Word order in Ancient Greek is a complex and difficult topic. The evidence is limited to surviving written texts, which are abundant but differ widely in chronological period, dialect, and genre as well as the level of stylistic and esthetic ambition to which the various authors aspire. We have very little access to what might be called ordinary conversation (only some short passages of Aristophanes and Plato perhaps come close to replicating it), and of course the phonological structures of extended discourse are incompletely understood. Intensive study of the texts has produced descriptive or statistical results that indicate tendencies of varying degrees of strength. In recent decades studies embracing concepts and theories that have proved useful in cross-linguistic investigations have shed light on Ancient Greek word order, but often demonstrations have been based on rather small samples or too few authors and genres, and even so the results usually leave many unexplained anomalies. The aim of this short discussion is to give the beginning or intermediate Greek student a brief introduction to some important factors to be considered, especially factors that may assist in reading and translating Greek texts.

Ancient Greek is among the languages that are said to have a free word order, but this freedom must be understood in relation to the comparatively fixed word-order patterns found in languages such as English. There are actually many constraints on the positions of particular words or phrases in Greek. Learning to recognize the segmentation of a Greek sentence is one of the key skills of reading continuous texts because it ensures the correct distribution of different elements (see the separate document on Transitioning to Reading Continuous Greek Texts). For example, most subordinate clauses are discrete, beginning with words like the relative pronoun ὅς or the temporal conjunction ἐπειδή or the purpose conjunction ἵνα. One normally will not find any element of such a clause before these introductory words, and between that first word and the end of the subordinate clause, there will usually not be any word that belongs instead to the superordinate clause.

Extended circumstantial participial phrases, including genitive absolutes, are similar to subordinate clauses and so usually distinctly demarcated, although a transitive nominative participle sometimes shares the same object as the main verb, making the boundary between main clause and subordinate phrase less distinct. On a smaller scale, a prepositional phrase has a very strong tendency to be similarly discrete. The adjectival modifiers of a noun that has the article are subject to a constraint that has semantic significance, since in classical prose those outside the article-noun group are predicative while those inside it are attributive.

Whereas the factors mentioned so far are syntactic, intonational factors (also termed prosody in older studies or phonology in more recent ones) also play a role in some aspects of word order. The proclitic article must be followed by a noun or noun-equivalent (sometimes with a postpositive conjunction intervening), unless ὁ, ἡ, τό is being used in its older pronominal function. Enclitic and postpositive words cannot appear first in clause or a smaller intonation unit (often called a *colon*, plural *cola*, in studies of ancient Greek). An understanding of postpositives can contribute importantly to detecting the segmentation of a Greek passage: normally the word immediately before the postpositive must be the beginning of a new structural unit or at least a unit that can be considered separate from the preceding in intonation), whether this is a single word (ἀνὴρ δίκαιος εὐσεβής τε) or something more (τὸ μὲν εὐθύς, τὸ δὲ καὶ διανοούμενον).

Postpositives can even intrude upon what is usually a syntactic unity. The postpositive conjunction introducing a complex sentence falls second in an initial subordinate clause (e.g., ἐπεὶ δὲ…, εἰ γὰρ…) but applies to the whole sentence, not the subordinate clause itself. The article-noun group or a prepositional phrase can be interrupted (e.g., οἵ τ' ἄνδρες αἵ τε γυναῖκες; περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς Θησέως ἀρετῆς).

An important approach to word order that underlies many studies of ancient Greek in recent years is pragmatic analysis. Pragmatics refers to the mechanisms of communication between

speaker and addressee, taking account of shared presuppositions and the gradual construction of a message or narrative by conveying new pieces of information. The terminology used in pragmatic analysis is not uniform and many issues are still under debate. With some simplification, however, we can posit that there are two important pragmatic functions in most utterances: a topic function performed by the element that refers to some entity within the shared pragmatic information or presuppositions of the speaker and addressee and that serves as the foundation for constructing a message; and a focus function performed by the element that expresses the information the speaker considers to be the most urgent part of the message to be conveyed. The elements that represent topic and focus may be said to be pragmatically marked, and focus is the most salient and/or new information conveyed in the utterance. The elements that follow the verb are said to be pragmatically unmarked and may be called the remainder. Current studies argue that ancient Greek (like some other languages) has, in a large proportion of simple declarative sentences, the following pragmatic order:

TOPIC — FOCUS — VERB — REMAINDER

This simple scheme requires a number of qualifications.

