in Latin comedy). In other words, the illocutionary force of the clause with the subordinator is *co-constructed* with the information in the immediate linguistic common ground (cf. la Roi *forthc.* a for more extensive discussion of such examples in drama).

- (11) Trygaeus τῆ;
 Slave ἴνα μὴ γένηται Θεογένους ὑγνία. (Ar. Pax 927–928)
 Trygaeus 'Why not?'
 Slave 'So we don't turn piggish like Theogenes!'

To sum up, ἴνα clauses in Classical Greek have not developed insubordinate syntactic status yet, as their use is limited to subordinate clause contexts with different pragmatic functions.

3 Between subordinate and insubordinate ἴνα in Post-Classical Greek

As summarized in la Roi (2021, 27–30), ἴνα develops its insubordinate status in Post-Classical Greek, but, I argue, further clarifications are in order, especially of its insubordinate uses across the different periods of Post-Classical Greek, viz. early (III–I BCE), middle (I–III CE) and late (IV–VI) Post-Classical Greek.⁸ The three main reasons for that are:

⁸ This periodization was taken from Lee (2007). Using this periodization *forces* us to pro-

- (i) existing diachronic descriptions focus on independent directive uses of ὄπως instead (e.g. la Roi 2021; forthcoming. a): Kalén’s discussion of ‘independent’ uses of ἴνα and ὄπως clauses (Kalén 1941: 98–137) is almost completely limited to the latter one;
- (ii) Kalén’s and accounts based on Kalén (e.g. Labiano Ilundain 2008: 56–58) take a rather liberal approach to “independent” use which does not directly correspond to insubordinate clauses, as I illustrate below;
- (iii) The diachronic accounts given differ from insubordination accounts: Kalén for example hypothesizes that independent uses are developed through analogy with imperatives, which is why he mainly collects “independent” directive uses in groups where there is actually still another directive (see Kalén 1941: 107–108 for the grouping and 127 for this imperatival hypothesis).

To improve upon available descriptions, I synthesize the patterns from the papyri with those mentioned for literary texts. To do so, I checked for insubordinate uses of ἴνα in a data search from Trismegistos Words, searching for ἴνα with punctuation immediately preceding. This search yielded 1539 results in total, 461 for Early, 758 for Middle and 277 for Late Post-Classical Greek, with the remaining 42 in the later eras. Unfortunately, a full descriptive analysis of the papyrological data lies beyond the scope of this study, which is why I focused on finding clearly insubordinate usages. Therefore, I chose those instances where the editors also felt confident enough to print a full stop⁹ before the insubordinate clause, as in (12), stressing, however, that there are also examples where the use of ἴνα is insubordinate but this is not fully reflected in the editing, as in (18).

In Early Post-Classical Greek, we find insubordinate usages of ἴνα as directives from the earliest centuries, but notably only in the papyri. Though there are ἴνα occurrences in Menander’s works according to the TLG, none present an insubordinate usage. Mayser had recorded some three uses from the third century BCE which can convincingly be classified as insubordinate, but only made the rather vague observation about this construction that it is rare and colloquial, “immerhin seltene aber unstrittige volkstümliche” (Mayser 1926: 261). I give two of his examples here as (12) and (13). With regard to the former, note that the insubordinate syntactic status is reflected in the fact that

vide more fine-grained descriptions of developments in the Post-Classical Greek period than other, broader periodizations which would, for example, take IV BCE–VI CE as one period (see la Roi 2020: 229–233 for a theoretical discussion of these issues).

9 See la Roi 2021 for extensive discussion of the relationship between ancient and modern editorial choices regarding punctuation and their impact on insubordination analyses.

the directive main clause has its own final subordinate clause, also expressed by ἵνα. Still, as shown by (13), such a finite subordinate clause need not be there to tell us that we are dealing with an insubordinate usage: the ἵνα μέ(=μή) clause in (13) is not just syntactically but also discursively independent, as it expresses the main speech act without dependence on another form expressing an order.

- (12) ὑπόμνημα Ζήνωνι. ἵνα λαλήσης // Εὐνόμωι μετὰ Ἴστρου, καθάπερ σοι Κρίτων ἐνετείλατο, περὶ Θήρωνος // τοῦ ἐν τῷ Βουσιρίτι σιτολογούντος τοπαρχίαν Θελβωντίτηι, ἵνα κομί- // σῆται τὴν τοπαρχίαν καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἦι. (PSI 4.412.1–7, mid III BCE, private letter)
 ‘Note to Zenon. Talk to Eunoos with Istrus, as Kriton commanded you, about Theron, the grain collector in the Bousiritis region for the toparchy in Thelbontis, **so that** he may get the toparchy and it may be under their control.’
- (13) ὑπόμνημα Ζήνωνι // Πέτακος [ς] (= Πέτακος prev. ed.) ὁ ἀύλητής. πρὸ τοῦ σε ἀποδημη- // σαι, ἵνα μέ(=μή)με καταλί- πης(=καταλί|πη<ι>ς) ἐν τῷ δεσμῶ- // τηρίωι· οὐ γὰρ ἔχω τὰ ἀναγκαῖα· (PSI 4.416.1–7, mid III BCE, private letter)
 ‘Note to Zenon from Petakos, the flutist. Before you depart, **don’t leave me behind** in prison. For I do not have the necessary things.’

Moreover, I would like to point out that the insubordinate directive usage can be shown to be conventionalized in other ways too: as shown by (14), it spreads outside directives in the second person to the first person and ἵνα immediately precedes the subjunctive.

- (14) Ζήνωνι χαίρειν Πετееρμῶτις γ[..... π]αρά σου ἐκ τοῦ Σαραπείου. τ[ὸ ἐν-] τεύθεν ἐνέτυχόν σοι περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ [τοῦ γενη]σομένου τοῦ Ἀρσινόης ἵνα ᾧδε γιν[οίμην]. εἰ οὖν σοι δοκεῖ, ἵνα ὑπάρχω καὶ ᾧδε πα[ρά σοί (p.lond.7.2046.1–3, mid III BCE, business letter)
 ‘Petereum greets Zenon, [...] of you at the Sarapieion. Therefore I came to you regarding the temple that is going to be built for Arsinoe, so that it may happen this way. **If it seems good to you, I should also be here with you.**’

This is not an isolated example; compare P. Lond. 7.2055.3. Moreover, the insubordinate use of ἵνα spreads to the third person as well, already in Early Post-

Classical Greek: in (15), Agesilaos signposts the main communicative purpose of his message separately on the verso of the papyrus, viz. requesting Zenon to come visit him with his dog.

(15) -----

v

(ἔτους) λγ, Τῦβι ς. Ἀγησίλαος Ζήν[ωνι].

ἵνα παραγένη- // ται. (p.cair.zen.5.59824, 8–10, 252 BCE, private letter)

‘Year 33, Tybi 6. Agesilaos to Zenon. **Let him come.**’

Other examples with a third person subjunctive include UPZ 2 225, 22, 131 BCE, and with a second person subjunctive P. Wash. Univ. 2 106, 4, 18 BCE.

In Middle Post-Classical Greek, we find several further innovations: (i) a spread from directive to wish usage, (ii) negative directive specialization (μὴ ἵνα) and (iii) surfacing of these constructions in literary texts. As for the first point, I have noted (2021, 28) that we start to find wish uses, as in (16), especially in closing formulae, as wishes are typically found there.

