The Secondary Interjections εἶεν and εἰέν as Fossilized Wish Optatives: a Conversation Analysis Approach

Ezra la Roi

Ghent University
ezra.laroi@ugent.be
ORCID iD: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4542-0610

Las interjecciones secundarias εἶεν y εἰέν como optativos de deseo fosilizados: una aproximación desde el análisis de conversación

The interjections εἰέν and εἶεν are generally said to mark some form of acceptance and be unrelated to the third person plural wish optative εἶεν. This paper argues that both the interjection εἰέν and εἶεν are fossilized wish optatives of the third person plural. Instead of acceptance, they are used in conversation and monologues to signal that continuing in the way of the previous turn / act is dispreferred by the speaker in completing the higher communicative goal of the sequence / move (i. e. *let that be that; be that as it may*; *anyway*). First a contrastive analysis is offered of εἰέν and εἶεν in Classical Greek conversation and monologue using concepts from Conversation Analysis. Second, the evolution of this wish optative into a secondary interjection is sketched. Finally, the textual transmission is discussed of εἰέν, εἶεν and other interjections in both Classical and Post-Classical Greek.

Key words: wish optative; secondary interjections; Conversation Analysis; preference; pragmatics.

Se ha afirmado generalmente que las interjecciones εἰέν y εἶεν marcan cierta forma de aceptación y no están relacionadas con el optativo de deseo de tercera persona plural εἶεν. En este trabajo demostraremos que ambas interjecciones son optativos de deseo de tercera persona de plural fosilizados que, en vez de expresar la aceptación, se emplean en conversaciones y monólogos para señalar que el locutor no sigue en la línea del turno / acto de habla anterior a fin de conseguir el objetivo comunicativo principal de la secuencia / acto de habla (p. ej. 'de todos modos', 'sea como fuere'). Empezaremos con un análisis contrastivo de εἰέν y εἶεν en conversaciones y monólogos en el griego clásico basado en conceptos del análisis de conversación. Luego, esbozaremos la evolución y conversión de este optativo de deseo en interjección secundaria antes de comentar la transmisión textual de εἰέν, εἶεν y otras interjecciones del griego tanto clásico como postclásico.

Palabras clave: optativo de deseo; interjecciones secundarias; análisis de conversación; preferencia; pragmática.

I. From εἶέν to εἶεν?

Strep.	<u>τίνα τρόπον; κάτειπέ μοι.</u>
Pupil	ζητοῦντος αὐτοῦ τῆς σελήνης τὰς ὁδοὺς
	καὶ τὰς περιφοράς, εἶτ’ ἄνω κεχηνότος
	ἀπὸ τῆς ὀροφῆς νύκτωρ γαλεώτης κατέχεσεν.
Strep.	ἤσθην γαλεώτῃ καταχέσαντι Σωκράτους.
Pupil	ἐχθὲς <u>δέ</u> γ’ ἡμῖν δεῖπνον οὐκ ἦν ἑσπέρας.
Strep.	<u>εἶέν</u>. τί <u>οὖν</u> πρὸς τἄλφιτ’ ἐπαλαμήσατο;
Pupil	κατὰ τῆς τραπέζης καταπάσας λεπτὴν τέφραν,
	κάμψας ὀβελίσκον, εἶτα διαβήτην λαβὼν
	ἐκ τῆς παλαίστρας θοἰμάτιον ὑφείλετο. (Ar., *Nu*. 170-179)
Strep.	<u>How was that? Tell me.</u>
Pupil	He was investigating the moon’s paths and revolutions, and as he was looking upwards with his mouth open, from the roof in darkness a gecko shat on him.
Strep.	I like that, a gecko shitting on Socrates!
Pupil	Yes, <u>and</u> last night we had no dinner to eat.
Strep.	<u>Be that as it may,</u> how did he finagle your eats?
Pupil	Over the table he sprinkled a fine layer of ash and bent a skewer, then he picked up a faggot from the wrestling school and swiped his jacket[1].

In this passage, Strepsiades is keen to learn about acts of cunning by Socrates (τίνα τρόπον; κάτειπέ μοι), who revealed insights into ordinary animals such as fleas, gnats and geckos. In line 175 the pupil, who tells him these insights, turns the conversation to another topic (δέ), viz. they had nothing to eat yesterday, to which Strepsiades responds with the interjection εἶέν. Most commonly, this interjection has been interpreted as indicating some kind of acceptance (especially Biraud 2010) or compliance (Nordgren 2015). However, I would argue that such a meaning does not do justice to why Strepsia-

---

[1] This paper uses translations based on the most recent Loeb translations available through https://www.loebclassics.com/, in particular Murray and Dimock 1919 for the *Odyssey*, Henderson 1998-2007 for Aristophanes, Kovacs 1994; 1995 for Euripides, Lloyd-Jones 1994 for Sophocles, Emlyn-Jones & Preddy 2017 for Plato, Sommerstein 2009 for Aeschylus, and Miller 1913 and Henderson et al. 2013 for Xenophon. Minor adaptations were made to the translations of εἶέν / εἶεν since translators follow existing literature in translating it as an agreement / acceptance marker (e. g. Okay, all right, Well), which, as I show, does not seem to work in context.

des uses it. First of all, it would stretch the idea of acceptance, if we read εἶέν as accepting the Pupil's unsolicited excursus about last night's dinner. In fact, Strepsiades immediately after εἶέν steers the pupil back to the acts of cunning by Socrates with his question: he uses a question with οὖν to express that he is asking about something which is more to-the-point / crucial[2] and ἐπαλαμήσατο to refer to contrivance. In other words, εἶέν might be better viewed as a signal by Strepsiades that this new subject brought in by the pupil (i.e. they had no dinner to eat) is not what Strepsiades is interested in, conversationally. In other words, one could translate εἶέν with *let that be that* or *be that as it may*, as Strepsiades wants the conversation to turn back to his topic of interest, Socrates' acts of cunning[3]. Other examples could be explained in a similar way, such as the following early example from the opening of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound.* At the start of the play Power has commanded Hephaestus to fulfil his obligation to punish Prometheus by binding him to the cliffs: Ἥφαιστε, σοὶ δὲ χρὴ μέλειν ἐπιστολὰς ἅς σοι πατὴρ ἐφεῖτο, τόνδε πρὸς πέτραις ὑψηλοκρήμνοις τὸν λεωργὸν ὀχμάσαι ἀδαμαντί-νων δεσμῶν ἐν ἀρρήκτοις πέδαις. «Hephaestus, you must attend to the instructions the Father has laid upon you, to bind this criminal to the high rocky cliffs in the unbreakable fetters of adamantine bonds». Hephaestus responded to this with a long excursus about the difference in fates for Power, the gods and Prometheus.

(2)

Hephaestus	πολλοὺς δ' ὀδυρμοὺς καὶ γόους ἀνωφελεῖς
	φθέγξηι· Διὸς γὰρ δυσπαραίτητοι φρένες,
	ἅπας δὲ τραχὺς ὅστις ἂν νέον κρατῆι.
Power	εἶέν, τί μέλλεις καὶ κατοικτίζηι μάτην;
	τί τὸν θεοῖς ἔχθιστον οὐ στυγεῖς θεόν,
	ὅστις τὸ σὸν θνητοῖσι προύδωκεν γέρας;
Hephaestus	τὸ συγγενές τοι δεινὸν ἥ θ' ὁμιλία. (A., *Pr.* 33-39)
Hephaestus	and will utter many wailing laments, all in vain. The mind of Zeus is implacable—and everyone is harsh when new to power.

_____

[2] Van Emde Boas et al. 2019, p. 681.

[3] For other examples of εἶέν followed by a question, see Ar., *Ra.* 607 or *Pax* 877. In fact, half (20) of the transmitted occurrences of εἶέν in Classical Greek drama are followed immediately by a question, which in my view would make it unlikely that εἶέν is used to accept something, since questions prototypically demand new conversational effort.

Power	Well, then, why are you waiting and grieving to no purpose?
	Why do you not loathe this god whom the gods hate so much,
	who traitorously gave your most prized possession to mortals?
Hephaestus	Kinship is terribly powerful, you know, and so is companionship.

Power's response shows that he does not appreciate the delay by Hephaestus and wants him to complete the requested command. In other words, εἶέν seems to signal that the previous turn by Hephaestus is not the preferred response contributing to fulfilment of the command, indicating that Power is not ready to accept the delay by Hephaestus. Nevertheless, in the lines that follow this example Hephaestus makes it clear that he is rather unwilling to do his part to fulfil this command (cf. line 48 ἔμπας τις αὐτὴν ἄλλος ὤφελεν λαχεῖν. «All the same, I wish someone else had been allotted them») but Power insists that Hephaestus must follow his father's instructions.