- The topic function may be empty whenever it is obvious to both the speaker and the addressee what the topic is, as when in Greek a subject noun or pronoun is not necessary because the subject is continued from the preceding discourse.
- The topic, although usually a matter of shared knowledge or presupposition, is sometimes new material, as at the beginning of an extended message or a narrative or when two or more topics are set in contrast or enumerated (as happens so often in Greek because of the frequency of antitheses or enumerations with μέν-δέ).
- The verb may serve as focus, so that the scheme is reduced to TOPIC — FOCUS/VERB — REMAINDER.
- The verb may, in some contexts, serve as topic, again with a reduction of the scheme, to TOPIC/VERB — FOCUS — REMAINDER.
- The focus may be a phrase (such as a verb and its argument or object) rather than a single word.
- In more complex sentences, there is often material before the topic position: this provides background information or scene-setting and takes the form of an adverbial phrase, a temporal clause, a genitive absolute, or similar constructions.
- In some authors, there is frequently a subordinate element like a temporal clause or extended participial phrase between the topic and the main part of the sentence (this may be called a suspended topic). For example, Xen. *Hellenica* 2.1.15 Λύσανδρος δ', | ἐπεὶ αὐτῷ Κῦρος πάντα παραδοὺς τὰ αὑτοῦ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἀρρωστοῦντα μετάπεμπτος ἀνέβαινε, | μισθὸν διαδοὺς τῇ στρατιᾷ | ἀνήχθη τῆς Καρίας εἰς τὸν Κεράμειον κόλπον (*Lysander, | when Cyrus had turned all his affairs over to him and was heading inland under summons to visit his father, because his father was sick, | after distributing wages to the army | set sail for the Cerameian bay in Caria*): Λύσανδρος is TOPIC, and ἀνήχθη is FOCUS. The ἐπεί-clause here is scene-setting information, placed after the TOPIC instead of before it. The nominative participial phrase might also be called scene-setting, but it could also be viewed as a kind of secondary focus (this is a new action, enabled by the fact that in the previous sentence Cyrus provided Lysander with funds), subordinated to the main focus in a way that is typical of Greek prose style (where English says *Joe did X and did Y*, Greek often prefers *Joe, having done X, did Y*).

From the above it can be seen that there will be considerable variation in the order of subject and verb and object. Whereas English uses a standard order SVO (subject–verb–object), Greek offers many examples of both SVO and SOV (subject–object–verb) as well as, less frequently, other permutations. Subjects are very frequently topics and very often appear early in a sentence, sometimes (as just mentioned) with scene-setting information preceding or following in parenthetic fashion before the focus and verb. Objects are in many circumstances the focus and end up before the verb, but in various circumstances the object may not be pragmatically marked (for instance, a modifier of the object may be marked, but not the object noun itself) and thus may follow the verb. For instance, in the Lysias passage discussed in detail below, the clause *οὔτε χρημάτων ἔνεκα ἔπραξα ταῦτα* exhibits an adverbial prepositional phrase *for the sake of money* as the focus, the verb follows, and the object *ταῦτα* follows the verb.

