BRILL

Parenthetical conditionals and insubordinate clauses in Ancient Greek

Protasis with βούλομαι (boúlomai) and (ἐ)θέλω (ethélō)

Emilia Ruiz Yamuza | ORCID: 0000-0003-4016-8097
University of Seville, Seville, Spain
eruiz@us.es

Abstract

The purpose of the article is an in-depth study of the pragmatic and textual functions of several conditional clauses of ancient Greek constructed with verbs meaning "to want". As a prior step, six types of structures are identified applying Thetical Grammar concepts and the idea of insubordination: five of these are parenthetical, and one is insubordinate. The structures work in the domain of speaker/hearer interaction, the domain of text organisation—reformulators and exemplifiers—and the domain of expressing the speaker's attitudes.

Keywords

conditionals – insubordination – parentheticals – pragmatic functions – textual functions

1　Introduction

Conditional clauses have been the subject of recent study from perspectives that allow for even more refinement in the interpretation of cases not integrated into descriptive outlines based on the conditional sentence's use of moods and tenses. As a result, the diversity of pragmatic and textual functions that express these seemingly anomalous examples has been laid bare. These perspectives vary: they have been considered relevant cases of insubordination—the use of apparently subordinate structures for main clause functions. Or they have been listed in the parenthetical class—elements with little

clausal integration that express pragmatic and textual functions. This work aims to evaluate, as completely as possible, the situation of the conditionals that contain a specific type of verb in their protasis: verbs that express the idea of "to want," βούλομαι (*boúlomai*) and (ἐ)θέλω (*ethélō*). This evaluation includes: 1) a highly detailed description of the different varieties, determining whether they are parenthetical or insubordinate structures, differentiating in the first type whether it is a case of a fixed, recurrent or sporadic construction, 2) the determination of their functions within the framework of these two theories and 3) a proposal on the diachronic evolution and the mutual relationships of subtypes.

The paper is organised as follows: Section 1 outlines the theoretical and methodological background of the study, introducing insubordination and Thetical Grammar. Section 2 presents the results of the analysis. Section 3 proposes a hypothesis on the organisation of the structures. Section 4 sets out the conclusions of the study.

1.1   *Preliminaries*

In (1), there is a conditional clause, protasis, which perfectly exemplifies the type of conditionals that are the object of this work.

(1)   Hecuba—*ὁ χρυσός, εἰ βούλοιο τἀληθῆ λέγειν,* | *ἔκτεινε τὸν ἐμὸν παῖδα* (καὶ κέρδη τὰ σά).

ὁ	χρυσός	εἰ	βούλοιο	τἀληθῆ	λέγειν
ho	khrusós	ei	boúloio	tale:thê	légein
ART	gold-NOM	if	want-2SG.OPT	the truth-ACC	tell-INF

ἔκτεινε	τόν	ἐμόν	παῖδα
ékteine	tón	emón	paîda
slay-3SG.AOR	ART	my-ACC	son-ACC

It was the gold, If you would only speak the truth, (*tell the truth please!*), *that slew my son,* (and your greedy spirit)[1] (E. *Hec.* 1206–1207) (Coleridge)

This protasis cannot be considered to express the sufficient and necessary conditions for the fulfilment of an apodosis, which, furthermore, is not even said. Whether the intended speaker, Polymestor, wishes to speak the truth or whether he refuses to do so, the presented reality is that Hecuba's son was slain

---

1   The translations are from the Loeb with minimal modifications. As my examples are long and the context is relevant, I put the context in parentheses without glosses and give the gloss only for the relevant portion. The relevant portions are in italics. I have added paraphrases in parentheses of the functions of the structure when necessary.

for his gold, and in this sense, figuratively, it could be said that it was gold that killed him. The conditional acts on the plane of speaker/hearer interaction and express a mitigated order, *pace* Wakker (1994: 239, 251). The sequence of tenses in the structure also demonstrates the weak integration of the components: optative of possibility without particle versus indicative in past tense referring to an action presented as real.

However, in (2) and (3), the structure comprises protasis and apodosis. The main clause, the apodosis, expresses a directive speech act; it conveys a request. The sequence of moods in the period is indicative + imperative.

(2)   Θη. κἀμοῦ νυν ἀντάκουσον, εἰ βούληι, πάλιν.| -Κη. (κλύοιμ' ἂν οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ δεῖ
       δοῦναι μέρος.)
       κἀμοῦ   νυν   ἀντάκουσον   εἰ βούλει   πάλιν
       kamoû   nun   antákouson   ei boúlei   pálin
       and-my-ACC   PTCL   hear-2SG.IMP if want-2SG.PRS ADV
       Theseus—*Hear me then in reply, if you please.* (Herald—I shall: I can
       hardly refuse you your turn) (E. *Supp.* 569–570) (Kovacs)

(3)   (Θείβαθε γὰρ φυσᾶντες ἐξόπισθέ μου | τἄνθεια τᾶς γλάχωνος ἀπέκιξαν χαμαί). |
       ἀλλ' εἴ τι βούλει, πρίασο (τῶν ἰὼ φέρω, | τῶν ὀρταλίχων ἢ τῶν τετραπτερυλλίδων)
       ἀλλ'   εἰ τι   βούλει   πρίασο
       all'   ei ti   boúlei   príaso
       PTCL   if anything-ACC want-2SG.PRS buy-2SG.IMP
       (All the way from Thebes they've been puffing behind me and blowing
       my pennyroyal blossoms to the ground.) *But if you like, buy* (*please, buy*)
       (some of the goods. of its blossom). (Ar. *Ach.* 868–870) (Henderson)

In these examples, there is no semantic relationship between protasis and apodosis, consisting of the protasis expressing the sufficient and/or necessary condition for the apodosis to occur. Moreover, the protases are entirely dispensable and, at best, have functions within domain of the speaker/hearer interaction.

Conditional clauses such as those in example 1 have recently been analysed in other languages as examples of insubordination. The concept of insubordination—the use of formally subordinate structures for other functions—was introduced by Evans (2007) and has been widely applied to the study of different clausal subtypes, particularly conditional structures and completive constructions. Evans (2007: 386) understood that, despite the formal diversity of the cases, insubordinate structures have functions related to (1) the expression of modal meanings, (2) speaker/hearer interaction, and (3) discourse organisation. As Evans and Watanabe indicate (2016: 1), the concept makes it possible

to refine the idea of constructional meaning and pay attention to the grammar of conversational interaction, amongst other things. The concept has a synchronic, as suggested above, or diachronic dimension, the analysis of how the evolution occurs from a conventional subordinate to an insubordinate-type structure. In Evans' hypothesis, insubordination is produced via a mechanism of ellipsis and conventionalisation of the remaining terms, reinterpreted independently of the elided material. It is not the only existing hypothesis.[2] Conditionals as insubordinates have been the subject of extensive research in Germanic languages by d'Hertefelt (2018), in Spanish by Schwenter (2016ab), and in English by Lastres-López (2018, 2020), to mention just a few of the authors to have studied the subject.

On the other hand, the conditionals in examples 2 and 3 can be considered Extra Clausal Elements (ECCs) (in the terminology of Dik 1997), Parenthetical or Thetical (in the terminology of Thetical Grammar). ECCs are defined by their syntactic and intonational independence, their non-restrictive meaning, their positional freedom and their elliptical character (Kaltenböck et al. 2011: 853). The study of parentheticals is the central aim of Thetical Grammar (TG hereafter). One of these, the class of parentheticals that are adverbial clauses, includes conditional clauses (Petola 1983: 105, 106, 111–113, Kaltenböck 2016: 341–377). Two aspects are particularly important: the study of the functions of theticals and the typology of theticals. Both Dik (1997: 384–407) and later Kaltenböck et al. (Heine et al. 2013: 182) agree that ECCs function at different planes: the speaker-listener interaction, the specification of the speaker's attitudes, the organisation of the discourse and the execution of the discourse. Kaltenböck (2011) adds two more planes: the determination of the sources of information and the knowledge of the world. The analysis of the typology of ECCs takes into account: their internal structure, their locus of insertion and their diachronic evolution. In terms of their diachronic evolution, a distinction is made, according to their degree of conventionalisation, between instantaneous, constructional and formular thetics (Kaltenböck et al. 2011: 874–876). Instantaneous are isolated cases, constructional parentheticals are recurrent schemes, which have schematic structures, and formular parentheticals are invariant structures.

---

2   Van linden et al. (2014: 226–250) consider that speaker/hearer interaction, the dynamics of conversation, is the mechanism that explains the developments. There has also been some reference to intermediate states or structures which are from a similar family to insubordinates, sometimes being referred to as semi-insubordinates, but they fail to ultimately achieve this state as they maintain elements of the main root clause. (Sansiñena 2019).