Thus, the interjection εἶέν appears to do something different than expressing acceptation / compliance to speakers of Classical Greek, yet this contrasts with the views on εἶέν expressed in the secondary literature, for which see table 1. While earlier scholars such as López Eire, Labiano Ilundain and Perdicoyianni-Paléologue (ii) have rightly emphasized, I think, that εἶέν is found at places of topic transition, εἶέν seems to do more on the discourse-organizational level than simply a topic transition. It would seem to indicate something about the relevance of the choice of topic to the speaker as well, in contrast to the previous topic which the speaker would not like to accept.

Table 1. Secondary literature views on εἶέν.

Secondary source	Linguistic characterization of εἶέν
López Eire (1996, pp. 92-93)	Para indicar la transición de un discurso que se da por acabado a otro que se desea iniciar
Labiano Ilundain (2000, p. 150)	Indica la transición entre un discurso que se da por acabado y otro que se desea iniciar
Perdicoyianni-Paléologue (2002, p. 83)	(i) in replies, it denotes attention to a request or acceptance of a statement: 'All right' (ii) (more frequently) it introduces a transition to a fresh point by a backward glance at what has been established
Biraud (2010, p. 213)	il manifeste toujours *l'acceptation*: soit il s'agit de prendre acte des propos de l'interlocuteur ou de ceux d'un énonciateur dont on a rapporté les paroles, que ceux-ci consistent en un argument, une conjecture, un projet, un protocole de dialogue
Nordgren (2015, p. 184)	Core meaning: Now speaker *complies* with the preceding utterance

Furthermore, the literature in this overview glosses over the fact that εἶεν (sic) can, I argue, be used in the same function as εἶέν (cf. example 3 below). Moreover, both occur in monologues which would make compliance / acceptance as core value increasingly unlikely, since the speaker would be agreeing with himself.

> (3)
> [So you too should consider, as I argue, that my accusers fall into two groups: first the ones who have just brought these accusations, secondly those who did so long ago who I'm talking about,]
> καὶ οἰήθητε δεῖν πρὸς ἐκείνους πρῶτόν με ἀπολογήσασθαι· καὶ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐκείνων πρότερον ἠκούσατε κατηγορούντων καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ τῶνδε τῶν ὕστερον. Εἶεν·ἀπολογητέον δή, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ ἐπιχειρητέον ὑμῶν ἐξελέσθαι τὴν διαβολὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ ἔσχετε ταύτην ἐν οὕτως ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ. (Pl., *Ap.* 18e1-19a2)
> and allow that I must make my defence against those first. Indeed you've heard them making their accusations before and much more than these recent ones. Anyway, my fellow Athenians, I must make my defence and I must try in such a short time to rid you of this prejudice that you have acquired over a long time.

Biraud (2010, p. 200) sees some type of acceptation in this example, supposedly of the situation between these two turns by Socrates. On a general level one could perhaps suggest that Socrates here moves from one topic to another one by means of Εἶεν. Instead, however, I would argue that Socrates corrects himself here and puts himself back on track to the preferred topic of conversation by indicating with Εἶεν: it signals that continuing to talk about what the jury must do in his defence is not the preferred way to complete his defence, because it is Socrates who should do the defence (see ἀπολογητέον δή) and convince them that he is not guilty (ἐπιχειρητέον ὑμῶν ἐξελέσθαι τὴν διαβολὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ ἔσχετε). The interjection could thus be translated as *Be that as it may / Let that be that* and signals to the audience that Socrates shifts back to a topic that is of higher relevance than the previous one. In pragmatic terms, Socrates thus responds to the need to satisfy the Gricean maxim of relation (Yule 1998, p. 37), because he shifts himself back to doing what is most relevant to complete the higher communicative goals of his exchange with the jury. In other words, Εἶεν is used here to reflect on

communicative assumptions behind Socrates' linguistic behaviour which are normally left implicit[4].

How then should we explain this overlap between εἰέν and εἶεν? Thus far the literature has followed renowned etymologists such as Chantraine (1968, p. 317), who emphatically state that εἰέν is unrelated to the optative 3rd person plural[5]. This would exclude the suggestion which I would like to advance, that is, that εἰέν and εἶεν have their source in a wish optative and are both fossilized wish optatives of εἰμί 'to be' (i.e. I wish that [things X=previous turn] be as it may)[6]. Their relationship with wishes can already be glanced from the fossilized wishes used to render their value in modern translations: *soit* a fossilized wish subjunctive in French or So *be* it / *Be* that as it may as fossilized subjunctives in English[7]. Both translations are also from the verb for to be.

Now, a problem for the line of argumentation sketched above would be the observation that εἰέν is written with a unique internal aspiration, which ancient grammarians already mentioned (e.g. Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian). However, they mention it as an odd exception and there is considerable variation in the manuscripts between εἰέν and εἶεν, where typically εἶεν is 'corrected' by editors to εἰέν in Classical Greek drama but not in prose, where it is found in authors such as Antiphon, Xenophon, Plato and Demosthenes. For example, the footnotes to the list of examples of εἰέν by (Nordgren 2015, p. 221) reveal that what is now treated as εἰέν in Sophocles was mostly εἶεν before 'correction'. In Euripides, we find interjectional εἶεν (sic) still at *Alc.* 299 and *Hec.* 314 in the edition by Murray (1908) but streamlined to εἰέν in Diggle (1984). In fact, εἰέν is limited to drama (Aeschylus, Euripides, Sophocles and Aristophanes) in Classical Greek, but not found in Classical Greek prose where we find it in rhetoric (e.g. Antiphon and Demosthenes) as well as Platonic dialogue and Xenophon's dialogues and histories (see exam-

---

[4] See, however, Verano 2016 for a useful study of markers which reflect on discourse production in Plato.

[5] E.g. Labiano 2000, p. 149 or Biraud 2010, p. 195. Other etymological dictionaries such as Frisk 1960 and Beekes & Van Beek 2010 endorse the same view. Nordgren 2015, p. 217 is an exception, since he suggests that only εἶεν might perhaps be related to εἰμί 'to be'.

[6] An exception is Brugmann and Thumb 1913, p. 536 who gloss the interjection as a wish optative «so sei's! nun gut! Genug davon!» and compare it to a similar wish particle in Old Indic.

[7] For the independent French subjunctive for wishes, see Jensen 1974. For the history of the independent subjunctive in English, see Visser 1963, pp. 786-815.

ples below)[8]. Moreover, as I demonstrate, the exact relation between εἰέν and εἶεν is never actually addressed but instead εἶεν is treated as εἰέν[9].

This article is structured as follows. In section 2 I offer a contrastive analysis of examples of εἰέν and εἶεν using concepts from Conversation Analysis to illustrate that they are used with the same preference organization function in both conversation (2.2 & 2.3) and monologue (2.4). Section 3 details the historical trajectory of εἶεν and εἰέν from wish optatives to secondary interjections and discusses the continued textual confusion between εἰέν and εἶεν in Post-Classical works.

II.   εἶεν AS εἰέν IN CLASSICAL GREEK

I first introduce some Conversation Analysis notions relevant to the analysis of εἶεν as εἰέν in Ancient Greek such as turn design, preference and sequence. Next I analyse examples of εἶεν found in conversation in 2.2 and of εἰέν in 2.3. In 2.4 I take the analysis one step further and assess whether εἶεν and εἰέν have the same function in monologues. I argue that εἶεν and εἰέν both express that *the speaker wishes to not continue discourse in the way of the previous turn / act as it is a dispreferred way to the speaker in completing the sequence / move*[10]. As will be observed, the reasons why continuing along the track of a previous turn is evaluated as dispreferred differs from context to context.

1. *Conversation Analysis and Classical Greek*

Communication crucially involves various forms of joint action, meaning that speakers coordinate their linguistic actions to reach a shared communicative goal (Clark 1996). To do this they follow shared rules of conduct determined by the context of communication (e.g. buying something in a store, asking a stranger for directions or addressing a group). Conversation Analysis is a

---

[8] An interesting exception is Ar., *Th.* 1188 where the aspiration is dropped by the Scythian who drops aspiration more often.

[9] E.g. Labiano Ilundain 2000, pp. 157-166.

