

FYI: Predicate insubordination with ἵνα in documentary post-classical Greek

Abstract:

This chapter examines insubordinate ἵνα in the disclosure formula ('I want you to know that') and the future-open conditional sequence ('if the weather is nice, I will go for a walk') in the documentary papyri. The future-open conditional sequence with ἵνα as an apodosis-initial signpost appears in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods and seems to disappear afterwards. The disclosure formula in the form ἵνα μάθῃς / μάθητε / ἰδῆς ὅτι 'know that' appears in the early Byzantine period only. While in the former ἵνα seems to act as a discourse marker in the left periphery of the sentence, in the latter ἵνα seems to cliticise to the verb. Unlike the adverbial insubordinate 'just so you know' which is attested throughout the history of Greek and cross-linguistically common, insubordinate ἵνα in the future-open conditional sequence and the disclosure formula appear to be context-specific developments that diachronically constitute dead ends.

Keywords: future-open conditional, disclosure formula, pragmaticalisation, particle, discourse marker, signpost

1 Insubordination

The term ‘insubordination’ emerged in a bid to refer to structures that seemingly contradict two basic assumptions of traditional grammar: (i) There are two types of morpho-syntactically distinctive clauses, dependent and independent ones. (ii) There are conjunctions for dependent and independent clauses, subordinators vs co-ordinators. Insubordination is ‘the conventionalized main clause use of what, on prima facie grounds, appear to be formally subordinate clauses’ (Evans 2007: 367). LaRoi (2021: 8) qualifies more strictly 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)’. Consider [1] and [2]:

[1] *Pierre est parti **parce que** je ne vois plus sa voiture dans le parking.*

‘Pierre left; (sc. I think so) because I cannot see his car in the parking lot anymore.’
(Debaisieux 2004: 51 n. 2)

In [1], Pierre has not left because his car is gone but the speaker knows that he has left because his car is gone. The *parce que*-clause provides a reason for the affirmative speech act rather than the propositional content. By laRoi’s definition, [1] is not insubordinate as it is not discursively independent (e.g. D’Hertefelt & Verstraete 2014 on dependency shift).

By contrast, the *que*-clause in [2] is discursively and syntactically independent since *que* is not connected to any superordinate verb.

[2] ***Qu**'il en soit ainsi!*

‘So be it!’

The subjunctive is usually limited to dependent clauses in French. Standard grammar acknowledges a limited number of structures like [2] (Grevisse 2011: §§ 407b and 1098.b.1) by reinterpreting *que* as a particle (cf. Sansinena, De Smet & Cornillie 2015: 14).

[1] and [2] violate the aforementioned assumptions of traditional grammar, in that *parce que* and *que* are considered subordinators and thus should not head independent clauses. [1] and [2] differ in their distribution across periods, genres, and registers. [1] belongs to a colloquial spoken context; [2] appears in higher-register literary discourse. Moreover, the clause following *parce que* in [1] could be replaced by any other clause that suits the context,

whereas the expression in [2] is fixed, such that changes to the subject and verb are impossible (Posner 1997 on *qu'il vienne*). For the remainder of this article, we use Kaltenböck's (2019: 174–175) elaborative in subordinate for structures like [1] and stand-alone in subordinate for structures like [2].¹ By laRoi's definition, only the latter type would be in subordinate (see la Roi 2021: 28 on “just so you know”)

In subordinate clauses fall into adverbial, attributive, and predicative / completive ones, like subordinate clauses (Thompson, Longacre & Hwang 2007: 172). In Greek, adverbial in subordination exists already in classical literature: ὥστε ‘therefore’ (Ruiz Yamuza 2020), εἰ(θε) / εἰ γάρ ‘if only’ (la Roi 2021), ἐπεὶ and ὡς in sentences providing ‘a motivation for the preceding utterance’ (van Emde Boas et al. 2019: para. 48.5). Attributive structures take the form of continuing relatives (e.g. Xenophon, *Anabasis* 2.3.6). Complement / predicative structures are the focus of this chapter.

Classical complement in subordinates are limited to ὅπως + future indicative or subjunctive in emphatic exhortations (van Emde Boas et al. 2019: para. 38.34). Independent usages of ὅπως are frequently prefixed with the interjection-like particles ἄγε or εἶα (e.g. Xenophon, *Symposion* 4.20 ἄγε νῦν ὅπως μεμνήσει ‘do remember now!’) or in Attic with the ‘formula’ δεῖ σε (e.g. Sophocles, *Ajax* 557–8 δεῖ σ' ὅπως πατρὸς δείξεις ἐν ἐχθροῖς, οἷος ἐξ οἴου ἑτράφης ‘amongst your father's enemies, you must show what lineage you are of’) (Kühner & Gerth 1894: 376 n. 6).² In Sophocles, *Oedipus Colonus*, 155–157 (see [7] below), ἵνα + subjunctive replaces expected ὅπως (Kalén 1941).

Complement in subordinates can be expressive or directive (Verstraete, D'Hertefeldt & Linden 2012), mirroring the divide between factive (anaphoric) and prospective (kataphoric) dependent complement clauses (Fendel 2022a with further references):

[3] **Dass** ich den Abriss der Berliner Mauer noch erleben **durfte!**

‘That I could see the Berlin wall fall!’ (Panther & Thornburg 2011: 95)

[4] **Dass** Sie bitte **ja** das Fenster schließen, bevor Sie gehen!

‘Make sure to close the window before you leave!’ (Panther & Thornburg 2011: 99)

¹ Dyadically-dependent patterns are not considered as they reflect interlocutors collaborating on establishing the dependency relation (see e.g. Sansinena, De Smet & Cornillie 2015).

² Kühner and Gerth (1894: 376 n. 6) assume ellipsis, ‘indem ursprünglich dem Redenden ein Gedanke wie ὅρα, ὁρᾶτε, σκοπεῖ, σκοπεῖτε, vide, videte unausgesprochen vorschwebte’ similarly to Evans’ (2007) seminal paper. Yet, Kühner and Gerth (1894: 479 n. 7) cite Lange (1872) for the opposite proposal.

[3] is factive, or expressive, in that it comments on an event that has happened (Panther & Thornburg 2011: 95). With the modal verb *durfte* ‘be allowed’, the event is evaluated as positive; with the modal verb *musste* ‘must’, the event would be evaluated as negative (Panther & Thornburg 2011: 98). [4] is prospective, or directive, in that it makes a future event happen (Panther & Thornburg 2011: 99). Modal verbs are not permissible in [4] (Panther & Thornburg 2011: 99–100). This chapter focuses on directive insubordinates with *ἵνα*.

In post-classical times, *ἵνα* as a subordinate conjunction acquires in addition to its adverbial meaning (purpose), another adverbial meaning (result) (Mandēlaras 1973: paras. 772–774; Hult 1990: 85 and 123–125; di Bartolo 2020) along with a completive function (Bentein 2015; Hult 1990: 166–207). Adverbial insubordinate *ἵνα*-patterns appear in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods (la Roi 2021: 27–30). Insubordinate *ἵνα* in 5th c. AD *Normalprosa* has been interpreted as a lower-register feature (Hult 1990: 86–87 and 115; Mandēlaras 1973: para. 587). This interpretation is controversial given their appearance in classical and post-classical literature as well as their appearance in formulaic contexts (e.g. the disclosure formula).

This chapter examines insubordinate *ἵνα* in the disclosure formula (‘I want you to know that’) and the future-open conditional sequence (‘if the weather is nice, I will go for a walk’) in the documentary papyri with three questions in mind:

- (1) What is predicate insubordinate *ἵνα*?
- (2) How is it distributed, co-textually and contextually (cf. Crystal 2008: 109 and 119) ?
- (3) Why does it not become productive, in the sense of generality (Barðdal 2008: 21)?

It proposes to view insubordination of complementary *ἵνα* in the framework of the *approche pronominale*, dividing grammar into the sentence and discourse tiers (Blanche-Benveniste 1984). Insubordinate usages of *ἵνα* have come about through the usage-driven pattern of pragmaticalisation (see Section 4).

The chapter finds that the future-open conditional sequence with *ἵνα* as an apodosis-initial signpost appears in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods and seems to disappear afterwards. The disclosure formula in the form *ἵνα μάθῃς / μάθητε / ἰδῆς ὅτι* ‘know that’ appears in the early Byzantine period only. While in the former *ἵνα* seems to act as a discourse marker in the left periphery of the sentence, in the latter *ἵνα* seems to cliticise to the verb. Unlike the adverbial insubordinate ‘just so you know’ which is attested throughout the history of Greek and cross-linguistically common (see Section 4), insubordinate *ἵνα* in the future-open conditional sequence and the disclosure formula appear to be context-specific developments that diachronically constitute dead ends.

The chapter falls into eight sections. Section 2 reviews the functional profile of ἵνα as a complementiser and Section 3 the phenomenon of complement insubordination. Section 4 discusses the adverbial insubordinate ‘just so you know’. Section 5 describes the data sample, Section 6 examines the future-open conditional sequence and Section 7 the disclosure formula. Section 8 summarises the results and offers conclusions.

