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The clause start in ancient Greek: focus and the second position

By Bruce Fraser, Cambridge

Synopsis: The paper undertakes an examination of the start of the Greek clause, adopting a prosodic approach with two inter-related stages. Firstly, the functions of initial elements are analyzed in terms of their prosodic prominence, rather than of any "pre-set" communicational role. Secondly, clitic words following the initial group are analyzed as placed, not in a single "second position", but on either side of an intonation break, depending on their function: while pronouns are intonationally and syntactically part of the basic clause, particles emphasize the initial group. Even their connective functions are interpreted as dependent on this emphatic role.

The background

The beginning of the ancient Greek clause has two regular features: a prominent word or phrase in first position (henceforth P1), followed by phonetically light words, which are canonically considered to be in "second position": henceforth P2. Problems of the communicational function of the P1 group are considered below. The meanings of words in P2 are notoriously elusive, but it seems possible to identify their major functions:

1) a connective role, which may be correlative, as at Λ.Εν. 1–2:

πρῶτον μὲν εὐχῇ τῆδε προσβελώ θεῶν
τὴν πρωτόμαντιν Γαίαν ἐκ δὲ τῆς Θημιᾶν . . .

First then among the gods in this prayer I honour
the first prophet Earth, and (born) from her, Themis . . .

2) an emphatic force directed towards single words, as that of δὴ at

Ἅλλοισιν δῆ ταῦτ᾽ ἐπιτέλλεο, μὴ γὰρ ἐμοιγε
σῆμαιν . . .

Tell others to do these things, yet do not give commands to me . . .

1 Thanks are offered to Professor James Diggle, who very kindly read a
draft of the paper, and made valuable comments on its argument.
3) a sententially adverbial use, as at *Il. 2.103:*

\[ \text{αὐτὰρ ἄρα Ζεὺς δόξε διακτόροφ ἄργειφόντη} \ldots \]

and then in turn Zeus gave it to the messenger, the slayer of Argos ...

4) a modal force, directed towards the verb, as of *κε* at *Il. 9.303:*

\[ \text{ἡ γὰρ κέ σφι μάλα μέγα κύδος ἄροιο.} \]

for indeed you win very great glory among them.

5) Pronominals and clitic verbs also appear in P2, as at *Il. 1.521:*

\[ \ldots \text{νεικεῖ, καὶ τέ μέ φησι μάχη Τρώεσσιν ἀφήγειν.} \]

\[ \ldots \text{she criticizes [me], and speaks of how I help the Trojans in battle.} \]

*The problems*

A structural analysis of the start of the Greek clause faces a number of problems, which may be grouped under three headings:

1) Words in P1 are normally analyzed by their function: either semantically, in terms of their function with respect to the rest of the clause, or pragmatically, in terms of textual relevance or of “point of view”. These are usually discussed in terms of the structural positions of “topic”, “theme” or “focus”. However, these categories can provide a very restricted model of the clause start, where there appears to be great authorial freedom in the choice of words, and their usefulness is sometimes obscured by terminological confusion.

2) A major problem relates to words in P2, where the placing in the one position of words with differing functions may create interpretative difficulty. The so-called “particles” are especially resistant to categorization: μὲν at *Eu. 1.1* above has also an emphatic effect on πρῶτον, which is different from the effect of ὤν on ἄλλοισιν at *Il. 1.295*, while subtleties of meaning may make any translation inadequate, as with ἄρα at *Il. 2.103*. Even more problematically, specific aspects of particles are traditionally analyzed in different ways:

   a) individually, they have always been analyzed in terms of pragmatic function, as by Denniston (1954), Ruijgh (1971), Halpern and Zwicky (1996), and Rijksbaron (1997a).

   b) their relative order within a P2 sequence is standardly interpreted syntactically, either in terms of scope or “domain” (by Ruijgh 1990) or of “movement” from within the basic clause (by Hale 1987, 1996).
c) yet their placing in P2 is canonically attributed solely to phonetic factors – most influentially by Wackernagel (1892).

3) Surprisingly, no syntactic relationship between the elements in P1 and in P2 has ever been proposed, apart from the emphatic function identified for some particles. Yet, in the citations above, the initial words (πρῶτον, ἀλλὰς, αὐτάς, ἤ, καί) all have a close relationship to the particles following, and indeed mostly have grammatical functions too. A more complete analysis of the clause start might, then, seek to identify functional connections between P1 and P2 elements, while taking into account the variety of particle function, and in particular the placing in the same position of particles with extra-clausal, connective, functions and those with intra-clausal, adverbial, roles.

The proposal

The P1 > P2 sequence can best be described by a model which integrates prosody and structure. Rather than starting with a semantic or pragmatic categorization of the words in P1, their grammatical and textual functions may better be interpreted as deriving from their prosodic prominence, to which enclitics in P2 can be seen as contributing.

The basis of the proposal is an analysis of P2 as not a single position, but as defined by the intonation group to which the words belong: either as enclitic on P1, or (following them in collocations) as preposed at the start of the basic clause. This difference accords with their functions as particles or as pronouns²:

1) Emphatic, co-ordinating, and adverbial particles, being part of the same intonation group as the P1 word, emphasize it by adding their phonetic material to it, like affixes, so are here termed “cohesive focalizers”³. For semantic and prosodic reasons which will be discussed below, indefinite and ethic dative pronouns belong to this group.

2) Interrogative, relative, and personal pronouns, and clitic verbs, are regularly separated from the word in P1 (and any following par-

---

² In theoretic terms, the difference accords with that between “special clitics” and “bound words”: see Zwicky (1977). A similar distinction between “Wackernagel’s Law clitics” and “WH-words” is drawn by Hale (1987).

³ “Focalization” is defined in this paper as the creation of prosodic prominence for any communicative purpose.
articles) by an intonation break. Unlike particles, their role is directed towards the following clause, rather than to the initial element, so they are placed proclitically. The sentence may, then, be schematized as in Fig. 1:

\[
[\{P1\} \text{cohesive particles}] \ [\text{interrogatives/relatives (personal pronouns, verbs \{clause\})}]
\]

A unified view of particle functions as prosodic focalization may seem to underplay their variety: as Rijksbaron (1997b, 12) argues, “instead of treating ‘the’ particles as one monolithic block in ‘the’ Greek literature, there is a need for studies dealing with (groups of) particles in specific dialects, genres, authors and discourse types.” However, the intention here is not to deny the value of such specificity, but rather to explore the phonetic relationships which may underlie the multiplicity of discourse functions, as well as the immediate linguistic context in which a particle appears. It will be argued that this constitutes a practical alternative to broader-scale functional interpretations of particle meaning, and can describe more precisely how the words may actually have been used.

**Consequences**

The proposed \[P1 > P2\] model has seven principal advantages:

1) it combines prosodic and syntactic factors, so paying maximum attention to the actual linguistic form.

2) it proposes a specific, emphatic, function for initial elements, whose placing is entirely within authorial control, rather than having to fulfil a preset semantic or pragmatic role.

3) it proposes a mechanism by which initial elements gain prominence: that is, by the phonetic assimilation of enclitics.

4) the resulting initial prominence contributes to the typically contrastive nature of Greek co-ordinated clause linking.

5) it explains certain features of the order of words within P2, such as why particles regularly precede pronouns, more completely than does a purely syntactic approach.

---

4 They typically start with the *spiritus asper*, whose phonetic friction accentuates the prosodic break preceding them.
6) it shows how early subordinating constructions exploit focal patterns similar to those of co-ordinated links, by the placing of indefinite markers (τις and τε) and modal particles (ἂν and κε) in P2.

7) it accords with historical changes in the position of particles, which came to be placed within the clause, with an entirely local emphatic function.

The organization of the paper

In Section 1, reasons for analyzing first position by prosodic rather than by semantic or pragmatic criteria are discussed. A functional categorization of elements in second position is outlined in Section 2, and the bipartite model of second position is described, with analyses of the relative order of particles and pronouns. Textual evidence for the model is considered in Section 3, and extended to subordination in Section 4, where an emphatic function is identified for indefinite τις, "epic" τε, κε and ἄν.

1: Initial position

The start of the clause is always taken to be communicatively special, but there are reasons to question the canonical descriptions of topic, theme, and focus, whose weaknesses can be summarized as their over-rigid association of logical and textual categories with grammatical structure.