[10] After this paper had been written and accepted, I found out that Verano (forthcoming) independently came to similar findings as he concludes, using the methodological framework of Conversation Analysis, that εἰέν / εἶεν is most often used in the Corpus Platonicum to close a previous sequence.

theoretical framework especially equipped at explaining how conversations are managed by linguistic behaviour and why such communications break down (Van Emde Boas 2017a, p. 412). This theory has gained ground in recent years and is now being applied more and more to the various forms of conversation that we find in Ancient Greek (and Latin)[11]. Starting from the notion of the conversational turn of speaking (which can be allocated, taken or transferred naturally), conversation analysts determine how speakers' turns realize certain communicative needs. For example, when speaker A opens with a communicative act of greeting in a so-called first pair part, the socially preferred[12] reaction by B is a greeting which forms the so-called second pair part completing the adjacency pair of two cohesive turns. Similarly, preferred adjacency pairs can consist of offer-acceptance, question-answer, request-acceptance, whereas the dispreferred responses to such first pair parts would be denial, no answer, refusal respectively. Of course, conversation and communication in general is more complex than these simple pairings, since these pair parts can be expanded. As van Emde Boas (2017a, p. 414) put it, «At any point in such a sequence, speakers can insert 'expansions', to facilitate the most efficient possible resolution of the overarching sequence (the 'base pair') and to prevent dispreferred turns». Such expansions can precede the first pair part (pre-expansion), can be inserted before the realization of the second pair part (insert-expansion), or can follow the second pair part (post-expansion)[13]. To exemplify, in example 2 Power's command to Hephaestus to bind Prometheus to the rock (the first pair part of the base pair) is met with a dispreferred expansion, viz. the avoidance of direct response to this command by Hephaestus, with the result that the first pair part command by Power only receives its second pair part after some expansions. In other words, the

---

[11] For a survey and helpful introduction to the utility of Conversation Analysis for Classical Greek, see van Emde Boas (2017a). I would especially like to refer the reader to the project *Conversation Analysis and Classics*, in particular their up-to-date bibliography of work on Ancient Greek and Latin within this framework https://caclassics.wordpress.com/cacl-bibliography/

[12] See Pomerantz & Heritage 2012 for the many facets of preference within Conversation Analysis.

[13] The functions of these expansions vary, for which see van Emde Boas 2017a, pp. 414-416.

various turns by Power and Hephaestus complete a coherent sequence[14] of turns only after expanding the first and second pair parts with various types of expansions. As a result, the communicative goal of the sequence initiated by Power, i.e. carrying out the command, is only realized after some delay.

In addition to sequence organization, turns themselves can consist of multiple so-called linguistic actions which together form a respective pair part. For example, when asked 'How are you?' it is socially expected to answer not just positively but also to ask how the other is e.g. 'Fine. How are you?' (Levinson 2012, pp. 118-119). Due to the coherence created by a shared object of conversation, turns can make use of features such as ellipsis and repetition to fit together turns (Drew 2012, p. 134; la Roi forthcoming b.)[15]. Similarly, speakers therefore typically use the turn-initial positions of a turn to signal how their turn relates to the previous turn with interactive elements e.g. *Ah, Well, Speaking of X, Actually* (Drew 2012, pp. 137-140). In Classical Greek, well-known signals to the addressee on how to interpret the speaker's turn are turn-initial ἀλλά (Drummen 2009), imperative particles such as εἰπέ μοι (Zakowski 2014, 2018) or contrastive particles such as μήν (Thijs 2017). In a way, such markers function as signposts for the addressee to understand the type of turn that is on its way (cf. Sidnell 2010, p. 143).

2. εἶεν *in Classical Greek conversation*

In example 4 from Plato's *Euthyphro* we find Εἶεν immediately after a disagreement. Euthyphro has just agreed with Socrates (Καὶ ὀρθῶς γε) that he misrepresented Euthyphro's opinion, i.e. a dispreferred second pair part response to a first pair part assessment. Socrates then aims to close off this disagreement with Εἶεν, as indicated not only by the interjection but also by the introduction of the question with the adversative particle ἀλλὰ which

---

[14] For an overview of the notion of sequence in Conversation Analysis, see Stivers 2012 and van Emde Boas 2017a for an application to Classical Greek drama.

[15] Moreover, the shared linguistic common ground can be a diachronic source for creating novel syntactic means. For example, subordinate clauses (lacking their own illocutionary force) can become insubordinate in dialogic contexts (i.e. with their own illocutionary force independent of pragmatic context) as happened to ὅπως when it turned from a subordinator into a marker of directive insubordinate clauses, see la Roi 2021 and forthcoming b. For insubordination in Latin, see la Roi 2022b.

breaks off the previous discourse topic (cf. Drummen 2009). In other words, rather than acceptation / compliance, the secondary interjection εἶεν is used by Socrates to signal that he wishes not to continue along the path of conversation from the previous turn, because this is dispreferred in completing the conversational goals of his sequence, that is, to hear from Euthyphro how he thinks attendance to the gods is an essential part of holiness (cf. Pl. *Euthphr.*13a).

(4)

Socrates	Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγώ, ὦ Εὐθύφρων, οἶμαί σε τοῦτο λέγειν —πολλοῦ καὶ δέω—ἀλλὰ τούτου δὴ ἕνεκα καὶ ἀνηρόμην τίνα ποτὲ λέγοις τὴν θεραπείαν τῶν θεῶν, οὐχ ἡγούμενός σε τοιαύτην λέγειν.
Euthyphro	Καὶ ὀρθῶς γε, ὦ Σώκρατες· οὐ γὰρ τοιαύτην λέγω.
Socrates	Εἶεν· ἀλλὰ τίς δὴ θεῶν θεραπεία εἴη ἂν ἡ ὁσιότης;
Euthyphro	Ἥπερ, ὦ Σώκρατες, οἱ δοῦλοι τοὺς δεσπότας (5) θεραπεύουσιν. (Pl., *Euthphr.* 13c11-d6)
Socrates	No, I certainly don't think this is what you're saying, Euthyphro—far from it but this is the reason I actually asked what you might mean by attendance on the gods, as I don't think you mean this sort of thing.
Euthyphro	And rightly so, Socrates. That's not the sort of thing I mean.
Socrates	Let that be that, but what kind of attendance on the gods would holiness be?
Euthyphro	It would be what slaves pay to their masters, Socrates.

In the next example, Critobulus moves the conversation that he has with Socrates along in an attempt to sufficiently understand from Socrates why he thinks that he is more beautiful (meaning that his features are more apt to serving the needs that they were created for). Critobulus probably starts this line of questioning out of disbelief that the same Socrates who was proverbially ugly in Athens would in fact be beautiful. As the translation would also suggest, Critobulus, rather than commenting on Socrates' assessment moves on to the next point of Socrates' characteristically ugly nose (see the final line)[16].

_____

[16] This removal function would explain why we find it in contexts where a speaker tries to take the turn of speaking, cf. Labiano Ilundain, table 1, 151.

(5)

Critobulus	Λέγεις σύ, ἔφη, καρκίνον εὐοφθαλμότατον εἶναι τῶν ζῴων;
Socrates	Πάντως δήπου, ἔφη· ἐπεὶ καὶ πρὸς ἰσχὺν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄριστα πεφυκότας ἔχει.
Critobulus	<u>Εἶεν,</u> ἔφη, τῶν <u>δὲ</u> ῥινῶν ποτέρα καλλίων, ἡ σὴ ἢ ἡ ἐμή;
Socrates	Ἐγὼ μέν, ἔφη, οἶμαι τὴν ἐμήν, εἴπερ γε τοῦ ὀσφραίνεσθαι ἕνεκεν ἐποίησαν ἡμῖν ῥῖνας οἱ θεοί. οἱ μὲν γὰρ σοὶ μυκτῆρες εἰς γῆν ὁρῶσιν, οἱ δὲ ἐμοὶ ἀναπέπτανται, ὥστε τὰς πάντοθεν ὀσμὰς προσδέχεσθαι.
Critobulus	<u>τὸ δὲ δὴ σιμὸν τῆς ῥινὸς πῶς τοῦ ὀρθοῦ κάλλιον;</u> (X., *Smp.* V 5.5-6.6)
Critobulus	Do you mean to say that a crab is better equipped visually than any other creature?
Socrates	Absolutely; for its eyes are also better set to insure strength.
Critobulus	<u>Well, let that pass;</u> but whose nose is finer, yours or mine?
Socrates	Mine, I consider, granting that Providence made us noses to smell with. For your nostrils look down toward the ground, but mine are wide open and turned outward so that I can catch scents from all about.
Critobulus	<u>But how do you make a snub nose handsomer than a straight one?</u>

In the following example of reported conversation from the *Cyropaedia*, Cyrus uses Εἶεν to respond to a dispreferred response by the Armenian king to Cyrus' commands. Since the Armenian king fears that he will lose not only his troops but also his family, he provides a dispreferred response to Cyrus' command to give him his troops. Cyrus, however, does not want to hear it (as signalled by Εἶεν) and asks him instead what he would give to get his family back. Note also the narratorial cue that Cyrus wants to get his troops quickly (cf. καὶ ὁ Κῦρος οὐκ ἐμέλλησεν, ἀλλ᾽ εἶπε «And without hesitation, Cyrus replied»). Also, since Cyrus will give back the family after his cross-examination[17] (in III 1.37), the use of the interjection Εἶεν to indicate that the Armenian's response is unwarranted in Cyrus' eyes makes even more sense.