Pragmatic analysis is often revealing, but runs into difficulties in prose passages involving long and complex sentences and leaves the status of the less marked portion of the sentence unexplained. Issues of word order can also be evaluated under a different but complementary type of analysis involving tree structures that map dependencies in phrases, with a head constituent and its dependents. One can then observe dislocations or projections (sometimes referred to as left dislocation or left projection) of elements out of their routine positions. Analogies have been drawn between the structuring of noun phrases (esp. in the form with an article) and of verbal phrases or clauses, with the article understood as the left boundary of the noun phrase and the subject (if present) as the left boundary of a verb phrase. Any element of the phrase that is projected to the left of the boundary is a marked element and bears some pragmatic or semantic emphasis. Dependent elements within a phrase can also be classified as either *argument* (obligatory concomitant) or *adjunct* (optional concomitant), and again one may postulate marked and unmarked positions for these words. For instance, in the recent study of Beschi (see bibliography at end), phrases of the following patterns are described as follows:

noun with article and genitive argument:
ἡ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐπιθυμία is unmarked, argument more important than noun
ἡ ἐπιθυμία τοῦ ὕδατος is unmarked, but noun now more important than argument
ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἡ τοῦ ὕδατος is marked, conveying separateness of the two constituents, argument distinct from noun

noun with article and adjective adjunct:
οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες (or *ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες* without article) is unmarked, conveying a neutral status of the adjective relative to the noun
ἄνδρες ἀγαθοί is unmarked, but noun is now more important than adjective
οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἀγαθοί is marked, conveying separateness of the two constituents, adjective distinct from noun

noun with article and adjunct and argument:
τὴν ἄγαν τῶν πλεόνων ἐπιθυμίαν: normal position of argument when both adjunct and argument are present is between adjunct and noun

Note that this analysis of phrases of the type *οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἀγαθοί* (as expressing distinctness and some emphasis in the adjective) differs from the claim based on a pragmatic analysis that adjectives following their nouns are relatively unmarked, while those that precede their nouns are relatively more salient than the noun. For verb phrases, similar claims are made about the position of adjuncts and arguments:

verb with argument (object):

subject (optional)—argument—verb is unmarked, and the argument is more important than the verb

subject (optional)—verb—argument may be unmarked, and the verb is more important than the argument

subject (optional)— verb—argument may also be marked, conveying separateness of the two constituents, distinct force of the argument relative to the verb (or this order may be due to the length or weight of the argument)

verb with adjunct (adverb, adverbial expression):

subject (optional)—adjunct—verb is unmarked, conveying a neutral status of the adjunct relative to the verb

subject (optional)— verb—adjunct may be unmarked, and the verb is more important than the adjunct

subject (optional)—verb—adjunct may also be marked, conveying separateness of the two constituents, distinct force of the adjunct relative to the verb (or this order may be due to the length or weight of the adjunct)

verb with both adjunct and argument:

subject (optional)—adjunct—argument—verb: normal position of argument when both an adjunct and an argument are present is between adjunct and verb

In this kind of analysis of constituents, there is also a rule about elements that are lengthy and thus have a certain "weight": these tend to be postponed until after the noun or verb, but may retain a marked status (pragmatic function or extra emphasis).

In what follows, three example passages are described in detail.

<div align="center">Example 1</div>

Here is a sample passage from Xenophon (*Anabasis* 1.8.14-16), separated into sentences, with the label of pragmatic function preceding each phrase in the translation.

καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ καιρῷ τὸ μὲν βαρβαρικὸν στράτευμα ὁμαλῶς προῄει, τὸ δὲ Ἑλληνικὸν ἔτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μένον συνετάττετο ἐκ τῶν ἔτι προσιόντων.

And [setting] *at this juncture* [topic in contrast] *the Persian army* [focus, including verb] *was advancing evenly, but* [topic in contrast] *the Greek force,* [parenthetic participial phrase] *still remaining in the same position,* [verb as focus] *was being assembled and arranged* [remainder] *out of the soldiers who were still coming up.*

καὶ ὁ Κῦρος παρελαύνων οὐ πάνυ πρὸς αὐτῷ τῷ στρατεύματι κατεθεᾶτο ἑκατέρωσε ἀποβλέπων εἴς τε τοὺς πολεμίους καὶ τοὺς φίλους.