1a: Topic

A lexical word may be placed initially because it expresses the topic: what the sentence is "about". Demetrius (Eloc. 4.199) writes of it as τὸ περὶ οὗ. It is standardly associated with the logical subject, which in propositional logic usually precedes the predicate. Initial placing is canonically defined as the topic position in early Indo-European

---

5 Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὄνόμασα τὸ περὶ οὗ. His example (from Ὡν. 1.24) is "Επιδαμνός ἐστὶ πόλις ἐν δέξια ἐπιλέοντι εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ἰονίου χόλπον" (Epidamnos is a town on the right as you sail into the Ionian gulf).

6 See Hockett (1958, 201), Li and Thompson (1976), and Lyons (1977, 503).
languages, as by Steele (1977) and by Kiparsky (1995, 153), who describes it as preceding an emphatic, or "focus", position. The structure is shown, with a Greek quotation added, at Fig. 2:

\[
\begin{align*}
S'' & \quad \text{Topic} \\
& \quad \kappaαι \ νυν \ \tauα \ \muασσω \ \muεν \\
S' & \quad \text{Focus} \\
& \quad \tilde{\tau}ι \\
S & \quad [+WH] \\
& \quad \deltaει \ \sigma' \ \epsilonμοι \ \lambdaγειν; \\
& \quad \text{Obj.}
\end{align*}
\]

A "topic phrase" is standardly considered to be preposed from within the clause. However, the Greek citation shows that an initial element does not always represent the topic: clearly, any phrase could be preposed, in order to make it more prominent. And the prosody here does not support a [topic > focus] sequence: interrogative τί appears less, not more, prominent than the initial phrase, which is emphasized by the intonation break following it. Finally, a topic or subject does not necessarily precede comment or predicate, even in declarative sentences (as may be seen in copulative constructions, such as A.Ch. 554: ἀπλούς ὁ μύθος simple [is] the story). Even Demetrius, who (Eloc. 4.199–200) proposed that το περὶ οὗ precedes in the "natural order" (φυσικὴ τάξις), writes (in fact iconically):

---

7 The quotation is from A.Ag. 598 ("And now, for the full story, what need have you to tell me it?"). Kiparsky (1995, 154) cites Vedic constructions at RV. 10.135.5 (rātham kō nir avart ayat "the chariot, who rolled it out?") and RV. 7.55.7.

8 This interpretation is supported by the metre: Raalte (1986, 186) considers that a sequence of two monosyllables following the penthemimeral caesura emphasizes a word-boundary after the third foot (here, between μέν and τί).

9 Thomson (1938, 367) in fact argues that the basic word order of classical Greek is predicate-first, and that subject-first is always an emphatic order.
γίνοντο μὲν οὐν ἀν καὶ τὸ ἔμπαιν ... 
οὐ γὰρ πάντη ταύτην δοξιμάζομεν τὴν τάξιν

Of course the order might be reversed ... 
for we do not absolutely approve the one order.

A certain confusion has, it seems, been created by terminology: in structural terms, initial elements outside the basic clause are canonically described as “topicalized”¹⁰. The use of that word to describe such extraposition is unfortunate, because it implies an association with the semantic category of topic, yet “topicalization” cannot be always semantically topical (since, although a proposition can logically have only one topic, it is possible to have multiple topicalized elements adjoined to one clause, but at different points)¹¹. Anaphoric pronouns can be topicalized, and are sometimes placed at the start of the clause, as at A.Eu. 649–650:

τούτων ἐπιθέας οὐκ ἐποίησεν πατήρ
οὖμός ...

For these matters, my father has not set charms ...

However, initial placing appears phonetically motivated: as discussed below, light pronouns regularly appear in second position, and even heavy pronouns may appear elsewhere in the sentence, as at Eu. 199:

αὐτὸς σὺ τοῦτων οὗ μεταίτιος πέλῃ ...

you yourself, for this you are not only jointly responsible ...

They may be analyzed as structurally “topicalized”, but seem unlikely always to be topics, which have a unique semantic function in the clause.

---

¹⁰ This may be defined, following Emonds (1976), as movement to a position adjoined to the clause, with a purely co-referential link to it.

¹¹ See Horrocks (1983, 104) on modern Greek, and Kiss (1995a, 11) for references to other languages.
1b: Topic and theme

A related explanation for initial placing is that the element is thematic, and expresses known information, which has been established in the preceding text. Theme is often associated with topic, and so taken to create a parallel between the intra-sentential and textual organization of information: narratively coherent texts may be analyzed as sequences of "discourse topics" in which the sentence topics are embedded, and, in discourse analysis, texts are standardly seen as organized by "clause chaining" or "thematic paragraphs". However, a congruence of textual theme and sentential topic creates a very constrained model of sentence structure: a topic may be a theme, but there is no reason to consider that it must be thematic.

In the functional grammar of Dik (1978, 1980, 1989), topic and theme are allocated different structural positions (theme being more peripheral), so potentially giving a more subtle analysis. However, few sentences have both an element which is topical and another which is thematic, so in most cases the availability of two positions merely reduces the specificity of the analysis (an initial element may be judged topical or thematic, as convenient). Nor does the model explain the instances where a topical element is also thematic.

The two categories of topic and theme have, clearly, been of considerable value in describing function: their formulation by Dik has informed much work on the pragmatic organization of ancient Greek. However, they have less power to explain details of clause structure, since they risk presupposing what is to be proved (that structure can be systematically mapped onto specific communicative function). Theme is an especially questionable structural category, since textual cohesion is typically marked by pronouns in second position, and themes are not necessarily expressed explicitly, but are often communicated indirectly.

A description of the initial phrase at Hdt. 1.10.2 as "thematic" therefore seems inappropriate:

---

12 See Firbas (1964, 268).
14 By Ruijgh (1971, 1990); Rijksbaron (1989, 1997a); and others cited throughout this paper.
15 Through presupposition and implicature: see Strawson (1952) and Grice (1989).
και ἡ γυνὴ ἐπορεύεται·

et (quant à) la femme, elle le voit sortir\textsuperscript{16}.

Yet Ruijgh (1990, 229) defines ἡ γυνὴ here as the theme of the sentence – an interpretation which could perhaps be plausible for an noun phrase, but scarcely for the temporal phrase at Od. 8.55–56 which he defines similarly:

ὡς δὲ ἐν νοτίῳ τὴν γ’ ὤρμασαν· ἀυτῶ ἔπειτα
βὰν ἐ’ ἱμεν . . .

... mais quant à ce qui se passa après cela,
ils se mirent en marche pour aller . . .

Ruijgh's translation puts quite a strain on a two-word phrase, but its length implies emphasis, and the view taken here is that both these phrases are emphatic, either as part of the basic clause (as the first could be) or perhaps "topicalized" to a position preceding the clause, but are not thematic: they may rather establish a new topic, and so create a contrast with the preceding text.

More importantly, neither theme nor topic appears to be a structural category of classical Greek: there is no evidence that any syntactic position is determined by thematic factors, or that any particles mark topic or theme (as they appear to do in some languages)\textsuperscript{17}.

\textit{1c: Emphasis and prosodic prominence}

The initial word group in the Greek clause does, however, have an identifiable structural feature: its regular prominence\textsuperscript{18}. In itself, em-

\textsuperscript{16} The translations of this and the following citation are taken from Ruijgh (1990).

\textsuperscript{17} As the Japanese theme marker \textit{wa}, on which see Bach (1971). Bakker (1993) argues that δὲ is a topic marker, but his definition of topic excludes both “what a given sentence is about” and “that part of a sentence providing ‘given’ information”, so is terminologically idiosyncratic.

\textsuperscript{18} Most commentators, subsequent to Thomson (1938, 367) identify a specific initial position as emphatic. A slightly different view is held by Denniston (1952, 44), who considers that “the weight of a Greek sentence or clause is usually at its opening, and the emphasis tends to decline as the sentence proceeds.”
phasis is a purely formal category, involving phonetic prominence, which may carry stress, perhaps even in classical Greek. It is, of course, likely to have a communicative function, as “prominent” usually implies “important”, and may, in fact, imply a variety of functions, such as emotional stimulation or expositive power (Dover 1960, 32), or the marking of information as new (Halliday 1967, 204; Jackendoff 1972; Lambrecht 1994, 208) or as salient or relevant (Dik 1980, 16; Sperber and Wilson 1986, 202–217). However, any communicative function requires its marker to be prominent, which depends on the prosodic feature itself.