(16) μὴ ἀμελήσης τῆς μεταφορᾶς // τοῦ ἀχύρου τῆς Θώλθεως. ἄρτι δὲ μισθὸν μὴ δίδου κτήσι χάριν κόπρου // ἄχρι τῆς ἀναβάσεως. ἵνα μὴ μισθὸν διδῶς. (P.Oxy. XLI 2985 (II–III CE), 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.**’

Note that this usage does not replace the directive uses, for which see for example P. Ryl. Gr. 2 230.9, 40 CE, or P. Merton 1 22.3, 59 CE. In fact, such directive uses are not just found in letters on papyri but also on ostraca, as shown by example 17:

(17) Πίσων Ζήνωνι καὶ Ὀρίωνι τοῖς/ ἀδελ- // φοῖς πολλὰ χαίρειν. προσδέχομαι ὑμᾶς ἐν ταῖς κα[λ]άνδαις. ἵνα οὖν // πέμψη<ς> μοι μίικον χαρτάριον καὶ στημόνιν. (O.Claud.2.239. 1–5, middle II CE)

‘Pison sends many greetings to his brothers Zenon and Orion. I welcome you in the Calendae. **Send me a bit of paper and an inkpot.**’

Second, I have observed (2021: 27–28) that we find a specialization of this directive in subordinate use to negative directives, with the morphosyntactic innovation that the negation, which has scope over the whole directive, precedes the subordinate marker.

- (18) οὐκ οἶδα // τί μ[ε ὁ] πάτρων ποιήσει,
 πολλοὺς δανειστάς ἔχο- // μεν. μὴ ἵνα ἀναστατώ-
 σης ἡμᾶς, ἐρώτα αὐτὸ\ν/ // καθ' ἡμέραν· τάχα δύναι-
 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.'

Another example of this construction is PSI 14.1404.14, 42 CE, although the construction is not that productive with only some examples being recorded.¹⁰

Third and finally, these in subordinate constructions start surfacing in literary texts, though caution is of course needed not to project usage from the papyri or later stages of Greek onto those texts. A good illustration can be offered by reviewing the evidence for in subordinate usage in the New Testament, evidence which I believe to be much less convincing than has been supposed. The grammars and secondary literature have suggested that we “often” find “imperative” independent usages of ἵνα in the Greek of the New Testament (Radermacher 1925: 170; Blass & Debrunner 1959: 236; Blass, Debrunner & Rehkopf 1990: 313; Labiano Ilundain 2008: 56–58). Yet, examples which have been mentioned as allegedly independent need not always be interpreted that way.¹¹ In example 19, only the modern punctuation with “.” and an imprecise translation (e.g. how would the subjunctive refer to the factual past as per the NIV translation?) support such an interpretation. Instead, the purpose clause seems to be better interpreted as the narratorial interpretation of the event, i.e. he stayed there *so that* there would be fulfilled what we expected based on the prophets.

- (19) καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἕως τῆς τελευτῆς Ἡρώδου· ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος, Ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου. (NT *Ev. Mat.* 2.15)
 'He stayed there until the death of Herod so that what the Lord had said through the prophet would be fulfilled: “Out of Egypt I called my son”'

10 Some examples of this construction have been collected by di Bartolo (2022), who records only 9 examples, but she does not discuss or even refer to the analysis of the same construction provided by la Roi (2021).

11 Another possibility is that the matrix clause has an ellipsis of an accessible verb, as NT 1 *Ep. Cor.* 7.29 (given as independent example by Labiano Ilundain 2008: 56): τὸ λοιπὸν [ἔστιν] ἵνα “the rest is that”. The fact that ἔστιν is present in the preceding line might have contributed to the lack of it in the matrix clause of ἵνα. A similar ellipsis of ‘to be’ might explain NT *Ev. Jo.* 2.19.

(NIV with revisions by author)

‘He stayed until the death of Herod. And so was fulfilled what the Lord had said through the prophet: “Out of Egypt I called my son”’ (NIV)

Similarly, we find examples of alleged “independent” ἵνα which are dyadically dependent (cf. Sim 2006: 54–68). As explained above in section 2, these are not insubordinate at all. Compare (20), where Paul answers his own question with a dyadically dependent ἵνα clause.¹²

- (20) τίς οὖν μοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ μισθός; ἵνα εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀδάπανον θήσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, εἰς τὸ μὴ καταχρησασθαι τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. (NT 1 *Ep. Cor.* 9.18)
 ‘What then is my reward? Just this: that in preaching the gospel I may offer it free of charge, and so not make full use of my rights as a preacher of the gospel.’

Only some examples can be interpreted as properly insubordinate. This becomes clearest in (21) where the insubordinate directive in the third person is paratactically connected (with δὲ balancing the different topics) to the preceding third person imperative, demonstrating discursive independence.

- (21) τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. πλὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ’ ἓνα ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν, ἣ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα. (NT *Ep. Eph.* 5.32–33)
 ‘This is a profound mystery—but I am talking about Christ and the church. However, each one of you also must love his wife as he loves himself, **and the wife must respect her husband.**’

Still, insubordinate uses can also be found in contemporary literary texts from the middle Post-Classical Greek period, as illustrated by the following example from Epictetus. Note how the insubordinate usage can now also occur on its own in reported conversational contexts, where the directive interpretation is signposted with imperative particles (see la Roi 2021: 33–34 for parallel instances of insubordinate ὅπως with imperative particles such as ἄγε).

- (22) τί οὖν; ἔδει εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ θέατρον τοῦτο εἰπεῖν “ἄγε ἵνα Σώφρων στεφανωθῆ;” ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνο “ἄγε ἵνα τηρήσω τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ προαίρεσιν ἐπὶ ταύτης τῆς ὕλης κατὰ φύσιν ἔχουσιν.” (Epict. 3.4.9)

¹² A similar example is NT *Ev. Luc.* 5.23–24.

‘What then? Ought you upon entering the theatre to say, “Come, let’s see that Sophron gets the crown?” and not rather, “Come, let me in this subject-matter maintain my moral purpose in accord with nature”?’

In Late Post-classical Greek, we find the continued use of in subordinate *ἵνα* for directives and wishes (cf. resp. P. Köln Gr. 5 238.12 and P. Oxy. XLVI.3314.12–17, both from VIAD). Similarly, we find some directive usage in literary texts, as exemplified in (23) and (24).

(23) πέμπετε μοι αὐτά. **Ἴνα δὲ γινώσκῃς**, Πάτερ, ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας, ἐξέρχομαι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. (Mosch. *Prat.Spi.*42.2896.41–42)
‘Send them to me. **You should know**, Father, that after two days, I am departing from this world.’

(24) εἰ θέλετέ με βασιλεύειν ὑμῶν, **ἵνα πάντες χριστιανοί ἐστέ**. (Mal. *Chron.* 13.27.2)
‘If you want me to be your king, **you should all be Christians**.’

It should be noted that (24) carries a morphosyntactic innovation which partially foreshadows some later uses with the indicative: the use of the present indicative instead of the subjunctive.