---

[17] Gera (1993, pp. 78-98) provides a thought-provoking analysis of the cross-examination techniques used by Cyrus and discusses the relationship with Socratic elenchus and legal questioning (ἐρώτησις).

(6)

[And without hesitation, Cyrus replied: <u>Send with me</u> then, said he, only half
the army, since your neighbours, the Chaldaeans, are at war with you. And of
the money, instead of the fifty talents which you used to pay as tribute, <u>pay
Cyaxares double that sum</u> because you are in arrears with your payments. And
lend me personally a hundre more, said he; and I promise you that if God
prospers me, I will in return for your loan either do you other favours worth
more than that amount or at least pay you back the money, if I can; but if I
cannot, I may seem insolvent, I suppose, but I should not justly be accounted
dishonest.]

καὶ ὁ Ἀρμένιος, <u>Πρὸς τῶν θεῶν</u>, ἔφη, <u>ὦ Κῦρε, μὴ οὕτω λέγε· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐ
θαρροῦντά με ἕξεις·</u> ἀλλὰ νόμιζε, ἔφη, ἃ ἂν καταλίπῃς μηδὲν ἧττον σὰεἶναι
ὧν ἂν ἔχων ἀπίῃς. <u>Εἶεν</u>, ἔφη ὁ Κῦρος· ὥστε δὲ τὴνγυναῖκα ἀπολαβεῖν, ἔφη,
πόσα ἄν μοι χρήματα δοίης; Ὁπόσα ἂν δυναίμην, ἔφη. Τί δέ, ὥστε τοὺς
παῖδας; Καὶ τούτων, ἔφη, ὁπόσα ἂν δυναίμην. (X., *Cyr.* III 1.35.1-7)

<u>For heaven's sake, Cyrus,</u> said the Armenian, <u>do not talk that way</u>. <u>If you do,
you will make me lose heart.</u> But consider, said he, that what you leave here
is no less yours than what you take away. <u>Let that be that</u>, said Cyrus; now
how much money would you give to get your wife back? As much as I could,
said he. And how much to get your children? For these also, said he, as much
as I could.

3. εἶέν *in Classical Greek conversation*

In the next example from Sophocles, Athena signals to Ajax that she wants
to move on to Odysseus, a topic which is obviously more important to her
than the current one. One of the factors behind the use of εἶέν is that Ajax
is being an uncooperative conversational partner who does not answer her
queries with direct answers but with dispreferred responses (e.g. line 98 does
not answer Athena's yes-no question unambiguously, as she lets Ajax know
in the next line). The use of εἶέν, I argue, targets the dispreferred expansions
by Ajax (line 98 & 100) who gloats over his killings, meaning that Athena
uses it to disconnect from the previous turn to steer Ajax towards the prefe-
rred object of discussion, Odysseus[18].

---

[18] Biraud (2010, p. 202) suggests that we are dealing with a feigned acceptation, but as
shown by my discussion here and throughout the article, εἶέν seems to do the opposite of
accepting a previous turn.

(7)

Athena	ἦ καὶ πρὸς Ἀτρείδαισιν ἤχμασας χέρα;
Ajax	ὥστ᾽ οὔποτ᾽ Αἴανθ᾽ οἵδ᾽ ἀτιμάσουσ᾽ ἔτι.
Athena	<u>τεθνᾶσιν ἄνδρες, ὡς τὸ σὸν ξυνῆκ᾽ ἐγώ.</u>
Ajax	θανόντες ἤδη τἄμ᾽ ἀφαιρείσθων ὅπλα.
Athena	<u>εἶέν·</u> τί γὰρ δὴ παῖς ὁ τοῦ Λαερτίου; ποῦ σοι τύχης ἕστηκεν; ἦ πέφευγέ σε; (S., *Ai.* 97-102)
Athena	Did you arm your hand against the sons of Atreus too?
Ajax	So that never again shall they refuse honour to Ajax.
Athena	<u>The men are dead, if I understand your words.</u>
Ajax	Let them try to deprive me of my arms, now that they are dead!
Athena	<u>Be that as it may,</u> what of the son of Laertes, what is his situation? Did he escape you?

Similarly, in the next passage of a confrontational conversation between Philoctetes and Neoptolemos the confrontation reaches its conclusion through the use of εἶέν. Philoctetes confronts Neoptolemos about the fact that he did not let him shoot his bow at Odysseus when he heard him. Note the confrontational use of so-called turn-initial ἀλλὰ which seeks to correct preceding utterances (Drummen 2009). Philoctetes goes off-topic by revealing what he thinks is relevant information about leaders of the army, but the subsequent use of εἶέν by Neoptolemos shows that Philoctetes' assessment of the Greeks as cowards is not relevant in Neoptolemos' eyes for solving the issue at hand, viz. Philoctetes being mad at Neoptolemos. By steering the conversation in the direction that he prefers, Neoptolemos gets Philoctetes to lose his anger against him as he cannot do anything else than calm down and agree, which he does in line 1310 (ξύμφημι 'I agree').

(8)

Philoc.	φεῦ· τί μ᾽ ἄνδρα πολέμιον
	ἐχθρόν τ᾽ ἀφείλου μὴ κτανεῖν τόξοις ἐμοῖς;
Neoptolemos	<u>ἀλλ᾽</u> οὔτ᾽ ἐμοὶ καλὸν τόδ᾽ ἐστὶν οὔτε σοί.
Philoctetes	<u>ἀλλ᾽</u> οὖν τοσοῦτόν γ᾽ ἴσθι, τοὺς πρώτους στρατοῦ,
	τοὺς τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ψευδοκήρυκας, κακοὺς
	ὄντας πρὸς αἰχμήν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς λόγοις θρασεῖς.
Neoptolemos	<u>εἶέν.</u> τὰ μὲν δὴ τόξ᾽ ἔχεις, κοὐκ ἔσθ᾽ ὅτου
	ὀργὴν ἔχοις ἂν οὐδὲ μέμψιν εἰς ἐμέ.
Philoctetes	<u>ξύμφημι.</u> τὴν φύσιν δ᾽ ἔδειξας, ὦ τέκνον,
	ἐξ ἧς ἔβλαστες, οὐχὶ Σισύφου πατρός,

ἀλλ' ἐξ Ἀχιλλέως, ὃς μετὰ ζώντων ὅτ' ἦν
ἥκου' ἄριστα, νῦν δὲ τῶν τεθνηκότων (S., *Ph.* 1302-1313)

Philoc.	Alas! Why did you prevent me from killing a hated enemy with my bow?
Neoptolemos	<u>But</u> that would not be honourable for me or for you.
Philoctetes	<u>Yet</u> know this much, that the leaders of the army, the false heralds of the Achaeans, are brave with words, but cowardly in battle!
Neoptolemos	<u>So be it!</u> You have the bow, and you have no reason to be angry with me or to blame me.
Philoctetes	<u>I agree!</u> You showed the nature, my son, of the stock you come from, having not Sisyphus for father, but Achilles, who had the greatest fame while he was among the living and has it now among the dead.

A final example where εἶέν is in fact used to signal that the absence of response by Phaedra to several commands by the nurse to speak is the dispreferred way to fulfil the sequence initiated by the nurse. The nurse clearly wants Phaedra to speak, but Phaedra responds only with silence, which is why the nurse uses εἶέν to signal that she in fact cannot accept this (see the following counterfactual οὐκ ἐχρῆν σιγᾶν), as she explicitly evaluates that Phaedra should not be silent but speak up.