TG is relevant to the structures studied because it allows the study of cases that cannot be analysed as full insubordination. Some of the cases studied are clearly examples of insubordination, i.e. they are structures which were subordinate but are no longer subordinate and have different functions from the original ones and constitute distinct speech acts. But in other examples the original structure—supraordinate and subordinate—is still present, although the relations of dependence between the two have changed and cannot be defined in semantic terms, nor does it seem sufficient to say that they function on the illocutionary plane. Heine et al. (2016, 2017) and Kaltenböck et al. (2011: 848–893) postulate the concept of cooptation—the spontaneous use of a structure of the sentence grammar as a parenthetical element—to explain the mechanism by which they are created. There are essential points of contact between insubordination and TG and clear overlapping areas, for example, conditionals (Kaltenböck 2016: 372–373). These will be cases of insubordination in the final stage of their evolution when a conventionalised isolated subordinate structure occurs for other purposes. Nevertheless, during the intermediate stages of their evolution, they are an inserted parenthesis. Taking this idea to the limit, Heine et al. (2016)[3] and Kaltenböck (2019: 189) think that insubordinates could be considered a parenthetical subtype.

1.2   *Corpus and parameters*

For this study, I have analysed the Homeric poems, the tragedies of Sophocles and Euripides, the comedies of Aristophanes, and the Platonic dialogues. I have examined the texts with the following methodology: I have discerned those cases where there were no canonical conditional periods and understood them as those in which the protasis expresses a sufficient and/or necessary condition for the fulfilment of the apodosis.[4] It can be summarised by saying that the

---

3 Not just because they understand that they can occur by "cooptation" like parentheticals, but because they are freer from syntactic restrictions and their meanings are redefined by their contexts, and their domain—the discourse—is broader than that of the pure subordinate clause (2016: 43).

4 The definition of Wakker (1994: 50) attempts to be inclusive: "In using the linguistic expression if p, then q (or q, if p) a speaker envisages an SoA that may or may not correspond to reality. Via the subordinate clause if p the speaker puts forward a condition in which the SoA is to be provisionally regarded as having been realised and in which, consequently, the proposition presented in the subordinate clause is to be provisionally regarded as true. This condition specifies the domain of discourse for the predication q, the proposition q or the speech act q, depending on the level of the clause to which the conditional clause is attached." It reflects Ducrot's idea (1972: ch. 6) that the relationship is not always established between the phenomena of reality declared in the clauses but between the respective declarations: the declaration of the conditioner implies the declaration of the conditioned.

structure is not canonical (Wakker 1994: 367) when the realisation of the situation (State of Affairs—SoA) that describes the apodosis does not depend on the condition being met, or that the situation (SoA) of the protasis is reached after the SoA of the apodosis is reached, or that no apodosis exists. I have focused on these structures.

Regarding the host unit, I have taken into account the position of the protasis. I have differentiated between initial, medial, and final positions. I have determined the type of speech act involved, establishing the greatest number of possible distinctions between different speech acts. Thus, within the speech acts related to actions, we find commissives: promises and threats, as well as directives (Risselada 1993: 46–48, Denizot 2011: 24): true orders, offers, invitations, recommendations, and advice. There is a peripheral subtype of directives: acts in which permission to do something is given. In the interrogative speech acts, according to Siemund (2018: 158–228), a difference is made between real questions, questions that do not seek answers ("rhetorical"), questions for keeping the conversation going, for reprimanding, suggesting, greeting, offering, expressing surprise, catching attention, asking, inviting, and apologising. Acts related to emotions are called expressive speech acts (Haverkate 1984: 15, 23, Siemund 2018: 267–300). I have discerned whether they convey surprise, wishes, complaints, regrets, congratulations, and, lastly, greeting and leave-taking formulas. The subtle difference in distinct types of speech acts obeys the fact that it is normally put forward that both insubordinates and parentheticals have a function in speaker/hearer interaction. The speaker's position and his or her intention are unequivocally expressed or reflected in the speech act executed.[5] In addition to this interactive plane, I have determined the existence or not of functions on planes related to the speaker's attitudes: particularly in the domain of subjective epistemic modality and the speaker's commitment to what he or she is saying (Dik [1989] 1997: 242). I have reviewed whether or not the structures were functional in the sources of information plane, i.e. evidentiality. I have also looked at whether they are functional at a pure text-organisation plane, act as closing or opening formulas, introduce a new topic, or specify a term. Finally, I have also considered whether or not the structures function at the discourse-setting plane.[6] Parentheticals, as ECCs, are typically multifunctional. Dik (1997: 383) noted that this multifunctionality

---

5   "At the interpersonal level, the smallest unit is the speech act, as represented by a single (simplex or complex) clause" (Dik 1997: 429).

6   Fuentes (2018), who differentiates between parenthetical declarations and parenthesis (2018: 82), distinguishes functions on the meta-discursive, modal, and argumentative planes, as well as the text-informative structure plane.

manifests itself in two ways: they may have different functions in different contexts of use, while some may simultaneously have several functions in one and the same occurrence. Finally, I have determined whether the structure involved an instantaneous, constructional or formulaic (Kaltenböck, Heine et al. 2011: 871–873) parenthetical via searches on TLG.

I have not dealt with cases where conditional structures are employed to express desire, which are clear examples of insubordination, or elative clauses, which are parenthetical type structures, because they have been already treated by la Roi (2021) and Ruiz Yamuza (2021).

2   Results of the analysis

2.1   *Fixed structures with* (ἐ)θέλω (*ethélō*): *The expression* ἤν θεὸς θέλῃ (*én theós thélēi*) / ἐὰν θεὸς ἐθέλῃ (*eán theós ethélēi*) / εἰ θεὸς ἐθέλοι (*ei theós ethéloi*)

This expression is the first case study. The verb βούλομαι (*boúlomai*) does not appear in this construction.[7] Perhaps the meaning of both verbs makes it impossible.[8] The structure shows some variability. It appears in the subjunctive and only seldom in the optative.[9] It is very infrequent in the plural, and the prevalent form is subjunctive in the third sg. In the *Iliad*, it appears in the epic form αἴ κ᾽ ἐθέλῃσι (*ai k' ethélēisi*). There is an oscillation between the Ionic and Attic forms resulting from the crasis of the conjunction + modal particle: it appears as ἤν (*én*) in Euripides and Aristophanes, and alternatively as ἐάν (*eán*) and ἄν (*án*) in Plato.

In the first documented examples, the verb (ἐ)θέλω (*ethélō*) has two arguments, subject, and object, and the structure is an appendix of a term that has appeared before. Thus, in the following example, it is an appendix to the first possibility πέσωμεν (*pésōmen*). It is outside the framework of the main structure that evaluates two alternatives with the subjunctive of probability, prospective: πέσωμεν (*pesōmen*) vs ἔλθωμεν (*élthōmen*).

---

7   Cf. Allan (2003: 236–242) for the distribution of both forms and their evolution.

8   The LSJ understands that (ἐ)θέλω is wider than βούλομαι, and that in Homer, the former is used in reference to the gods on occasions where the second would have been expected because, for them, "wish is will." Note also Dihle (1982: 20): "during the period when the two verbs βούλομαι and (ἐ)θέλω were still different in meaning, the first signified primarily the planning and reflecting which precedes the action. The second only meant 'to be disposed, to be prepared'."

9   Three times out of five in Aristophanes, with only one optative: *Ra.* 522–523. In Plato, there are two optatives in a total of fifteen examples: Pl. *Lg.* 799e and 845 c–d.

(4)   (ἔνθεν δ' ἂν μάλα πᾶσαν ἐπιφρασσαίμεθα βουλήν | ἤ κεν ἐνὶ νήεσσι πολυκλή-
       ϊσι) *πέσωμεν |αἴ κ' ἐθέλῃσι θεὸς δόμεναι κράτος,* (ἤ κεν ἔπειτα πὰρ νηῶν ἔλθωμεν
       ἀπήμονες.)

       πέσωμεν   αἴ κ'   ἐθέλῃσι   θεὸς
       pésōmen   ai k'   ethélēisi   theòs
       fall-1PL.SBJV if PTCL   want-3SG.SBJV   god-NOM

       (Then we shall take thought of manner of counsel, whether we fall on
       the many-benched ships,) *to see if the god wills to give us victory,* (or shall
       then return unscathed back from the ships) (Hom. *Il.* 13. 741–747) (Murray
       & Wyatt)

In these first examples there is an infinitive—of verbs meaning "give", "con-
cede"—and the infinitive has a subject/agent θεός (*theós*), but quickly the struc-
ture changed and the infinitive is no longer present. Such an absence is linked
to a displacement of the meaning of the verb, which comes to be absolute "to
be the will of". The displacement can be demonstrated because when it is pos-
sible to replace an infinitive from the context, its agent is no longer θεός, but
another:

(5)   (εἵματά τ' ἀμφιέσω πέμψω δέ τοι οὖρον ὄπισθεν, | ὥς κε μάλ' ἀσκηθὴς σὴν
       πατρίδα γαῖαν ἵκηαι), | *αἴ κε θεοί γ' ἐθέλωσι,* (τοὶ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν) |

       αἴ κε   θεοί   γ'   ἐθέλωσι,
       aí ke   theoí   g'   ethélōsi
       if PTCL   gods-NOM   at least want-3PL.SBJV