Summarizing, Post-Classical Greek is the origin period of the in subordinate usage of *ἵνα*, as it can be shown to develop different kinds of directive uses (with different persons), to evince wish usages, and to develop morphosyntactically (e.g. changes in person of the subjunctive and variation into the indicative). Next, I turn to the evidence from Medieval Greek, the period in which many of the in subordinate uses of *να* known to us from Modern Greek are developed.

4 In subordinate and semi-in subordinate *να* in Medieval Greek

In Medieval Greek (VII–XV CE), we find *ἵνα* in its novel, reduced form as *να*, a reduction which might have happened around the 6th century CE (according to Trypanis 1960). Though I had suggested (2021: 30) that *να* developed a host of novel in subordinate functions in this period, I show here that matters are even more complex, since we find extensions in illocutionary uses as well as morphosyntactic changes in combinations. Horrocks (2019: 1886–1883) has provided a brief overview of independent uses of Medieval Greek *να*, which, I argue, qualify as in subordinate usages, because they are syntactically and discursively independent. In what follows, I describe the different uses noted in previously and additionally note several innovations that had

not been described yet. For the latter, I incorporated searches for insubordinate usages in the TLG of earlier Medieval Greek works as much as possible (but they were not as frequent as expected), because the Cambridge Grammar relies more on examples from the last centuries of Medieval Greek (XII–XV CE). Before we can turn to these uses of ἴνα and να in Medieval Greek, I note that we also continue to find syntactically independent yet dyadically dependent usage in this period, despite the extensions to other illocutionary uses of this pattern. In (25) below from Early Medieval Greek, ἴνα is used as a direct answer to a *wh*-question:

- (25) στραφείς δὲ Μαυίας λέγει τῷ Ἀνδρέᾳ· “τί ζητεῖς;” ὁ δὲ λέγει· “ἴνα δώσης βοήθειαν κατὰ τοῦ ἀντάρτου.” (Theoph. Conf. *Chron.* 349.10–11)
 ‘Turning around Mavias says to Andrew: what are you looking for? He answers: **to provide help** against the rebel.’

Furthermore, as in the Post-Classical Greek period, insubordinate (ἴ)να could be used for directives in all three persons, as shown respectively by (26) in the first person from Early Medieval Greek and (27) in the second person from later Medieval Greek.

- (26) καὶ τῷ μὲν βασιλεῖ ὑπέσχετο, τῇ δὲ Πουλχερίᾳ ἔγραψε παρακαλῶν αὐτὴν μὴ δεχθῆναι εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτῆς, “ἴνα μὴ ἀναγκασθῶ,” φησί, “τῶν λυπούντων σε πράξαι τι.” (Theoph. Conf. *Chron.* 99.10–12)
 ‘He promised the king, but wrote to Pulcheria, requesting her not to receive him in her presence, saying, “**do not let me be compelled** to take action against those who are causing you distress”’
- (27) Μαθὼν μὴδ’ ἄρτι βιάζεσαι, ἔλθε καὶ νὰ καθίσῃς (Ptoch. 3.242)
 ‘Learn to also not rush now; come and **sit**’

Note that in (27) the insubordinate directive is paratactically connected to an imperative, thus offering the speaker a way to express a second directive differently.

There are also extensions in the insubordinate expression of wishes. We for example start to find first person subjunctives, so that speakers can express wishes aimed at themselves, as in (28) below.¹³

13 A counterfactual wish of this type is Dig. Ak. E 159 σήμερον νὰ ἀπόθανα ‘If only I had died today’ and another wish example is Dig. Ak. G.; 2.213–215 εἰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐποίησα, ζῶσαν ἢ γῆ

- (28) *νὰ μηδὲ τῆς μητέρας μου εὐχὴν κληρονομήσω* (Dig. Akkr. E 902)
 ‘And **may** I never **inherit** my mother’s blessing’

Note, however, that there are alternative modal strategies for making very similar speech acts, such as the fossilized *ἄς* used for third person directives or wishes (cf. Horrocks 2019: 1878 & 1882). There are also innovations with respect to the morphosyntax of *ἵνα* to express wishes, when compared to the Post-Classical period. A particularly interesting innovation in the marking of the wish from the perspective of insubordination is that *ἄμποτε* “if only” is combined with insubordinate *να*; I suggest that the former is also an insubordinate marker (cf. the conditional origins of *ἄμ*, from the conditional subordinator *ἄν*), which makes this combination a doubling. Such doubling, or fusion of two insubordinate wish markers has parallels in Post-Classical Greek (cf. la Roi 2021: 22 on *ὡς εἶθε*), but also internally in Medieval Greek with *εἶθε να* (e.g. Anon. *Belthandrus et Chrysantza* 844). Moreover, *ἄμποτε* can be used by itself as well to mark an insubordinate counterfactual wish, as illustrated by (30) below.

- (29) *ἄμποτε νὰ παρακληθῆ καὶ νὰ μᾶς ἐπακούσῃ* (Dig. Akkr. E 1353)
 ‘If only that she will be persuaded and listen to us.’

- (30) *ἄμποτε τὸ μᾶς ἔταξαν νὰ τὸ φυλάξωσι τελείως* (Horrocks 2019: 1991, Lambros 1930: 285.20)
 ‘If only they ordered us to guard it fully.’

Furthermore, insubordinate *να* starts to express *exclamative* speech acts, a use that is preserved in Modern Greek, for which see (31) below in the third person (or Horrocks 2019: 1956 for the second person):

- (31) *νὰ λέουν ὀκάποιος φτωχὸς [...] ἐνίκησεν τοῦ βασιλέως τὸν ἀδελφὸν* (Chron. Mor. H 5008–9, Horrocks 2019: 1881)
 ‘To have people say that some pauper defeated the king’s brother!’

Similarly, the insubordinate use of *να* conventionalizes uses in a variety of *assertive* speech acts, in combination with a range of novel mood forms. “Assertive” is here taken in the Searlean sense (1979) to refer to acts that commit the speaker to something being the case (e.g. state, conclude, swear). In (32), we

με πῶς, νὰ γένωμαι παράδειγμα πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὡς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς μυστήρια κατάδηλα ποιούσα. ‘If I did that, may the earth swallow me up alive, so that I may become an example to all the world of one who makes public her husband’s secrets.’

can see that the in subordinate use of $\nu\alpha$ with a first person subjunctive now acts as a future expression.¹⁴ The fact that this use developed comparatively late in Medieval Greek likely relates to the major changes to the expression of the future in Medieval Greek, where the in subordinate use of ($\tilde{\iota}$) $\nu\alpha$ in future-referring contexts connects with the fact that other periphrastic expressions are taking over from the synthetic future (see Markopoulos 2009: 115–224 for a complete overview of the literature). In other words, because other strategies came to replace the synthetic future in assertive contexts, new assertive uses of $\nu\alpha$ could be developed.