In this paper, prosodic prominence is described as “focalization”, rather than only as “emphasis”, because it appears to be affected by enclitics in P2, whose function is described in Section 3 below. The proposed structure is shown in Fig. 3, with the same citation as in Fig. 2:

![Diagram](image)

The preposing of the P1 element is not a necessary condition of focalization: the presence of an initial prominent element in practically every classical Greek main clause implies that at least some of the

---

19 See Allen (1987, 131 ff.) and Devine and Stephens (1994, 216) on the possibility of a stress component to the classical Greek accent.

20 The Prague model of “communicative dynamism” exemplifies the connection: see Firbas (1964, 270).

21 P1 and P2 are here matched with the specifier and head positions of a “complementizer phrase” (CP) preceding the basic clause: for the terminology see Chomsky (1981).
variations must represent "normal" word order. The functional consequences of this prosodic emphasis, and its relation to following enclitics, are examined in the remainder of the paper.

Id: Emphasis and semantic scope

A functional reason for words to be initial is when they have semantic scope over the basic clause, even if not expressing the sentence topic. This category includes interrogative and relative pronouns\textsuperscript{22}. Scope position is canonically identified with the category of sentence focus, as it is regularly associated with emphasis (in English and other modern languages)\textsuperscript{23}.

It does, however, appear that scope and emphatic positions are not the same in Greek: though pronominals can be emphasized by preposing, their regular position is in P2 following the intonation break, and they appear in initial position only when emphatic and (almost always) followed by a focalizing particle in P2. In order to test this hypothesis, the 78 finite interrogatives in Choephoroi may be considered. If the 25 polar questions\textsuperscript{24} are discounted (because they are either not marked as questions, or are introduced by the prepositions η or πότες), the 53 remaining constructions with interrogative pronouns may be categorized in two groups:

a) In P1: 38.
   i) With particles following: 24\textsuperscript{25}.
   ii) With light verbs following: 3 (at 87, 778, 883)\textsuperscript{26}.
   iii) As quantifier in a noun phrase: 4 (at 10, 12, 338, 530)\textsuperscript{27}.
   iv) With no P2 elements following: 7 (at 88 × 2, 844, 858,

\textsuperscript{22} In theoretic terms, these are grammatical "operators": that is, quantifiers having scope over the clause, or binding variables within it. See Lyons (1977, 454).


\textsuperscript{24} The expression derives from Jespersen (1924). They may also be termed "yes/no" questions: see Lyons (1977, 754). They comprise: Ch. 14, 90, 92, 112, 120, 122, 177, 220, 222, 224, 297, 339, 418, 495, 496, 526, 774, 775, 845, 894, 899, 909, 912, 1010, 1074.


\textsuperscript{26} Of the verbs (φῶ, φῆς, and ἕστι), the first is not strictly enclitic.

\textsuperscript{27} At Ch.10 (τι χρήμα λέως; "What thing do I see?") there could be a prosodic host: Dindorf (1851, Vol. 1) adds <έα> before the line, to parallel Α.Ρ. 298.
871 × 2: all with interrogative πώς, and 885, with τί).
b) In P2, following emphatic elements: 1528.

Most interrogative pronouns are clause-initial, in which case they are almost always followed by P2 enclitics: πώς is the only pronoun to appear in first position without following enclitics (apart from 885, though here M has τί δέ), so is clearly a stronger prepositive than τί, though Dover (1960, 12) classes it with the other interrogative / indefinite pronouns and adverbs. It is phonetically different from the others in having a long closed syllable.

Because clause-initial placing does not otherwise occur without following particles, it appears that emphasis there is associated with the presence of the P2 particles, and that interrogatives are in P1 only when emphatic, even though that is their most common position (as would be expected for pragmatic reasons).

1e: *The contrastive function of emphasis: interrogatives*

This interpretation accords with the common placing of emphatic words preceding interrogative pronouns, observed by Thomson (1939) in over 400 Attic constructions. Thomson identifies a number of contexts:

1) When one of the clauses in a μέν-δέ construction is interrogative, as at S.OT 1232–3:

λέεις μέν οὖν ὁ πρὸςθεν ἴδεμεν τὸ μὴ οὐ βαρύστος εἶναι. πρὸς δ' ἕκεινοισίν τί φήσι;

What we knew before does not fall short by not being lamentable: and in addition to that, what can you say?

and A.Ag. 598 (also cited in Figs. 2 and 3):

καὶ νῦν τά μάσσω μέν τί δεῖ σ' ἐμοὶ λέγειν;

And now the full story, what need have you to tell me it?

2) When a word is repeated, by one speaker or in a stichomythic exchange, as at A.Eu. 94:

εὐδοιτ' ἄν, ὢν' καὶ καθευδοσῶν τί δεῖ;

28 Ch. 179, 214, 216, 218, 256, 315, 394, 408, 528, 532, 594, 778, 855, 899, 925.
Do sleep on, hey – and of sleeping, what need is there?

3) When there is a shift of emphasis between speakers in dialogue, as Ar. Ra. 1430:

εὖ γ', ὦ Πόσειδον. σὺ δὲ τίνα γνώμην ἔχεις;

Brilliant, by Poseidon. And as for you, what is your opinion?

Or a change of emphasis between ideas, as A. Ch. 924–5:

ὁρα, φύλαξαι μητρὸς ἐγκότους κύνας.
tὰς τοῦ πατρὸς δὲ πῶς φύγω παρεῖς τάδε;

(Clyt.) Look, watch out for your mother’s spiteful hounds.
(Or.) Those of my father, how may I escape them, neglecting this?

Intra-sentential contrast is also associated with the same pattern, as at E. Cyc. 525:

θεός δ' ἐν ἀσκῷ πῶς γέγηθ' οἴκους' ἔχων;

But a god in a wineskin, how can he be happy to have his home there?

Thomson identifies other functions: to mark stages in an interrogation, to make an objection, or to recall something in the previous text. Metrical convenience cannot be the explanation, as the pattern occurs in Plato too, as at Cri. 44a929:

ἡν δὲ δὴ τί τὸ ἐνύπνιον;

What was it, the dream?

The use of this construction to express emphasis suggests that P2 is the regular position for interrogatives, and that they appear first in the clause only by being emphasized in which case they are usually followed by particles, as at A. Ag. 1286:

τί δὴ τ' ἐγὼ κάτοικος ὁδ' ἀναστένω;

Why then do I make this pitiful lament?

and Ag. 1643–4:

τί δὴ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἀπὸ ψυχῆς κακῆς
ουκ αὐτὸς ἡναρίζεις, ἀλλὰ σὺν γυνῇ …

29 Thomson (1939, 151) cites other Platonic examples at R. 349b, Cra. 388a, Ap. 20c.
Why then with your cowardly heart did you not yourself kill this man …

Both types of construction express an adversative force: all Thomson’s citations involve a contrast with the preceding text (which is mediated through the choice of initial element), while interrogatives placed initially either introduce a new line of argument (as at Ag. 1286 above) or raise an objection in dialogue (as at 1643).

This paper argues that prosodic prominence is a regular feature of declarative as well as interrogative clauses, for similar communicational reasons, and that it is amplified by the presence of enclitics in P2. Initial words, therefore, cannot be analyzed adequately without considering their syntactic relationship with words in P2. The functions of these words are summarized in the next section.

2a: P2

The regular presence of grammatical words in P2 is associated with languages having largely free word order, including many early Indo-European languages, which suggests that the position has a regular syntactic function. The variety of roles of words in P2 may be summarized in four main categories, and it will be shown below that these have a systematic relationship with the P1 element:

1) Linking. A connective function is implied in the term σύνδεσμος (conjunction), applied by Aristotle (Rh. 1407a20) to μὲν and δὲ. Aristotle (Po. 1456b36–1457a4) identifies two features, a lack of denotative meaning and a postpositive placing, in his definition of σύνδεσμος as φωνὴ ἅσημος ἢ οὕτε κωλύει οὕτε ποιεῖ φωνὴν μίαν σημαντικὴν ἐξ πλειόνων φωνῶν περικυκλωμένην συντίθεσθαι (a sound without meaning which neither hinders nor causes the formation of a single sound or phrase from several sounds), which is not put at the beginning of a phrase which is by itself (ἡν μὴ ἀμόττει ἐν ἀρχῇ λόγῳ τιθέναι καθ’ αὐτόν)\(^{30}\). The qualification seems to allow clause-initial placing within a complex sentence, which has been observed in other languages too\(^{31}\). The linking function is subcategorized by Denniston (1954) as addi-

---

\(^{30}\) Po. 1456b38–1457a10 is marked by Kassel (1965) as “corrupta et confusa”, but the general sense may be discerned.

tional (καὶ), adversative (μὲν οὖν, ἀλλὰ, δὲ, μήν), confirmatory (γάρ), or inferential (τῶ, τοιγάρ, οὖν, ἄρα), though, as noted below, functions cannot be systematically matched with individual particles.