       (And I will give you clothes to wear. Also I will send a fair wind behind you,
       that all unscathed you may return to your native land), *it be the will of the
       gods* (who hold broad heaven) (Hom. *Od.* 5.168–170) (Murray & Dimock)

The *if*-clause can appear on the right periphery as a Tail. It occurs in this posi-
tion in the four Aristophanes' examples and in the only instance in Euripides.
In Plato, conversely, the distribution is different, with a preference for medial
position[10] occurring on ten occasions, compared to four at the end.[11] In Aristo-
phanes and Plato, its usage is very similar to that of equivalent expressions in
other languages. The religious content and the appeal to the divine will accord-
ing to which the events must unfold permits the displacement to an expressive
speech act. The notional contiguity, practically an implication, between invok-

---

10   In *Phd.* 69d, 80d–e, *Alc.* I.127e, *Hp. Ma.* 286c, *Lg.* 739e, 752a, 778c, 859b, 799e, 841c.
11   In final position in *La.* 201c, *Ion* 530b, *Lg.* 632 e, 688e.

ing the divine will to bring about an event and that this is what the speaker desires, allows the shift of the *if*-clause to an expressive speech act:

(6) Ορ. (ὁδὸν παρ' αὐτήν, ὡς ἔοικ', ἀγροὺς ἔχει.| Πρ. ὅθεν ⟨γ'⟩ ἰδών σε δαιτὶ κοινω-
νὸν καλεῖ.) | Ορ. *πικρόν γε συνθοινάτορ', ἢν θεὸς θέληι.*

πικρόν	γε	συνθοινάτορ',	ἢν	θεὸς
pikrón	ge	sunthoinátor'	én	theòs
bitter-ACC	PTCL	companion in the feast-ACC	IF+PTCL	god-NOM

θέληι
thélēi
want-3SG.SBJV

(Orestes—His fields, it seems, are right next to the road? Old man—Yes, and from there he will invite you to share in his feast.) Orestes—*And an unwelcome fellow feaster I shall prove, if heaven is willing!* (E. *El.* 636–638) (Kovacs)

(7) Βλ. (γέγονας δ' ἀληθῶς, ὡς λέγουσι, πλούσιος;) | Χρ. *ἔσομαι μὲν οὖν αὐτίκα μάλ', ἢν θεὸς θέλη.*

ἔσομαι	μὲν	οὖν	αὐτίκα μάλ	ἢν	θεὸς
ésomai	mèn	oûn	autíka mál'	én	theòs
be-1SG.FUT	PTCL	PTCL	ADV ADV	if+ PTCL	god-NOM

θέλη
thélēi
want- 3SG. SBJV

(Bl.—Have you really grown rich as they say? Ch.—*I shall be soon, if the god wishes it* (*God willing it!*)) (Ar. *Pl.* 346–347) (O'Neill)

In ancient Greek, as in other languages, the protasis of a truncated conditional, an already insubordinate structure,[12] is grammaticalised to express wishes. In Greek, this structure tends to express unfulfilled wishes, whereas in other languages, like Spanish, the assignment is not as defined. It is undoubtedly a structure conveying an expressive function when the verbal mood is synergic: optative for realisable wishes and historical indicative tenses for unrealisable wishes. But the two previous examples are not of this type. The verbal moods are subjunctive with particle. They express probability, a notion of the domain

---

12   "If only I were rich …", without wishing to be exhaustive: Lastres-López (2018: 42). In ancient Greek the question has been dealt with by Ruiz Yamuza (2021: 291–297) and la Roi in the framework of an extensive diachronic study of the insubordination of *if*- and *that*-clauses (2021: 10–22).

of epistemic modality. Thus it is the structure itself, whose formal face is εἴ + subjunctive with particle (ἐ)θέλω + θεός ((e)thélō + theós), that has this function, not the verbal mood.

The structure is fixed; it is formulaic.[13] This is not its sole function: in many examples,[14] there is no perception that the referential religious content is still latent and constitutes an expressive speech act, a wish. Rather it is a courtesy formula for replying to an invitation or a leave-taking formula. It, therefore, has a function in the domain of text organisation. In the field of normative politeness, it acts as a ritualised incipient formula that is added as a postscript to commissive or prospective acts and which constitute a courteous act. But, moreover, it has other content: it indicates that the speaker's commitment to the realisation of a state of affairs, which shall take place in the future and is considered favourable, is not absolute. It introduces an element of reasonable doubt that removes the commitment to future action from the speaker's sphere and can be interpreted as a mitigating element from its apotropaic nature. It thus expresses a content similar to that of a subjective epistemic modality satellite.

The most significant number of examples comes from Platonic texts. The two below illustrate, furthermore, their formulaic character. In *Laches*, Socrates ends the dialogue responding to Lysimachus's invitation to his house the following day to continue debating the matter. The protasis is part of the answer and acts as a leave-taking formula:

(8) (ΛΥ. αὔριον ἕωθεν ἀφίκου οἴκαδε καὶ μὴ ἄλλως ποιήσῃς, ἵνα βουλευσώμεθα περὶ αὐτῶν τούτων, τὸ δὲ νῦν εἶναι τὴν συνουσίαν διαλύσωμεν. ΣΩ. Ἀλλὰ ποιήσω, ὦ Λυσίμαχε, ταῦτα,) καὶ ἥξω παρά σὲ αὔριον, ἐὰν θεὸς ἐθέλῃ.

ἥξω	παρὰ	σὲ	αὔριον	ἐὰν	θεὸς
Héxō:	parà	sè	aúrion	eàn	theòs
go-1SG.FUT	PREP	you-ACC	tomorrow	if+PTCL	god-NOM

---

13   The total number of Platonic examples is fifteen—thirteen in the subjunctive and two in the optative. In the authors studied, the structure appears in five examples in Aristophanes and in two in Euripides. It does not appear in Sophocles.

14   This does not mean that in Platonic texts such as *Phaedo* 69d and 80d in the mouths of characters who are vigorously defending theistic positions, it is not possible to maintain primary referential content: *Phd.* 80d–e "On the other hand the soul then, the invisible part which makes its way to another place of that kind, noble, pure and invisible: Hades in the true sense, to be with the good and wise god where, if the god wills it, my soul too must go directly—will this soul of ours, being naturally of such a kind, be immediately dispersed and destroyed when it is separated from the body, as most people say?" (Emlyn-Jones & Preddy). It is a sequence that constitutes an explicit parenthesis demonstrated by the backtracking of *soul* (ψυχή) through the means of *this soul of ours* (αὐτή).

ἐθέλῃ
ethélēi
want-3SG.SBJV
(Lysimachus—Come to my house tomorrow at daybreak; be sure not to
fail, and then we shall consult on this very matter. For the present, let us
break up our meeting). Socrates—*I will not fail, Lysimachus, to come to
you tomorrow, god willing.* (Pl. *La.* 201b–c) (Lamb)

In *Hippias*, it appears at the beginning of the dialogue, also in reply to an
invitation. The sophist Hippias has proposed that Socrates attend a public per-
formance he is going to give in two days, with the latter responding using the
formula:

(9)   Ἀλλὰ ταῦτ' ἔσται, ἂν θεὸς θέλῃ, ὦ Ἱππία.
      ἀλλὰ   ταῦτ'   ἔσται   ἂν   θεὸς   θέλῃ
      allà   taût'   éstai   án   theòs   thélēi
      PTCL that-ACC be-3SG.FUT. PTCL god-NOM want-3SG.SBJV
      Well, that shall be done, god willing, Hippias (Pl. *Hp. Ma.* 286c) (Lamb)

In all cases, it can be omitted without the occurrence of ungrammaticality or
semantic imprecision. It is perfectly dispensable. Due to its stability, it is a for-
mulaic parenthetical structure. It has functions in the domain of the expression
of the speaker's attitude, constituting an expressive speech act, in the text struc-
ture domain constituting a closing formula, and in the domain of epistemic
modality, conveying a subjective modality content.

2.2   *Constructional parenthetical structures in 2SG/2PL indicative or subjunctive with particle, in direct directive speech acts*

I turn now to examples in which the parenthesis acts as a politeness marker,
specifically εἰ (ἐ)θέλεις (*ei (e)théleis*), εἰ βούλῃ (*ei boúlēi*), ἐὰν βούλῃ (*eàn boúlḗi*),
ἐὰν βούλει (*eàn boúlei*), εἰ βούλεσθε (*ei boúlesthe*), ἐὰν βούλησθε (*eàn boúlēsthe*)
This group of examples occurs when the host unit contains a verb in the imper-
ative. Considering the type of speech act, directive, in many cases a precise
order, or a recommendation, a piece of advice for others, it would only be fit-
ting to suppose that it expresses one of the "conditions of happiness" of the
fulfilment of the order. However, this does not exhaust the description. The pro-
tasis is, as occurs in other languages, such as *s'il te plaît* in French, *si us plau* in
Catalan, a polite form, equivalent to *please* in English, *por favor* in Spanish. The
following is a prototypical example:

(10) *εἰ γὰρ θέλεις, δίδαξον ἀνθ' ὅτου τανῦν | αἴσχιστα πάντων ἔργα δρῶσα τυγχάνεις, (|ἥτις ξυνεύδεις τῷ παλαμναίῳ, μεθ' οὗ | πατέρα τὸν ἀμὸν πρόσθεν ἐξαπώλε-σας, | καὶ παιδοποιεῖς, τοὺς δὲ πρόσθεν εὐσεβεῖς | κἀξ εὐσεβῶν βλαστόντας ἐκβαλοῦσ' ἔχεις)*

εἰ	γὰρ	θέλεις	δίδαξον	ἀνθ'	αἴσχιστα	πάντων
ei	gàr	théleis	dídaxon	anth'	aískhista	pántōn
if	PTCL	want-2SG.PRS	tell-2SG.IMP	PREP	shameless-ACC	all-GEN.