- (32) ὑπάγετε, ἀναμείνατε μόνον κἄν τρεῖς ἡμέρας, καὶ τότε δεῦτε πρὸς ἐμέ καὶ ὀκάτι
 $\nu\alpha$ σᾶς εἶπω (Spaneas 441–442)
 ‘Go, wait just three days, and then come to me, and **I will tell you** something I have to say’

A similar explanation applies to the following innovative uses of $\nu\alpha$ in counterfactual apodoses, as shown in (33) and (34) with the bare indicatives. The progressive loss of the modal particle in counterfactual apodoses in Medieval Greek thus led to a variety of replacements (not just the bare indicative, *pace* Horrocks 1995; 2010; 2019), such as the in subordinate declarative use of $\nu\alpha$ with a bare past indicative and various epistemic modals.¹⁵

- (33) Καταβλαττὰς ἂν ἔμαθον καὶ σηκωτῆς ἂν ἦμουν,
 ὡς σηκωτῆς $\nu\alpha$ ἐδούλευα τὴν ἄπασαν ἡμέραν, καὶ τὸ βραδὺ $\nu\alpha$ με ἔδιδον μεγά-
 λην κομματούραν
 καὶ τὸ ἄσπρον τὸ ἐμποτόπουλον γεμάτον τὸ κρασὶν μου
 καὶ μονοκύθρου μερτικὸν ἐκ τὰ λαπαριμαῖα,
 καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ σχόλασμα $\nu\alpha$ ἐπίανα τὴν λαπάραν,
 καὶ $\nu\alpha$ τὴν ἔκρουα κοπετόν, ὡς καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἔχει. (Ptoch. 3.181–187)
 ‘If I had learned weaving, **I would have been a porter, to toil all day**, and
 in the evening to be given a large portion and the white loaf soaked in

14 In the Grottoferrata version of Digenis Akritis, we find a similar example with a first-person subjunctive: Dig. Akrit. G. 1.304–306 εἰ οὐκ ἀπαξιῶνυτε τοῦ ἔχειν με γαμβρόν σας, διὰ τὰ κάλλη τὰ τερπνὰ τῆς ὑμῶν ἀυταδέλφης $\nu\alpha$ γένωμαι Χριστιανὸς στραφεὶς εἰς Ῥωμανίαν. ‘If you do not reject having me as a brother-in-law, because of the delightful beauty of your sister, **I shall come over to Roman territory and become a Christian.**’

15 As discussed in the overview in la Roi (2024b), the replacement of the modal particle in its combination with the past indicative in the apodosis is much more complex than a one-to-one replacement by bare indicatives.

my wine and a small portion of cheese from the wicker basket, for even during leisure to grab the loaf, and to strike it, as is just.’

- (34) εἰ τοῦ πατρός μου ἤκουσας καὶ μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἐστράφης,
 ἄρτι νὰ εἶχον τὰς βγάγιας μου καὶ τὴν ἐξόπλισίν μου,
 νὰ ἐγίνωσκε καὶ ὁ σὸς πατήρ τίνος παιδὶν ἀπήρες· (Dig. Akr. G. 4.809–811)
 ‘If you had listened to my father and had gone back with me, **I would now have my serving girls and my retinue**, so that your father could be aware whose child you have taken.’

Note also in particular how these in subordinate constructions have provided the mood system with an alternative strategy to make assertive speech acts with different kinds of epistemic strength. In (35), the combination of νὰ with a past indicative expresses a hypothetical meaning (viz. not merely future-referring), similar to (i)νὰ with the subjunctive for directives or assertives. In (36), the combination with the double negation, οὐ μὴ, and the 2nd person subjunctive expresses a strong negative assertive.

- (35) ἐπεὶ ἔνι γὰρ καὶ ὁ τόπος σου γυμνὸς ἐκ τὰ φουσσάτα,
 νὰ τὸν ἐπάρουν εὐκόλα καὶ νὰ τὸν ἔχῃς χάσει (Chron. Mor. H 4236–7)
 ‘Since your land is stripped of its armies, **they would take it easily** and you would lose it’¹⁶
- (36) Μισὶρ Ντζεφρέ, ἀφέντη τῆς Καρυταίνου,
 μὴ προῦ σὲ σφάξουν, ἀδελφέ, ἴς ἐμέναν παραδόσου·
 ἀπάνω εἰς τὴν ψυχίτσα μου δόλον οὐ μὴ νὰ ἔχῃς (Chron. Mor. H 4063–4065,
 Horrocks 2019: 1870)
 ‘Sir Geoffroy, lord of Karytaina, before they kill you, brother, surrender to me; on my dear soul **you will find no guile**.’

The latter innovation is also revealing in that the use of οὐ μὴ νὰ need not be limited to second person subjunctives and attests to the conventionalized status of νὰ in assertive contexts, since οὐ μὴ νὰ occurs in assertives with 1st person subjunctives (Chron. Mor. H 5519 οὐ μὴ νὰ ἀφήσω καὶ νὰ εἰπῶ καὶ ἀτόκρισιν νὰ δώσω ‘**I will not fail to speak and give answer**’) and in counterfactual apodoses with bare indicatives (Chron. Mor. H. 4849 οὐ μὴ νὰ ἐγλύτωσε ἀπ’ ἐκεῖ, ἂν εἶχασιν οἱ Φράγκοι ‘**They would have slaughtered [the Roman race] there and then, if**

¹⁶ The translation for this example was taken from Lurier (1964: 205).

the Franks had been able').¹⁷ Additionally, there are novel occurrences of this pattern in interrogatives with 1st person subjunctives (Chron. Mor. H. 819 διατὶ νὰ ὑπάμε εἰς τὴν Συρίαν καὶ οὐ μὴ νὰ στραφοῦμε ὀπίσω; 'Why should we go to Syria and **shouldn't we turn around?**'). Taken together, these innovations in the form and use of in subordinate (ἰ)να provide suggestive evidence of the integral position that in subordinate speech acts with να have taken in the modal system of Greek, a role which is strengthened even further in Modern Greek, as discussed in section 5 below.

Lastly, there are some novel *semi-in subordinate* patterns which develop in Medieval Greek. These patterns do not present in subordinate usages of formally subordinate clauses, because they still preserve traces of matrix clause material, though serving evaluative functions (cf. Van Linden & Van de Velde 2014 for parallel structures from Flemish Dutch, e.g. *Misschien/Goed da Kris komt* ['Maybe/Good that Kris is coming']). In (37) there occurs a semi-in subordinate pattern with an epistemic adverb to make an assertion, a construction which, as noted by Van Linden & van der Velde (2014: 247), has clear parallels in other modern Indo-European languages: Swedish (*Kanske att ...* 'maybe that'), French (*Peut-être que ...* 'maybe that') and Spanish (*Tal vez que ...* 'maybe that', *Por supuesto que ...* 'certainly that').

- (37) Ἴσως νὰ ἀπλώσῃ ἐπάνω σου καὶ νὰ σὲ σύρῃ ἐμπρὸς τῆς (Ptoch. 1.162)
'Perhaps she will come over you and pull you before your nose'

To conclude, a review of the data from Medieval Greek has demonstrated for (ἰ)να (i) stability in the use for directives and wishes (with the latter extending to first person wishes and counterfactual wishes), (ii) morphosyntactic changes in those domains (e.g. in subordinate doubling in wishes and spread to counterfactual, hypothetical, and double negative contexts), (iii) pragmatic spread of the in subordinate use to other speech acts (e.g. assertive and exclamatory speech acts), and (iv) the creation of semi-in subordinate patterns. Thus, these in subordinate strategies have taken up a larger share in the modal system which is used to express speech acts, although in some cases alternative strategies exist for similar speech acts (e.g. fossilized ἄς used for third person directives or wishes).

¹⁷ Another example is Chron. Mor. H. 8963.