2) Adverbial. Some words, which Demetrius (Eloc. 2.55.1) terms παραπληρωματικοὶ σύνδεσμοι (expletive conjunctions), seem to have a primarily stylistic function within the clause, by virtue of their position, ἀρχηγὸς γὰρ τεθεὶς ο σύνδεσμος καὶ ἀποσπάσας τῶν προτέρων τὰ ἐχόμενα μεγαλειών τι εἰσγάζατο (“for, as the conjunction is set initially and separates what follows from what precedes, it creates a certain dignity”: Demetr. Eloc. 2.56.4–5). Demetrius’s examples include δὴ, νῦν, πρότερον, φεῦ, and even ποιὸν τι ἐστίν, so comprising orthotonic words as well as enclitics, though this paper concentrates on the latter.

As well as Demetrius’s μεγαλειών τι, words like “subtlety”, “nuance”, “elusive”, “colour”, and “bouquet” have been used to describe this group, as they have the most delicate shades of meaning. They are subcategorized by Denniston (1954, xxxvi-xl) as affirmative, intensive, determinative, and limitative particles. Perhaps surprisingly, they cannot be grouped in a binary division between adverbials with scope over one word, and those with clausal scope (which may be called sentence adverbs), because many can be interpreted as being in both categories. It will be argued below that all adverbials belong to the same semantic group: the focalizers. Further, they share features with the connectives, which are also παραπληρωματικοί, and it may be noted that Aristotle (Po. 1456b36–1457a4) appears to view the category of σύνδεσμος as including adverbials, as he gives as examples δὴ and τοι, as well as μὲν and δὲ. Connectives and adverbials constitute what are now generally termed “particles”, though this does not correspond to ancient use.

3) Anaphoric textual reference. Bergaigne (1877) and Delbrück (1878) described second position as the natural place or Haus of pronominals as well as of connective particles. Bergaigne (1877, 177–178) suggested that anaphoric pronouns come as early as possible in the sentence because, like conjunctions, they have a linking function, and that first and second personal pronouns are placed there by

---

32 These epithets are used by Denniston (1954) and Smyth (1956).

33 The terms μόριον and particula were applied by the ancient grammarians to phonetically light words, including lexical ones, rather than only to particles. For references, see Schenkeveld (1988), and, for a historical overview, Sluiter (1997).
analogy. However, an argument by analogy seems incomplete: pronouns might be placed in P2 for purely phonetic reasons, or for reasons of syntactic scope (discussed in Section 1d above).

4) Scope. As noted above, pronominals may be placed early because they have scope over the clause. Similarly, Wackernagel (1892, 34–5) pointed out that clitic verbs (which also have scope over their clause) are regularly placed in P2 in early Greek, and Hock (1982) observes the same feature in Vedic. It may be noted that an element placed in P2 for reasons of scope over a clause is likely to belong to the same intonation group as that clause, rather than to the initial emphatic group, so verb placing in P2 rather than P1 may have more than just prosodic motivation (as assumed by Anderson 1993, and Adams 1994b). However, scope is clearly less important than morphology, because, as inflections became more complex over time, so verbs came to be placed within the clause (and, in classical Greek, often clause-finally).

As no functional motivation appeared to explain why all types are placed in the same position, Wackernagel (1892) attributed their placing in P2 (to which he famously gave the status of ein Gesetz) to prosody, by defining P2 words in terms of their lack of accent, and so concentrating on the position itself as attracting all the light elements in categories 1–4 above. Dik (1980, 23) identifies P2 as the preferred placing for pronominals in a similar way, on the basis of word size. Both criteria identify a phonetic phenomenon, but do not give a complete explanation. However, both imply a contrast with the element in P1, which is therefore the more prominent. Consequently, even a purely prosodic analysis has a communicative implication.

The relative ordering of words in P2 collocations may shed light on the relations between their position and function, and some recent discussions have, consequently, concentrated on the internal details of the P2 “string”, in Vedic (Hock 1982, 1996; Hale 1987, 1996; Schäufele 1996), Hittite (Luraghi 1998), and Homeric and Koiné Greek (Ruijgh 1990, Wills 1993, Taylor 1996). The two principal syntactic approaches are evaluated in the next section.

---

34 For a discussion of his model, see Anderson (1993).
35 Mallinson and Blake (1981, 151) combine Dik’s explanation with a pragmatic one, based on theme-first, but reasons not to accept that have been adduced above, in Section 1b.
2b: Function and order in P2 collocations

It was observed by Delbrück (1900, 51) that, in early Greek, connectives precede pronouns, and Denniston (1954, lx) notes that sentence adverbials usually follow connectives. A more comprehensive ordering is proposed by Ruijgh (1990, 223) for Homeric particle clusters:

1) Adverbials with single-word scope (πε nurture, γε, μά, μάν, μέν).
2) Preparatory co-ordinating connectives (μέν, τε).
3) Connectives (δέ, γάρ, τε, μέν).
4) (Ruijgh does not discuss the placing of interrogatives and relatives, but others have suggested that they appear in this position: see Hale 1987, 42; Wills 1993, 72).
5) Sentence adverbials (ἀφαίον πριν, επίτε πριν, ἀν πριν, οὔν πριν, ὑπ' ἀν)
6) “One or two” indefinite pronouns or adverbs (not identified).
7) Personal pronouns.

Ruijgh (1990, 217) explains this sequence in terms of increasing syntactic domain (which appears equivalent to scope), in that “un postpositif suit immédiatement le mot initial de la séquence qui constitue son domaine”, so, in a complex sentence at ll. 3.396-8, the postpositives are ordered by increasing domain, with the connective τ' at 398 preceding the adverbial ἂοι' whose domain is the whole line (θάμβησεν ... ὄνομαξε), while τ' has scope only over the first clause (θάμβησεν ... ἐπειτα):

καὶ ὡς οὖς ἐνόπηθες θεάς περικαλλέα δειρήν
στήθεα θ' ἵμερόντα καὶ Ὑμνὴ μαρμαίροντα.
θάμβησεν τ' ἂοι' ἐπειτα, ἐπος τ' ἐφατ', ἐκ τ' ὄνομαξε] ...

And then, [ (as she recognized the round sweet throat of the goddess
and her desirable breasts and her eyes that were full of shining),
she then (both wondered, and spoke a word, and called her by name) ] ...

Organization by increasing domain apparently has some validity, since it suggests why particles which have scope over single words (like γε, πε nurture, and adverbial ὡς) precede others in collocations. The position of preparatory linking particles may also be explained by

36 Watkins (1964, 130ff.) generalizes that feature as common to all early Indo-European languages.
their domain: μὲν and τε (in τε καὶ) precede other connectives because their function is limited to the first clause of a compound sentence, while a connective like γάρ has scope over both. Ruijgh (1990, 218) infers this from the use of μὲν γάρ in constructions like Il. 11.824–637:

οἱ μὲν γὰρ δὴ πάντες, ὡσοι πάροι ἦσαν ἀριστοὶ ἐν νησὶ κέαται βεβλημένοι οὐτάμενοι τε χερσίν ὑπὸ Τρώων τῶν δὲ σθένος ὀρνυταί αἰὲν.

For [all of those who were before the bravest in battle are lying up among the ships with arrow or spear wounds under the hands of the Trojans – and their strength is forever increasing].

However, a principle of increasing domain does not explain the standard sequence, decreasing in scope, of [indefinite > personal pronoun], as at Il. 4.24538:

... ἐστάσο, οὖν ἄρα τίς σφί μετὰ φρεσὶ γίγνεται ἀλκῆ.

(connective > adverbial > indefinite > personal pronoun)
... stand still, and there is no heart of courage within them?

Nor does it explain the decreasing sequence of δ' and ἄρα at Il. 5.47:

ἡμεῖς δ' ἔξ ὀχέων, στυγερὸς δ' ἄρα μίν σκότος εἶλε.