ἔργα	δρῶσα	τυγχάνεις,
érga	drɔ̃sa	tunkháneis
deeds-ACC	do-PTCP	AUX-2SG.PRS

Electra—*For tell me, if you please, (for tell me, please)* (what crime it is that you requite by doing the most shameless deeds of all: sharing your bed with that blood-guilty one, with whom you first destroyed my father and now bear his children while you have cast out the earlier born, the pious offspring of a pious marriage?) (S. *El.* 584–590) (Jebb)

The *if*-clause is, in general, a formula of mitigation because it introduces the will, the consent of the hearer in the domain of the order.[15] However, as occurs frequently, it can be used ironically in the context of total confrontation as an example of hyper-politeness (Watts 2005: xliv). This is what precisely happens in the above example, in *Electra* 548–590 in the tense confrontation between Electra and her mother, Clytemnestra.

There is also a similar formula in Latin, *sis*, which comes from a sister structure, *si vis*, via phonological reduction. The meanings of the formula have been the subject of extensive debate in recent years.[16] Ancient Greek fails to reach the state of grammaticalisation/ pragmaticalisation that Latin shows because there is no reduction of the components.

The origins of the use are in Homer. The pseudo-protasis is utilised in different speech acts: there is an offer in the *Iliad*, 14.337. The temporal sequence is significant: the verb in the host unit should be in the present tense. In permissions, conversely, if expressed, the pseudo-protasis must contain a future reference. All of them, both the sequences in which a pseudo-protasis precedes, and those in which it follows, arise from illocutionary conditionals, which express

---

15 Wakker (1994: 264) considers them illocutionary conditionals, "often added purely for the sake of politeness". Cf. Wakker (1994: 236–256) for the various pragmatic effects of propositional and illocutionary if-clauses.

16 Dickey (2019), aware of not being able to account for all usages as politeness or as ironic politeness, hyper-politeness, presents the hypothesis that it functions as a focalising particle.

the condition for the appropriateness of the speech act currently performed by the speaker (Wakker 1994:269)

(11) *ἀλλ' εἰ δή ῥ' ἐθέλεις (καί τοι φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ,) | ἔστιν τοι θάλαμος, (τόν τοι φίλος υἱὸς ἔτευξεν | Ἥφαιστος, πυκινὰς δὲ θύρας σταθμοῖσιν ἐπῆρσεν.)*
    εἰ   δή   ῥ'   ἐθέλεις   ἔστιν   τοι   θάλαμος
    ei dé   rh'   ethéleis   éstin   toi   thálamos
    if PTCL PTCL want-2SG.PRS be-3SG:PRS you-DAT chamber-NOM
    If you really are so minded, (and it is your heart's pleasure), *there is a chamber* (that your dear son Hephaestus fashioned for you, fitting strong doors to the door post) (Hom. *Il.* 14.337–339) (Murray & Wyatt)

The beginning of the displacement is already observable in the Homeric poems. The position in the following example is also significant: pseudo-protasis follows pseudo-apodosis (Wakker 1995:60). It must be separated by commas, as edited by West, thus reflecting its parenthetical character. Moreover, it has scope over both κατακοιμηθήτω (*katskoimēthḗtō*) and ἕπηται (*hépētai*). It introduces mitigation to the third-person imperative and converts the order into an invitation.

(12) *Φοῖνιξ (δ' αὖθι παρ' ἄμμι μένων) κατακοιμηθήτω | ὄφρά μοι (ἐν νήεσσι) φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἕπηται | αὔριον, ἢν ἐθέλησιν·(ἀνάγκηι δ' οὔ τί μιν ἄξω.)* (West)
    Φοῖνιξ   κατακοιμηθήτω   ὄφρά   μοι   φίλην
    Phoînix   katakoimēthḗtō   óphrá   moi   phílēn
    Phoenix-NOM laydown-2SG.IMP that   me-DAT   dear-ACC
    πατρίδ'   ἕπηται   αὔριον   ἢν   ἐθέλησιν
    patríd'   hépētai   aúrion   èn   ethélēisin
    land-ACC follow-3SG.SBJV tomorrow   if+PTCL want-3SG.SBJV
    But let Phoenix (remain here with us and) *sleep, so that he may follow with me* (on my ships) *to my dear native land on the morrow, if he wishes,* (but by force I will not take him) (Hom. *Il.* 9.427–429) (Murray & Wyatt)

The consolidation of the structure has already occurred in the texts of Sophocles,[17] through the well-known process of subjectification and intersubjectification, considering the respective positions of speaker and hearer:[18]

---

17 In two (*E.* 584 and *Ph.* 730–731) of the four examples of non-canonical conditionals with ἐθέλω (*Ai.* 1393–1397; *OT* 343).

18 In Traugott's (2010: 35) words: "Subjectification and intersubjectification are the mechanisms by which: (a) meanings are recruited by the speaker to encode and regulate attitudes

(13) Νε. ἕρπ’, εἰ θέλεις. (τί δή ποθ’ ὧδ’ ἐξ οὐδενὸς | λόγου σιωπᾷς κἀπόπληκτος ὧδ’ ἔχῃ;)

ἕρπ’	εἰ θέλεις
hérp’	ei théleis
come on-2SG. IMP	if want-2SG. PRS

Neoptolemus. *Come on, if you please*, (*come on, please*). (Why so silent with no apparent cause? And why are you paralysed?) (S. *Ph.* 730–731) (Jebb)

Only the verb βούλομαι, save for error or omission, appears in this function in Platonic texts; the verb (ἐ)θέλω is not documented. This construction constitutes 14.2%[19] of those occasions where a conditional of βούλομαι is not canonical. An archetypal example is the following, which has, furthermore, the peculiarity of forming part of a parenthetical structure in which the speaker interrupts himself in order to question a listener whom he imagines, or sees, about to interrupt his discourse.

(14) (ΣΩ. ἅμα δὲ ἐκλείποντος τοῦ ἀναψύχοντος τὸ σῶμα ἀπόλλυταί τε καὶ τελευτᾷ· ὅθεν δή μοι δοκοῦσιν αὐτὸ "ψυχὴν" καλέσαι.) *εἰ δὲ βούλει—ἔχε ἠρέμα·* (δοκῶ γάρ μοί τι καθορᾶν πιθανώτερον τούτου)

εἰ δὲ	βούλει	ἔχε	ἠρέμα·
ei dè	boúlei	ékhe	ēréma
if but	want-2SG.PRS	keep-2SG.IMP	still-ADV

(and when this revivifying force fails, the body perishes and comes to an end therefore, I think, they called it ψυχή.) But—*please keep still a moment.* (I fancy I see something which will carry more conviction) (Pl. *Cra.* 399e–400a) (Fowler)

(15) Ἀλλ’ οὕτω ποίει, (φάναι τὸν Ἐρυξίμαχον), *εἰ βούλει·* (Σωκράτη ἐπαίνεσον.)

ἀλλ’	οὕτω	ποίει	εἰ	βούλει
all’	hoútō	poíei	ei	boúlei
PTCL	ADV	do-2SG.IMP	if	want-2SG. PRS

"Well, *do that if you like*," (said Eryximachus; "praise Socrates") (*"please, do that", praise Socrates*) (Pl. *Smp.* 214d) (Fowler)

---

and beliefs (subjectification) and (b) once subjectified, may be recruited to encode meanings centred on the addressee (intersubjectification)."

19 With βούλει in: *Cra.* 399d–400a, *Smp.* 214d, *Grg.* 448c, *Men.* 71d, *Hp. Ma.* 291c, 295b, *Hp. Mi.* 369c, *Prt.* 333c. Βούλῃ appears in *Smp.* 214e; *Prt.* 348 a. Both forms βούλει and βούλῃ are alternatives for 2SG. indicative. In the plural, it appears in the indicative in *Prt.* 317 a.

In all cases but one (*Prt.* 317c)[20] there is an imperative in the second person in the supposed apodosis. The protasis has a formulaic character: it mitigates the order and indicates the speaker's interest regarding its fulfilment. Such a function becomes perceivable when οὕτω ποίει, εἰ βούλει (*hoúto: poíei, ei boúlei*) from *Smp.* 214d is compared with the bare imperative from *Phdr.* 272d Καὶ σύ γε οὕτω ποίει (*kaì sú ge hoútō poíei*). Both imperatives appear in the listener's reactions to a pseudo-promise of Alcibiades—to not laud anyone in the presence of Socrates—and in Socrates' question to Phaedrus about whether he should introduce another aspect into the discussion and play devil's advocate. Eryximachus' answer favours a line of argument implicit in what has been previously set out, whereas Phaedrus' response is limited to granting permission for making the defence.