2 Completive ἵνα

The classical Greek prospective complementation system was dominated by infinite structures (Fendel 2022b: 159–163). Both verbs of asking / begging and verbs of ordering / commanding were primarily combined with an accusative- or dative-and-infinitive structure. However, verbs of making an effort / urging could be complemented by a ὅπως-clause, as in Thucydides, *Histories* 5.36.2 ἐδέοντο Βοιωτοὺς ὅπως παραδώσουσι ‘they asked the Boiotians to hand over (...)’. The verb in the ὅπως-clause was usually in the future indicative, but occasional examples of the subjunctive appear, as in Lysias 1.29 ὅπως μὲν μὴ ἀποθάνῃ ἠντεβόλει καὶ ἰκέτευεν ‘he asked and begged not to (have to) die’. ἵνα did not usually appear in such structures. It functioned as a subordinator in purpose clauses, combined with a verb in the subjunctive or the oblique optative in historic sequence.³

In the post-classical period, the infinitival patterns yielded to ἵνα / ὅπως-clauses with verbs of asking / begging (Fendel 2022b: 159–163), as in P.Neph.4, ll. 10–11 (letter, Alexandria, AD 301–400) παρακαλῶ, ἵνα μου μνημονεύσης ‘I beg you to remember me’, but remained the predominant pattern with verbs of ordering / commanding, as in CPR.30.29, ll. 1–2 (letter, Hermopolites, AD 643–644) [ἐκέλευσέν] μοι ὁ κοινὸς δεσπότης ... γράψαι τῇ θεοφυλ(άκτῳ) ὑμῶν ἀδελφότητι ‘our common master ... told me to write to your pious brotherhood’ (see further Fendel 2022b: chap. 4 § 51).⁴

Oblique optatives occasionally appeared but seem to correlate with a higher register or the desire to elevate the register, as in P.Lond.6.1914, ll. 40–41 (letter, Herakleopolites, AD 335) ἔγρ[α]ψα ἕϊνα γνοῖται (...) ‘I want you to know (...)’ (Fendel 2022a). The letter is a long

³ The function of this optative is debated (Kühner & Gerth 1894: 361; Rijksbaron 2006: 53–54; Lillo 2021: 249). The optative is not possible in insubordinate contexts, yet this may reflect its overall decline (Fendel 2022b: chap. 4 § 26 with further references).

⁴ This is a tendency only. Some lexical items defy the pattern, e.g. εὔχομαι ‘to pray’ prefers the old accusative-and-infinitive pattern, whereas ἐντέλλω ‘to order’ is regularly combined with a ἵνα-clause in the papyri, e.g. P.Cair.Zen. 4.59546, l. 2 (letter, Philadelphia, 257 BC). Markopoulos (2009: 171) finds a contrast between grammaticalized θέλω ‘want, will’ + infinitive (future) and θέλω νά + subjunctive (volitional) still in the 12th c. AD.

report of the maltreatment of brothers in a camp environment. The writer seems to be informing a superior about the events and seek help.

The patterns described in the preceding paragraphs fall into Verstraete’s category ‘subordinate’ as the *ἵνα*-clause is under the scope of the superordinate verb, which assigns speech function and modality, see Table 1:

Table 1 Types of clause linking (Verstraete 2007: 283)

Speech function	Modality	Scope	Type
+	+	–	Coordination
–	+	–	Modal subordination
–	–	–	Free subordination
–	–	+	Bound subordination

Speech function refers to the assigning of responsibility to the speaker (e.g. in a declarative) or interlocutor (e.g. in a question) (Verstraete 2007: 106). Modality refers to the assigning of a probability value (epistemic modality) or a desirability value (deontic modality) to a proposition (Verstraete 2007: 112). Scope refers to the integration of the secondary clause under the modal and speech function profile of the superordinate clause (Verstraete 2007: 119–120).

The *ἵνα*-clauses in [5] and [6] are not under the scope of the superordinate verb:

[5] *ἵνα μ[ῆ]* ὁ παῖς
 that NEG the.NOM.sg.m child.NOM.sg.m
 ὑπαναπισθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ
 persuade.AOR.PTCP.PASS.NOM.sg.m by the.GEN.sg.m
 ἀντιδίκου **δοκοίη** περιγραφὴν τινα
 plaintiff.GEN.sg.m pretend.PRS.OPT.ACT.3sg rule.ACC.sg.f some.ACC.sg.f
 ὑπομένειν, **τοῦτο** γὰρ **σπουδάξει**,
 maintain.PRS.INF.ACT this.ACC.sg.n PRT urge.PRS.IND.ACT.3sg
 μηδεμίαν καινοτομίαν γίγνεσθαι
 no.ACC.sg.f novelty.ACC.sg.f become.PRS.INF.MID
 ἀπόντος τ[οῦ] κουράτορος·
 be.away.PRS.PTCP.ACT.GEN.sg.m the.GEN.sg.m curator.GEN.sg.m

‘for he urges this, i.e. that the child, who is persuaded by the plaintiff, pretend to maintain the rule (?) that there be no novelty/innovation while the *curator* is away’ (P.Abinn. 63.2, ll. 37–38 (protocol, Alexandria, AD 350–351))

[6] ἄξιῶ	τὸν	Θεὸν	ἵνα	ἢ
ask.PRS.IND.ACT.1sg	the.ACC.sg.m	god.ACC.sg.m	that	either
ἀπόλυσόν	μαι	ἢ	παραδοτε	
release.AOR.IMP.ACT.2sg	I.ACC.sg.m	or	give.AOR.IMP.ACT.2pl	
μοι	το	χρυσ(οῦ)	νομ(ισμάτια)	η.
I.DAT.sg.m	the.ACC.sg.n	gold.GEN.sg.m	nomisma.ACC.sg.n	8

‘I ask God: Release me or give me the eight *nomismata* of gold!’ (P. Herm. 7.11–13 (letter, Lykopolis, AD 381))

In [5], the *ἵνα*-clause does not assign its own speech function and/or modality, but explicates *τοῦτο* ‘this’, thus falls into Verstraete’s category of ‘free subordination’; in [6], the *ἵνα*-clauses assigns its own (deontic) modality, as visible in the imperatival verbs, thus falls into the category ‘modal subordination’.

However, *ἵνα* does not regularly appear with the imperative. The logical subordination visible in [6] is usually expressed without *ἵνα*, as in P. Neph. 2, ll. 5–6 *καὶ παρακαλῶ, μνημόνευε ἡμῶν* (Alexandria, AD 301–400, private letter) ‘I ask (you), remember us’.

Unlike factive complement clauses with *ὅτι*, which can be internally dependent, explicative, recitative and eventually also independent, *ἵνα* does not readily appear in all the patterns represented in Table 1 and illustrated in [5] and [6]. Rather, insubordinate patterns co-exist with internally dependent patterns from classical times onwards. In the post-classical papyri, the explicit encoding of internal dependency by means of an optative in historic sequence retreats (Fendel 2022b: 146) and insubordinate usages increase.

The question is how we can differentiate between instances of adverbial and complete insubordinate *ἵνα*.

3 Complement insubordination

Adverbial insubordinates comment on the speech act, in the case of *ἵνα* providing a purpose or in post-classical times also a result; complement insubordinates predicate, in that they assign

modality and illocutionary force, in the case of $\text{ĩ}\nu\alpha$ deontic modality and exclamative force (cf. D’Hertefelt & Verstraete 2014).

Adverbial and complement insubordinates differ in their prosody and structure. For example, in German, adverbial insubordinate *weil* ‘because’ appears with the verb-second word-order pattern of independent clauses (similarly to *denn* ‘for’), whereas [4] showed that complement insubordinate *dass* ‘that’ appears with the verb-final pattern of dependent clauses (e.g. Günthner 2003). However, unlike in dependent clauses, a particle (‘ja’) can be inserted, e.g. *Dass du ja pünktlich bist!* (insubordinate) and *Sei ja pünktlich!* ‘Be on time!’ (independent) (Panther & Thornburg 2011: 102), and modal verbs such as *können* ‘to be able to’, *müssen* ‘to have to’, and *sollen* ‘to be obliged to’ are not permissible in the insubordinate (Panther & Thornburg 2011: 99–100). Prosodically, adverbial insubordinate *weil*, similarly to French *bien que* ‘although’, is set apart from the clause following it by means of a pause (Pusch 2017: 325). The adverbial insubordinate seems to appear in the left periphery of the sentence, the subordinate in the sentential core (cf. Giorgi 2016; Kojadinović 2022). Section 4 contrasts the complement insubordination with $\text{ĩ}\nu\alpha$ with adverbial insubordination with $\text{ĩ}\nu\alpha$.

Insubordinate uses of conjunctions concern the interpersonal rather than the propositional context. The relevant patterns structure the discourse rather than the sentence. In fact, the Greek disclosure formula and the future-open conditional sequence reviewed below as contexts with insubordinate $\text{ĩ}\nu\alpha$, have relatively more common alternants without $\text{ĩ}\nu\alpha$. These alternants have a different value discursively speaking. Thus, rather than being able to establish a one-to-one form-function mapping for insubordinate $\text{ĩ}\nu\alpha$ in the sense of Goldberg’s (1995) construction grammar, we have two options, one syntactic and one discursive.

Debaisieux (e.g. 2016) conceptualises this in her distinction between constructions and configurations with French *parce que* based on Blanche-Benveniste’s (1984) *approche pronominale*, which posits two tiers, the microsyntax (i.e. the morphosyntax) and the macrosyntax (i.e. the discourse syntax). In the macrosyntax, the (verbal) *noyau* is the centre of the unit, a préfixe, postfixe, and suffixe can be appended. E.g. *Comme il était malade, il est pas venu* ‘As he was ill, he did not come’ (préfixe + *noyau*) and *Il est pas venu, vu qu’il était malade* ‘he did not come, given that he was ill’ (*noyau* + suffixe) (Debaisieux, Deulofeu & Martin 2008: 232–233).⁵ These additions are dispensable. This two-tier system was in place for *parce que* already in Old French (Debaisieux 2016: 90–91 with further references). The same two-tier system has also been observed for complementisers in several languages, e.g. Deulofeu

⁵ Cf. Heine and Kaltenböck’s (2021) distinction between sentence and thetical grammars.

(2008) for French *que* and Van Linden and Van de Velde (2014) on Dutch *dat* (both factive). Furthermore, Markopoulos (2009: 151) observes *và ἔχω* in independent commands alongside subordinate adverbial and completive uses in 14th c. AD literature.