(connective > adverbial > personal pronoun)
and he dropped from the chariot, and the hateful darkness took hold of him.

Ruijgh’s ordering has other features which are either over-rigid or ambiguous: μὲν and τε are categorized twice, while ἄρα and νῦ sometimes follow δὴ (as Ruijgh 1990, 225 allows), and the categorizations of γάρ as connective only and οὖν as adverbial only do not capture their full range of function.

Position by syntactic domain does not, therefore, give a full description. An alternative analysis of P2 in terms of word movement has been suggested for Vedic by Hale (1987), who proposes that sentence adverbials follow connectives because they are enclitic to P1

37 Wills (1993) adopts a similar analysis, observing that particles which emphasize single words are normally adjacent to them, so precede connectives and sentence adverbs. His examples are γε and περί, and he notes that μὲν, δὴ and νῦ may be placed in the same position.
38 Although τίς is here an adjective, it occupies the same position as a pronominal.
as defined after the preposing of interrogatives or relatives, but before the emphasizing of lexical words, while connectives are, as it were, "inserted" last, as discourse rather than sentential elements, and so precede question words. Emphatics are "cliticized to the constituent they will emphasize, and ... following this the emphasized element can be topicalized" (Hale 1987, 46).

This model is formalized by Hale (1996) in terms of a topic phrase and a focus phrase (the latter being the position for pronominals and adverbials). The sequence accords with the observed order [emphatic > connective > interrogative pronoun > adverbial], so agrees with the collocation sequence more closely than does Ruijgh’s principle. However, it is inadequate in two respects: it does not match the prosody, and Hale (1996, 178) admits to being "not entirely comfortable with ‘focus’ as a general name for that function"; and secondly, it is uninformative: no explanation is given of why emphatic preposing should occur after that of relatives, or why indefinites should precede demonstratives.

In addition, neither Ruijgh’s nor Hale’s model explains the great variety of particle function. A more general explanation, which takes account of the prosody as well as the syntax, seems to be required. Yet the two aspects are normally held (as by Halpern 1995, 192 and Hock 1996, 202) to be quite separate, and, of the P2 enclitics, only the emphatics are considered to have a syntactic as well as a prosodic link with their host words.

An influential attempt to overcome this problem was made by Halpern (1995), who proposed that P2 elements are structurally the leftmost elements (adjoined to the basic clause), but are placed in P2 by a prosodic "flip", which forces an enclitic to move one place rightwards if it lacks a prosodic host (i.e. if there is an intonation break to its left). In Halpern’s view, a phrase can be in P1 only if it is preposed, but a single word in P1 results from an automatic "prosodic inversion" with the enclitic. The functional difference is that only the first, phrasal, construction involves pragmatic motivation. However, it has subsequently been suggested (by Hock 1996, Taylor 1996) that phrases as well as single words can undergo prosodic inversion.

The "prosodic flip" of Halpern is ingenious, but is, as he admits (1995, 67), "a sort of last-resort measure" to stitch together the syntax and the prosody. It will be argued in the next section that they have a more substantive relationship, and that the prosody in fact closely mirrors the syntax.
The clause start in ancient Greek: focus and the second position

2c: The cohesive focalizer/operator division

The interpretative problem may be solved by the proposal that not only emphatics, but also connectives, adverbials and indefinite pronouns have a syntactic relationship with their prosodic host. All function as "cohesive" particles, and should be analyzed differently from (interrogative / relative) pronouns and clitic verbs.

The whole sentence may then be schematized as in Fig. 1 above, repeated here as Fig. 5, where the P1 intonational group is separate from the main clause, and "second position" is defined, not as a regular syntactic position (which seems an inappropriate description for clitic placing), but as the position of elements at either side of the intonation break which normally separates the P1 group from the clause:

\[
\text{[[P1] cohesive particles] [interrogatives/relatives (personal pronouns, verbs \{clause\})]}
\]

This interpretation predicts an ordering within particle collocations which differs from the canonical one in two principal respects:

1) Adverbials which can have sentential scope (ὡς, νυ, epic τε, θην, οὖν, δή, ωδ) and the modal particles κε and άν form part of the initial intonational group.

2) Indefinite pronouns are also part of the initial group, rather than being placed with the interrogatives. Dative pronominalis like τοι also function cohesively, with the initial group.

The regular intonation break enables differences in position to be clearly identified, including the distinction between indefinite and interrogative pronouns: interrogatives are preceded by a break, while indefinites are not. However, as τις cannot be used indefinitely without a prosodic host, there may on occasion be interpretative ambiguity: Dover (1960, 12–13) questions whether A.Ag. 1344 (σίγα· τις πληγήν αϋτή καθώς ούτασμένος; Silence: who/someone tells of a blow, mortally wounded) is really a question or an indefinite statement. Any

---

39 Of course, phonetic factors may eliminate the break, as in the citation from Λ.Eu. 1.1 at the start of this paper, where there is no discernable pause between μέν and εύχη.

40 Liddell and Scott (1968, 1801) suggest that its function corresponds to focal stress in English. Horrocks (1990, 39) notes that μοι, too, may be placed next to the most emphatic sentence constituent, rather than to its governing verb (as at X.Ath. 3.10 and D. 37.23).
ambiguity here depends on the presence or absence of an intonation break: at Ag. 449, τις is truly enclitic to σίγα, with no intonation break, so the indefinite meaning is unambiguous:

τάδε σίγα τις βαύζει ... 

these things someone mutters in a whisper ...

The semantic basis underpinning the prosodic difference is considered below in Section 4, in discussing constructions where τις is enclitic on the relative pronoun ὅς.

It might be objected that a prosodic division after the cohesive focalizers does not correspond to syntactic domain: after all, emphatics have a single-word domain, connectives link two clauses, and adverbs may modify a verb or a whole clause. This is what prosodic interpretations like those of Hock (1996) and Taylor (1996) assume. However, it is argued here that emphatics and connectives have the same domains, and that the same can be attributed to other adverbials.

This is because, in all cases, their scope can be interpreted as local, and limited to their prosodic host. Enclitic particles may be seen as functioning like affixes (and indeed the boundary between the two is indeterminate, since many words like τις and δὲ may function as either). As Cervin (1990, 59–65) notes, particles have a regular emphatic effect on constituents to their left (or complex constituents in which they appear late). Assimilation in a larger morphological unit is a general feature of particles, which may be seen in their capacity to function as affixes (δὲ: οἰκόνομος, ὅδε, ἦδε; ὑπ: ἐπειδή; and τε: ὀστε), or to have affixes added (ὅτα), or indeed to be composed of other particles (γάρ < γε + ἄρα, ἄρα < ἦ + ἄρα, γονυ < γε + οὖν).

The more conventional notion of domain is therefore inappropriate. It is structurally more likely that emphatic, connective, and adverbial particles have similar placing, though the syntactic domain of each appears quite different, because they all function in the same way: by creating a unified prosodic group centred on a focalized word in P1. The proposed mechanism is described in the next section.

41 The position of τις as third word implies that τάδε is “topicalized” outside the clause.
2d: The mechanism of "cohesive focalization"

The functions of grammatical words are rarely considered phonologically. Conjunctions are usually described simply by their communicational roles: as "signals" (Hockett 1958, 153–4), "markers" (Matthews 1981, 60–69), or "co-ordinators" (Quirk et al. 1985, 918–1007). However, it is reasonable to suppose that function has a relation with form, and this is most clearly so in the case of emphatic elements, which tend to be phonetically prominent.

It is proposed here that the connective function is also a kind of emphasis, because, just as a flag attracts attention by being physically prominent, so connectives also function, by making a contiguous element phonetically prominent. The mechanism has four principal aspects:

1) Phonetic. The cohesive focalizers function by adding their weight to the prosodic host, and marking it off prosodically from the following intonation group. This has an emphatic effect, which is inherently short-range (no particle emphasizes a preceding sentence).

2) Contrastive. The word in P2 is consequently also prominent in comparison with the preceding text. Its meaning is therefore marked as important or new.

3) Textual. The prominent element also introduces the new proposition of which it is a part. If it is a referring expression, it introduces a new referent into the discourse, and so may (though not necessarily) express the new topic. If it is a grammatical word, it expresses the syntactic and pragmatic status of the new clause\(^{42}\).

4) Structural. In subordinated constructions, the relative pronoun may be focalized by an indefinite affix. This appears to strengthen the inter-clausal link by substituting textual reference for definite, real-world, reference. Connections between indefinite reference, indirect interrogation, and focalization are discussed below in Section 4.