5 Insubordinate and semi-insubordinate $\nu\alpha$ in Modern Greek

As a final step in the investigation of the impact of insubordinate $\nu\alpha$ on the history of Greek, I now aim to provide an overview of insubordinate usage of $\nu\alpha$ in Modern Greek in two ways: (1) compare and contrast the evidence from several grammars (section 5.1), and (2) supplement uses from searches in the Greek *ELTenTen 2019* corpus in Sketch Engine and the Hellenic National Corpus (section 5.2).¹⁸

5.1 *Insubordinate and semi-insubordinate $\nu\alpha$ in the secondary literature*

As for the grammars, there are notable differences in granularity of the descriptions found of insubordinate uses. To illustrate, I provide an overview of the usages which are distinguished by the different grammars in table 1 below. I use pluses to refer to authors which illustrate the usage but do not specify it (e.g. imperatival for directive $\nu\alpha$), whereas quotations serve to summarize their specific wording.

As the table indicates, the most striking finding from this comparison is that the most recent grammar by Holton et al. does not seem to list all the different speech acts for which insubordinate $\nu\alpha$ is used, whereas Hesse, whose book of course does not have the burden of providing a complete grammar, provides a more comprehensive overview.

At the same time, various observations are made in the grammars which cannot be grasped by such a table but provide crucial information about the conventionalized status of (semi-)insubordinate $\nu\alpha$ in Modern Greek. First of all, Mackridge (1987: 283) observes that $\nu\alpha$ directives can occur in the third, second and first person. He states that the following directives provide alternatives with slightly different socio-pragmatic values:

- (1) (3rd person) ο Γιώργος $\nu\alpha$ έρθει στο τηλέφωνο
‘Let George come to the telephone’ (cf. imperative, έλα Γιώργο στο τηλέφωνο ‘come to the telephone, George’);
- (2) (2nd person) $\nu\alpha$ φύγεις αύριο, όχι σήμερα
‘You should leave tomorrow, not today’ (cf. imperative, φύγε αύριο ..., which is more abrupt);

¹⁸ These can be accessed at <https://www.sketchengine.eu/eltenten-greek-corpus/> (last accessed: 08.08.2024) and <https://hnc.ilsp.gr/index.php> (last accessed: 08.08.2024).

TABLE 1 Modern Greek grammars on in subordinate *να*

Grammars	Mackridge 1987	Hesse 2003	Holton et al. 2014
Directive <i>να</i>	“commands and exhortations”	“command”	“suggestion ... request”
Wish <i>να</i>	“wishes and curses”	“wish or curse”	“wishes and curses”
Assertive <i>να</i>	–	+	–
Exclamative <i>να</i>	“exclamations”	“exclamation, indignation, protest”	–
Interrogative <i>να</i>	“deliberative questions”	“question: a) deliberative b) wondering”	+

- (3) (1st person) *λύσε με και νά σου δείξω τό θησαυρό*
 ‘untie me and let me show you [or ‘I’d show you’] the treasure.’

In other words, he demonstrated what may be called the *paradigmatic strength* of *να* directives in the mood system of Modern Greek to make directives. In contrast to an earlier period such as Post-Classical Greek, the use of in subordinate *να* directives seems to be more pervasive. In Modern Greek these in subordinate uses can also compete with the use of the future with *θα*, e.g. for Mackridge’s (3) *και θα σου δείξω*.

Second, grammarians are rather brief about the use of in subordinate clauses for interrogative speech acts. For example, Mackridge (1987: 283) only very briefly noted that a use for “deliberative questions” is possible and Hesse (2003: 74–76) distinguished between deliberative questions (“about the duty, necessity, or possibility of an action: ‘must, shall ...?’”) and wondering questions (“The question is about a fact; the addition of *να* indicates that the speaker wonders or doubts as to what the answer can be (like the Danish ‘mon’). If the question can be answered by ‘yes’ or ‘no’, the doubt is about the existence of the fact (can it really be that ...?), or put forward with some reservation (could it be that ...?).”). Though this would suggest that *να* interrogatives exclusively concern yes-no questions proper, it had already been shown convincingly by Pavlidou (1991) that such yes-no questions may serve other speech act purposes such as indirect requests or offers (e.g. *να ρωτήσω κάτι* “can I ask something?” though only in the first person). Similarly, she shows that *να* occurs after question words in *wh*-questions, rhetorical questions and echo questions (Pavlidou 1991: 32). Note however that *να* does not seem to have full in subordinate status in this construction, since it appears to be dependent on the question word and some type of conventional ellipsis (e.g. what is it that X?).

Third, besides in subordinate patterns, some grammars note important *semi-in subordinate* patterns too; Mackridge (1987: 289–290) in particular collects

patterns which qualify as semi-insubordination, although he interprets them differently as “subjunctive marking”: “ἴσως ‘perhaps’ may act as subjunctive marker on its own”.

- (38) ἴσως να μη βρεθούμε πάλι
 ‘Maybe we won’t meet up again.’

This semi-insubordinate pattern seems to have a greater productivity than previously assumed, since we find similar patterns with general adjectives such as ‘good’ as in (40), ‘possible’ as in (41), ‘probable’ (πιθανόν), or ‘rare’ (σπάνιο). The examples provided by Mackridge (40) and Hesse (39) underline that this semi-insubordinate pattern has the crucial function of expressing deontic evaluation (cf. example 39), epistemic possibility (cf. the use of epistemic adverbs such as ἴσως and adjectives such as δυνατόν as in (40)), and epistemic probability (e.g. πιθανόν). In fact, Hesse (2003: 79) rightly notes the comparability in epistemic value of some semi-insubordinate patterns with actual epistemic modal verbs like *μπορεί*: “ἴσως να is almost synonymous with *μπορεί να* ‘maybe that’”

- (39) καλά να πάθεις
 ‘It served/serves/will serve you right.’ (literally, “well that you.suffer”)

- (40) δυνατόν να μη συμβεί ποτέ
 ‘It’s possible it will never happen.’

Fourth, it should be noted that semi-insubordinate syntax provides a crucial pattern in Modern Greek for what in linguistic typology have been called *avertives* (Kuteva et al. 2019). Avertive constructions express the non-realization of a once imminent past situation, such as *He nearly fell* (Kuteva et al. 2019: 852, 858, 868–869). As detailed by la Roi (2024a), this avertive construction was expressed in Ancient Greek by combining an approximative adverb such as ὀλίγου with a past tense, as in (41) below. Also, avertives share with counterfactuals that they express a polarity reversal, since *He nearly fell* and *He would have fallen* both express that he did *not* fall.

- (41) πανούργος εἶ, ὦ Μένων, καὶ ὀλίγου ἐξηπάτησάς με. (Pl. *Men.* 80b7)
 ‘You are a rogue, Meno, and **had almost deceived me**.’

Kuteva et al. had hypothesized that languages which grammaticalize a distinction between perfective and imperfective would use the perfective to mark avertives. However, I had shown (2024a) that this generalization is not in line

with the evidence from Classical Greek, where imperfectives are also possible, as long as they express telic state of affairs (e.g. Pl. *Smp.* 198b7–8 ὀλίγου ἀποδράς ὠχόμην ‘I would almost have run away’). The evidence for Modern Greek avertives gathered here similarly casts doubt on the generalization that perfectives would encode avertives, since Mackridge (1987: 290) explicitly notes that both perfectives and imperfectives are possible, for specific pragmatic effects:

- (42) παρά λίγο να πνιγούμε/πνιγόμαστε
 ‘We nearly drowned.’