Insubordination has not only a synchronic but also a diachronic dimension (cf. Evans 2007; Debaisieux 2016; Debaisieux, Martin & Deulofeu 2019). Some insubordinate uses of *ἵνα* exist in classical Greek, e.g. [7] to [10] in chronological order⁶:

[7] “χαῖρε,	ξεῖν’,	ἵνα	καί	ποτ’
welcome.PRS.IMP.ACT.2sg	stranger.VOC.sg.m	that	even	when
ἐὼν	ἐν	πατρίδι		γαίῃ
be.PRS.PTCP.ACT.NOM.sg.m	in	fatherland.DAT.sg.f		country.DAT.sg.f
μνήσῃ	ἐμεῖ’,	ὅτι		μοι
remember.AOR.SBJV.MID.2sg	I.GEN.sg.m	because		I.DAT.sg.m
πρώτῃ	ζώαγρι’	ὀφείλλεις.”		
first.DAT.sg.f	reward.ACC.pl.n	owe.PRS.IND.ACT.2sg		

‘Welcome, stranger, may you remember me – even when you are (back) in your own land – because you owe me rewards for saving your life in the first place.’ (Homer, *Odyssey* 8.461–462 [2sg])

[8] περᾶς	γάρ,	περᾶς·	ἀλλ’	ἵνα
go.far.PRS.IND.ACT.2sg	PRT	go.far.PRS.IND.ACT.2sg	however	that
τῷδ’	ἐν	ἀφθέγκτω	μὴ	προπέσης
this.DAT.sg.n	in	voiceless.DAT.sg.n	NEG	step.AOR.SBJV.ACT.2sg
νάπει		ποιάεντι,	(...),	τῶν,
glade.DAT.sg.n		grassy.DAT.sg.n	(...)	this.GEN.pl.n
ξένε		πάμμορ’	– εὔ	φύλαξαι –
stranger.VOC.sg.m		unlucky.VOC.sg.m	good.ADV	guard.AOR.IMP.MID.2sg
μετάσταθ’,		ἀπόβαθι.		
step.away.AOR.IMP.ACT.2sg		move.away.AOR.IMP.ACT.2sg		

⁶ Kalen’s Xenophon, *Cynegeticos* 6.7 is not insubordinate; Plato’s *Gorgias* (505e, 516b) and Lysias’ speeches (12.25; 12.25; 1.12) contain otherwise only dyadically dependent instances. Data was collected in the context of the *ECF Leverhulme corpus* (DOI 10.5287/ora-g2op5v0em).

‘You went too far, too far; however, do not step on this voiceless grassy glade, (...). From these, unlucky stranger, beware, step away, move away! (Sophocles, *Oedipus Colonus* 155–157 [2sg])

[9] ὡς δὲ	τῷ	ἀνδρὶ	ὄν	ἄν	
so	PRT	the.DAT.sg.m	man.DAT.sg.m	who.ACC.sg.m	PRT
ἔλησθε		πεισομαι	ἧ		
select.AOR.SBJV.MID.2pl		obey.FUT.IND.MID.1sg	which.DAT.sg.f		
δυνατὸν	μάλιστα,	ἵνα	εἰδῆτε	ὅτι	καὶ
possible.NOM.sg.n	most	that	know.PRF.SBJV.ACT.2pl	that	also
ἄρχεσθαι	ἐπίσταμαι		ὥς	τις	καὶ
serve.PRS.INF.MID	know.PRS.IND.MID.1sg		as	some.NOM.sg.m	and
ἄλλος	μάλιστα	ἀνθρώπων.			
other.NOM.sg.m	most	man.GEN.pl.m			

‘So, I will obey the man who you have selected, as much as I possibly can – so you know that I know how to serve just as any other man does.’ (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 1.3.15 [2pl])

[10] ἀλλ’	ἵνα	μὴ	θαυμάζῃς	ἐὰν	καὶ
however	that	NEG	be.surprised.PRS.SBJV.ACT.2sg	if	also
ὀλίγον	ἕστερον		τοιούτῳ	τί	
little.ACC.sg.n	later.ACC.sg.n		such.ACC.sg.n	some.ACC.sg.n	
σε	ἀνέρωμαι,		ὃ		
you.ACC.sg.m	ask.AOR.SBJV.MID.1sg		which.NOM.sg.n		
δοκεῖ	μέν	δῆλον	εἶναι,		
seem.PRS.IND.ACT.3sg	PRT	obvious.NOM.sg.n	be.PRS.INF.ACT		
ἐγὼ	δ’	ἐπανερωτῶ			
I.NOM.sg.m	PRT	ask.again.PRS.IND.ACT.1sg			

‘However, do not be surprised if a little later I ask you something of the type that it seems obvious, but I persist in asking.’ (Plato, *Gorgias* 454b [2sg])

[7] is preceded by the greeting imperative / particle χαῖρε. This may be comparable to the interjection-like particles ἄγε or εἶα prefixed to insubordinate ὅπως (Section 1). It also seems to resemble Van Linden and Van de Velde’s (2014: 226–228) semi-subordination pattern with

Dutch *dat*, e.g. *Misschien/ Goed da Kris komt!* ‘Good/maybe Kris is coming!’.⁷ Finally, di Bartolo’s (2022) later μή ἵνα ‘not that’ in the papyri seems to fall in line too. [8] is a conditional sequence. [9] is an example of the disclosure formula in the form of an elaborative rather than stand-alone insubordinate. [10] shows the ἵνα-clause in parallel with second-person imperatives. Later, la Roi’s (2021: 26–30) wishes in Roman-period papyri, featuring ἵνα in combination with a second-person subjunctive in parallel with imperatives, seem comparable (BGU IV 1079, ll. 17–23 (1st c. AD), P. Oxy. XLI 2985, ll. 9–13 (2nd – 3rd c. AD), and P. Oxy. XLVI 3314, ll. 12–17 (4th c. AD), all letters).

In [7] to [10], the verb combined with ἵνα is in the second-person subjunctive. The ἵνα-clause conveys a warning in [7], [8], and [10], thus analogy with insubordinate ὅπως cannot be excluded. We revisit [7], [8], and [10] in Section 6, and [9] in Section 7.

4 Parenthetical ‘just so you know’

Parentheticals fall under Kaltenböck’s (2019: 187–189) ‘elaborative insubordination’ as they are pragmatically dependent. The parenthetical adverbial insubordinate ‘just so you know’ existed in Homeric times already⁸ and provides a purpose for the speech act (e.g. *I have submitted my essay now, just so you know*) (Beeching 2016: 98). It witnesses lexical renewal affecting the conjunction in the post-Homeric period, ἵνα replaces ὄφρα (Ruiz Yamuza 2022: 253).⁹

‘Just so you know’ (and the colloquial abbreviation *fyi*) shows all the signs of a pragmaticalised phrase. Consider [11]:

[11] Διονυσίῳ	προσ[τ]άτη	Νεμερῶν			
Dionysios.DAT.sg.m	chief.DAT.sg.m	Nemeroi.GEN.pl.m			
κέκρηκα	(δραχμάς)	ἡ	καὶ	ταῦτας	
provide.PRF.IND.ACT.1sg	drachma.ACC.pl.f	8	and	this.ACC.pl.f	
οὐκ ἔπεμψε,	ἵνα	εἰδῆς.			
NEG send.AOR.IND.ACT.3sg	that	know.PRF.SBJV.ACT.2sg			

⁷ They apply the approach of hypoanalysis: ‘in specific contexts subordinate *dat*-clauses happened to express interpersonal meaning, ... **language users came to reinterpret** this meaning as an inherent semantic property of the construction with the subordinating conjunction (*dat*)’ (Van Linden & Van de Velde 2014: 228).

⁸ It differs formally and functionally from pragmaticalised *you know* (e.g. Beeching 2016 (*you know*)).

⁹ *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* proximity searches (10 instances): Od. 7.317; Od. 9.348; Od. 22.234; Il. 1.185; Il. 6.150; Il. 8.420; Il. 20.213; Il. 21.487; Od. 9.16 (pl), Il. 18.52 (pl). None after Homer.

‘to Dionysios, the chief (?) of Nemerai, I have provided 8 *drachmae*, but he did not send these, just so you know.’ (P. Oxy. 2 299, ll. 4–5 (letter, Oxyrhynchos, AD 76–100))

‘Just so you know’ does not provide a purpose for the propositional content of (not) sending money but of the writer making the statement. It has an interpersonal meaning securing the addressee’s attention (Claridge & Arnovick 2010: 179). It has scope over the whole utterance, i.e. the writer in [11] states that he supplied money, but this was not sent on. Both these events he wants the addressee to be aware of, which is why he is making the statement in [11] (Claridge & Arnovick 2010: 180). ‘Just so you know’ appears in extra-sentential position, i.e. to the right of the sentence in [11] (Claridge & Arnovick 2010: 182). It has its own illocutionary force (Koev 2022: 18).¹⁰

‘Just so you know’ decategorizes to the extent that it is perceived as a largely contiguous lexical unit (Claridge & Arnovick 2010: 181). In the parenthetical, οἷδα does not allow for an accusative object and cannot be co-ordinated with another verb.¹¹ Thus, only particles (e.g. οὐν) can intervene between the conjunction and the verb. Hiatus between the verb and the conjunction is mostly resolved, as Table 2 shows. If an object was to be expressed or a verb was to be co-ordinated, the polite-request formula ‘I am writing so you know (...)’ (Fendel 2022a) is available and frequently used in the papyri.