The introductory function of (3) above explains a regular feature of Greek clause linking: the presence at the clause join of a prominent element. When the conjunction is in P2, the link is pragmatically contrastive, because information in the second clause precedes the conjunction. This explains the typically adversative character of classical Greek co-ordination, and also the association of focus with new information, noted above in Section 1c: the word highlighted in con-

---

\(^{42}\) The focalization of the article of a noun phrase, then, marks specificity, though not the specific reference: see Section 3b below on μὲν γάρ.
trast with the preceding text is likely to bring a new fact or perspective to the discourse. If this initial element is itself a grammatical word (ἡ, καί, ἀλλά preposed τι, and so on), it highlights the syntactic relation between the clauses, so creating a purely structural, though still contrastive, link.\(^43\)

In sum, a prominent word is needed to mark the clause link, but the pragmatic effect varies according to the word selected, as much as to the particle itself. Focalization is, in pragmatic terms, epiphenomenal: it is not the presentation of any particular category of information, but the intensification of the presentation of (potentially) any category: it could be described as a framing device.\(^44\) Prosodic emphasis creates pragmatic emphasis, whose function depends on the choice of P1 element, as well as of the particle.

3a: Syllabic weight

It is not proposed here that the prosodic effect of particles is proportional to their weight, in terms of vowel length and number of consonants. All are light words, and shorter syllables do not necessarily imply a weaker effect: the insertion of an extra syllable, of whatever quantity, makes a difference to the sentence prosody, by separating the P1 element from the rest of the clause. Rather than being an intrinsic effect, focalization depends on the phonetic characteristics of the P1 element too: following a light element, collocations of particles are common, as with the μὲν γὰρ sequence discussed in section 3b below, and a mere accentual change (that is, a difference of emphasis) creates the radical semantic difference between οὐχουν and οὐχοῦν.

However, its phonetic qualities may have some effect on a particle’s function.\(^45\) The factors which could be involved are vowel length and openness, and the presence of a final consonant:

\(^{43}\) The importance of such adversative function is observed by Slings (1997) and Jacquinod (1997), in studies of orthotonic conjunctions and P1 > P2 sequences. Slings examines ἀλλά, ἀλλὰ γάρ, μέντοι, and καί τοῖ; and Jacquinod καίτοι.

\(^{44}\) On information framing, see Goffman (1974) and Tannen (1993).

\(^{45}\) Cf. Quintilian (Inst. 9.4.84): “plurimum igitur auctoritatis... et ponderis habent longae, celeritatis breves...” (so, long [syllables] have most authority... and weight; short ones most speed).
1) Of the P2 words discussed in depth by Denniston (1954), short- and long-vowelled particles are equally common, the former comprising ἀφά, γάφ, γε, δέ, μά, μέν, νυ, νυν, περ, and τε, while the latter are ἀφά, δή, γοῦν, ἔθεν, καὶ, μήν, νῦν, οὖν, ποῦ, and τοῦ. Denniston describes an emphatic force for all the long-vowelled particles, and, where there are both short- and long-vowelled variants (ἀφά - ἀφά, δέ - δή, μέν - μήν, νῦν - νῦν), the longer always has more force or "liveliness".

2) Particles with the (articulatory) open vowels α and η have intrinsically greater length than high vowels (see Devine and Stephens 1994, 62), and so might be expected to be more prominent. This seems to hold, as ἀφά, γάφ, δή and μήν are all notably emphatic.

3) Open and closed syllables are approximately equally common, too⁴⁶. This does not seem to have a discernable effect on their force, though particles with short, open, mid (or high) vowels (γε, δέ, and νυ) seem relatively unemphatic.

Yet the connection between form and function is not purely mechanical. An interpretation of particle function must allow for their contribution to sentence prosody. What requires analysis is the whole "sound envelope" of the clause start, and not merely the phonetic characteristics of the particle.

3b: Γάφ and dual function

It is argued, then, that the emphatic and linking functions are always shared by the same particles, that particles with one function are always associated with both, and that the same dual function may be observed with all adverbial particles. The connection may be seen in the range of uses of γάφ. Denniston (1954) considers that its core function is causal, all instances having some connective force. Similarly, Sicking and van Ophuijsen (1993, 24) suggest that γάφ is responsive in the sense of "making explicit a presupposition of the previous sentence." However, noting that "few Greek connecting particles started their careers as conjunctions", Denniston (1954, 56–57) proposes that "an earlier, asseverative, force lay behind the causal sense", and links this to the etymology of γάφ from γε + ἀφά. Smyth

---

⁴⁶ All particles with final closed syllables end in -ν or -ο rather than -ς. Enclitics ending in -ς, such as τις, πος, and ὁς, not discussed by Denniston, have wider contexts than "special clitics".
(1956, 638) has the same view, suggesting that γε originally gave prominence “either to the word it followed or to the whole clause, while ἂγα marked this prominence as due to something expressed or latent in the context.”

Such an interpretation raises the possibility that retrospective and preparatory function may reflect the same force, and indeed preparatory use is considered by Denniston (1954, 68) to be a stylistic variant, rather than an independent asseveration (which was the view of Kühner 1904, 332–3). In fact, retrospective and anticipatory γαρ simply reverse the dependency ordering: “since a, therefore b” is logically equivalent to “b, because a”, and parenthetical γαρ following the main subject could be translated as either, as Α.Αγ. 1069:

ἐγὼ δ’, ἐποικίσω γαρ, οὐ θυμώσομαι ...

But I, because/since I pity her, will not be angry ...

The emphatic effect appears to be entirely local: the view of Halpern (1995), cited above in Section 2b, that only phrasal focalization is pragmatically motivated, while focalization of individual words is an automatic “flip”, is not supported by the textual evidence: γαρ is always adjacent to the word or phrase which it emphasizes pragmatically, though when it follows noun phrases, the whole phrase may be regarded as prominent, as at Αγ. 461:

τῶν πολυκτόνων γαρ οὐκ ἄσχοποι θεοί ...

for of the killers of many, the gods are not unwatchful ...

However, when γαρ appears within a phrase, as at Ευ. 334, only the demonstrative seems emphatic, and a specific pragmatic effect may be understood:

τούτο γαρ λάχος διανταία
Μοίῳ ἐπέκλωσεν ἐμπέδως ἔχειν …

For this lot, piercing Fate
spun for us to be permanent …

After a verb phrase at Αγ. 222, the adjacent element, rather than the whole phrase, appears pragmatically emphatic (as Dover 1987, 61 implies):

βροτοῦς θρασύνει γαρ αἰσχρομῆτις
τάλαινα παρακοπά πρωτοπήμων …
For it emboldens men, woeful madness –
suggesting evil, the first cause . . .

Though γάρ may emphasize cohesive words (as at A.Eu. 334 above),
Dover (1987, 61–3) argues that it tends to highlight new information.
The reason is prosodic: an emphatic function certainly results in a
contrastive effect, and when the emphatic and linking functions are
in tension, the former is dominant, as at Eu. 797, where it is adjacent
to ἐκ Διός, though its linking function is related to that of ἀλλά:

ἀλλ’ ἐκ Διός γάρ λαμπρὰ μαρτύρια παρῆν . . .

and yet, from Zeus, there was clear witness . . .

The real-world reference of lexical words may, in such instances,
make their prominence appear somewhat arbitrary. The focalization
of grammatical words more clearly exposes the function of a particle
following them:

1) The emphatic function is particularly clear following grammatical
words: both those which have anaphoric reference, as at S.OT'409:

ἳσ’ ἀντιλέξαι: τοῦδε γάρ κάγω κρατῶ . . .

. . . arguing equally, for in that I rule too . . .

and also those which have a specifying function within the second
clause, as at E.Med. 1376:

πώς οὖν; τί δράσω; κάρτα γάρ κάγω θέλω.

How? What shall I do? For I too very much wish that.

2) When the grammatical word is a conjunction, a particle (or cluster)
following may create a very emphatic clause link, as at Il. 9.515:

εἰ μὲν γάρ μη δοθὰ φέροι τὰ δ’ ὀπίσθ’ ὄνομάζοι . . .

And yet, if he were not to bring gifts and to name still more hereafter
. . .

Dependency patterns of this type include εἰ γάρ and ἦ γάρ, which
appears to have a sense of urgency in Plato\(^47\).