And [topic, returning from earlier in passage] *Cyrus,* [parenthetic participial phrase] *riding not too close to the army itself,* [verb as focus] *was surveying the scene,* [remainder] *looking in both directions toward both the enemy and his friends.*

ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Ξενοφῶν Ἀθηναῖος, πελάσας ὡς συναντῆσαι, ἤρετο εἴ τι παραγγέλλοι·

And [setting] *catching sight of him from the Greek army,* [new topic] *Xenophon of Athens,* [parenthetic participial phrase] *having drawn nearer so as to meet him face to face,* [verb as focus] *asked him* [remainder] *whether he had any messsage to pass along.*

ὁ δ' ἐπιστήσας εἶπε καὶ λέγειν ἐκέλευε πᾶσιν ὅτι καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ σφάγια καλά.
And [topic, returning] *he (Cyrus),* [parenthetic participial phrase] *coming to a halt,* [extended focus including verb] *said (to Xenophon) and ordered him to tell* [remainder] *everyone that the offerings to the gods are favorable and the prebattle sacrifices are propitious.*

ταῦτα δὲ λέγων θορύβου ἤκουσε διὰ τῶν τάξεων ἰόντος, καὶ ἤρετο τίς ὁ θόρυβος εἴη.
And [setting] *as he was saying this,* [topic, unexpressed in Greek] *he* [verb] *heard* [focus: before the verb in Greek] *an uproar* [remainder] *passing through the ranks, and* [topic, unexpressed in Greek] *he* [verb as focus] *asked* [remainder] *what the tumult was.*

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ὅτι σύνθημα παρέρχεται δεύτερον ἤδη.
And [topic, returning] *he (Xenophon)* [verb as focus] *said* [remainder] *that a second password is already passing through the army.*

Perhaps it is odd to term the important indirect statements and questions as remainder. An alternative would be to regard the indirect statement/question and its verb as a complex focus, and explain the postponement of the dependent clauses after the verb of saying or asking in terms of the tendency for a lengthy dependent constituent (or argument) to be placed after the governing word, in contrast to shorter arguments usually appearing before the governing word.

Note that the analysis can be extended to some subordinate clauses. In the indirect question τίς ὁ θόρυβος εἴη, the order is the one that is most common in questions, that is, the question word τίς is the focus and is promoted to first position, followed by topic and verb. In the first ὅτι-clause the topics τὰ ἱερά and τὰ σφάγια are newly introduced in enumeration, and the focus elements are the predicate adjectives (the copula is omitted, as often in Greek). In the second ὅτι-clause, σύνθημα should be taken as focus and the clause is a compressed version of "the uproar is the password, which is passing etc."

<center>Example 2</center>

Now consider the passage of Lysias (*Oration* 1.4-6) that appeared as Ex. III in U37.

ἡγοῦμαι δέ, ὦ ἄνδρες, τοῦτό με δεῖν ἐπιδεῖξαι, ὡς ἐμοίχευεν Ἐρατοσθένης τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ ἐκείνην τε διέφθειρε καὶ τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἐμοὺς ᾔσχυνε καὶ ἐμὲ αὐτὸν ὕβρισεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐμὴν εἰσιών, καὶ οὔτε ἔχθρα ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐκείνῳ οὐδεμία ἦν πλὴν ταύτης, οὔτε χρημάτων ἕνεκα ἔπραξα ταῦτα, ἵνα πλούσιος ἐκ πένητος γένωμαι, οὔτε ἄλλου κέρδους οὐδενὸς πλὴν τῆς κατὰ τοὺς νόμους τιμωρίας.
ἐγὼ τοίνυν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑμῖν ἅπαντα ἐπιδείξω τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ πράγματα, οὐδὲν παραλείπων, ἀλλὰ λέγων τὰ ἀληθῆ· ταύτην γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ μόνην ἡγοῦμαι σωτηρίαν, ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἰπεῖν ἅπαντα δυνηθῶ τὰ πεπραγμένα.