In all cases except two (*Smp.* 214d, 214e), the *if*-clause precedes the imperative and is in the left margin. No case of hyper-politeness is observed. The structure is recurrent, a constructional parenthetical with a function in the domain of speaker/hearer interaction as a politeness marker.

2.3 Constructional parentheticals in 2SG/2PL indicative or subjunctive without an infinitive, with semantic displacement, conveying an interactive and textual function

The combination of interactive and textual function is very well documented in Platonic texts with a percentage of 41.5% of the total of examples.[21] There is an appeal to the hearer whose agreement, conformity, is sought and which, in turn, gives cause for continuing reasoning and thus occurs on the interactive plane, and is a way of introducing a new argument; it has a function on the textual plane. It acts as an element that contributes to creating momentary common ground, from which the reasoning is constructed. Following Brown & Levinson (1987 [1978]:117), it is possible to identify with the seventh strategy of politeness, which consists of presupposing or asserting an element as a shared domain. In the following example, two of the characteristics can be observed that permit the identification of the function: the dislocation between the verb tenses of the structure and the host unit: βούλει (*boúlei*) vs κεχρήμεθ' (*kekhrḗmetha*) and the change of person: second singular vs inclusive first plural.

---

20 The verb is in the indicative. The formula is used to ask permission. Pl. *Prt.* 317c.

21 Βούλει (*boúlei*) appears in thirty-two occurrences: *Euthphr.* 9d; *Grg.* 501d, 522d; *Cra.* 408d; *Tht.* 183 a, 196e; *Men.* 92d; *Alc.1* 106c; *R.* 429d; *Chrm.* 172c; *La.* 188c, 194c; *Prt.* 331c (two); *Phlb.* 23c, 28c, 33 a, 53 a; *S.* 251e. Βούλῃ (*boúlēi*) in *Euthd.* 6c; *Phd.* 96 a; *Cra.* 426 a; *Hp. Mi.* 368; *R.* 430c. With the plural forms, with βούλεσθε (*boúlesthe*) in *Smp.* 176e, 199a–b; *Lg.* 667 a, 683 a; with *βούλησθε* (*boúlēsthe*) in *La.* 179e; *Prt.* 347e; *Lg.* 632e, 688d.

(16) *εἰ δὲ βούλει, καὶ νῦν ἐν τῷ παρόντι κεχρήμεθ' αὖ τῷ "ἀγνοεῖν"* (τε καὶ "συνιέναι," ὡς προσῆκον αὐτοῖς χρῆσθαι εἴπερ στερόμεθα ἐπιστήμης.)

εἰ	δὲ	βούλει	καὶ	νῦν	ἐν	τῷ	παρόντι
ei	dè	boúlei	kaí	nûn	en	tôi	parónti
if	PTCL	want-2SG.PRS	and	now	PREP	the-DAT.	moment-DAT

κεχρήμεθ'	τῷ	ἀγνοεῖν
kekhrémetha	tô:i	agnoeîn
use-1PL.PRF	the-DAT	be ignorant-INF

and at this very moment, if you please, (if you agree) (we have again used the terms "be ignorant" and "understand," as though we had any right to use them if we are deprived of knowledge) (Pl. *Tht*. 196e) (Fowler)

There is a semantic shift—βούλομαι (*boúlomai*) is now a verb of opinion, not will—which adds to the difference of the time reference, simple present compared with the temporal complexity of the perfect tense. Furthermore, the verb does not appear construed with the infinitive. The semantic shift of the verb βούλομαι (*boúlomai*) is demonstrated in the following Platonic text, in which it appears as an alternative to δοκεῖ (*dokeî*):

(17) *Μή μοι,* (ἦν δ' ἐγώ) *οὐδὲν γὰρ δέομαι τὸ "εἰ βούλει" τοῦτο καὶ "εἴ σοι δοκεῖ"* (ἐλέγχεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐμέ τε καὶ σέ· τὸ δ' "ἐμέ τε καὶ σέ" τοῦτο λέγω, οἰόμενος οὕτω τὸν λόγον βέλτιστ' ἂν ἐλέγχεσθαι, εἴ τις τὸ "εἴ" ἀφέλοι αὐτοῦ)

μή	μοι	οὐδὲν	γὰρ	δέομαι	τὸ	εἰ βούλει
mḗ	moi	oudèn	gàr	déomai	tò	ei boúlei
NEG	I-DAT	NEG	PTCL	need-1SG.PRS	the-NOM	if want-2SG.Prs

τοῦτο	καὶ	εἴ σοι	δοκεῖ
toûto	kaì	eí soi	dokeî
this-NOM	and	if you-DAT	agree-3SG.PRS

No, no, I said; *I do not want this "if you like" or "if you agree" sort of thing* (to be put to the proof, but you and me together; and when I say "you and me" I mean that our statement will be most properly tested if we take away the "if.") (Pl. *Prt*. 331c–d) (Lamb)

I must insist on the fact that there is no complete conditional period. In effect, for example, in *Tht*. 196e = ex. 16, it cannot be said that the clause of εἰ is the sufficient condition of that of κεχρήμεθα, although an elided apodosis can be reconstructed: "If you agree, it can be said that …". But it is not always possible to replace it easily. In many cases, it is frankly impossible, see ex. 18 and 19:

(18) *Καὶ τιθῶμέν γε αὐτοὺς λέγειν, εἰ βούλει, (πρῶτον μηδενὶ μηδὲν μηδεμίαν δύναμιν*
       ἔχειν κοινωνίας εἰς μηδέν)
       κ_αὶ   τιθῶμέν   γε   αὐτοὺς   λέγειν   εἰ   βούλει
       kaì   tithȏmen   ge   autoús   légein   ei   boúlei
       and   let-1Pl.SBJV PTCL   they-ACC   say-INF   if   want-2SG.PRS
       And let us, *if you please, (if you agree)* assume (that they say first that noth-
       ing has any power to combine with anything else) (Pl. *Sph.* 251 e) (Fowler)

(19) *(ὥστε τούτου μὲν ἀφίημί σε, ὦ Εὐθύφρων)·εἰ βούλει, πάντες αὐτὸ ἡγείσθων θεοὶ*
       ἄδικον (καὶ πάντες μισούντων).
       εἰ   βούλει   πάντες   αὐτὸ   ἡγείσθων   θεοὶ
       ei   boúlei   pántes   autò   hēgeísthōn   theoí
       if   want.2SG.PRS   all-NOM   it-ACC think-3PL.IMP gods-NOM
       (Consequently, I'm letting you off this one, Euthyphro). *If you like, (if you*
       agree) let all the gods consider it unjust (and all hate it.) (Pl. *Euthphr.* 9d)
       (Emlyn-Jones and Preddy)

This third type usually appears in a medial position on eighteen occasions. In
initial position, it appears on seven occasions, and on the right periphery it
occurs seven times. The verb of the host unit tends to appear in the exhorta-
tive subjunctive (eight occasions), in third person singular or plural imperative
(five occasions). Second-person imperatives only occur on two occasions. On
the remaining occasions, the verb is indicative or, more frequently, does not
appear.

    This type of *if*-clause is a recurrent parenthetical that has functions on both
the plane of speaker/hearer interaction and of establishing the text, to the
extent that it contributes to the introduction of a new topic that advances the
argument.

2.4   *Instantaneous parentheticals in 2SG or 2PL, without infinitive, with*
meta-textual function

These structures are very similar to the preceding ones, from which they dif-
fer by their scope, in other words, the anchor to which they attach themselves.
It must be borne in mind that in other languages, there are fixed expressions
of the comment-clause type such as "if you want", "if you allow me", which,
arising in the context of verbs of "saying," develop metalinguistic functions as
in (a):

a)   This is the fundamental philosophical fact, the grundrisse if you will of
       our enterprise (Brinton 2008:165)

or of general mitigators as in (b):

b)   This is similar, if you will, to the accounting and engineering professions, which have peer review processes (Brinton 2008: 166)

In this way, they express the opinion of the speaker that the term they accompany is imprecise or may be inappropriate or unusual. The effect they have is to achieve the sanction of the hearer for using a determined expression. They act as epistemic mitigators and also imply subjectification and intersubjectification processes, going from implying "if you want—to call it that" to "if we want—to call it that".

In Ancient Greek, we find few examples of this metalinguistic function in Brinton's terminology, and those that exist are in Plato.