(9)

Nurse	εἰ δ' ἔκφορός σοι συμφορὰ πρὸς ἄρσενας, <u>λέγ',</u> ὡς ἰατροῖς πρᾶγμα μηνυθῆι τόδε. <u>εἶέν, τί σιγᾶις; οὐκ ἐχρῆν σιγᾶν,</u> τέκνον, ἀλλ' ἤ μ' ἐλέγχειν, εἴ τι μὴ καλῶς λέγω, ἢ τοῖσιν εὖ λεχθεῖσι συγχωρεῖν λόγοις. <u>φθέγξαι τι, δεῦρ' ἄθρησον.</u> ὦ τάλαιν' ἐγώ, γυναῖκες, ἄλλως τούσδε μοχθοῦμεν πόνους, ἴσον δ' ἄπεσμεν τῶι πρίν· οὔτε γὰρ τότε λόγοις ἐτέγγεθ' ἥδε νῦν τ' οὐ πείθεται. (E., *Hipp.* 296-303)
Nurse	If your misfortune may be spoken of to men, <u>speak</u> so that the thing may be revealed to doctors. (Phaedra is silent.)Well, <u>why are you silent? You ought not to be silent</u>, child, but should either refute me if I have said something amiss or agree with what has been said aright. (She remains silent.) <u>Say something! Look at me!</u> Oh unlucky me, women, my efforts are a waste of time: I am just as far off as ever! Words failed to soften her before, and now too she is not won over

Thus, the distribution of εἶέν supports the view that it is used by speakers to make sure that the preferred communicative behavior relevant to completing a higher communicative goal is obtained. This would also explain why it is found in contexts where speakers select themselves and take the floor (cf. Labiano Ilundain 2000, p. 151) or after comments which do not further the conversation in the eyes of the speaker (e.g. after chorus comments, see Van Emde Boas 2017b, pp. 206-207).

4. εἶεν *and* εἶέν *in Classical Greek monologue*

Before comparing the use of εἶεν and εἶέν in monologue with the usage found in conversation, it should be ascertained whether concepts from Conversation Analysis could in fact be applied to monologue[19]. As has already been noted in work within the related field of Discourse Analysis, monologues also use dialogical means such as interactive discourse particles to structure their discourse and tackle assumptions on the part of the addressee(s) (see Kroon 1995, pp. 109-116 applied to text types and discourse particles in Latin). While monologues, then, may fall outside the scope of conversation analysts, it would appear worthwhile to use similar methods of analysing interactive discourse when analysing monologues in order to ascertain the interactive features of monologues. For example, from a Conversation Analysis perspective a monologue strictly speaking is a discourse consisting of one large turn. However, this discourse can from a Discourse Analysis (DA) perspective obviously be broken down into segments of so-called Moves which consist of main and subsidiary Discourse Acts, the former referring to the «the minimal free unit of discourse that is able to enter into an exchange structure» and the latter referring to «the smallest identifiable unit of communicative behaviour» (Kroon 1995, pp. 65-66). Thus, as within Conversation Analysis pairs can have their expansions, discourse acts can get subsidiary acts, both of which contribute to fulfilling the communicative goal of the sequence (CA) / Move (DA). In addition, monological discourse can be «diaphonic» and contain so-called embedded voices which can be signalled by for example voca-

---

[19] Wooffit (2005, pp. 78-91) provides a helpful summary of difference in scope, data and utility of both Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis.

tives or addressee oriented conditionals[20], voices to which the speaker may fictively respond with reactive behaviour (Kroon 1995, p. 111). Finally, since speakers of monologues use dialogical means to structure their discourse and tackle assumptions on the part of the addressee(s), they also inevitably reflect on how they themselves are trying to achieve their communicative or argumentative goals (see example 10 below), which is something that speakers in conversation also do as we have seen above.

In example 10 from Plato's *Apology* Socrates has just discussed which people rightly support him, using rhetorical strategies such as a rhetorical question (τίνα until ἀληθεύοντι). He now wants to move on to his defense and he does that by using the interjection Εἶεν in combination with the vocative. I would like to propose that Εἶεν is used as a tactical means by Socrates to reflect on his defence and signal that to continue defending himself would be infelicitous. Thus, he responds to the expected audience response that he might be losing track of the preferred subject and the fitting linguistic behaviour. It is for this reason that he, I think, compares his conduct with how others might have defended themselves, because he implies that he does not want to stoop to that level (see the underlined).

(10)

αὐτοὶ μὲν γὰρ οἱ διεφθαρμένοι τάχ᾽ ἂν λόγον ἔχοιεν βοηθοῦντες· οἱ δὲ ἀδιάφθαρτοι, πρεσβύτεροι ἤδη ἄνδρες, οἱ τούτων προσήκοντες, τίνα ἄλλον ἔχουσι λόγον βοηθοῦντες ἐμοὶ ἀλλ᾽ ἢ τὸν ὀρθόν τε καὶ δίκαιον, ὅτι συνίσασι Μελήτῳ μὲν ψευδομένῳ, ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀληθεύοντι; Εἶεν δή, ὦ ἄνδρες· ἃ μὲν ἐγὼ ἔχοιμ᾽ ἂν ἀπολογεῖσθαι, σχεδόν ἐστι ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλα ἴσως τοιαῦτα. τάχα δ᾽ ἄν τις ὑμῶν ἀγανακτήσειεν ἀναμνησθεὶς ἑαυτοῦ, εἰ ὁ μὲν καὶ ἐλάττω τουτουῒ τοῦ ἀγῶνος ἀγῶνα ἀγωνιζόμενος ἐδεήθη τε καὶ ἱκέτευσε τοὺς δικαστὰς μετὰ πολλῶν δακρύων, παιδία τε αὑτοῦ ἀναβιβασάμενος ἵνα ὅτι μάλιστα ἐλεηθείη, καὶ ἄλλους τῶν οἰκείων καὶ φίλων πολλούς, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐδὲν ἄρα τούτων ποιήσω, καὶ ταῦτα κινδυνεύων, ὡς ἂν δόξαιμι, τὸν ἔσχατον κίνδυνον. (Pl., *Ap.* 34b1-7) For perhaps those who have been corrupted themselves have a reason to support me, but those who are uncorrupted, rather elderly by now, the kinsmen of these people, what other reason do they have for supporting me except the

---

right and just one: that they are aware that Meletus is lying, and I am telling the truth? <u>Let that be that</u>, gentlemen; what I may have by way of a defense is more or less this, and perhaps more like this. Perhaps someone among you may be offended when he remembers his own conduct, if he, even in a case of less importance than this, begged and besought the judges with many tears, and brought forward his children to arouse compassion, and many other friends and relatives; <u>whereas I will do none of these things, though I am, apparently, in the very greatest danger.</u>

With the combination Εἶεν δή, ὦ ἄνδρες he signals to the jury (see the vocative) not only that his defence *should* be considered a settled matter (something which is obviously a smart rhetorical strategy) but also that this can evidently be realized now (δή) [21].

In example 11, Medea uses εἶέν to structure her monologue with herself aimed at deciding how she will kill and get away with it (see line 377). After discussing options and the potential problems they might have for her personally (note the underlined self-reference before εἶέν), she coldly moves to the post-killing scenario with εἶέν to consider what is more important to her, who would protect her afterwards. I would suggest that Medea uses εἶέν to express that she would not prefer to continue to consider killing options, because she wants to focus on herself (see the increased self-reference after εἶέν)[22]. On a theatrical level this use of εἶέν contributes to the negative characterization of Medea as self-involved and heedless of the lives of others[23]. Thus, in discussing with herself what ought to be done, she moves on to what matters to her addressee, herself.

(11)
πολλὰς δ' ἔχουσα θανασίμους αὐτοῖς ὁδούς,
<u>οὐκ οἶδ' ὁποίαι πρῶτον ἐγχειρῶ, φίλαι·</u>
πότερον ὑφάψω δῶμα νυμφικὸν πυρί,

---

[21] Compare Thijs 2021, p. 266, who suggests that δή in directives signals that «(the speaker assumes that) the addressee is able, prepared and ready to perform the course of action referred to». La Roi (2020, p. 214) only records one occurrence of a wish optative with δή in Plato, but when εἶεν and εἶέν are seen as fossilized wish optatives, this number would be incorrect.

[22] Note that this example is also discussed by Clark (2022, p. 407), who argues that the extrametrical position of εἶέν represented a theatrical pause reflecting Medea's thought process.

[23] Cf. the evaluation by Page (1967, p. 101): «After εἶέν Medea pauses. She sees the whole course of her future plan in her mind's eye, and starts out her reverie at the moment of triumph when she sees her victims dead».