First-person verbs of opinion or intention are often fronted, as ἡγοῦμαι is here, although it is also possible to find them interlaced with an indirect statement using the infinitive or participle construction, often in second position as in Thuc. 1.23.6 τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἡγοῦμαι μεγάλους γιγνομένους καὶ φόβον παρέχοντας τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀναγκάσαι ἐς τὸ πολεμεῖν. One can also find such a verb positioned at the end after the accusative and infinitive construction: Ἐγὼ δ' οὔθ' ὑμᾶς ταύτην ἔχειν τὴν γνώμην ἡγοῦμαι, πρός τε τοὺς ὑπειρημένους λόγους ῥᾴδιον ἀντειπεῖν νομίζω (Isoc. 18.36).

It is extremely common for vocative phrases like ὦ ἄνδρες to be placed right after the initial word or short phrase of the sentence that is addressed to the persons named in the vocative.

The demonstrative οὗτος and related words like οὕτω, τοιοῦτος, τοσοῦτος are very often found at the opening of a sentence or colon, as is natural both to their anaphoric force (the demonstrative often has topic function) and emphatic nature. The fronting of the demonstrative gives the same sort of emphasis as English "that *this* is the thing I have to demonstrate."

The enclitic form of the personal pronouns (and also oblique forms of αὐτός as unemphatic pronoun) are usually found in second position within a colon, as here με after τοῦτο.

It is much more common for δεῖ or δεῖν to precede the infinitive that is its subject than to follow it, so the order δεῖν ἐπιδεῖξαι is normal. Sometimes δεῖ is in fact the first word in its clause, but often it is found in between the constituents of the infinitive phrase, as here.

The ὡς-clause is in apposition to τοῦτο. The order within it is interesting. The initial assertion is ἐμοίχευεν Ἐρατοσθένης τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμὴν with the verb fronted to emphasize the criminal act (about the gravity of which the preceding opening lines of the speech spoke, without every using the word "adultery"). Eratosthenes' name comes second (the first time the name has been used), and the object of the verb is in the least salient position. In the three following predicates, however, the object precedes the verb, and these objects can be explained as enumerated topics preceding the verbs as focus. Note also how the conjunctions mark out the structure as [clause 1] + [clause 2 + clause 3 + clause 4] + [clause 6 + clause 6 + clause 7]: the καί before ἐκείνην links the first two groups, while the τε after ἐκείνην coordinates with the two following καί's to join the next three terms together; then another καί introduces the third grouping, whose clauses are joined by the triple οὔτε.

Lysias uses τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμὴν here instead of τὴν ἐμὴν γυναῖκα. The orators often have this fuller form with μητέρα and ἀδελφήν as well as with γυναῖκα, although in general the possessive adjective tends to be between the article and noun. The longer form is apparently rhetorically more weighty and thus more formal or solemn. There are places where adjective placement seems to be well explained by the hypothesis that when the adjective comes first it is the more salient word in the context and when the noun comes first it is more salient. In this phrase there does not seem to me to be a semantic or pragmatic difference between the two possibilities, but rather a rhetorical one in terms of separation of the elements of the phrase and added weight. Compare τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἐμοὺς and τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐμήν in the following clauses.

The participial phrase with εἰσιών follows the verb here. Instead of being offered as setting or background (a common function when nominative participles precede the verb), here it might be considered an adjunct (optional complement) of the verb ("outraged me in my own house").

In the triple οὔτε structure, the concepts enmity, money, and profit may be regarded as enumerated new topics, with the focus being on the denial carried by οὐδεμία and (οὐ) ἔπραξα. The emphatic pronouns ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐκείνῳ are perhaps to be taken as also topical, making the topic here an extended one. In ἔπραξα ταῦτα the demonstrative is rather weakly anaphoric and carries no pragmatic marking and is thus after the verb.