The *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri* was searched for ἵν’ + εἰδῆς, ἵνα + εἰδῆς, ἵν’ + εἰδῆτε, ἵνα + εἰδῆτε, ὅπως + εἰδῆς, ὅπως + εἰδῆτε (December 2022). Homeric ὄφρα does not appear in the papyri except in the literary papyri. The time frame was set to 300 BC and AD 650. Literary papyri and those with unknown provenance were excluded. The results are manually corrected and ordered by (i) ἵνα acting at the sentence level (including the polite-request formula γράφω ἵνα εἰδῆς), (ii) ἵνα acting at the discourse level, and (iii) other, consisting of instances too damaged to be judged. Table 2 shows the discursive usages:

Table 2 ‘just so you know’ in the papyri

¹⁰ It would be interesting to assess the intonation contour e.g. by inspecting (prosodic) word-level punctuation. However, the present data set does not bear out this kind of information (see further on the issue Crellin 2022a; Crellin 2022b)

¹¹ Yet, a recurring structure is εἰδῆς καὶ πρόνοιαν ποιήσης ‘you shall know and have foresight’ (e.g. P. Col. 10.282, ll. 10–11; letter, unknown, AD 201–400; P. Panop. Beatty 1, l. 226; letter, Panopolis, AD 298–299). Compare earlier P. Wisc. 1.31, l. 15 εἰδῆς καὶ προνοήσης ‘you shall know and foresee’ (letter, Theadelphia, AD 147–149). In these, the support-verb construction (πρόνοιαν ποιέω / ποιέομαι) takes the object, yet co-ordination happens.

Combination searched	ἴν' + εἰδῆς	ἴνα + εἰδῆς	ἴν' + εἰδῆτε	ἴνα + εἰδῆτε	ὅπως + εἰδῆς	ὅπως + εἰδῆτε
Total of hits	202	161	41	19	117	8
Relevant to insubordination	8	4	1	1	3	0
PG	0	P. Petr. Kleon 112, l. 25; P. Zen. Pestm. 30, l. 19	0	0	P. Tebt. 1. 26, l. 23; P. Tebt. 3.1.769, l. 63; P. Tebt. 4. 1099, l. 5	0
RG	P. Oxy. 9 1220, l. 5; P. Oxy. 41 2996, l. 33; P. Oxy. 2. 237 6, ll. 17 and 19–20; P. Stras. 4 296, ll. 11 and 16; P. Oxy 63 4363, l. 19; P. Cair Isid. 132, l. 20; BGU 7 1669, l. 6; SB 10	BGU 4. 1201, l. 20; P. Oxy. 2. 299, l. 5;	P. Flor. 1. 2col8, l. 206	CPR 5.4r, l. 9	0	0

	10257, 1. 20 ¹²					
EBG	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅

*PG = Ptolemaic Greek (300–0 BC); RG = Roman Greek (AD 0–400); EBG = Early Byzantine Greek (AD 400–650)¹³

Table 2 shows that instances of ἴνα outnumber those of ὅπως and that instances of the second person singular of the verb outnumber those of the second person plural. These lexical and morphological constraints point towards a phrase that became increasingly fixed. However, while lexical and morphological flexibility of the phrase seems to decrease over time, the constituent parts seem to have been accessible at least in the Roman period still, as e.g. the preference for periphrastic ἴν'εἰδέναι ἔχουσ 'so you may know' to the shorter subjunctive version in P.Panop.Beatty.1 (Panopolis, AD 298, official letter) shows.¹⁴ The absence of phrases for the early Byzantine period may relate e.g. to lexical renewal or preference for a periphrastic or a combination of the two (e.g. P. Oxy. 16 1830, ll. 12–17 καὶ ἴν'δέναί ἔχου 'and so you may know', letter, Oxyrhynchos, AD 501–600), which the present search procedure would not capture.

5 Data

The chapter is based on searches of the *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri* (DDbDP) for LEX ἴνα – literary texts and those of unknown provenance are excluded, the timeframe is set to 300 BC and AD 650. The search returned 2652 hits. Like this, most phonetic spellings (e.g. involving iotacism) are included as they appear in the critical apparatus. Manual data collection in all the papyri identified as relevant by the DDbDP search function is necessary as often more instances than identified by the tool appear in a text. Elided forms, such as ἴν', are not captured in this way. Instances of ἴν'εἰδῆς and variants were collected separately. The annotated dataset is available here: DOI 10.5287/ora-6gpde4e. The data for in subordinate ἴνα is summarised in Table 3:

Table 3 In subordinate ἴνα in the papyri

¹² Possibly also O.Krok. 1. 87lin51_62, ll. 54–55 (letter, Krokodilo, AD 118), yet severely damaged.

¹³ Timeframes were manually applied to the entire annotated dataset drawn from the *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri* in line with Fendel (2022b).

¹⁴ Also P. Oxy. 16 1830, ll. 12–17 (Oxyrhynchos, AD 501–600, letter).

Pattern	Number of instances	Percentage of all instances
Identified as insubordinate / independent	82 [+2 ¹⁵]	
Of these conditional sequences	14	17%
Of these disclosure formulae (F1)	8 [+2]	10%
Of these in the 1 st person (sg/pl)	6 + 3	11%
Of these in the 2 nd person	22 + 3	31%
Of these in the 3 rd person	19 + 5	30%
Of these verbless	1	1%

The relevant passages in the papyri appear primarily in the lower / personal registers, as Table 4 shows:

Table 4 Distribution of insubordinates

	Letter	Contract / petition	Total
300 BC – 0	25 100%	∅	25
0 – AD 400	35 92%	3 8%	38
AD 400 – AD 650	17 89%	2 11%	19
Total	77	5	82

The instances of the future-open conditional sequence and the disclosure formula amount to 27% of all instances of insubordinate ἴνα. All the passages except for one come from the lower registers.

6 The future-open conditional

In classical Greek, the future-open conditional sequence consists of a protasis formed with ἔάν ‘if’ + subjunctive and an apodosis formed with a prospective verbal form (e.g. an imperative

¹⁵ Two instances appeared in the search for the parenthetical but seem to be instances of the disclosure formula: Chr. Mitt. 91, 2 ll. 11–12 (protocol, Alexandria, AD 157–159) Διογένης εἰ[ῖ]πεν· ἴν’ εἰδῆς ὅτι (...) ‘Diogenes said: you shall know that’; PSI 15 1549, l. 5 (protocol, Oxyrhynchos, AD 249–250,)]ς συνήγορος ταμείου εἰπ(εν)· καὶ ἴν’ εἰδῆς ὡς [‘the treasurer said: and you shall know that’.

or a future tense) (Kühner & Gerth 1894: 463–465 and 473–475).¹⁶ In the post-classical period, the distinction between εἰ ‘if’ and εἰάν ‘if’ weakened and phonological changes (esp. iotacism and vowel-length distinctions) resulted in morphological ambiguity e.g. between the aorist subjunctive vs the future indicative (Fendel 2022b: chap. 4 §§ 129–136 with further references).

The protasis is marked by the conjunction ‘if’. The apodosis can be marked with apodotic elements, such as ἔπειτα ‘then’ (LSJ I.4) (cf. Ruiz Yamuza 2011: 7). The order of protasis and apodosis is flexible and determined by the information structure (e.g. Dik 1995). When the protasis precedes, the apodotic element marks the clause boundary, as in [12]:

[12] ἢ μὴ διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ,
 if NEG due.to the.ACC.sg.f love.ACC.sg.f the.GEN.sg.m god.GEN.sg.m
 ἐπὶ ἔμελλον ἀποθανῖν τῇ
 then would.IMPF.IND.ACT.1sg die.AOR.INF.ACT the.DAT.sg.f
 πίνῃ
 thirst.DAT.sg.f

‘If it had not been for the love of God, I would have died of thirst.’ (P. Misc. inv. 2. 70, l. 18–20 (Gonis 2008))

ἐπεὶ, used apodotically is ‘historically derived (...) from a paratactic marker’ (Hackstein 2017: 260). Independent uses of ἐπεὶ appear throughout classical Greek already, e.g. Plato, *Gorgias* 473e (Hackstein 2017: 258).

In the post-classical papyri, the apodosis several times contains ἴνα. In all except one instance, the apodosis follows the protasis. Table 5 summarises the passages in chronological order:

Table 5 Future-open conditional sequence

Citation	Passage	Text type	Provenance	Date

¹⁶ A future-open protasis did not have to combine with a future-open apodosis and vice versa (Kühner & Gerth 1894: 465).

P.Cair.Zen. 2.59240	ll. 11–12 ἐὰν δὲ μήπω προσπεπτωκότες ᾧσιν, ἵνα τοῖς παρὰ σοῦ συντάξις ὡς ἡξιώκαμέν σε οἰκονομήσαι. ‘If they have not yet fallen to their knees / begged, you shall tell those with you that we consider it right that you manage (affairs).’	letter	Alexandria	253– 252 BC
P.Cair.Zen. 3.59428	ll. 16–20 ἐὰν οὖν εἰδῶ τὰ περὶ ἐμέ ἐν τίνι εἰμί, ἵνα καὶ τῆμ μητέρα καὶ τὸ ἀδελφίον μεταπέμψωμαι ᾧδε. ‘Thus, if I see the matters concerning me (and) in what state I am, I will send for the mother and the little brother in this way.’	letter	Philadelphia (Arsinoites)	275– 266 BC
P.Lond. 7.1944	ll. 6–7 εἰ δὲ μή γε, ὡς ποτε αὐτῷ δοκεῖ, ἵνα τὰ σύμβολα ἡμῖν δοθῆι. γράφε δὲ καὶ σὺ ᾧν ἂν χρειᾶν ἔχης. ‘If not, as it seems right to him, he shall give the sum to you. Write (to us) about what you need!’	letter	Athribis	257 BC
P.Lond. 7.2046	l. 3 εἰ οὖν σοὶ δοκεῖ, ἵνα ὑπάρχω καὶ ᾧδε πα[ρὰ σοί. ‘If it seems good to you, I shall be subordinate to you in this way.’	letter	Philadelphia (Arsinoites)	275– 226 BC
P.Lond. 7.2055	ll. 3–5 εἰ σοὶ δοκεῖ, ἵνα παρὰ σοὶ ἐργάζωμαι τὰς ψιλοτάπιδας. ‘If it seems good to you, I shall make the simple rugs for you.’	letter	Philadelphia (Arsinoites)	275– 226 BC
PSI. 6.584	ll. 18–21 εἰ δυνῆ οὖν μοι αὐτὰς οἰκονομήσασθαι ἴν[α] αὐτὰς ἀπενέγκωμαι. ‘I you can manage	letter	Philadelphia (Arsinoites)	275– 226 BC