ἢ θηκτὸν ὤσω φάσγανον δι' ἥπατος,
σιγῆι δόμους ἐσβᾶσ' ἵν' ἔστρωται λέχος.
ἀλλ' ἕν τί μοι πρόσαντες· εἰ <u>ληφθήσομαι</u>
δόμους ὑπερβαίνουσα καὶ τεχνωμένη,
<u>θανοῦσα θήσω</u> τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐχθροῖς γέλων.
κράτιστα τὴν εὐθεῖαν, ἧι πεφύκαμεν
σοφοὶ μάλιστα, φαρμάκοις αὐτοὺς ἑλεῖν.
εἶέν·
καὶ δὴ τεθνᾶσι· τίς <u>με</u> δέξεται πόλις;
τίς γῆν ἄσυλον καὶ δόμους ἐχεγγύους
ξένος παρασχὼν ῥύσεται <u>τοὐμὸν δέμας</u>;
οὐκ ἔστι. <u>μείνασ'</u> οὖν ἔτι σμικρὸν χρόνον,
ἢν μέν τις ἡμῖν πύργος ἀσφαλὴς φανῆι,
δόλωι <u>μέτειμι</u> τόνδε καὶ σιγῆι φόνον· (E., *Med.* 376-391)
Now since I possess many ways of killing them, <u>I do not know which I should try first, my friends</u>: shall I set the bridal chamber on fire or thrust a sharp sword through their vitals, creeping into the house where the marriage bed is laid out? One thing, however, stands in my path: <u>if I am caught</u> entering the house and plotting its destruction, <u>I will be killed</u> and bring joy to my foes. Best to proceed by the direct route, in which I am the most skilled, and kill them with poison. <u>Let that be that!</u> Now let us suppose they have been killed. What city will receive <u>me</u>? What friend will give <u>me</u> a safe country and a secure house and rescue <u>me</u>? There is no one. And so I shall wait a short time yet, and if some citadel of rescue appears, <u>I shall go about</u> this murder by stealth.

Thus, the use of εἶέν is parallel to εἶεν as used in monologues and (as in conversation) signals the speaker's dispreference with regard to the previous discourse act, because it is not relevant to meeting the higher communicative goal.

III.   εἶεν AND εἶέν AS FOSSILIZED WISH OPTATIVES

A recent paper by la Roi (2020) described the interactive functions of wishes based on a corpus study of wish optatives in Aristophanes and Euripides. He concludes that there are three more general interactive[24] functions of wishes (expressed by wish optatives), which can be subdivided by specific contex-

---

[24] Thus, wish optatives are not just oriented at the speaker him / herself, as is reflected by the fact that wishes in the first person are not attested most frequently, but in the third person

tual situations: (1) to align positive psychological commitment (e.g. wishes of emotional support, oaths, conventionalized best wishes), (2) wishing for resolution (wishes for aid, retribution, own demise, curses), (3) strong declaration of commitment (if preceding or following conditional clause is present). He also notes that these wishes, like other speech acts, have a so-called sincerity condition, which means that by using a wish the speaker normally sincerely wishes for the realization of the wish. Consequently, when this condition is not met, the interpretation of the wish changes, e.g. *May you die* turning into a figurative damnation *Damn you*. The functional resemblance between the use of εἶεν / εἶέν and wishes should in my view be explained by their shared ancestry. As we have seen in the examples above, the usage of both εἶεν and εἶέν can in fact be explained as a type of wish, viz. the speaker wishes to not continue discourse in the way of the previous turn as it is a dispreferred way to the speaker in completing the sequence. As such, the function of these fossilized wish optatives is specialized and does not have the functional range that wish optatives have. Also, both interjections occur used together with vocatives as wish optatives do, e.g. A., *Ch.* 719, Pl., *Euthd.* 290c7, 293d2, *Ap.* 34b6. Thus, both in use and in terms of their specialized use across authors εἶεν and εἶέν are better viewed as fossilized wish optatives.

Probably because we often lack the textual evidence for most interjections from Archaic Greek, the diachrony of interjections is a dimension that is not typically considered in the description of interjections[25]. Nordgren (2015, p. 200) even goes on to claim that «the core semantics of each interjection is synchronically invariant»[26]. Exceptions to this are the so-called secondary interjections which have their origin in a different part of speech. Nordgren (2015, p. 12) cites the following influential definition by Ameka (1992, p. 102) who states that «secondary interjections are forms that belong to other word classes based on their semantics and are interjections only because they can occur by themselves non-elliptically as one-word utterances and in this usage refer to mental acts». For this reason, fossilized

---

(la Roi 2020, p. 227). Also even first person wishes can serve to let addressees (incl. the theatrical audience) know about the emotional dealings with current events by characters on stage.

[25] An exception is Labiano 2017 who provides a diachronic study of the interjection ἆ.

[26] He subsequently qualifies this: «However, since there is such a wide variety of uses of some interjections, understanding certain uses qua pragmatic markers provides an explanation for some of these, though it may seem far from their primary meaning».

imperatives such as ἄγε, ἴθι, φέρε are normally classified as secondary in-
terjections in recent secondary literature (Biraud 2010, pp. 25-42; Nordgren
2015, p. 12). The functions of interjections are typically divided into three
categories (Nordgren 2015, pp. 17-21): *expressive* (signifying the speaker's
mental state, action or attitude, or reaction to linguistic or extra-linguistic
event), *conative* (e.g. commands and exhortations) and *phatic* (expressing
the speaker's mental state towards the on-going discourse).

Nevertheless, this approach is problematic in specific cases, especially for
fossilized imperatives and fossilized wish optatives such as εἶεν / εἶέν. First
of all, it has been convincingly shown that fossilized imperatives have a va-
riety of functions which cannot be captured by classifying them simply as
conative interjections as Nordgren does[27]. Such an approach also disregards
the various diachronic changes (e.g. semantic and morphosyntactic) from
imperative to interjection / imperative particle for which we *do* possess tex-
tual evidence from Archaic Greek (especially Homer) and synchronic evi-
dence from Classical Greek from which diachronic changes can be inferred.
Second, with regard to εἶεν / εἶέν, the classification is problematic in that
Nordgren (2015, p. 221) suggests that εἶέν has expressive, conative and
phatic meaning: «1. phatic of compliance, concession or reluctant approval,
All right!, Now then!, So!, Well!, Well now!, Well then! 2. fig. expressive of
cognition, Ah!, Aha! 3. fig. conative to get attention or demand action, Come!,
Come now!». Among others, this classification is too broad to helpfully de-
scribe its usage (e.g. why would εἶεν / εἶέν be conative?) and does not ac-
count for the resemblance with the source construction of εἶεν / εἶέν, viz. of
a wish optative[28].

Still, we do not have much earlier textual evidence of εἶεν / εἶέν as stand-
alone wish optative from Archaic Greek. An example from Archaic Greek
that comes closest to the function of Classical Greek εἶεν / εἶέν is found in
the *Odyssey*. Odysseus (still unrecognized) has just made the wild suggestion
that Eumaeus might deceive and kill him, to which Eumaeus of course res-
ponds with a socially expected denial. Subsequently, Eumaeus signals that it

---

[27] See, however, Biraud 2010, pp. 25-42 for the useful identification of some differences
between them. More recent studies are provided by Zakowski (2018), Fedriani (2019) and
la Roi (2022a).

[28] See now Fedriani 2019 and la Roi 2022a for the role of the source construction in the
development of imperative particles.

is time for supper, thus implying that such talk should stop, and wishes that his comrades would soon be there. Conversationally this wish instructs Odysseus that Eumaeus wishes to focus on supper and comrades, which Odysseus is to interpret as closing off the dispreferred talk of deceit and killing. Narratologically it closes the scene.