(20) (Ἁπλοῦν τό γ' ἐμόν, ὦ Νικία, περὶ λόγων ἐστίν,) εἰ δὲ βούλει, οὐχ ἁπλοῦν ἀλλὰ διπλοῦν·(καὶ γὰρ ἂν δόξαιμί τῳ φιλόλογος εἶναι καὶ αὖ μισόλογος)

εἰ   δὲ   βούλει   οὐχ   ἁπλοῦν   ἀλλὰ   διπλοῦν
ei dè   boúlei   oukh haploûn   allà   diploûn
if PTCL want-2SG.PRS NEG single-NOM but   double-NOM
(I have but a single mind, Nicias, in regard to discussions), *or if you like, a double rather than a single one*. (For you might think me a lover, and yet also a hater, of discussions) (Pl. *La*. 188c) (Lamb)

One can be more precise and label this function as reformulation. This is a very well documented operation in Plato (Verano Liaño 2016, 2017). In any event, there are very few examples.[22] The bridging context may well have been the presence next to the structure of reformulators such as μᾶλλον:

(21) (Πάντα τὰ νῦν ὄντα ἐν τῷ παντὶ διχῇ διαλάβωμεν), μᾶλλον δ', εἰ βούλει, τριχῇ.

μᾶλλον   δ'   εἰ βούλει   τριχῇ
mâllon d'   ei boúlei   trikhễi
rather   PTCL if want-2SG.PRS three-DAT
(Let us divide all things that now exist in the universe into two), *or rather if you please, three classes* (Pl. *Phlb*. 23c) (Fowler)

It is a parenthetical that has functions on both the interaction and textual organisation planes.

---

22   As well as the two mentioned, Pl. *Theait*. 183 a.

2.5 *Constructional parenthetical in the second person singular or plural, without infinitive, with text organisation function*

Another function, in contrast, is better documented: it introduces a new element in a series instead of expressing metalinguistic content. Rather than correcting, it exemplifies.

(22) (Τί οὖν δή; οὐκ οἴει τοῦτο σεμνόν τι εἶναι γνῶναι, ὅπη ποτὲ ὀρθῶς ἔχει ἐκεῖνον τὸν ποταμὸν Ξάνθον καλεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ Σκάμανδρον;) *εἰ δὲ βούλει, περὶ τῆς ὄρνιθος ἣν λέγει ὅτι*—(χαλκίδα κικλήσκουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δὲ κύμινδιν,—φαῦλον ἡγῇ τὸ μάθημα ὅσῳ ὀρθότερόν ἐστι καλεῖσθαι χαλκὶς κυμίνδιδος τῷ αὐτῷ ὀρνέῳ;)

εἰ	δὲ	βούλει	περὶ	τῆς	ὄρνιθος	ἣν
ei	dè	boúlei	perì	tễs	órnithos	hḗn
if	PTCL	want-2SG.PRS	PREP	the-GEN	bird-GEN	REL-ACC

λέγει	ὅτι
légei	hóti
say-3SG.PRS	that

(Well, do you not think this is a grand thing to know, that the name of that river is rightly Xanthus, rather than Scamander?) *Or, if you like, (for example) about the bird which he says* ("gods call chalcis, but men call cymindis", do you think it is a slight thing to learn that it is much more correct for the same bird to be called chalcis than cymindis?) (Pl. *Cra.* 392 a) (Fowler)

The structure introduces a new case in a series of related elements, a sub-topic. It appears alone, in parenthesis, and it is not possible to recover any pseudo-apodosis from the context. The host unit in which it is inserted conveys a direct or indirect assertive speech act. In the previous example, it is the preamble of a biased question that is the continuation of another that was also biased. Both are polar questions. But it is not the only type of speech act of the host unit, there are also expressive ones (Wakker 1994: 256):

(23) (Νὴ τὴν Ἥραν, καλή γε ἡ καταγωγή, ἥ τε αὖ πηγὴ χαριεστάτη ὑπὸ τῆς πλατάνου ῥεῖ μάλα ψυχροῦ ὕδατος, ὥστε γε τῷ ποδὶ τεκμήρασθαι.) (..) *εἰ δ' αὖ βούλει, τὸ εὔπνουν τοῦ τόπου ὡς ἀγαπητὸν καὶ σφόδρα ἡδύ.*

εἰ	δ'	αὖ	βούλει	τὸ	εὔπνουν	τοῦ
ei	d'	aû	boúlei	tó	eúpnoun	toû
if	PTCL	PTCL	want-2SG.PRS	the-NOM	breeziness-NOM	the-GEN

τόπου	ὡς	ἀγαπητὸν	καί	ἡδύ
tópou	hōs	agapētòn	kaì	hēdú
place-GEN	how	lovely-NOM	and	sweet-NOM

(By Hera, it is a charming resting place. For this plane tree is very spreading and lofty, and the tall and shady willow is very beautiful, and it is in full bloom, so as to make the place most fragrant; then, too, the spring is very pretty as it flows under the plane tree, and its water is very cool, to judge by my foot.) (…)*Then again, if you please, (for example) how lovely and perfectly charming the breeziness of the place is!*) (Pl. *Phdr.* 230b–c) (Fowler)

The type is well represented in Plato. Except for one case,[23] it only occurs with the verb βούλομαι (*boúlomai*). It comprises 35% of the examples in the non-canonical forms.[24] Furthermore, I suggest that the famous example in *Antigone* in which Creon complains about the seers and those who oppose him represents a transition from the interactive/textual function to this same type, more textual than interactive:

(24) (ὦ πρέσβυ, πάντες ὥστε τοξόται σκοποῦ | τοξεύετ' ἀνδρὸς τοῦδε, κοὐδὲ †μαντικῆς | ἄπρακτος ὑμῖν εἰμι· τῶν δ' ὑπαὶ γένους† | ἐξημπόλημαι κἀκπεφόρτισμαι πάλαι. κερδαίνετ',) *ἐμπολᾶτε τἀπὸ Σάρδεων* | *ἤλεκτρον, εἰ βούλεσθε, καὶ τὸν Ἰνδικὸν* | *χρυσόν·* (τάφῳ δ' ἐκεῖνον οὐχὶ κρύψετε, | οὐδ' εἰ θέλουσ' οἱ Ζηνὸς αἰετοὶ | βορὰν | φέρειν νιν ἁρπάζοντες ἐς Διὸς θρόνους)

ἐμπολᾶτε	τἀπὸ	Σάρδεων	ἤλεκτρον	εἰ	βούλεσθε	καὶ
empolâte	t'apò	Sárdeōn	élektron	ei	boúlesthe	kaì
deal-2PL.IMP	the-PREP	Sardis-GEN	gold-ACC	if	want-2PL.PRS	and

τὸν	Ἰνδικὸν	χρυσόν
tòn	Indikōn	khrusón
the-ACC	of India-ACC	gold-ACC

(Old man, you all shoot your arrows at me, like archers at their mark, and I am not safe even from the plottings of the seer's divine art, but by their tribe I have long been bought and sold and made their merchandise. Turn your profits,) *make your deals for the white gold of Sardis and the gold of*

---

23   Pl. *R.* 596 a Θῶμεν δὴ καὶ νῦν ὅτι βούλει τῶν πολλῶν. οἷον, εἰ 'θέλεις, πολλαί πού εἰσι κλῖναι καὶ τράπεζαι. "In the present case, then, let us take any multiplicity you please; for example, there are many couches and tables." (Shorey). In this example, of the two verbs, βούλομαι and ἐθέλω, only the second one is relevant. It is one of the few cases in Plato where the verb ἐθέλω appears in non-canonical conditional structures. Probably, as one of the reviewers suggests, it appears because there is already another βούλει in the sentence.

24   In total twenty-seven examples. Βούλει appears in: *Cra.* 392 a, 407d, 408 e (two), 427b, *Tht.* 208d, *Prm.* 136 a, 209 e, *Phdr.* 230c, *Prt.* 320 a, *Men.*71e (two), 72 a (two), 73c, 94 a, *Grg.*503e, *Hp. Ma.* 282c, *Hp. Mi.* 295d, 301 a, *R.* 425d, 432 a. Βούλῃ in: *Grg.* 472 a (two), 472b. In the plural, βούλεσθε in *Smp.* 220d–e, *Th.* 129 a.

India, if it pleases you, (*for example*) (but you shall not cover that man with a grave, not even if the eagles of Zeus wish to snatch and carry him to be devoured at the god's throne) (S. *Ant.* 1033–1041) (Jebb)

In platonic texts, the positions it occupies are initial or medial, with balanced distribution. It tends to be accompanied by δέ (*dé*) or μέν (*mén*) particles. When it has no particle (on only four occasions) it is because it is in the sequence οἶον εἰ βούλει (*hoîon ei boúlei*), which reinforces the function of the structure. They are parenthetical structures.