	them for me, I shall take them away.’			
BGU. 1.48	ll. 18–21 ἐὰν ἀναβῆς τῇ ἑορτῇ, ἵνα ὁμόσε γενώμεθα, καὶ μὴ ὑπερηφανήσῃς. ‘If you come up for the celebration, we shall be together and you will not be left alone (?).’	letter	Arsinoites	AD 101– 300
BGU. 3.742, 2FrA	ll. 1–3 ἵνα σοι μεταδῶμεν, εἰ ταῖς ἀληθείαις ἀντὶ φερνῆς ἢ παραχώρησις ἐγένετο καὶ εἰ ἡ ὠνὴ προτέρα ἐγένετο τῆς σιτολ(ογίας) κἂν οὕτως ἔχη τὴν [αἰ]τίαν δι’ ἣν κατεσχεθ(). ‘We shall inform (you) if the withdrawal instead of the dowry happens to the sincere and if the previous purchase of forage happens – even if there is a reason why ...’	letter	Arsinoites	AD 122– 138
O.Did. 462	ll. 6–8 ἐὰν ἀκούσης κενότερον περὶ τοῦ κλήρου ἵνα καὶ ἐμοὶ δηλώσης. ‘If you hear something new about the lot, tell me too!’	letter	Didymoi (Eastern desert)	AD 201– 250
P.Giss. 1.40	ll. 6–8 καὶ εἰ φανερόν ἐστιν, πῶς πλήρη τὴν χάριτά μου παρενέθηκα, ὁμως ἵνα μὴ τις στενότερον παρερμηνεύσῃ τὴν χάριτά μου ἐκ τῶν ῥη[μά]των το[ῦ] προτέρου διατάγματος, ἐν ᾧ οὕτως ἀπεκριν[ά]μην· ‘If it is clear how much thanks I give, nonetheless no-one shall narrowly misinterpret my thanks from the words of the	edict	Apollonopolites Heptakomias	AD 215– 216

	previous edict, in which I answered in this way.’			
SB. 6.9017_8	ll. 8–9 εἰ πέπρακες τὴν κριθὴν,/ εἰ δὲ μὴ [δ]ώσις Ἀλβανῶ ἵνα μοι οἴσι· ‘If you have sold barley, if you do not give it to Albanos, he will bring it to me.’ ¹⁷	letter	Wadi Fawakhir (Eastern Desert)	AD 1–200
P.Fouad. 84	l. 2 εἰ δ’ ἐν πέμπεις εἶπε Ἰορδανίῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ σ[ου(?)] εἰ τοῦτο πέμπει μοι, ἀλλὰ πάντως ἵνα ἔλω χρηστησῶν. . . ‘If you send one, tell Iordanios, your brother, whether you send it to me, but certainly I will receive (it) ...’	letter	Arsinoites	AD 501– 700

The relevant passages date predominantly from the Ptolemaic and Roman periods; there is only one instance from the early Byzantine period. All the instances except for P. Giss. 1. 40 are letters, thus belong to the private or personal register. BGU. 3.742, 2FrA shows two past tense forms in the protasis, which seem to adopt a future perfect value (‘when this has been done, then we shall do X’).

Table 6 tabulates the number of items intervening between ἵνα and the verb in the ἵνα-clause and the personal ending of the verbs:

Table 6 Intervening items and personal endings

Citation	Intervening items	Person of the verb
P.Cair.Zen. 2.59240	3 (τοῖς παρὰ σοῦ ‘those with you’)	2sg
P.Cair.Zen. 3.59428	6 (καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὸ ἀδελφίον ‘both the mother and the little brother’)	1sg
*P.Lond. 7.1944	3 (τὰ σύμβολα ἡμῖν ‘the sum to you’)	3sg

¹⁷ ll. 10–13 confirm this reading: ἐὰν ἦς πεπρακὸς τὴν κριθὴν πέμπεις ἐμοὶ τὸν χαλκὸν διὰ Ἀλβανοῦ τοῦ ἵππεος ‘if you have bought the barley, send the money to me through Albanos the horseman’.

*P.Lond. 7.2046	0	1sg
*P.Lond. 7.2055	2 (παρὰ σοὶ ‘for you’)	1sg
PSI. 6.584	1 (αὐτὰς ‘them’)	1sg
*PSI. 6.584	1 (μὴ ‘not’)	3pl
BGU. 1.48	1 (ὁμόσε ‘together’)	1pl
#BGU. 3.742, 2FrA	1 (σοὶ ‘to you’)	1pl
O.Did. 462	2 (καὶ ἐμοὶ ‘also to me’)	2sg
*P.Giss. 1.40	3 (μὴ τις στεγότερον ‘nobody narrowly’)	3sg
SB. 6.9017_8	1 (μοι ‘to me’)	3sg
P.Fouad. 84	0	1sg

* = contains hedge; # = future perfect

Table 6 shows that insubordinate ἵνα-clauses are no longer limited to second-person verbs. Apparently, insubordinate ἵνα had become an independently available pattern, rather than just an analogical one (cf. ὅπως).

Table 6 also shows that ἵνα and its verb are rarely contiguous. Conversely, contiguity is observed in the one classical ancestor, Plato, *Gorgias* 454b ἵνα μὴ θαυμάζῃς ἐὰν (...) ‘do not be surprised if’ (see [8] above). ἵνα is separated from its verb by the function word μὴ ‘not’, which without paradigmatic changes (cf. Loporcaro 2022: 36), cannot be moved.

The principle of iconicity holds that items that belong together usually appear in close proximity (cf. Bertrand 2014; Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 130; Bentein 2016: 14). This suggests that ἵνα does not function as a modal particle with the verb but as an adverb at the left edge of the clause, like earlier apodotic particles and adverbs. However, unlike these, ἵνα only appears when the clause is expressing a deontic meaning.

5 of the 13 instances in Table 6 contain a protasis in the form of a pragmatized hedge¹⁸, e.g. P.Lond. 7.2055, ll. 3–5 εἴ σοι δοκεῖ ‘if it seems good to you’. These protases are comparable to the ‘just so you know’ parenthetical (Section 4), in that they have a discursive link with the ἵνα-apodosis (Ruiz Yamuza 2022; Fendel 2022b: chap. 9). In fact, the entire hedge should perhaps be read as a discourse marker in the left periphery, with ἵνα appearing at the left edge of the sentential core. This would align these instances loosely with Sophocles,

¹⁸ Hedging is a ‘broad pragmatic concept encompassing nearly any expression of tentativeness or possibility, or with a softening or downtoning function’ (Hulleberg Johansen 2021: 82).

Oedipus Colonus 155ff. (see [7] above), which is written in verse, such that the word order is less indicative.

ἴνα in the actual conditional sequences – i.e. the protasis is not a hedge –, seems to function as a guidepost. A guidepost (such as English *so*) ‘suggests how you might interpret what the speaker is trying to get across’ (Davis & Maclagan 2020: 64–65) (e.g. a summary, an invitations). ἴνα does not seem to cliticise to the verb. It is unlike the deontic periphrases¹⁹ with e.g. θέλω ‘want, will’, καταξιώω ‘deem right’, etc. + infinitive (Fendel 2022b: chap. 4 §59) which appear frequently in the documentary papyri and form addenda to the paradigm (cf. Haspelmath 2000). Ruiz Yamuza (2011: 7) links apodotics in conditional sequences to correlatives, considering the sequences moving closer to a diptych structure and thus towards paratactic structures. Thus, ἴνα may be either at the left edge of the sentential core or in the left periphery, akin to pragmatikalised sentential adverbs in this position (Jiménez Delgado 2018).

Insubordinate ἴνα as a guidepost in the apodosis appears throughout the Ptolemaic, Roman and marginally in the early Byzantine periods in the papyri. ἴνα seems to appear at the left edge of the clause or in the left periphery. The form of the verb with ἴνα is no longer limited to the second person. ἴνα as an apodotic is flexibly applicable in conditional sequences. This contrasts with ἴνα in the disclosure formula.

7 The disclosure formula

The range of structures labelled ‘disclosure formula’ is debated (Porter & Pitts 2013). Here, the disclosure formula is defined narrowly as the combination of a deontic form of a verb of knowing / realising / learning (periphrastic or simple), aimed at the addressee, and a factive complement referring to the piece of information to be transmitted, often in the form of a complement clause (Fendel 2022b: chap. 8). In a late Roman / early Byzantine letter corpus, we find the following structures, see [13] and [14]²⁰:

[13] Periphrastic (7): P. Kell. 1.66, ll. 8 and 19 (μαθεῖν σε θέλω ὅτι ‘I want you to know that’), P. Misc. Inv. 2. 70, l. 4 (γινώσκειν σε βούλομαι ‘I want you to know’), P. Lond. 3 981, ll. 13–14 (γινώσκειν σε βούλομαι ‘I want you to know’), P. Lond. 6. 1914, l. 2 (γινώσκειν ὑμᾶς θέλομεν ‘we want you all to know’), P. Lond. 6. 1917, l. 8 (γνῶναί

¹⁹ Periphrastic structures are those that express by means of multiple words a feature bundle in a paradigm (for further discussion in general, see Loporcaro 2022).