---

\(^{47}\) Both are common in Plato, εἰ γάρ appearing 128 times and ἦ γάρ 205
times. Aristotle, too, uses the form regularly (581 and 596 times respectively).
See also Erp Taalman Kip (1997) on Platonic ἦ γάρ.
3) The P2 combination μὲν γάρ cited above is a particularly interesting collocation, as it is very common: in Homer (109 instances), the major tragedians (126), Herodotus (143), Isocrates (254), Demosthenes (360), Plato (447) and Aristotle (2,213). The contribution of γάρ does not appear to be only explanatory (as Denniston 1954, 67 proposed), but either balances the preparatory force of μὲν to create a two-way logical link, or combines with it to emphasize a definite noun phrase in the second sentence. This interpretation is supported by the regular use of μὲν γάρ to carry an argument forward, and by the high frequency with which the sequence follows an anaphoric pronoun or article, as at Il. 11.824–6 (cited in Section 2b above), and Arist.Po. 1448b25–6⁴⁸:

οἱ μὲν γάρ σεμνότεροι τὰς καλὰς ἐμμοῦντο πρᾶξεις καὶ τὰς τῶν τοιούτων, οἱ δὲ εὐτελέστεροι τὰς τῶν φαύλων ...

for the more serious [poets] represented fine actions and the actions of fine men,
while those of a cheaper nature represented the actions of inferior men ...

Particle placing within a noun phrase adds proportionally more weight to the light initial element, and also marks specificity of reference (the previous sentence has established that there will be a contrast).

The dominance of the emphatic over the linking function follows from the mechanism of cohesive focalization described above, because the force of γάρ cannot be determined without interpreting the P1 element too. It may be observed that emphatic force is implicit in the nature of anticipatory function: it cannot be known by a listener at the moment of utterance that there will be a responsive clause, so every instance of μὲν must therefore imply an emphatic force.

3c: Emphasis and co-ordination: chronological factors

A connection may also be drawn between dual force and historical changes of function: Denniston (1954), Ruijgh (1990, 221ff.) and Wills (1993, 63n7) all relate specific functional variations to historical

⁴⁸ Of the 24 instances in Arist.Po., 18 follow pronouns or articles, and of the 156 instances in EN, 111 do.
change. Four factors appear to be involved, implying a sequence in which adverbials acquired, and then lost, a connective function:

1) Adverbial origins. The observation by Denniston (1954, xl-xlxi) that “it is by no means certain that the connective sense of any Greek particle is the original sense” implies that at least some particles changed function from adverbial to connective. Denniston (1954, xxxvii) maps the functions of γε, δη, μήν, τοι as having originally expressed thoughts in isolation, and (1954, 359) argues that “the primary function of μέν, as of μήν, is emphatic”, and (1954, xl) also suggests an adverbial origin for apodotic function in conditionals (i.e. in the consequent clause), which involves both adverbials (γε, ἕ, μέντοι, δη) and connectives (καί, οὖν, τοίνυν). A general development from adverbial to connective functions is a plausible inference, since intra-clausal meaning might be expected to precede a linking function chronologically (because it precedes logically).

2) Rightwards movement. The (later) converse development is well established: in post-Homeric Greek there was a diachronic movement of enclitics, from P2 to adjacency to head words within the clause. This movement appears to have been motivated in part by an international change, with the movement of a postulated sentence accent from Wackernagel's position in classical Greek to fall on the main verb in Hellenistic Greek.

3) Rightwards movement and subordination. A functional motivation for intra-clausal placing may be found in the replacement of P2 enclitics by orthotonic subordinating conjunctions like ἐπει and ὅτι.

4) A consequent decline in contrastive linking. The change from co-ordination to subordination involves greater syntactic integration of the constituent clauses, which leads to a cohesive rather than contrastive link. This is paralleled by the changing force of co-ordi-
nating particles such as ὥς, which seems to have weakened in force from a "seriously" adversative particle to a continuative one, as Morpurgo Davies (1997) shows for Arcadian.

However, a purely chronological sequence does not give a complete explanation. Temporal change is indeed apparent, but its very possibility depends on synchronic variations, which demonstrate the great freedom of authorial choice.

The use of particles to emphasize a clause link is a notable feature of Platonic style: propositions are regularly introduced by framing them as questions, often negative, and there is a distinctive use of τι ὁν to mark logical coherence, and of τι ὥς to mark a new train of thought. Co-ordinated and subordinated linking may also be combined, producing great contrast, as at Crito 50e3-4:

ἔχεις ἂν εἰπεῖν πρῶτον μὲν ὃς ὁδόξη ἡμέτερος ἡσθα καὶ ἔχουσας καὶ δούλος, αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ σοὶ πρόγονοι;

Could you say to begin with that you were not our offspring and slave, both yourself and your ancestors?

Contrastive linking is, naturally, particularly suited to a dialogic style, though even here, authorial variations are considerable: in the Melian Dialogue of Thucydides, there is a marked absence of P2 elements, and consequentially the clause links are strikingly unemphatic. Conversely, the high frequency of μὲν γὰρ across genres has been noted above.

Particles are, clearly, not mechanical markers of pragmatic function, but are stylistic tools which are used distinctively by different authors. Therefore, rather than viewing historical variation in their function as simply the inevitable result of changes in Greek syntax, a more dynamic interpretation might seek to identify their use in stimulating such structural change. Their roles in the developing structure of early subordination are surveyed in the next section.

---

52 For other discussions of the pragmatic functions of ὥς, see Dover (1987, 59–61) and Rijksbaron (1997c).

53 See Sicking (1997). Τι ὁν appears 306 times in Plato, and τι ὥς 458 times; both far more than in any other author (only Demosthenes also uses τι ὁν regularly – 84 times). For brief comments on the Platonic use of particles, see Cook (1992).
4: Subordination

Clause linking in early subordination shares the emphatic character of co-ordinated linking. The emphasis may be purely prosodic, when a P2 enclitic follows a prosodic host in a preceding clause\(^{54}\), or may have a structural dimension. The earliest types of subordination, conditional and relative constructions, demonstrate only prosodic emphasis:

1) In conditionals which precede their main clause, a focalized constituent regularly precedes the conjunction, as at A.Ag. 345–7:

\[\text{θεοῖς δ’ ἀναμπλάκητος εἰ μόλις στρατός, \} \]
\[έγγηγορὸς τὸ πῆμα τῶν ὄλωλότων \]
\[γένοιτ' ἀν ... \]

And even if, without wandering from the gods, the army return, the awakened pain of the dead might arise ...

Interpolated or following conditionals, however, always follow an emphatic element in the main clause, as at Ag. 37–8:

\[\text{βέβηκεν· οἶκος δ’ αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν λάβοι, \} \]
\[σαφέστατ' ἀν λέγειεν· ώς ἐκὼν ἐγὼ ... \]

... the house itself, if it had a voice, could best say ...

2) In relative clauses which precede their main clause, the pronoun itself is typically emphatic, as at A.Ag. 501–2:

\[\text{ὁστις τάδ’ ἄλλως τῇ δ’ ἐπεύχεται πόλει, \} \]
\[αὐτός φρενῶν καρποῖτο τὴν ἀμαρτίαν' \]

Whoever prays otherwise for this city may he himself reap the error of his mind.

This structure has the resumptive pronoun typical of early correlatives, and also the common indefinite > definite sequence, with indefinite reference marked by the (focal) affix.

3) When the relative clause follows, the pronoun, though syntactically initial, is prosodically in P2, following its main-clause head word, and has purely definite reference, as at E.Med. 702:

---

\(^{54}\) See Hock (1996, 202ff.), and also the observation by Aristotle (Po. 1457a3) cited above in Section 2, that a connective is not placed at the start of a clause which is placed "καθ’ αὐτόν".
Kréon, óç áρχει τῆς γῆς Κορινθίας.55

Kreon, who rules this land of Corinth.

However, a syntactic as well as a prosodic dimension appears in free relatives (where there is no head noun in the main clause). In Homer, 64 relative clauses are introduced by ὃστις, as at I. 1.230:

δῶρ' ἀποσωφεῖσθαι ὃς τις σέθεν ἀντίον εἶπῃ . . .

... to take away the gifts of any who speaks up against you . . .