> (12)
> ξεῖν’, οὕτω γάρ κέν μοι ἐϋκλείη τ’ ἀρετή τε
> εἴη ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους, ἅμα τ’ αὐτίκα καὶ μετέπειτα,
> ὅς σ’ ἐπεὶ ἐς κλισίην ἄγαγον καὶ ξείνια δῶκα,
> αὖτις δὲ κτείναιμι φίλον τ’ ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἑλοίμην·
> πρόφρων κεν δὴ ἔπειτα Δία Κρονίωνα λιτοίμην.
> νῦν δ’ ὥρη δόρποιο· τάχιστά μοι ἔνδον ἑταῖροι
> εἶεν, ἵν’ ἐν κλισίῃ λαρὸν τετυκοίμεθα δόρπον.
> ὣς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον, (Hom., *Od.* XIV 402-409)
> Aye, stranger, so should I indeed win fair fame and prosperity among men both now and hereafter, if I, who brought you to my hut and gave you entertainment, should then slay you, and take away your dear life. With a ready heart thereafter should I pray to Zeus, son of Cronus. But it is now time for supper, and may my comrades soon be here, that we may make ready a savory supper in the hut. Thus they spoke to one another

Furthermore, the functional resemblance of Classical Greek εἶεν / εἰέν with wish optatives and parallel changes in the history of Ancient Greek and other languages may support the historical trajectory suggested in this article. The history of the wish optative μὴ γένοιτό (literally: may this not happen, figuratively and parenthetically: God forbid!) shows a similar process of fossilization, as discussed by Evans (2003, pp. 70-80). In Classical Greek times it was used both as wish in independent sentences (e.g. E., *Alc.* 1135) but specializes to parenthetical usage in the sentence to qualify a part of the sentence (e.g. E., *Heracl.* 714), a function which it has expanded in Post-Classical Greek and retained until Modern Greek times. Similarly, French *soit* (so be it) provides a historical parallel for the use of εἶεν / εἰέν, since it is used similarly to let the hearer know that the does not want to continue discourse in the way of the previous turn but continue in a different direction.

Now, the corpus evidence and diachronic trajectory detailed above leaves only the puzzling distribution of accentuation. What LSJ report is typically also what etymologists and recent literature have reported, namely that the

aspiration found in drama is supported by ancient sources (e.g. Beekes & Van Beek 2010, p. 380). Nordgren (2015, p. 137) for example cites Mastronarde (1994, p. 397) who says that «the internal aspiration is established by Apoll. Dysc. Synt. 318, 26 and Plut. *Mor.* 393B» (but the latter text refers to something different, εἶ ἕν as 'thou art one' to address a god). However, when we take a closer look at what ancient grammarians such as Apollonius Dyscolus actually say about εἰέν, it becomes clear that Apollonius Dyscolus saw the accentuation of εἰέν as an oddity that did not fit neatly in the accentuation rules of Ancient Greek. In his discussion of the status of διότι / διὅτι he mentions that medial -h- is rare in Ancient Greek and mentions some of the exceptional examples that have it, one of which is εἰέν[29]. In other words, he might have mentioned the secondary aspiration but was nonetheless puzzled by it, which weakens the opportunity to use such commentary as the basis for assuming that the secondary aspiration was standard in Classical Greek times (in addition to the temporal distance).

(13)

Πρόδηλον γὰρ κἀκ τῆς συνούσης δασείας ὡς οὐχ ἓν ἁπλοῦν ἐστιν τὸ διότι, καθὸ οὐ παρεμπίπτει ἡ ἐν τοῖς φωνήεσι δασεῖα ἐν μέσαις ταῖς λέξεσιν, ἕνεκα τοῦ τοιούτου σεσημειωμένων <ἐνίων> ὡς ἀλόγων ὄντων ἢ ἀπὸ Λακωνικῆς διαλέκτου παρεισδεδυκότων εἰς τὰς ἄλλας διαλέκτους, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐν τῷ περὶ πνευμάτων ἠκριβώσαμεν. Ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦτό φημι αὔταρκες <...> διότι συνεστάναι ἐκ διαφόρων μερῶν τοῦ λόγου, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲν ἐκώλυεν τοῖς σεσημειωμένοις ὅμοια αὐτὰ καθίστασθαι, τῷ εὐοῖ, εἰέν καὶ ἔτι τῷ παρ' Ἀττικοῖς ταῶς. (A. D., *Synt.* 4.458.5-13)

«The medial [intervocalic] -h- (*daseia*) also shows that *dihoti* is not a single simple word, since medial h does not normally occur [in Attic]. This is the reason why the words which have it are classed as exceptional or loans from the Laconian dialect into the other dialects, a matter which we have discussed in detail in "On Breathings". I don't claim that this argument is sufficient, however, to show that *dihoti* consists of several words (*meros tou logou*), since there is no way to prove that it is not one of these exceptions (*sesemeiomenon*), like *euhoi* [an excited exclamation associated with Bacchic revelry], *eihen* ("well then", a conversational interjection), and also, in Attic, *tahos* ("peacock", a loan-word)» (Householder 1981)

---

[29] He mentions εἰέν, εὐάν, εὐοῖ in the same context of διὅτι (sic) at *Coni.* 242.25.

Biraud (2010, p. 156 note 9) summarizes a similar account by Herodian who also emphasizes that this group of interjections is exceptional with its secondary aspiration. Thus, although these ancient grammarians acknowledge the use of the secondary aspiration for εἶεν / εἶέν, it cannot be concluded with certainty that this means that the secondary aspiration was standard.

Moreover, as we have already seen above, this aspiration is by no means regular for other writers and their textual transmission in Classical Greek, even though secondary literature treats it as such. In fact, the accentuation of interjections in general is notoriously irregular. As Probert (2006, p. 129) put it, «the accents of interjections are hardly reducible to rules». Variations in textual transmission similar to εἶεν/εἶέν exist for other interjections, e.g εἶα vs εἶα, εὐοῖ vs εὐοῖ[30] or the fossilized imperative ἰδοῦ, which, Probert (2006, p. 130) informs us, has three different forms. Furthermore, fossilized items more generally undergo phonological change over time, as evidenced by diachronically related forms such as νῦν to νυν or μέν...τοι to μέντοι[31]. Thus, especially with fossilized interjections it is essential to scrutinize the corpus evidence to get a grasp on εἶεν / εἶέν. As mentioned above, evidence from the textual transmission for the dramatists Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and Aristophanes establishes a textual trend where εἶεν is treated as textual corruption and therefore corrected into εἶέν even though interjectional εἶεν is still attested in the respective authors themselves or the standard form found in contemporary authors such as Plato, Xenophon or Demosthenes. In addition, in Post-Classical Greek this approach to the textual representation of εἶεν is similarly problematic, as we continue to find a confused printing of εἶεν and εἶέν. Searching the TLG for the form ειεν (sic), reveals a distribution that matches the uncertainty from Classical Greek. Thus, the Post-Classical Greek data reveals a similar confusion over the accentuation of εἶεν and εἶέν, parallel to other interjections and fossilized particles.

---

[30] See Biraud 2010, p. 156. The transmission of accents by grammarians such as Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian might be misleading in itself, since εὔάν and εὐοῖ are only transmitted as such by them, not by Classical Greek writers.

[31] See Finglass 2007 and Allan 2017.

Table 2. Post-Classical survival of εἶεν and εἰέν.

Author	εἶεν and/or εἰέν	Example	Total
Menander	εἰέν	*Dysc.* 965	8
Dionysius of Halicarnassus	εἰέν	*Comp.* 13.1	1
Plutarch	εἶεν	*Mor.* 332c2	9
Dio Chrysostomus	εἶεν	4.91.1	18
Lucian of Samosata	εἰέν and εἶεν	*Tim.* 44 and *Cat.* 1.1	1 vs 8
Aelius Aristides	εἶεν	*Or.* 45.110.27	30

Continuing the secondary literature's approach of treating εἶεν as textual corruption of εἰέν on the basis of the textual evidence from Antiquity would thus be a dangerous enterprise, as not only Classical Greek but also Post-Classical Greek texts attest both variants. Nonetheless, only a comprehensive study of the manuscript traditions of the texts in which the variants are attested could conclusively answer whether the variation had its origin in a pronunciation difference or a likely phonological change common to fossilized interjections[32] and fossilized items more generally.