Fifth and finally, we should address the use of insubordinate να which has been briefly discussed under the header of “narrative να” (Mackridge 1987: 284–285; Hesse 2003: 74). Mackridge contends that this construction is used in “order to give dramatic effect to the description of a progressive or iterative action in the past”. I would argue, however, that given its use to express ongoing past events this use could be seen as related to the assertive speech act usages which we have seen in Medieval Greek, allowing this construction’s value to be paraphrased as *I claim that event X was going on in the past*.

- (43) Ἄμα τα ‘κουσε η Μαρία, να κλαίει, να φωνάζει, να τραβάει τα μαλλιά της.
 ‘As soon as Mary heard it, she began to cry and shout and tear her hair.’

Also, when compared with Medieval Greek, the different assertive uses in which να was richly in evidence in that era seem to have been replaced by future/modal θα, e.g. in counterfactual apodoses.

5.2 *Expanding the evidence for insubordinate and semi-insubordinate να*

Next, I report on which usages can be added to the overviews found in grammars once the corpus evidence from the *ELTenTen* 2019 corpus and the Hellenic National Corpus are incorporated. First of all, it should be clear that insubordinate να directives, as alternatives for imperatives, need not be polite¹⁹ in Modern Greek (contrary to the terminology of ‘request’ and ‘suggestion’ for directive να by Holton et al. 2014, 501), as illustrated by the offensive use in example 45 below.

19 This issue is also discussed in the theoretical literature, for example by Evans (2007: 387–393) who notes that insubordinate structures need not in their nature be polite.

- (44) Να πα να γαμηθείς μαλακισμένο. (HNC Doc_ID: 90269, Sent_ID: 4572302)
‘Go fuck yourself, asshole!’

Second, the use of insubordinate *είθε να* can be shown to be archaizing from its restriction to texts with a specialized or higher register, such as esoteric websites (e.g. with such esoteric knowledge as astrology) or translations of literary works or religious texts as in (45) and (46). This use thus preserves a morphosyntactic feature which had already been associated with high-register texts in preceding periods of the Greek language. The same picture seems to be shown by the mere 47 occurrences in the Hellenic National Corpus, which also includes religious wishes such as *Είθε ο Θεός/ο Αλλάχ να [verb]* ‘May God/Allah [verb]’.

- (45) Είθε να τους περιμένει ένα απολαυστικό τριήμερο από κάθε άποψη. (source: astroforum.gr)
‘May they look forward to an enjoyable weekend from every point of view.’
- (46) είθε να έχετε ειρήνη (source: esoterica.gr)
‘May you have peace!’

Similarly, a search for insubordinate *άμποτε (να)* yields only 300 hits in the Sketch Engine corpus with the majority being used in higher register contexts such as in (47). By contrast, in the Hellenic National corpus it is only found 7 times, but only once without *να*, as in (48). Taken together these distributions would suggest that this insubordinate wish strategy is not obsolete (*pace* Hesse 2003, 78) but lives on in specific settings of language use, though it is infrequent.

- (47) Άμποτε ο Θεός να τους φωτίσει και να ιδούν! (source: <https://proinoslogos.gr/monimes-stiles/προσκήνιο-παρασκήνιο/31955-ρησρητηξστρ>)
‘So may God enlighten them and let them see!’
- (48) Άμποτε και τηλεοπτική ανάλογη εκπομπή, στην πολυεθνική, με φυλετική ποικιλία και πολυπολιτισμική κοινωνία μας. (HNC Doc_ID: 17723, Sent_ID: 695346)
‘If only there were a corresponding television program, in our multinational, racially diverse, and multicultural society.’

By contrast, the continuity of another wish strategy that known from Medieval Greek does not seem to be as tightly linked to a high register: (i) (49) and (50) come from a website on cats, (ii) *μακαρι να* occurs 5680 times in the corpus and

has other signs of insubordinate status (such as its own subordinate clauses as in example 50). Also, there are 1563 occurrences in the Hellenic National Corpus (searched for *μακάρι + να* max. 5 apart) which would confirm that the construction had a much wider distribution.

(49) *Μακάρι να 'ναι καλότυχα όλα τα ζώακια!* (source: <http://www.gatospito.com/t9660-topic>)
'May all the animals be happy!'

(50) *μακάρι να μπορούσα να την πάρω* (source: <http://www.gatospito.com/t9128-topic>)
'I wish I could take her'

Second, there are assertive uses in Modern Greek that are not clearly documented in the grammars, such as the one shown in (51) below from the Hellenic National Corpus. Here, the insubordinate structure has a performative verb expressing a statement and similar verbs in the first person can be found here in this corpus, e.g. *εξηγήσω* 'explain', *πιστέψω* 'believe' or *δεχτώ* 'accept'.

(51) *Στρέβλωση, θα μου πείτε. Άντε, να συμφωνήσω.*
'Distortion, you might say. Alright, I agree.'

Third, the semi-insubordinate patterns with adverbs and adjectives are even more widespread in the Sketch Engine corpus,²⁰ as illustrated by the different examples given below:

(52) *Σαφώς να τον προτιμήσετε έναντι άλλων ομοειδών* (source: <https://www.ask4food.gr/reviewers/17422-tzia>)
'Clearly you should prefer it over other similar ones.'

(53) *Αδιανόητο να κατασκευάσουμε έναν δρόμο χωρίς αρχή και τέλος.* (source: http://www.ialmopia.gr/2013_12_16_archive.html)
'Unthinkable to build a road without a beginning and an end.'

20 The Hellenic National corpus also provides a range of other combinations not documented before, such as *ενδεχομένως* 'possibly', as in *Ενδεχομένως να υπάρξει κάποιο διαφορετικό ανθρωπιστικό μοντέλο, το σχήμα και το περιεχόμενο του οποίου είναι μη προβλέψιμο.* 'There may be a different humanitarian model, the shape and content of which is unpredictable.' (HNC Doc_ID: 2175, Sent_ID: 80056), or *καλύτερα* 'better', as in *Καλύτερα να μην το ρισκάρεις* 'Better not to risk it'. (HNC Doc_ID: 1118, Sent_ID: 40987).

- (54) Ἴσως, αν ἦμιουν ελεύθερος, να μην ἦταν και τόσο φευγαλέα. (HNC Doc_ID: 56918, Sent_ID: 2782676)
 ‘Perhaps, if I were free, it wouldn’t have been so fleeting.’

Interestingly, in (54) the semi-insubordinate pattern expresses a counterfactual apodosis,²¹ something which was possible in Medieval Greek with an insubordinate να pattern, as shown in section 4.

Fourth and finally, the ways in which avertives can be constructed in Modern Greek are also more diverse based on the evidence from Sketch Engine. We find alternative adverbs, e.g. σχεδόν in (55) and alternative scalar expressions such as παρά τρίχα in (56) (cf. English *by a hair’s breadth* = ‘nearly/almost’).

- (55) Σχεδόν να μην τις σκέφτεσε (for σκέφτεσαι) (source: <https://www.diorismos.gr/forum/viewtopic.php?f=17&t=74&p=61769&sid=a5ff3953b25addbe898247a3d724169>)
 ‘You should almost not think of them.’
- (56) Παρά τρίχα να πέσει πάνω σ’ ένα δέντρο μαμούθ (source: http://bestseller.gr/main.php?id=24&book_id=7467)
 ‘S/he nearly fell onto a mammoth tree.’