2.6   *Insubordinate structures, without apodosis but with infinitive*

There are few cases, but they present some interesting characteristics. They are equivalent to the uses that are documented in other languages to express requests or suggestions like:

(25) If you'd like to sign for me here …

They express an indirect directive act, a request or a less direct order (la Roi 2021: 31). They have been documented since Homer. In Homer, this sequence of ἐθέλω (*ethélō*) with an infinitive to express contents from the domain of orders occurs on half a dozen occasions. In three of them[25] the infinitive is

---

25   Hom. *Il.* 6.150–152 εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς | ἡμετέρην γενεήν, πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἴσασιν· |ἔστι πόλις Ἐφύρη μυχῷ Ἄργεος ἱπποβότοιο, (But, if you want, hear this also. So that you may know well my lineage; and many men know it. There is a city, Ephyre in a corner of Argos …) (Murray & Waytt). The infinitive can be understood as imperative. To Stoevesandt (BK *ad locum*), it doesn't appear necessary to interpret the infinitive as imperative, following Nicanor (scholium A); she considers that: *Die Apodosis (‡syi o.ä.) läßt sich leicht aus dem Zusammenhang ergänzen.* With similar characteristics is 20. 213–214 where Eneas employs the same expression, εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς, to tell Achilles his genealogy. The context of 21.487, where Hera tells Artemis to learn martial arts, is different εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις πολέμοιο δαήμεναι ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς ὅσσον φερτέρη εἴμ' ὅτι μοι μένος ἀντιφερίζεις (But if you are minded, learn of war, so that you may well know how much superior I am, since you vie with me in strength) (Murray & Wyatt). I do not agree with la Roi that this example is an offer: it is a threat in the mouth of Hera who attacks Artemis and tells her that she had better learn to fight if she wants to face her. It is a case of insubordination. La Roi's position is less blunt: "Nevertheless, the conditional clause is formally a subordinate clause which is pragmatically independent from the linguistic context. Therefore, the interpretation as an insubordinate clause with offer function would seem to also have more explanatory power, because the insubordinate clause hosts several finite clauses which explain the consequences of the offer". There is another example of the structure in the *Hymn to Apollo* 51–53.

δαήμεναι (*daémenai*), and it is accompanied by ὄφρ᾽ ἐῢ εἰδῇς (*óphra eú eidḗis*). In the following example Achilles gives Agamemnon permission to pursue whatever course of action he sees fit, to give the gifts or keep them, and urges him to act with alacrity.

(26) (Τὸν δ᾽ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς· | Ἀτρεΐδη κύδιστε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγάμεμνον) | *δῶρα μὲν αἴ κ᾽ ἐθέλῃσθα παρασχέμεν, ὡς ἐπιεικές,* |*ἤ τ᾽ ἐχέμεν παρὰ σοί·* (νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα χάρμης)

δῶρα	μὲν	αἴ κ᾽	ἐθέλῃσθα	παρασχέμεν	ὡς
dõra	mén	aí k᾽	ethélēistha	paraskhémen	hōs
gifts-ACC	PTCL	if PTCL	want-2SG.SBJV	give-INF	as

ἐπιεικές	ἤ	τ᾽	ἐχέμεν
epieikés	é	t᾽	ekhémen
seemly-NOM	or	PTCL	withhold-INF

(Then swift-footed Achilles answered him, and said: "Most glorious son of Atreus, Agamemnon, lord of men,) *as for the gifts, give them if you are so minded, as is proper, or keep them*—(it is up to you. But now let us take thought of battle quickly)" (Hom. *Il.* 19. 145–148) (Murray and Wyatt)

The two infinitives παρασχέμεν (*paraskhémen*) and ἐχέμεν (*ekhémen*) present two alternatives, to give or not to give the gifts. The infinitives can be understood as imperative infinitives or as verb-dependent infinitives.[26] If they are understood as imperatives, they are then the bridging context[27] that allows the function to develop.

There is no occurrence of this structure in Homer with βούλομαι (*boúlomai*), but it does occur afterwards. It is found both in Sophocles[28] and Euripides. The following example has already been mentioned as (1):

(27) E. *Hec.* 1206–1207 ὁ χρυσός, εἰ βούλοιο τἀληθῆ λέγειν, | ἔκτεινε τὸν ἐμὸν παῖδα καὶ κέρδη τὰ σά.

---

26   Chantraine (1963: 275) considers it probable that it depends on the verb. See also Wakker (1994: 245–246).

27   A bridging context (Heine 2002: 85–86) is a context which allows a construction to be interpreted both with the source meaning and with the target meaning, although the target meaning offers a more plausible interpretation of the utterance concerned. In this case, either as protasis and apodosis with imperative infinitive (source meaning) or as protasis alone, as an insubordinate structure expressing a command (target meaning).

28   S. *Aj.* 1393–1397.

It acts in the domain of interaction with the hearer as a politeness strategy.[29] However, it is also possible that it is used in a hyper-courteous manner, producing the opposite effect:

(28) Ορ. (πότερον ἐρωτᾶν ἢ κλύειν ἐμοῦ θέλεις; | Με. οὐδέτερ᾽· ἀνάγκη δ᾽ ὡς ἔοικέ σου κλύειν). | Ορ. μέλλω κτανεῖν σου θυγατέρ᾽, εἰ βούληι μαθεῖν.

μέλλω　　κτανεῖν σου　　θυγατέρ᾽　　εἰ βούληι
méllō　　ktaneîn sou　　thugatér᾽　　ei boúlēi
AUX-FUT kill-INF your-GEN daughter-ACC if want-2sg.PRS
μαθεῖν.
matheîn
know-INF

(Orestes—(Would you question me or hear me speak? Menelaus-Neither; but I suppose I must hear you). Orestes—*I intend to kill your daughter, if you want to know* (*find out, please!*)) (E. *Or.* 1575–1578) (Coleridge)

εἰ βούληι μαθεῖν (*ei boúlēi matheîn*) is not the sufficient and necessary condition of the protasis μέλλω κτανεῖν σου θυγατέρ᾽ (*méllō ktaneîn sou thugatér᾽*), to which it is, furthermore, postposed. It would be labelled, in Functional Grammar, as an illocutionary conditional:[30] it establishes the conditions of the illocutionary act, the declaration of Orestes's intentions, not of the reference, the content of this declaration. This pseudo-protasis is not necessary for expressing the content of the pseudo-apodosis. It is not essential from the semantic perspective. But it is relevant from the pragmatic point of view. It is clearly an ironic reaction, because the question and the interest of the hearer have already been expressed in the first intervention. It acts on the plane of speaker/hearer interaction. It expresses an attitude of the speaker, showing defiance and scorn of the hearer, whose opinion is granted little or no relevance.

In Plato, it is only documented in a couple of examples:[31]

29　Kühner (1904: 577) recognises it has a certain parenthetical nature: "Zuweilen wird ein Bedingungssatz, zu dem der nötige Nachsatz fehlt, zwischen die Rede eingeschaltet". See also Smyth (1920: 532, 2351). From a functionalist perspective, de la Villa (2021: 982–983) considers that in this example the protasis functions as an illocutionary disjunct.

30　Van Emde Boas et al. (2019: 551) express the idea saying that the protasis "specifies a condition on the … relevance of (putting forward) the apodosis". They also consider that it functions as "an adverbial disjunct".

31　A fascinating example, a sarcastic directive, is Pl. *R.* 389a–b οὐκ ἀποδεκτέον κατὰ τὸν σὸν λόγον.—Εἰ σύ, ἔφη, βούλει ἐμὸν τιθέναι· οὐ γὰρ οὖν δὴ ἀποδεκτέον. (It must not be accepted according to your reasoning. -If you, he said, wish to put it as my own! Effectively it must not be accepted) (Shorey).

(29) *εἰ δὲ βούλει αὖ σκέψασθαι τοὺς χρηστοὺς σοφιστάς, (Ἡρακλέους μὲν καὶ ἄλλων ἐπαίνους καταλογάδην συγγράφειν, ὥσπερ ὁ βέλτιστος Πρόδικος).*

εἰ	δὲ	βούλει	αὖ	σκέψασθαι	τοὺς	χρηστοὺς
ei	dé	boúlei	aû	sképsasthai	toús	khrēstoùs
if	PTCL	want-2SG.PRS	PTCL	consider-INF	the-ACC	worthy-ACC

σοφιστάς,
sophistás
professors-ACC

And again, *pray consider our worthy professors*, (and the eulogies they frame of Hercules and others in prose—for example, the excellent Prodicus.) (Pl. *Smp.* 177b) (Fowler)

In Plato, there are various examples of what could have been considered as the basis: conditional clause of βούλομαι (*boúlomai*) + infinitive + apodosis with the imperative of the verb that appears in the infinitive: "If you wish to do it, do it":

(30) *ἢ οὖν ἔα με εἰπεῖν ὅσα βούλομαι, ἤ, εἰ βούλει ἐρωτᾶν, ἐρώτα·*

εἰ	βούλει	ἐρωτᾶν	ἐρώτα
ei	boúlei	erōtā̂n	eróta
if	want-2SG.PRS	ask-INF	ask-2SG.IMP

(Either then allow me to speak at such length as I desire, or,) *if you prefer to ask questions, go on questioning* (Pl. *R.* 350e) (Shorey)

3   A hypothesis on the organisation of the structures

There is a clear evolution in the functions of the different structures, which come to be interactive and textual. The functions relating to speaker/hearer interaction (types 2, 3, and 6) are documented before the textual ones (types 4 and 5). The former already appear incipiently in the Homeric texts. In contrast, there is no clear manifestation of the textual functions until Plato. The interactive functions should be defined as a constellation of sub-functions. There is a function that derives from the originating referential content that consists in specifying the cooperative maneuver, thus developing interaction with the hearer. This structure is formalised and evolves to become an equivalent of "s'il te plaît" structures in other languages.