ἐγὼ τοίνυν is a combination that occurs at the beginning of new paragraphs and is used here even though the first person is prominent in the previous lines. The topic here seems to be a composite concept "me and my affairs," which has been the subject of the previous lines. The main focal word is presumably ἅπαντα, which precedes the verb and also gains

emphasis from the fact that this modifier has become separated from the rest of its noun phrase, *τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ πράγματα*. Such discontinuous placement is fairly common when the isolated fronted modifier is a demonstrative or *πᾶς*. Note that *ἄπαντα* is also in contrast with *οὐδέν* in the following (semantically redundant, but rhetorically strong) participial phrase *οὐδὲν παραλείπων*. *ἐξ ἀρχῆς* should be taken closely with *ἄπαντα* as part of the focus. The intervention of *ὑμῖν* between *ἐξ ἀρχῆς* and *ἄπαντα* reflects the fact that personal pronouns are often positioned second in a colon, even when they are not shown as enclitics in the text (ancient grammarians in fact say that there were enclitic forms of *ἡμῖν* and *ὑμῖν*, but few editors have ever printed *ἥμιν* and *ὕμιν*). Its position is probably a clue to intonational emphasis on *ἐξ ἀρχῆς*, confirming that we should take *ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἄπαντα* as unit in focus.

In the nominative participial phrase closing the sentence (again extending or elaborating the import of the verb rather than giving background), the order *λέγων τἀληθῆ* is rare. Far more common is *ἀληθῆ λέγειν* or *τἀληθῆ λέγειν*; but the force of placing *ἀληθῆ* after the verb is to give more emphasis to the act of speaking (as opposed to not speaking, being afraid to speak, or concealing) than to the truthfulness of what it being said.

ταύτην is the topic of the indirect statement, referring back to the action of telling the whole story, and the focus is *μόνην σωτηρίαν*. In this case the governing *ἡγοῦμαι* is placed within the accusative and infinitive construction, in fact, right after the first word of the focus, with the copula *εἶναι* being omitted. So this is another example of a noun phrase that is split by a verb form. The dative of reference *ἐμαυτῷ* has apparently gravitated toward second place (it is third, trumped by the postpositive *γάρ*), separating the topic from the focus, just as unemphatic *μοι* would likely have done.

<div align="center">Example 3</div>

This example is from Isocrates, who is known for a more elaborate and formal rhetorical style (his "orations" are mostly epideictic compositions). Here, *Panegyrikos* 29-31 is laid out in cola to show how Isocrates' long sentences are built up from smaller units, often in balance and/or contrast. Some of the important structuring words are rendered in bold.

οὕτως ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν
     οὐ μόνον θεοφιλῶς,
     ἀλλὰ καὶ φιλανθρώπως ἔσχεν,
ὥστε κυρία γενομένη τοσούτων ἀγαθῶν
     οὐκ ἐφθόνησεν τοῖς ἄλλοις,
     ἀλλ' ὧν ἔλαβεν ἅπασιν μετέδωκεν.
In this way our city proved to be not only dear to the gods but kindly-disposed to fellow humans, so that when it acquired control of so many good things, it did not begrudge them to the others, but gave to all a share of what it had received.

After the scene-setting anaphoric adverb *οὕτως* the subject phrase serves as topic. The focus (the main point Isocrates wants to emphasize) consists of the contrasting adverbs, with the colorless verb following (or one could consider the whole *ἔχω* + adverb idiom as complex focus). In the result clause, the topic *our city* is understood and a scene-setting participial phrase precedes the focus. Within the participial phrase, the salient or focal word is the adjective *κυρία*, and the participle as verbal form intervenes between it and its dependent genitive (which refers to benefits that have already been alluded to). It is interesting that the *οὐκ … ἀλλά* structure here does not

show parallel word order, but rather chiastic placement of the two verbs. One might say that ἐφθόνησεν is heavily emphasized because it is meant to substantiate the idea in φιλανθρώπως, while τοῖς ἄλλοις is more predictable and less salient; in contrast, ἄπασιν is placed before μετέδωκεν because it marks the universality of Athens' generosity, while the verb of sharing is merely a variation of what was already conveyed by οὐκ ἐφθόνησεν (ὧν ἔλαβεν is topical, referring back to ἀγαθῶν).