To round off this section, we can conclude that insubordination and semi-insubordination hold a crucial position in the modal system of Modern Greek for the encoding of a large set of speech acts, as shown by the paradigmatic strength of clauses with insubordinate να, its innovative use with novel moods in comparison to previous periods, and the productivity of semi-insubordinate syntactic patterns for the expression of different modal functions (especially in the epistemic domain).

6 Conclusions

In this article, I have pointed out the significant contribution that the evidence from the history of Greek can make to current areas of interest in typological research such as insubordination, as such areas are in need of diachronic studies.²² By applying the cross-linguistically tested concept of insubordina-

21 Another example is HNC Doc_ID: 1808, Sent_ID: 65733.

22 Another area of typological research where the diachronic evidence from Greek has contributed is the domain of past habituality, see la Roi (2023).

TABLE 2 The impact of insubordination on the history of Greek

Period	Speech act value	Morphosyntactic features
<i>Archaic to Classical Greek</i>	[-]	[-]
<i>Post-Classical Greek</i>	Directive ἵνα Wish ἵνα	1st, 2nd, 3rd person SBJV Negative directive specialization μή ἵνα 2nd, 3rd person SBJV
<i>Medieval Greek</i>	Directive να Wish να Exclamative να Interrogatives Assertive να	1st, 2nd, 3rd person SBJV 1st, 2nd, 3rd person SBJV ἄμποτε να SBJV 2nd, 3rd person SBJV 1st SBJV declaratives PST CF apodoses οὐ μή νὰ 1st SBJV declaratives οὐ μή νὰ PST CF apodoses οὐ μή νὰ 1st SBJV
<i>Modern Greek</i>	Directive να Wish να Exclamative να Assertive να Interrogative να	1st, 2nd, 3rd person SBJV 1st, 2nd, 3rd person SBJV ἄμποτε /μακάρι / εἶθε να SBJV 2nd, 3rd person SBJV 3rd person SBJV reporting past events 1st person SBJV performative declaratives 1st, 2nd, 3rd person SBJV

tion, I have explained how ἵνα and later να have developed a variety of insubordinate and semi-insubordinate uses in different periods of the history of Greek. The most important insight gained from the diachronic comparison is that insubordinate and semi-insubordinate constructions diachronically show a high degree of pragmatic spread, thereby obtaining a range of novel modal forms and functions over time. In other words, insubordination and semi-insubordination have had a major impact on the modal system in the history of Greek. Table 2 summarizes the evidence for insubordination and table 3 does so for semi-insubordination.

Table 2 documents the pragmatic enrichment of insubordinate να which has gone hand in hand with several morphosyntactic innovations such as

TABLE 3 The impact of semi-insubordination on the history of Greek

Period	Semi-insubordinate construction	Modal function
<i>Archaic to Classical Greek</i>	[-]	[-]
<i>Post-Classical Greek</i>	[-]	[-]
<i>Medieval Greek</i>	ἴσως να	Epistemic possibility
<i>Modern Greek</i>	ἴσως / δυνατόν / ενδεχομένως να ἴσως να πιθανόν / σπάνιο / σαφώς να καλά / καλύτερα να παρά λίγο / σχεδόν / παρά τρίχα να	Epistemic possibility Epistemic counterfactuality Epistemic probability Deontic evaluation Avertives

(i) spread across persons (e.g. directives in all three persons already in Post-Classical Greek but pervasively in Modern Greek), (ii) changes in the modal forms used with insubordinate να, and (iii) insubordinator doubling (e.g. εἶθε να wishes).

In table 3, the impact of semi-insubordinate strategies on the modal system in the history of Greek can be traced: in Medieval Greek we find the first instances of this construction with ἴσως να + main verb to express epistemic possibility, but in Modern Greek this semi-insubordinate pattern has spread to other adverbs and adjectives for deontic and epistemic assessment (e.g. καλά, ενδεχομένως, σαφώς + main verb), to counterfactual apodoses and to different types of so-called *avertive* constructions (la Roi 2024a) that express that a once imminent action was averted, e.g. with σχεδόν or παρά τρίχα + να + main verb. Finally, by comparing the corpus evidence for Modern Greek in the Hellenic National Corpus and the Sketch Engine corpus, I was able to demonstrate that some insubordinate wish strategies are linked with higher register contexts (such as εἶθε να) whereas other wish strategies are productive and occur across registers (e.g. μακάρι να). This finding underlines the impact of register on the form and function of insubordinate constructions (cf. on this issue, la Roi forthc. b).

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank both reviewers for their useful suggestions on how to improve an earlier version of this paper. This research is supported by a postdoctoral grant from the Scientific Research Foundation of Flanders, 12B4B24N.

References

- Agouraki, Georgia. 1991. A Modern Greek complementizer and its significance for Universal Grammar. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 3,1–24.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, Geoffrey Horrocks, & Melita Stavrou. 1999. Introduction. *Studies in Greek syntax*, ed. by Artemis Alexiadou, Geoffrey Horrocks, & Melita Stavrou, 1–21. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Amman, Andreas & Johan van der Auwera. 2004. Complementizer-headed main clauses for volitional moods in the languages of South-Eastern Europe: A Balkanism?. *Balkan syntax and semantics*, ed. by Olga Mišeska Tomić, 293–314. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bartolo, Giuseppina. di. 2022. The $M\eta$ "Iva + subjunctive construction in Greek documentary papyri. *Glotta—Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache* 98.1.136–147.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2018. The decline of infinitival complementation in Ancient Greek. A case of diachronic ambiguity resolution?. *Glotta—Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache* 94.82–108.
- Blass, Friedrich & Albert Debrunner. 1959. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner & Friedrich Rehkopf. 1990. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2016. Routes to insubordination: A cross-linguistic perspective. *Insubordination*, ed. by Nicholas Evans & Honoré Watanabe, 393–422. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Croft, William. 2022. *Morphosyntax: constructions of the world's languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Jong, Irene J.F. 2001. *A narratological commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delveroudi, Rhea, Irene Tsamadou & Sophia Vassilaki. 1994. Mood and modality in Modern Greek: The particle na. *Themes in Greek linguistics*, ed. by Irene Philippaki-Warbuton, Katerina Nicolaidis & Maria Sifianou. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- D'Hertefelt, Sarah. 2018. *Insubordination in Germanic: A typology of complement and conditional constructions*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Dixon, Robert M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald. 2006. *Complementation: A cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, ed. by Irina Nikolaeva, 366–431. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haberland, Hartmut. 2010. Mood in Greek. *Mood in the languages of Europe*, ed. by Björn Rothstein & Rolf Thieroff, 473–491. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in cross-linguistic studies. *Language* 86.3.663–687.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2016. The challenge of making language description and comparison mutually beneficial. *Linguistic Typology* 20.2.299–203.
- Hesse, Rolf. 2003. *Syntax of the Modern Greek verbal system: The use of the forms, particularly in combination with “tha” and “na.”* Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey C. 1995. On condition: Aspect and modality in the history of Greek. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 41.153–173.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey C. 2010. *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers*. Second Edition. Malden: Blackwell.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey C. 2019. Volume 4: Syntax. *The Cambridge grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*, ed. by David Holton, Geoffrey C. Horrocks, Marjolijne Janssen, Tina Lendari, Io Manolassou, & Notis Toufexis, 1859–2093. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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. *Postclassical Greek. Contemporary approaches to philology and linguistics*, ed. by Dariya Rafiyenko and Ilja A. Seržant, 145–162. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter.
- Kalén, Ture. 1941. *Selbständige Finalsätze und imperativische Infinitive im Griechischen*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Kramer, Christina Elisabeth. 1986. *Analytic modality in Macedonian*. München: Sagner.
- Kuteva, Tania, Bas Aarts, Gergana Popova, & Anvita Abbi. 2019. The grammar of ‘non-realization.’ *Studies in Language* 43.4.850–895.
- Labiano Ilundain, Mikel. 2008. La cronología de ἵνα con subjuntivo en expresión de mandato: La lengua de Sófocles, Eurípides y Jenofonte. *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica. Estudios Griegos e Indoeuropeos* 18: 55–72.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2020. A rephilologized diachronic analysis of ‘Post-Classical Greek’: Pitfalls and principles for progress. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 20.2.213–238.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2021. The insubordination of if- and that-clauses from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek: A diachronic constructional typology. *Symbolae Osloenses* 95.1.2–64.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2022. Insubordination in Archaic and Classical Latin: Commands, requests, wishes and assertives. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 21.1.23–45.