²⁰ Archives of Apa Nepheros, Apa John, Apa Paieous, village of Kellis, Dioscorus of Aphrodito.

σε θέλω ‘I want you to know’); P. Cair. Masp. 1. 67065, l. 1 (γνῶναι [σε / ὑμᾶς?]
βούλομαι ‘I want you (all) to know’)²¹

[14] Imperatival (8): P. Kell. 1. 74, ll. 14 and 21 (μάθε δὲ ὅτι ‘and know that’); P. Neph. 8, ll. 4 and 17 (γίνωσκε ‘know’ + accusative-with-infinitive / ὡς); P. Amh. Gr. 2. 145, l. 15 (γνῶθει δὲ ὅτι ‘and know that’); P. Herm. 8, l. 7 (γίγνωσκε ‘know’ + accusative-with-infinitive); P. Cair. Masp. 1. 67066, l. 5 (μανθάνετε + εἰ ‘know if’); SB 20 14241, l. 16 (καταξιώσατε κ(αὶ) ὑμεῖς μαθεῖν + accusative-with-infinitive ‘and you all shall deem it right to know’)

In this corpus, the disclosure formula takes a different form only in P.Cair.Masp. 1. 67060, l. 4 ἵνα τ[ἐ] μάθητε ὅτι (...) ‘and that you may know that’. The letter belongs to the sixth-century archive of Dioscoros of Aphrodito. It is signed off by Menas and addressed to Dioscoros and his father Apollo. The letter concerns payment of a village tax that is apparently late. The disclosure formula appears about half-way through the letter at the point when Menas has described the situation and wants to draw attention to the immediate action required.

The same structure appears several more times in the papyri. Table 7 summarises all the instances in chronological order:

Table 7 Disclosure formula²²

Citation	Passage	Text type	Provenance	Date
P.Cair.Masp. 1. 67060	ll. 4–6 ἵνα τ[ἐ] μάθητε ὅτι εἰ μὴ δι[ὰ τ]ῆς αὔριον ἐξενέγκητέ μοι τὸ μέτρον τοῦ τε ἀστικο(ῦ) καὶ κωμητικο(ῦ) ἐπλήρους, ο[ὐ]κ [ἔχετε] ε[ὐ]χαριστήσαι τῷ πράγματι. ‘You shall know that if you do not pay me your share of the city and village taxes in full tomorrow, you will not be thankful for the matter.’	letter	Antaiopolis	AD 553– 554

²¹ Outside of this letter corpus, οἶδα ‘to know’ is possible, e.g. SB 3 7244, ll. 34–36 ἰδέν[αι] [σ]αι θέλω, ὅτι (...); PSI 12 1259, ll. 4–5 εἰδέναι σε θέλω ὅτι (...) ‘I want you to know that’, both dating from the Roman period.

²² Punctuation is added where sentence particles clarify its location.

P.Laur. 2. 46	ll. 13–15 ἵνα μάθῃ οὖν ὅτι εὐρὼν των λεγόμενον . . . ιτ. (...) ‘You shall know that having found that which was said (...)’	letter	Thelbo	AD 501– 700
P.Oxy. 56.3870	l. 1 ϙ ἵνα μάθῃ ὁ ἐμὸς ἀγαθὸς δεσπότης ὅτι οὐκ αἰμάθαμεν. ‘My good master shall know that we are aware.’	letter	Oxyrhynchos	AD 501– 700
P.Muench. 3.1.130	ll. 25–26 καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι καὶ ὁ σῖτος ὀπίσω ἐστίν. ‘And you shall know that the food is on its way (?)’ ²³	letter	Arsinoites	AD 601– 700
P.Oxy. 16.1867	ll. 13–15 καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐκ ἐν εἴλε/ν ἕως ὅτε ἔλθῃ, δέσπο(τα), καθὼς ἔγραψές μοι ἐχθὲς διὰ πλοῖον. ἵνα μάθῃ/ οὖν, δέσποτα, ὅτι πλοῖον οὐκ ἔνι εἰς τὸν ὄρμον ἡμῶν εἰ μὴ τὰ ἀλιευτικά, δέσπο(τα). ‘And look, he did not have one until you came, master, as you have written to me yesterday from the ship. You shall know, master, that there is no ship for our journey (?) except the fishing boats, master.’	letter	Oxyrhynchos	AD 601– 700
SB. 5.7655	ll. 4–9 καὶ ἵνα μάθητε δὲ . [.] . . . , ὅτι ἐγὼ ὅλα τὰ πράγματά μου ἐπιρίπτω εἰς ὑμᾶς, ἐπειδὴ (...) ‘And you shall know ... that I sort out (?) all my matters concerning you, because (...)’	letter	Hermopolites	AD 601– 700
P. Oxy. 16 1829	ll. 1–7 κατὰ τὴν δεκάτην τ[οῦ παρόντος μηνὸς ἐγράφη] μοι παρὰ τοῦ [μ]εγαλοπρεπεστάτου ἄρχοντος ὅτι (...). καὶ ἵνα οἶδεν ἡ ὑμετέρα ἐξουσία ὅτι οὐκ ἡμελήθη [ἢ] κέλευσις ὑμῶν ἀλλ’ ἐπληρώθη εὐθέως (...) ‘On the 10 th of the present month, I was told by the most illustrious archon that (...). Your power shall know	letter	Oxyrhynchos	AD 577– 583

²³ In the sense of ‘behind / after me’.

	that your order was not ignored but immediately fulfilled (...)’			
P. Oxy. 16 1829	ll. 11–17 κατὰ τὴν δεκάτην τοῦ παρόντος μηνοῦ ἐγράφη μοι παρὰ τοῦ [μεγα]λοπρε[πεστάτου] ἄρχοντος ὡς (...). καὶ ἵνα οἶδεν ἡ ὑμετέρα ὑπεροχὴ [ὅ]τι τοῦ μεγαλοπρ(επεστάτου) ἄρχοντος καταλαβόντος εὐθέως ἡ κέλευσις ὑμῶν ἐγένετο καὶ (...). ‘On the 10 th of the present month, I was contacted by the most illustrious archon because (...). Your power shall know that when the illustrious archon visited, your order was immediately done (...)’	letter	Oxyrhynchos	AD 577– 583

In Table 7, 6 of the 8 instances feature the verb of realising *μανθάνω* ‘to learn’, which always appears in the aorist subjunctive. The variation between the second and third person of the verbal ending is linked to the increasing tendency to address the addressee by means of a title (Bentein 2017a), which can be figurative as in P. Oxy. 16 1829 (Dickey 2004). Porter and Pitts (2013: 430) suggest that *μανθάνω* ‘to learn’ and *ἐπίσταμαι* ‘to know’ are limited to the papyri. While the evidence from the letter corpus presented above shows that the lexical range in the papyri is wider than those two verbs, this would explain the strong preference for *μανθάνω* ‘to learn’ observed in Table 7.

In all the passages in Table 7, *ἵνα* forms a contiguous phrase with the verb. Particles that occupy the second position in the sentence appear after this phrase, e.g. *οὖν* in P.Laur. 2. 46 and P.Oxy. 16.1867, and *δέ* in SB. 5.7655. The only instance in which the *ἵνα*–verb phrase is split is P.Cair.Masp. 1. 67060, where enclitic *τε* intervenes, thus indicating that the phrase is not (yet) treated as a fully discontinuous unit. Unlike apodotic *ἵνα* assessed in Section 6, the disclosure-formula patterns seem to form largely invariable contiguous units. They are akin to Heine et al. (2016: 56–58) formulaic in subordinate clauses, e.g. English *if I may*. Heine et al.’s examples all concern adverbial insubordinates.

Porter and Pitts (2013: 430) suggest a development of the disclosure formula from the imperatival form in the Ptolemaic papyri to the periphrastic form in Roman times.²⁴ This also explains the appearance of the periphrastic form particularly in the literary writings of the New Testament, yet see also NT, Luke 5.23–24 **ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι** ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιεῖναι ἁμαρτίας ‘You shall know that the son of man has power to take away the sins from the world’. As shown above, the imperatival form remains intact well into the early Byzantine period, unlike the periphrastic form. The parallel existence of an imperatival pattern along with the Roman periphrastic containing a complementary infinitive of the verb of realising seem to bolster the interpretation of ἵνα + subjunctive as complement insubordination having a deontic meaning.

The disclosure formula always appears clause-initially. It does not convey a command to the addressee but highlights the piece of information referred to by the embedded clause. The writer is concerned about the addressee’s acceptance of and acting on this piece of information.²⁵ D’Hertefelt (2018: 42) cites the comparable example [15] from Dutch:

[15] **Dat** ge maar weet **dat** ik nu serieus zin heb om op uwe [sic] bakkes te slaan.
 ‘You should know that I seriously feel like punching you in the face right now.’

D’Hertefelt (2018: 43) comments that ‘[w]hile semantically these constructions express an order or a prohibition, pragmatically they are not used to tell the addressee what (not) to do. Rather, they serve to assert or deny the content of the second embedded complement clause’.²⁶ The insubordinate structure signposts the piece of information provided in the embedded clause.

The disclosure formula also bears resemblance to Heine and Kaltenböck’s (2021: 11–13) initial comment clauses, e.g. *I mean*. They list the following characteristics of items / phrases acting at the discourse level, see [16], which they call theticals²⁷:

[16] Theticals

²⁴ There are no classical predecessors. Comparable structures, such as Xenophon, *Anabasis* 1.3.15 (see [10] above) rely on adverbial insubordination, in that a purpose for the speech act (declaration) is provided by the ἵνα clause, as spelled out in e.g. Andocides, *De Mysteriis*, 106 **ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε**, ὧ ἄνδρες, **ὅτι** (...), **βραχέα βούλομαι καὶ περὶ τούτων εἰπεῖν** ‘So you know, gentlemen, that (...), I want to briefly speak about these things’.