καὶ
τὰ μὲν ἔτι καὶ νῦν καθ᾽ ἕκαστον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν δείκνυμεν,
τῶν δὲ συλλήβδην
            τάς τε χρείας καὶ τὰς ἐργασίας καὶ τὰς ὠφελείας τὰς ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν γιγνομένας
            ἐδίδαξεν.
And some of these benefits still even today we display every year, and of the others our city has taught, collectively, the usages and the developments and the advantages that arise from them.

In the first half of the balanced sentence, after the initial pronominal article provides the topic, the focus seems to be complex: *continuing annual display* rather than just the fact of display. The second half has a particularly weighty object phrase (in a tricolon crescendo structure [defined in the separate document on Transitioning to Reading Continous Greek Texts]), and this should probably be taken as an enumerating topic phrase (*and as for the usages, development, and advantages of the rest*), with the verb again focal, making a claim about the virtuousness of historical Athens.

καὶ τούτοις ἀπιστεῖν
            μικρῶν ἔτι προστεθέντων
            οὐδεὶς ἂν ἀξιώσειεν.
And to disbelieve these things, once some small further points have been added, no one would consider proper.
The initial demonstrative is anaphoric, referring to the previous statements, but the topic is presumably the infinitive phrase as a whole. The idea of disbelief is always in the air when Isocrates claims to be demonstrating the preeminence of Athens against a background of Greek resentment of her former power or to be using his rhetorical expertise to work against the resistance of foolish or ill-intentioned opponents. The conditional genitive absolute is parenthetic between topic and focus. The phrase οὐδεὶς ἂν ἀξιώσειεν has to be taken as complex focus (it is a variation on the idea *it is impossible*). It is normal for οὐδεὶς ἂν to head a new colon, with the optative verb following immediately or after a few words.

πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ
            ἐξ ὧν ἄν τις καταφρονήσειεν τῶν λεγομένων ὡς ἀρχαίων ὄντων,
            ἐκ **τῶν αὐτῶν** τούτων εἰκότως ἂν καὶ τὰς πράξεις γεγενῆσθαι νομίσειεν·
                        διὰ **γὰρ** τὸ πολλοὺς εἰρηκέναι καὶ πάντας ἀκηκοέναι
                        προσήκει **μὴ καινὰ μὲν**,
                                    πιστὰ δὲ δοκεῖν εἶναι τὰ λεγόμενα περὶ αὐτῶν.
For, first of all, on those grounds on which one might disparage what is being said as antiquated, on these same grounds one would justifiably believe that the events too took place: for thanks to the fact that many have said these things and all have heard them, it is fitting that what is being said about them seem not novel but trustworthy.

In the contrasting preposed relative clause and main clause, one notes again the chiastic placement of the finite verbs: *disparage* is in focus position (the relative pronoun phrase being topic) and takes precedence over the bland expression τῶν λεγομένων. This substantive and its participial modifier are in the normal pragmatic order: topic, focus (ὡς ἀρχαίων), verb form. In the main clause the correlative prepositional phrase is topic, and the rest may be regarded as complex focus. As often, the emphatic adverb is fronted with ἄν appended to it, while the καὶ emphasizing τὰς πράξεις puts this particular word in strong contrastive focus (opposite to λεγομένων). The verb is the least salient part of this group and rounds off the clause. In the last clause, the causal articular infinitive will have topic function, since it is a reformulation of earlier material. The fronting of προσήκει as focus (or the most salient part of a complex focus) is analogous to the position of many imperatives. The contrasting adjectives are also clearly a point of rhetorical emphasis, with the colorless verb phrase following and the subject of the infinitive, τὰ λεγόμενα, last as remainder, since it is a repetition of the earlier τῶν λεγομένων and the idea conveyed in εἰρηκέναι.