The pronoun is prosodically in P1, focalized by τις, just as in the preposed relative at Ag. 501–2 cited above. Here, however, it has an indeterminate syntactic function, being co-referent with an (unrealized) genitive in the main clause, as well as with the subject of the subordinate verb. A stronger linking function appears in indirect questions (free relatives with introductory verbs of speech or cognition), as at Od. 10.109–10.56:

οἱ δὲ παριστάμενοι προσεφώνεσθαι, ἐκ τ' ἑρέοντο ὃς τις τώνδ' εἶπ' βασιλεὺς καὶ οἶσιν ἀνάσσοι.

And they stood by her and talked with her, and asked her who was king of these people and who was lord over them.

Here, the pronoun has exchanged its indefinite function for an interrogative one (“who” in “they asked who” has a specifying force). The link between indefinite and interrogative function derives from their semantic interdependence: as noted by Lyons (1977, 761–3), an interrogative with “who?” presupposes the truth of an indefinite statement with “somebody”57. There is, therefore, a semantic overlap between two types of meaning, expressed through a similar form.

4) A more cohesive link is created by the neuter ὃτι (or ὃτια), in 39 indirect questions in Homer. Here the pronoun straddles the clause break, since it can be analyzed as syntactically in either clause. Its use represents an intermediate stage in the development of the relative pronoun as a textual connective in complective constructions (“say what

---

55 The line is stichomythic, and Κρέων is the only main clause element.

56 The other indirect questions are at I. 3.167, 3.192, 11.219, 14.509, 16.424, 20.363, Od. 4.380 = 423 = 469, 4.552, 8.28, and 9.331–2. For a discussion of the verb types, see Fraser (1999).

57 See also Dover (1960, 12), Monteil (1963, 65, 150, 154), Ruijgh (1971, 310), and Biraud (1985, 162). The semantic link is discussed further below under τε.
..." to "say that..."). Neuter pronouns retain an indefinite force, as might be expected for semantic reasons\(^{58}\), and are mostly followed by κε, as at *Il.* 8.408 = 422\(^{59}\):

\[\text{αἰεί γὰρ μοι ἔσθεν ἐνικλάν ὁτι κεν εἶπο.}\]

... for it is always her way to cross whatever I may say.

5) The interrogative function of τίς is shared by epic τέ, which appears in a number of Homeric indirect questions, as at *Il.* 2.365–6:

\[\text{γνώσῃ ἔπεμθ ὃς τ' ἤγεμόνων κακοῖς, ὃς τέ νυ λαὸν ἤδ' ὃς κ' ἐσθλὸς ἤσι ...}\]

Then you will see which of your leaders is cowardly, and which of your people, and which also are brave ...

and *Il.* 21.609–10\(^{60}\):

\[\text{μεῖναι ἔτ' ἀλλήλους, καὶ γνώμεναί, ὃς τέ πεφεύγοι ὃς τ' ἑθαν' ἐν πολέμῳ ...}\]

... to wait for each other and find out which one had got away and who had died in the battle ...

The functional parallel between τίς and epic τέ is supported by the analysis of Ruijgh, who (1971, 9) notes that τέ is regularly associated with digressive, non-restrictive, relatives (after ὃς, ὁ, ὅθεν, ὅτε, ὁίος, ὅς) and co-ordinated clauses (after δὲ, ἀτὰρ, γὰρ, μὲν, καὶ, ἀλλὰ). It is central to his definition of the function of epic τέ as "digressif-permanent" that it has a linking function and that it marks generic reference\(^{61}\). That connection was first identified by Delbrück (1897, 511ff.), who considered that, following a relative pronoun, Indo-European *kʷe always had an emphatic function, linked to indefiniteness, which was prior to a connective function\(^{62}\). The indefinite force of

\(^{58}\) Because there is no presupposition of specific reference with neuters: Lyons (1977, 763) notes that the answer to interrogative "what?" (unlike that to "who?") may be indefinite.

\(^{59}\) See also *Il.* 15.148 below. The others are cited in Fraser (1999, Appendix 3a).


\(^{61}\) The view of Sihler (1995, 401) that -τε is added to relative pronouns "without any apparent change in meaning" is not, therefore, followed here.

\(^{62}\) There may be an etymological connection too: Sihler (1995, 396–7)
both τις and τε therefore accords with their use in emphatic clause linking.

6) A parallel between τε and κε may be seen in the use of both at Il. 2.365–6 above. Κε appears also to have a general emphatic function, which is shared by ἀν: Howorth (1955) observes that there is a strong tendency for ἀν or κε to be used in indefinite clauses referring to the future, and argues that this is because they are placed after the first important word of the indefinite phrase, in order to emphasize it, even when referring to the main verb, as at Il. 15.148:

ἐχθάειν ὀτι τε κεῖνος ἐποτύρην καὶ ἀνώγη.

If he urges and orders you to do anything, then (κε) do it63.

Similarly, in Attic Greek, ἀν may emphasize the emphatic word or phrase which implies the condition to which the main verb is subject, as at Th. 7.13.1:

ἡμῖν δ’ εἶκολλής ἀν περιουσίας νεών μόλις τούτο ὑπῆρξε …

This would hardly be our position if we had a great abundance of ships …

The relationship between the modal and linking functions accords with the local model of focalization advanced here, because the modal force is expressed through the indefinite reference of the emphatic element ("whatever", "some great abundance") as well as through the verb. The linking function is, as with other focalizers, one which becomes chronologically less important: Howorth cites a number of similar constructions (Il. 24.661, And. 1.21, Pl.Phil. 101d, D. 19.29), which support his claim (1955, 93) that “although in Attic, where ἀν is used with the main clause, it has lost its tendency to come as second word, it has retained this tendency in indefinite clauses, because it was once felt as construed with the main verb.”

7) Focalization may also have a textually-referring function. In early completives involving ὅς, demonstrative τὸδε frequently anticipates

observes that the Proto-Indo-European stem *kʷe- has indefinite and interrogative function in every branch, and speculates that the link between relative and interrogative might be that *kʷe- was a focus marker. On the derivation of τε from the stem *kʷo-/*kʷe-, see Meillet (1898), Kühner (1904, 236, 241), Schwyzer (1950, 573ff.), Monteil (1963, 109–111), and Ruijgh (1971).

63 The translations of this and the following citation are taken from Howorth (1955, 84). Similar constructions occur at Il. 8.142–3 and 12.369.
the following clause, as well as creating a contrast with the preceding text, as at E. Med. 85–6:

... ἄρτι γιγνώσκεις τόδε,
ὡς πᾶς τίς αὐτὸν τοῦ πέλας μᾶλλον φιλεῖ;

... have you only just now learned this,
that/how each loves himself more than others?

Tóde and tāde are used with the same function in Homer, Sophocles, Herodotus, Plato and Xenophon64. In such constructions, the P1 intonation group is constituted by the demonstrative, with ὡς having an adverbial function within the subordinate clause, demonstrating how a co-ordinating structure could be adapted to subordinate use. This use of τόδε creates a more emphatic and contrastive clause link than those involving τις, τι, τε and κε (described above). However, all constructions demonstrate the use of focalization in early subordinated linking.

Conclusion: focus and prosody

At the start of the paper, three major problems were described: the functional status of the first position of the clause, the multiplicity of function of P2 elements, and the relationship between the first and second positions. An integrated approach was developed, by mapping the functions of initial elements in terms of their prominence, rather than from a dedicated topical or thematic function. This view was supported by observations on the functions of a number of particles (γάρ, μὲν γάρ, τις, τέ, κε and ἂν) in co-ordinated and subordinated constructions.

The principle underlying the argument is that interpretations of the functions of P2 elements must take account of their immediate context. Taxonomies of core meanings and attempts to identify wider pragmatic roles give rather general interpretations: a precise description must also identify a particle's functional relationship with its prosodic host, and its co-occurrence with other P2 elements.

A local interpretation links prosody with syntax, while giving max-

64 As Od. 3.255; Hdt. 3.108.1, 8.68.29–31 and 9.95.3–4; X. Eq.Mag. 8.16.1, and Hell. 5.2.18.7; Pl. Sph. 248d10; Plt. 259c6, 266c.10, 276c6; Philb. 20d7, 32d9, 43a1; Phdr. 245b5, 265c5; Men. 93; R. 370b7, 387d11, 526b5, 572b4; and Lg. 788d4, 791b5, 805c2, 809e3.
imum scope to authorial freedom in sentence composition, and also accords with historical changes in the placing of enclitics. The approach seems therefore appropriate to the study of particles, as well as to the investigation of syntactic changes in ancient Greek.
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