²⁵ In conversation-analytical terms, the possibly dispreferred option is elicited from the addressee (Emde Boas 2017: chap. 1).

²⁶ See also Huitink (2010: 30) on Greek specifically.

²⁷ The term parenthetical was used above and is commonly used in studies on (post)classical Greek.

- a. Meaning: Their meaning is not part of the meaning of the sentence they are associated with.
- b. Function: Their function is metatextual.
- c. Syntax: They are not a syntactic constituent of the sentence in which they occur.
- d. Prosody: They are likely to be set off prosodically from the rest of the sentence.
- e. Semantic-pragmatic scope: They have scope over the sentence or beyond the sentence.
- f. Placement: Depending on their discourse function they are flexible in their placement behaviour. (Heine & Kaltenböck 2021: 7)

The disclosure formula meets criteria a, b, and e when ὅτι is present (Heine & Kaltenböck 2021: 11). It does not add meaning to the sentence it is part of but serves a metatextual function, i.e. flagging a piece of information, which acts on the entire sentence. Without ὅτι, criteria c and f may also be met as a syntactic relationship with clause containing the piece of information to be flagged is no longer encoded. Criterion d cannot be assessed due to the type of data.

However, in P.Cair.Masp. 1. 67060, P.Oxy. 16.1867, and SB. 5.7655 cited in Table 7, a complex clause follows ὅτι, in P.Cair.Masp. 1. 67060 a conditional sequence. These instances seem to align with James (2008: 39 n. 125) observation that the disclosure formula is sometimes added like a formulaic chunk. Furthermore, ὅτι can become part of discourse markers, e.g. in the papyri emergent δηλονότι ‘obviously’ (from δηλον ὅτι ‘(it is) obvious that’). As predicted by Kaltenböck and Heine’s (2021) proposal of co-optation, the grammatical dependency relation attached to ὅτι is deleted when the phrase is lifted into the discourse grammar.

The in subordinate structure ἵνα μάθη / μάθητε / μάθης ὅτι ‘know that’ aligns with Heine and Kaltenböck’s (2021: 11–13) initial comment clauses in that syntactic and pragmatic readings are possible. The formula’s frequency of occurrence suggests that the pragmatic reading prevails. The lexical alternant οἶδα ‘to know’ is less frequently attested in the papyri but seems to dominate in the New Testament, such that it may be the more elaborate counterpart. The only instance with a possible deletion of ὅτι is too damaged to be indicative: SB 26 16808, ll. 6–7 ἵνα οὖν ἰδῆτε· καὶ . [-1-2-]. ρος ἀποδημεῖν μέλλει ‘you shall thus know: also ... he will be away from home’ (unknown, AD 201–300, letter).

Independent ἵνα in the disclosure formula is a particle in the sentential core as indicated by data on positioning. The context of the disclosure formula is lexically and syntactically

constrained such that the structure does not affect the non-formulaic syntax outside of the structure – except possibly by analogy.

8 Summary and conclusion

This chapter examined complement insubordination with *ἴνα* in the post-classical papyri (Sections 3). Complement insubordinate *ἴνα* seems to be an innovation of the post-classical period, possibly in line with prospective complement clauses being a development of the post-classical period (Section 2). By contrast, adverbial insubordination appears to be a minor use pattern available with a range of conjunctions, including in conventionalised phrases such as the ‘just so you know phrase’ (Section 4), throughout the history of Greek (cf. Debaisieux, Martin & Deulofeu 2019 on *si tu savais* and *quand je pense*). The classical predecessors of complement insubordination with *ἴνα* are (i) highly infrequent, (ii) limited to a verb in the second person singular, and (iii) express warnings or commands. (ii) and (iii) point to analogy with insubordinate *ὅπως* (Section 3). The chapter focused on the apodosis of the future-open conditional sequence (Section 6) and the disclosure formula (Section 7).

In the apodosis of a future-open conditional sequence, *ἴνα* seems to act as a clause-initial signpost in the form of a discourse marker at the left edge of the clause. In the disclosure formula, *ἴνα* seems to cliticise to the verb as a modal particle. The development of insubordinate *ἴνα* seems context-specific (cf. Vincent & Wheeler 2022). Yet, both patterns seem to be dead ends diachronically speaking (cf. Bentein 2017b), with the future-open apodosis with *ἴνα* appearing in the Ptolemaic and Roman periods, and the disclosure formula in the early Byzantine period.²⁸ Importantly, insubordinate and subordinate uses can co-exist for extended periods of time, as they have in Greek.

For both patterns, most instances come from letters rather than official documents. For the future-open conditional, there is a cluster of instances from the Arsinoite nome (across time periods), for the disclosure formula, just over half of all instances come from Oxyrhynchos. Thus, in both cases, we may wonder whether these are bottom-up changes that are relatively localised (cf. noticeably Pérez Fernández, Gras & Brisard 2022). This stands in stark contrast to parenthetical ‘just so you know’ which appears throughout the history of the language, in literary and non-literary texts, and seems to align with patterns across languages.²⁹

²⁸ Modern Greek deictic *να* is etymologically speaking not derived from the insubordinate (Roussou & Tsangalidis 2010: 56–59; Joseph 1981). Modal *να* is a modal particle. For the repositioning of the stress, see Markopoulos (2009: chap. 4 n. 8).

²⁹ Neither D’Hertefelt’s comparable pattern cited nor German *dass*-clauses construed to align with the future-open conditional based on Panther and Thornburg are equally established.

Both apodotic ἴνα and ἴνα in the disclosure formula primarily act at the discourse level. Apodotic ἴνα is a clause-initial guidepost to direct the interlocutor’s attention to the conditioned event; the disclosure formula as a whole signposts a piece of information as attention-worthy, possibly because the writer is concerned that the addressee will object. ἴνα attains a discourse-structuring function. Lifting ἴνα onto the interpersonal level seems to be due to speaker economy (Patard 2014: 126–128; Claridge & Arnovick 2010; Heine & Kaltenböck 2021).³⁰ Unlike its adverbial insubordinate counterpart, complement insubordinate ἴνα does not comment on the speech act but predicate it. In the two structures discussed, ἴνα serves to make prominent in the discourse the event of the apodosis and the event referred to by the embedded clause in the disclosure formula (von Heusinger & Schumacher 2019).

Acknowledgements

The article was written in the context of the project *Giving gifts and doing favours: Unlocking Greek support-verb constructions* (University of Oxford, 2020–2024), which was funded by the *Leverhulme Trust* (grant n. ECF-2020-181) with the author as the PI.

References

- Barðdal, Jóhanna. 2008. *Productivity: Evidence from case and argument structure in Icelandic*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bartolo, Giuseppina di. 2020. Purpose and Result Clauses: ἴνα-ἡίνα and ὥστε-ἡόστε in the Greek Documentary Papyri of the Roman Period. In Daria Rafiyenko & Ilja Seržant (eds.), *Postclassical Greek: Contemporary Approaches to Philology and Linguistics*, 19–38. Berlin; Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Bartolo, Giuseppina di. 2022. The μὴ ἴνα + subjunctive construction in Greek documentary papyri. *Glotta* 98. 136–147.
- Beeching, Kate. 2016. *Pragmatic Markers in British English: Meaning in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.

³⁰ Especially given its non-paratactic etymology (LSJ s.v. ἴνα A).

- Bentein, Klaas. 2017a. Politeness in pronouns: third-person reference in Byzantine documentary papyri. *Philologus* 161(2). 256–267.
- Bentein, Klaas. 2017b. Δία as a Polysemous Preposition in Early Byzantine Greek: “Dead Ends” and Other Uses in the Qurrah Archive (VIII AD). *Symbolae Osloenses* 91(1). 134–158.
- Bertrand, Nicolas. 2014. On tmesis, word order, and noun incorporation in Homeric Greek. In Annamaria Bartolotta (ed.), *The Greek Verb: Morphology, Syntax, and Semantics (Proceedings of the 8th International Meeting on Greek Linguistics, Agrigento, October 1–3, 2009)*, 11–30. Louvain-la-Neuve and Walpole, MA: Peeters.
- Blanche-Benveniste, Claire. 1984. *Pronom et syntaxe: l’approche pronominale et son application au français*. Paris: Société d’études linguistiques et anthropologiques de France.
- Bonifazi, Anna. 2010. Discourse cohesion through third person pronouns. The case of KEINOΣ and AYTOΣ in Homer. In Stéphanie Bakker & Gerry Wakker (eds.), *Discourse cohesion in Ancient Greek*, 1–19. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Claridge, Claudia & Leslie Arnovick. 2010. Pragmaticalisation and Discursisation. In Andreas Jucker & Irma Taavitsainen (eds.), *Historical Pragmatics*, 165–192. Berlin; Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Crellin, Robert. 2022a. Word-level punctuation in Latin and Greek inscriptions from Sicily of the imperial period. In Philippa Steele & Philip Boyes (eds.), *Writing around the ancient Mediterranean: practices and adaptations*, 195–220. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Crellin, Robert. 2022b. *The semantics of word division in northwest Semitic writing systems: Ugaritic, Phoenician, Hebrew, Moabite and Greek*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Crystal, David. 2008. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (Language Library). 6th edn. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell.
- Davis, Boyd & Margaret Maclagan. 2020. Signposts, Guideposts, and Stalls: Pragmatic and Discourse Markers in Dementia Discourse. In Trini Stickle (ed.), *Learning from the Talk of Persons with Dementia: A Practical Guide to Interaction and Interactional Research*, 63–83. Cham: Springer.
- Debaisieux, Jeanne-Marie. 2004. Les conjonctions de subordination : mots de grammaire ou mots du discours ? Le cas de parce que. *Revue de Sémantique et Pragmatique* (15–16). 51–67.
- Debaisieux, Jeanne-Marie. 2016. Toward a global approach to discourse uses of conjunctions in spoken French. *Language Sciences* 58. 79–94.