IV.   CONCLUSION

In this article it was argued that εἶεν and εἰέν behave in the same way and are used to signal that continuing discourse in the way of the previous turn / act is dispreferred by the speaker in completing the sequence / move (i. e. *let that be that; be that as it may*; *anyway*). Using concepts from especially Conversation Analysis, it was demonstrated that εἶεν / εἰέν occur when the speaker has received dispreferred responses or expansions in conversation, or when he reflects that his own previous act is dispreferred in reaching the communicative goal of the move in monologues. Thus, εἶεν / εἰέν signal that the speaker cannot accept where the previous turn/act is taking the discourse and wishes to resolve this issue by turning back to the matter relevant for completing the sequence/move. The interjections εἶεν and εἰέν are better interpreted as fossilized wish optatives, as also reflected by their functional resemblance to (fossilized) wish optatives and fossilized wish subjunctives

---

[32] Cf. Probert 2006, p. 140 on the phonological change undergone by ἰδού and its evaluation by ancient grammarians.

of 'to be' in other languages (So *be* it! [Eng.] *Soit*! [Fr.]). The mysterious phonology of εἶέν with secondary aspiration can only be explained when put into context of the usage of εἶεν and εἶέν and their troubled textual transmission in Classical and Post-Classical Greek authors. As many interjections, εἶεν / εἶέν have varying phonological and textual versions both in the same author and across different authors in Classical (e.g. drama vs prose) as well as Post-Classical Greek authors. This lack of phonological transparency of (secondary) interjections in combination with the fact that editors have tried to filter out εἶεν in favour of εἶέν (which had doubtful ancient authority) in Classical Greek drama has given us the complex picture that we see today in Classical and Post-Classical texts. Further research on the textual transmission of the texts in which these interjections (and interjections more generally) are found could prove a potential diachronic origin of the phonological difference similar to other interjections and fossilized grammatical items.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allan, R. J. (2017): «The Grammaticalization of Greek Particles: A Functional Discourse Grammar Approach», in Logozzo, F., and Poccetti, P. (eds.), *Ancient Greek Linguistics. New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives, Boston*, Berlin-Boston, pp. 103-118.

Ameka, F. (1992): «Interjections: The Universal Yet Neglected Part of Speech», *Journal of Pragmatics* 18 (2-3), pp. 101-118.

Beekes, R. S. P., & Van Beek, L. (2010): *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden.

Biraud, M. (2010): *Les interjections du théâtre grec antique. Étude Sémantique et Pragmatique*, Louvain-la-Neuve.

Brugmann, K., & Thumb, A. (1913): *Griechische Grammatik*, München.

Chantraine, P. (1968): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*, Paris.

Clark, H. H. (1996): *Using Language*, Cambridge.

Clark, J. T. (2022): «Extrametrical *NAI* and *EIEN* in Greek Tragedy», *Classical Philology* 117 (2), pp. 399-410.

Diggle, J. (1984): *Euripidis fabulae*, Oxford.

Drew, P. (2012): «Turn Design», in Sidnell, J., and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, Chichester, UK, pp. 131-149.

Drummen, A. (2009): «Discourse Cohesion in Dialogue. Turn-Initial ἀλλά in Greek Drama», in Bakker, S. J., and Wakker, G. C. (eds.), *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*, Leiden, pp. 135-154.

Emlyn-Jones, C., & Preddy, W. (2017): *Plato. Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo*, Cambridge, Mass.

Evans, T. V. (2003): «The Last of the Optatives», *Classical Philology* 98 (1), pp. 70-80.

Fedriani, C. (2019): «The Embodied Basis of Discourse and Pragmatic Markers in Greek and Latin», in Mocciaro, E., and Short, W. M., *Toward a Cognitive Classical Linguistics*, De Gruyter Open, pp. 69-92.

Finglass, P. J. (2007): «νῦν and νυν in Pindar», *Mnemosyne*, 60 (2), pp. 269-273.

Frisk, H. (1960): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.

Gera, D. L. (1993): *Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique*, Oxford.

Henderson, J. (1998-2007): *Aristophanes*, 5 vols, Cambridge, Mass.

Henderson, J., Marchant, E. C., & Todd, O. J. (2013): *Xenophon. Memorabilia. Oeconomicus. Symposium. Apology*, Cambridge, Mass.

Householder, F. W. (1981): *The syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia.

Jensen, F. (1974): *The Syntax of the Old French Subjunctive*, Berlin-Boston.

Kovacs, D. (1994): *Euripides. Cyclops. Alcestis. Medea*, Cambridge, Mass.

Kovacs, D. (1995): *Euripides. Children of Heracles. Hippolytus. Andromache. Hecuba*, Cambridge, Mass.

Kroon, C. (1995): *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*, Amsterdam.

Labiano Ilundain, M. (2000): *Estudio de las interjecciones en las comedias de Aristófanes*, Amsterdam.

Labiano Ilundain, M. (2017): «Greek Interjectional ἄ̃ = 'Stop doing that!' in Euripides», *Glotta* 93, pp. 36-47.

Levinson, S. C. (2012): «Action Formation and Ascription», in Sidnell, J., and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, Chichester, UK, pp. 101-130.

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1994): *Sophocles. Ajax. Electra. Oedipus Tyrannus*, Cambridge, Mass.

López Eire, A. (1996): *La lengua coloquial de la Comedia aristofánica*, Murcia.

Mastronarde, D. J. (1994): *Euripides Phoenissae*, Cambridge.

Miller, W. (1913): *Xenophon. Cyropaedia, Volume I: Books 1-4*, Cambridge, Mass.

Murray, G. (1908): *Fabulae*, Oxford.

Murray, G., & Dimock, G. E. (1919): *Homer. Odyssey, Volume II: Books 13-24.*, Cambridge, Mass.

Nordgren, L. (2015): *Greek Interjections. Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics*, Berlin-Boston.

Page, D. L. (1967): *Medea*, Oxford.

Perdicoyianni-Paléologue, H. (2002): «The Interjections in Greek Tragedy», *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 70 (1), pp. 49-81.

Pomerantz, A., & Heritage, J. (2012): «Preference», in Sidnell, J., and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, Chichester, UK, pp. 210-228.

Probert, P. (2006): *Ancient Greek accentuation synchronic patterns, frequency effects, and prehistory*, Oxford.

la Roi, E. (2020): «The Variation of Classical Greek Wishes: A Functional Discourse Grammar and Common Ground approach», *Glotta* 96 (1), pp. 213-245.

la Roi, E. (2021): «The Insubordination of If- and That-Clauses from Archaic to Post-Classical Greek: A Diachronic Constructional Typology», *Symbolae Osloenses* 95, pp. 2-64.

la Roi, E. (2022a): «Weaving together the diverse threads of category change: intersubjective ἀμέλει 'of course!' and imperative particles in Ancient Greek», *Diachronica* 39 (2), pp. 151-192.

la Roi, E. (2022b): «Insubordination in Archaic and Classical Latin: Commands, Requests, Wishes and Assertives», *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 21 (1), pp. 23-45.

la Roi, E. (forthcoming a): «The Pragmatics of the Past: A Novel Typology of Conditionals with Past Tenses in Ancient Greek», *Listy Filologické*.

la Roi, E. (forthcoming b): «Between Dialogic and Diachronic Syntax: the Insubordination of ὅπως in Classical Greek Drama», in Verano Liaño, R. (ed.), *Conversation Analysis and Classics. Talk-in-Interaction in Greek and Latin Literature*, Brill.

Sidnell, J. (2010): *Conversation Analysis: An Introduction*, Chichester.

Sommerstein, A. (2009): *Aeschylus. Persians. Seven against Thebes. Suppliants. Prometheus Bound*, Cambridge, Mass.

Stivers, T. (2012): «Sequence Organization», in Sidnell, J., and Stivers, T. (eds.), *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*, Chichester, UK, pp. 191-209.

Thijs, K. (2017): «The Attic Particle μήν: Intersubjectivity, Contrast and Polysemy», *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 17 (1), pp. 73-112.

Thijs, K. (2021): *Polysemous Particles in Ancient Greek. A Study with Special Reference to μήν and δή*, Unpublished PhD dissertation, Nijmegen, Radboud Universiteit.

Van Emde Boas, E. (2017a): «Analyzing Agamemnon: Conversation Analysis and Particles in Greek Tragic Dialogue», *Classical Philology* 112 (4), pp. 411-434.

Van Emde Boas, E. (2017b): *Language and Character in Euripides' Electra*, Oxford.

Van Emde Boas, E., Rijksbaron, A., Huitink, L., & De Bakker, M. (2019): *Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*, Cambridge.

Verano Liaño, R. (2016): «El comentario metadiscursivo en griego antiguo: aproximación desde la lengua de Platón», *Revista Española de Lingüística* 46, pp. 123-142.

Verano Liaño, R. (forthcoming): «Lengua hablada y análisis de la conversación en griego antiguo: estudio de εἰέν en los diálogos de Platón», *Anuari de Filologia. Estudis de Lingüística*.

Visser, F. T. (1963): *An Historical Syntax of the English Language*, Leiden.

Wooffitt, R. (2005): *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*, London.

Yule, G. (1998): *Pragmatics*, Oxford.

Zakowski, S. (2014): «εἰπέ μοι as a Parenthetical: A Structural and Functional Analysis, from Homer to Menander», *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies* 54, pp. 157-191.

Zakowski, S. (2018): «The Evolution of the Ancient Greek Deverbal Pragmatic Markers áge, íthi and phére», *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 19, pp. 55-91.