- la Roi, Ezra. 2023. Down the paths to the past habitual: Its historical connections with counterfactual pasts, future in the pasts, iteratives and lexical sources in Ancient Greek. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 57.s44–s1.87–116.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2024a. Polarity Reversal Constructions and Counterfactuals in Ancient Greek: Between implicature and conventionalization. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 14.2.335–375.
- la Roi, Ezra. 2024b. Counterfactuals, Post-Classical Greek. *Encyclopedia of Greek Language and Linguistics*, edited by Georgios Giannakis. Leiden: Brill. <https://reference.works.brill.com/view/entries/GLLO/COM-056735.xml>.
- la Roi, Ezra. forthcoming. a. Between dialogic and diachronic syntax: The insubordination of directive Ὀπως in Classical Greek drama. *Conversation analysis and classics. Talk-in-Interaction in Greek*, ed. by R. Verano Liaño. Brill.
- la Roi, Ezra. forthcoming. b. Correlating morphosyntactic stability, change, register and context of use in Post-Classical Greek: The case of insubordinate wishes. *Subordination and insubordination in Post-Classical Greek: From syntax to context*, ed. by Klaas Bentein, Eleonora Cattafi, and Ezra la Roi. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lee, John A.L. 2007. Ἐξαποστέλλω. *Voces biblicae: Septuagint Greek and its significance for the New Testament*, ed. by Jan Joosten & Peter J. Tomson, 99–113. Leuven: Peeters.
- Lurier, Harold E. 1964. *Crusaders as conquerors: The chronicle of Morea*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mackridge, Peter. 1987. *The Modern Greek language: A descriptive analysis of Standard Modern Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Markopoulos, Theodore. 2005. Categorical features and grammaticalization: The case of Medieval Greek 'na'. Presentation at the 7th international conference of Greek Linguistics, University of York.
- Markopoulos, Theodore. 2009. *The future in Greek from ancient to medieval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mauri, Caterina & Andrea Sansò. 2016. The linguistic marking of (ir)realis and subjunctive. *The Oxford handbook of modality and mood*, ed. by Jan Nuyts & Johan van der Auwera, 166–195. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mayser, Edwin. 1926. *Grammatik der griechischen papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. Band 2.1 Satzlehre*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Moorhouse, Alfred Charles. 1982. *The syntax of Sophocles*. Leiden: Brill.
- Narrog, Heiko. 2016. Insubordination in Japanese diachronically. *Insubordination*, ed. by Nicholas Evans & Honoré Watanabe, 247–282. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Noonan, Michael. 2007. Complementation. *Language typology and syntactic description, second edition: Volume 11: Complex constructions*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 52–150. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pavlidou, Theodossia. 1991. Cooperation and the choice of linguistic means: Some evidence from the use of the subjunctive in Modern Greek. *Journal of Pragmatics* 15.1.11–42.

- Philippaki-Warburton, Irene. 1994. The subjunctive mood and the syntactic status of the particle *na* in Modern Greek. *Folia Linguistica* 28.3–4.297–328.
- Philippaki-Warburton, Irene, & Vassilios Spyropoulos. 2004. A change of mood: The development of the Greek mood system. *Linguistics* 42.791–817.
- Radermacher, Ludwig. 1925. *Neutestamentliche grammatik: Das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments im zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Rivero, María Luisa. 1994. Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 12.1.63–120.
- Rouchota, Villy. 1994. Na-interrogatives in Modern Greek: Their interpretation and relevance. *Themes in Greek linguistics*, ed. by Irene Philippaki-Warburton, Katerina Nicolaidis & Maria Sifianou. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Roussou. 2000. On the left periphery: Modal particles and complementisers. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1.1. 65–94.
- Roussou, Anna. 2009. In the Mood for Control. *Lingua* 119.12.1811–1836.
- Ruiz Yamuza, Emilia. 2022. Parenthetical conditionals and insubordinate clauses in Ancient Greek: Protasis with βούλομαι (boulómai) and (ἐ)θέλω (ethélō). *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 22.232–259.
- Sansíñena, María Sol, Hendrik De Smet & Bert Cornillie. 2015. Between subordinate and insubordinate. Paths toward complementizer-initial main clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 77.3–19.
- Searle, John. R. 1979. *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sim, Margaretha. 2006. *A relevance theoretic approach to the particle ἵνα in Koine Greek*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Spyropoulos, Vassilios, David Holton, Peter Mackridge, & Irene Philippaki-Warburton. 2012. *Greek: A comprehensive grammar*. Milton Park: Routledge.
- Mišeska Tomić, Olga. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-Syntactic Features*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Trypanis, Constantine A. 1960. Early Medieval Greek ἵνά. *Glotta* 38 3/4. 312–313.
- Tsangalidis, Anastasios. 2004. Unidirectionality in the grammaticalization of modality in Greek. *Up and down the cline—the nature of grammaticalization*, ed. by Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde & Harry Perridon, 193–209. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van linden, An & Freek Van de Velde. 2014. (Semi-)Autonomous subordination in Dutch: Structures and semantic–pragmatic values. *Journal of Pragmatics* 60.226–250.
- Verstraete, Jean-Christophe & Sarah D’Hertefelt. 2016. Running in the family: Patterns of complement insubordination in Germanic. *Insubordination*, ed. by Nicholas Evans & Honoré Watanabe, 65–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wakker, Gerry C. 1994. *Conditions and conditional: An investigation of Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

- Wiemer, Björn. 2017. Main clause infinitival predicates and their equivalents in Slavic: Why they are not instances of insubordination. *Infinitives at the Syntax-Semantics Interface: A Diachronic Perspective*, ed. by Lukasz Jedrzejewski & Ulrike Demske, 265–338. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2019. On illusory insubordination and semiinsubordination in Slavic: Independent infinitives, clause-initial particles and predicatives put to the test. *Insubordination: Theoretical and empirical Issues*, ed. by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, & María Sol Sansiñena, 107–166. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.