- Debaisieux, Jeanne-Marie, Henri-José Deulofeu & Philippe Martin. 2008. Pour une syntaxe sans ellipse. In Michèle Bigot & Jean-Christophe Pitavy (eds.), *Ellipse et effacement. Du schème de phrase aux règles discursives. Actes du colloque international de linguistique, 27 et 28 Octobre 2005*, 225–246. Saint Etienne: Publication de l’université de Saint Etienne.
- Debaisieux, Jeanne-Marie, Philippe Martin & Henry-José Deulofeu. 2019. Apparent insubordination as discourse patterns in French. In Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck & María Sansiñena (eds.), *Insubordination: Theoretical and Empirical Issues*, 349–383. Berlin; Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Deulofeu, Henry-José. 2008. Quel statut pour l’élément QUE en français contemporain ? *Langue française* 158(2). 29–52.
- D’Hertefelt, Sarah. 2018. *Insubordination in Germanic: a typology of complement and conditional constructions*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- D’Hertefelt, Sarah & Jean-Christophe Verstraete. 2014. Independent complement constructions in Swedish and Danish: Insubordination or dependency shift? *Journal of Pragmatics* 60. 89–102.
- Dickey, Eleanor. 2004. Literal and extended use of kinship terms in documentary papyri. *Mnemosyne* 57(2). 131–176.
- Dik, Helma. 1995. *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Emde Boas, Evert van. 2017. *Language and character in Euripides’ Electra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Emde Boas, Evert van, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink & Mathieu de Bakker. 2019. *Cambridge grammar of classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: theoretical and empirical foundations*, 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2022a. Natural language use and bilingual interference: Verbal complementation patterns in post-classical Greek. In Michele Bianchoni, Martha Campano, Domenica Romangno & Francesco Rovai (eds.), *Ancient Indo-European languages between linguistics and philology: Contact, variation, and reconstruction*, 166–195. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Fendel, Victoria. 2022b. *Coptic interference in the syntax of Greek letters from Egypt*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Giorgi, Alessandra. 2016. Epistemic adverbs, the prosody-syntax interface, and the theory of phases. In Christina Tortora, Marcel den Dikken, Ignacio Montoya & Teresa O’Neill (eds.), *Romance Linguistics 2013: Selected papers from the 43rd Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), New York, 17-19 April, 2013*, 99–118. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Goldberg, Adele. 1995. *Constructions: a construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- Gonis, Nikolaos. 2008. Further Letters from the Archive of Apa Ioannes. *The Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 45. 69–85.
- Grevisse, Maurice. 2011. *Le bon usage: grammaire française*. Bruxelles: De Boeck.
- Günthner, Susanne. 2003. Lexical-grammatical variation and development: The use of conjunctions as discourse markers in everyday spoken German. In Klaus von Heusinger, Regine Eckardt & Christoph Schwarze (eds.), *Words in Time: Diachronic Semantics from Different Points of View*, 375–404. Berlin; Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2017. Paratactic because in Ancient Greek as constructional inheritance: A note on causal AGk. ὅτι and ἐπεὶ. In Ivo Hajnal, Daniel Kölligan & Katharina Zipser (eds.), *Miscellanea Indogermanica: Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65. Geburtstag*, 257–263. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2000. Periphrasis. In Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann & Joachim Mugdan (eds.), *Morphologie / Morphology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung / An international handbook on inflection and word-formation*, vol. 1, 654–664. Berlin; Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernd & Gunther Kaltenböck. 2021. From clause to discourse marker: on the development of comment clauses. *Language Sciences* 87. 1–16.
- Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck & Tania Kuteva. 2016. On insubordination and cooptation. In Nicholas Evans & Honoré Watanabe (eds.), *Insubordination*, 39–64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heusinger, Klaus von & Petra Schumacher. 2019. Discourse prominence: Definition and application. *Journal of Pragmatics* 154. 117–127.
- Hulleberg Johansen, Stine. 2021. A Contrastive Approach to the Types of Hedging Strategies Used in Norwegian and English Informal Spoken Conversations. *Contrastive Pragmatics* 2(1). 81–105.
- Hult, Karin. 1990. *Syntactic variation in Greek of the 5th century A.D.*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

- James, Patrick. 2008. *Retention and retreat: complementary participles and infinitives with verbs of perception and declaration in the Roman and Byzantine documentary papyri*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Thesis.
- Jiménez Delgado, José. 2018. Conjunctive adverbs in Ancient Greek: Position and development of conjunctive functions. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 18. 211–240.
- Joseph, Brian. 1981. On the synchrony and diachrony of Modern Greek NA*. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 7. 139–154.
- Kalén, Ture. 1941. *Selbständige Finalsätze und imperativische Infinitive im Griechischen*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2019. Delimiting the class: A typology of English insubordination. In Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck & María Sansinena (eds.), *Insubordination*, 167–198. Berlin; Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Koev, Todor. 2022. *Parenthetical meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kojadinović, Zlatan. 2022. Variation in the prosody of illocutionary adverbs. *Open Linguistics* 8(1). 593–617.
- Kühner, Raphael & Bernhard Gerth. 1894. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache 2: Satzlehre*. Hannover ; Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- Lange, Ludwig. 1872. *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel Ei*. Leipzig: Hirzel.
- Lillo, Antonio. 2021. On the Use of the Oblique Optative Dependent on Verba Dicendi in Herodotus. In Jesus de la Villa, Raquel Fornieles, Luz Conti & Georgios Giannakis (eds.), *Synchrony and Diachrony in of Ancient Greek: Language, linguistics, and philology*, 241–252. Berlin ; Boston: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Loporcaro, Michele. 2022. The morphological nature of person-driven auxiliation. In Adam Ledgeway, John Charles Smith & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Periphrasis and inflexion in diachrony: a view from romance*, 213–237. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mandēlaras, Vasileios. 1973. *The Verb in the Greek Non-literary Papyri*. Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences.
- Markopoulos, Theodore. 2009. *The future in Greek: from ancient to medieval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Panther, Klaus-Uwe & Linda Thornburg. 2011. A case study from German: Emotion and desire in independent complement clauses. In Mario Brdar, Stefan Gries & Milena Žic Fuchs

- (eds.), *Cognitive Linguistics: Convergence and Expansion*, 87–114. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Patard, Adeline. 2014. Réflexions sur l'origine de l'insubordination. Le cas de trois insubordonnées hypothétiques du français. *Langages* 196(4). 109–130.
- Pérez Fernández, Sofia, Pedro Gras & Frank Brisard. 2022. Insubordination and lectal variation: Geographic and discursive variation of subjunctive complement constructions in Spanish. *Ampersand* 9.
- Porter, Stanley & Andrew Pitts. 2013. The Disclosure Formula in the Epistolary Papyri and in the New Testament: Development, Form, Function, and Syntax. In Stanley Porter & Andrew Pitts (eds.), *The Language of the New Testament: Context, History, and Development*, 421–438. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Posner, Rebecca. 1997. *Linguistic change in French*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pusch, Claus. 2017. Bien que en français parle: une conjonction concessive entre grammaire et discours. In Florence Lefeuve & Gaétane Dostie (eds.), *Lexique, grammaire, discours: les marqueurs discursifs*, 325–341. Paris: Honoré Champion éditeur.
- Rijksbaron, Albert. 2006. *The syntax and semantics of the verb in classical Greek: an introduction*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press.
- Roi, Ezra Ia. 2021. The Insubordination of If- and That-Clauses from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek: A Diachronic Constructional Typology. *Symbolae Osloenses* 1–63.
- Roussou, Anna & Anastasios Tsangalidis. 2010. Reconsidering the “Modal Particles” in Modern Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 10. 45–73.
- Ruiz Yamuza, Emilia. 2011. Apodotic uses of adverbs: between syntax and text. In *Linguistics and classical languages: Comunicación en congreso*. Rome.
- Ruiz Yamuza, Emilia. 2020. Insubordination in Ancient Greek? The case of ὅστε sentences. In Martti Leiwo, Marja Vierros & Sonia Dahlgren (eds.), *Papers on Ancient Greek Linguistics Proceedings of the Ninth International Colloquium on Ancient Greek Linguistics (ICAGL 9) 30 August – 1 September 2018, Helsinki*, 383–402. Vaasa: Grano Oy.
- Ruiz Yamuza, Emilia. 2022. Parenthetical conditionals and insubordinate clauses in Ancient Greek: Protasis with βούλομαι (boulomai) and (ἐ)θέλω (ethélō). *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 22(2). 232–259.
- Sansinena, María, Hendrik De Smet & Bert Cornillie. 2015. Between subordinate and insubordinate. Paths toward complementizer-initial main clauses. *Journal of Pragmatics* 77. 3–19.

- Thompson, Sarah, Robert Longacre & Shin Hwang. 2007. Adverbial clauses. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Volume 2: Complex Constructions*, 237–300. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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. 2007. *Rethinking the coordinate-subordinate dichotomy: interpersonal grammar and the analysis of adverbial clauses in English*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Verstraete, Jean-Christophe, Sarah D’Hertefelt & An Van Linden. 2012. A typology of complement insubordination in Dutch. *Studies in Language. International Journal sponsored by the Foundation “Foundations of Language”* 36(1). 123–153.
- Vincent, Nigel & Max Wheeler. 2022. Layering and divergence in Romance periphrases. In Adam Ledgeway, John Charles Smith & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Periphrasis and inflexion in diachrony: a view from romance*, 93–122. Oxford: Oxford University Press.