- Type 3: *referential content → expression of cooperative interaction*
- Type 2 and 6: *referential content → expression of cooperative interaction → politeness "please"*

The functions relating to the textual and meta-textual domain (types 4 and 5) would have first arisen as functions secondary to cooperative interaction to be later distinguished into two domains: corrective reformulation and exemplifying reformulation, which introduces new topics into a text.

– Type 4: *referential content → expression of cooperative interaction → meta-textual function*
– Type 5: *referential content → expression of cooperative interaction → textual function "for example"*

A particular case is constituted by the formula εἰ θεὸς θέλει (*ei theòs thélei*) (type 1). The expression of desires with similar conditional structures permits the suggestion that conveying a wish is the primary function. However, it evolves to have functions as a text establishment formula and, also, to express content related to the epistemic modality, content from the sphere of the expression of the speaker's attitude.

– Type 1: *Referential content → expressive function (subjectification) → textual function // modalizing function*

4   Concluding remarks

As conclusions to be drawn from this study, it can be said that:

a)   Six different constructions have been established. Five belong to the parenthetical structure class and one to that of insubordinates.

b)   The scarcely-represented isolated structure εἰ + βούλομαι / (ἐ)θέλω + infinitive (*ei + boúlomai / (e)thélō* + infinitive) to express orders (type 6) is insubordinate.

c)   The constructions εἰ θεὸς (ἐ)θέλει (*ei theòs (e)thélei*) and others similar to it (type 1) constitute a formulaic parenthetical, with a function in the domain of the expression of the attitude of the speaker. It expresses a wish, plays a role as an epistemic marker, and acts as a closing formula in the establishment of the text plane.

d)   The constructions εἰ + verb in 2SG or PL indicative or subjunctive in hosts that express direct directive acts (type 2) are constructional parentheticals with function on the interactive plane and act as politeness markers.

e)   The constructions εἰ + verb in 2SG or PL indicative or subjunctive in hosts that express non-directive acts (type 3) are constructional parentheticals with interactive function, fostering cooperation on the part of the hearer, contributing towards the establishment of *common ground*, and having a function in the establishment of the text, as they contribute to the introduction of a new topic.

f)   The constructions εἰ + verb in 2SG or PL indicative or subjunctive of
      reduced scope (type 4) are instantaneous parentheticals with a function
      on the text establishment plane, with a corrective reformulating function.

g)   The constructions εἰ + verb in 2SG or PL indicative or subjunctive with
      broad scope (type 5) are instantaneous parentheticals with textual func-
      tions, which introduce new cases or sub-topics.

Acknowledgments

References

Allan, Rutger J. 2003. *The middle voice in Ancient Greek: A study of polysemy*. Amster-
    dam: Gieben.

Brinton, Laurel. 2008. *The comment clause in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univer-
    sity Press.

Brown, Penelope and Levinson, Stephen C. 1987. *Politeness. Some universals in language
    usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chantraine, Pierre. 1953. *Grammaire homérique, vol. 2 Syntaxe*. Paris: Klinsieck.

Denizot, Camille. 2011. *Donner des ordres en grec ancien*. Rouen: Publications des Uni-
    versités de Rouen et du Havre.

Dickey, Eleanor. 2019. When "please" ceases to be polite: the use of *sis* in early Latin.
    Journal of Historical Pragmatics 20.2.204–224.

Dihle, Albrecht. 1982. *The theory of will in classical antiquity*. Berkeley: University of
    California Press.

Dik, Simon. 1989 [1997]. *The theory of Functional Grammar. Part one*. Berlin/New York:
    Mouton de Gruyter.

Dik, Simon. 1997. *The theory of Functional Grammar. Part two*. Berlin/New York: Mouton
    de Gruyter.

Ducrot, Oswald. 1972. *Dire et ne pas dire. Principes de sémantique linguistique*. Paris:
    Hermann.

Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, ed. by Irina Nikolaeva, 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, Nicholas & Watanabe, Honoré. 2016. The dynamics of insubordination: An overview. *Insubordination*, ed. by Nicholas Evans & Honoré Watanabe, 1–39. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fuentes Rodríguez, Catalina. 2018. *Parentéticos*. Madrid: Arco.

Haverkate, Henk. 1984. *Speech Acts, Speakers, and Hearers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heine, Bernd. 2002. On the role of context in Grammaticalization. *New reflections on grammaticalization*, ed. by Ilse Wischer & Gabriele Diewald, 83–101. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tanja Kuteva, & Haiping Long. 2013. An outline of Discourse Grammar. *Functional approaches to language*, ed. by Shannon T. Bischoff & Carmen Jeny, 155–206. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, & Tanja Kuteva. 2016. On insubordination and cooptation. *Insubordination*, ed. by Nicholas Evans & Honoré Watanabe, 39–64. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Heine, Bernd, Gunther Kaltenböck, Tanja Kuteva, & Haiping Long. 2017. Cooptation as a discourse strategy. *Linguistics* 5.4.813–855.

D'Hertefelt, Sarah. 2018. *Insubordination in Germanic: A typology of complements and conditional constructions*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kaltenböck, Gunther, Bernd Heine, & Tanja Kuteva. 2011. On thetical grammar. *Studies in Language* 35.4.848–893.

Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2016. On the grammatical status of insubordinate if-clauses. *Outside the clause*, ed. by Gunther Kaltenböck, Evelien Keizer, & Arne Lohmann, 341–379. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2019. Delimiting the class: A typology of English insubordination. *Insubordination*, ed. by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, & María Sol Sansiñena, 167–198. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kühner, Raphael & Gerth, Bernd. 1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, [1966] Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchgesellschaft.

la Roi, Ezra. 2021. The insubordination of if- and that-clauses from archaic to post-Classical Greek: A diachronic constructional typology. *Symbolae Osloenses* 95.1–63.

Lastres-López, Cristina. 2018. If-insubordination in spoken British English: Syntactic and pragmatic properties. *Language Sciences* 66.42–59.

Lastres-López, Cristina. 2020. Beyond conditionality: On the pragmaticalization of interpersonal if-constructions in English conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 167.68–83.

Petola, Niilo. 1983. Comment clauses in present-day English. *Studies in classical and*

modern pchilology presented to Y.M. Biese, ed. by Liro Kajanto, Inna Koskennienemi, & Esko Pennanen, 101–111. Helsinki: Suomalainen, Tiedeakatemia.

Risselada, Rodie. 1993. *Imperatives and other directive expressions in Latin*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Ruiz Yamuza, Emilia. 2021. No es subordinado todo lo que lo parece. *Forum Classicorum* 1, ed. by Jesús de la Villa, Antonio Fonseca, Emma Falque, Mª Paz de Hoz, Mª José Muñoz, Irene Villarroel, & Victoria Recio, 283–316. Madrid: Guillermo Escolar.

Sansiñena, María Sol 2019. Patterns of independence. *Insubordination*, ed. by Karin Beijering, Gunther Kaltenböck, & María Sol Sansiñena, 167–198. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Siemund, Peter. 2018. *Speech acts and clause types*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schwenter, Scott. A. 2016. Meaning and interaction in Spanish independent *si* clauses. *Language Sciences* 58.22–34.

Schwenter, Scott. A. 2016. Independent si-clauses in Spanish: functions and consequences for insubordination. *Insubordination*, ed. by Nicholas Evans & Honoré Watanabe, 89–112. Amsterdam: John Benjamins,

Smyth, Herbert Weir. 1920. *Greek grammar*. Cambridge Ma Harvard University Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2010. (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment. *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*, ed. by Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte, & Hubert Cuyckens, 29–71. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Van Emde Boas, Evert, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink, & Mathieu de Bakker. 2019. *The Cambridge grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van linden, Ann & Freek van de Velde. 2014. (Semi-)autonomous subordination in Dutch: Structures and semantic-pragmatic values. *Journal of Pragmatics* 60.226–250.

Verano Liaño, Rodrigo. 2016. Ejemplificación reformulativa y ejemplifcación argumentativa en griego antiguo: un estudio de corpus basado en *La República* de Platón. *Habis* 47.123–145.

Verano Liaño, Rodrigo. 2017. Linguistic paraphrase in Platonic dialogue: a first approach. *Ancient Greek linguistics: New perspectives, insights, and approaches*, ed. by Felizia Logozzo and Paolo Poccetti, 475–488. Berlin: De Gruyter.

de la Villa Polo, Jesús. 2021. Oraciones condicionales. *Sintaxis Griega* 11, ed. by María Dolores Jiménez. Madrid: CSIC.

Wakker, Gerry C. 1994. *Conditions and conditionals*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Watts, Richard W. 2005. Linguistic politeness research: *Quo vadis? Politeness in language*, ed. by Richard W. Watts, Sachiko Ide, & Konrad Ehlich, xi–xlvii. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.