ἔπειτ'
οὐ μόνον ἐνταῦθα καταφυγεῖν ἔχομεν,
     ὅτι τὸν λόγον καὶ τὴν φήμην ἐκ πολλοῦ παρειλήφαμεν,
ἀλλὰ καὶ σημείοις μείζοσιν ἢ τούτοις ἔστιν ἡμῖν χρήσασθαι περὶ αὐτῶν.
     Αἱ μὲν γὰρ πλεῖσται τῶν πόλεων
          ὑπόμνημα τῆς παλαιᾶς εὐεργεσίας
          ἀπαρχὰς τοῦ σίτου
          καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ὡς ἡμᾶς ἀποπέμπουσιν,
     ταῖς δ' ἐκλειπούσαις
          πολλάκις ἡ Πυθία προσέταξεν
              ἀποφέρειν τὰ μέρη τῶν καρπῶν
              καὶ ποιεῖν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἡμετέραν τὰ πάτρια.

Secondly, this is not the only point in which we make take refuge—the fact that we have received the story and report transmitted from long ago, but there are also signs more significant than these to which we are able to appeal concerning the matter. For most of the (Greek) cities send to us annually firstfruits of their grain as remembrance of the ancient benefaction, and for any cities that cease from doing so, on many occasions the Pythia has commanded that they bring the due portion of their crops and perform the traditional duties toward our city.

In the οὐ μόνον … ἀλλὰ καί structure, the important new point is that there are *more significant* indications than those already cited. Thus we might consider the first clause merely as foil to the main point, and call ἐνταῦθα a contrastive topic (with σημείοις in the second limb). The verbal element καταφυγεῖν ἔχομεν does not seem to be important enough here to be called focus, and this would leave μείζοσιν as the only true focal element, followed by a comparative expression (parenthetic), the verb phrase ἔστιν ἡμῖν χρήσασθαι, and the remainder (note the weak pronoun αὐτῶν in this post-verbal prepositional phrase). The explanatory continuation again contains contrastive topics, now marked by μέν and δέ, but the focal elements are long and complex. In the first limb, the verb ἀποπέμπουσιν is held to end, after the appositive/predicative noun ὑπόμνημα (with its less salient dependent genitive following), the direct object ἀπαρχάς (with its less salient dependent genitive following), and the adverbial expression of time and destination. (Thus the argument precedes the adjunct, apparently conveying that there is more than usual emphasis on or salience in the argument.) In the second limb the Delphic prophetess deserves fronting because of the religious authority this reference supplies to the argument; the finite verb may

precede the (indirect) imperatival infinitives either because the word is forceful (*commanded*, not *advised, recommended*) or because the dependent infinitive phrases are so long in themselves and thus placed after the verb. The two infinitives both head their phrases, perhaps because they have the most salience as the commanded actions, whereas the objects are given information, rephrasings of what everyone understood about Eleusinian practices.

καίτοι
*περὶ τίνων χρὴ **μᾶλλον** πιστεύειν*
        ἢ περὶ ὧν
                ὅ τε θεὸς ἀναιρεῖ
                καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων συνδοκεῖ
                *καὶ **τά τε πάλαι** <u>ῥηθέντα</u> τοῖς παροῦσιν <u>ἔργοις</u> συμμαρτυρεῖ*
                *καὶ **τὰ νῦν** <u>γιγνόμενα</u> τοῖς ὑπ' ἐκείνων <u>εἰρημένοις</u> ὁμολογεῖ;*

After all, on what matters should one trust (tradition) more than those concerning which both the oracular god ordains and many of the Greeks are in agreement, and (concerning which) the things spoken long ago bear witness to the present deeds and the actions occurring now correspond to what had been said by those men (of earlier generations)?

In a question, the interrogative represents the focus and usually is positioned first. The idea of trust or belief is already a given in the passage. This is a rhetorical question, and the comparative expression is used to incorporate the expected answer, *these things, concerning which…* The relative pronoun turns this focal concept into the topic word, and I suggest that all the remainder of the sentence is in fact focal material, artfully arranged in two pairs of clauses, each clause ending in a verb with the same sound and prosody (-εῖ), and with careful antitheses: god and men in the first pair of clauses; then, with more complexity and parallelism of structure, words and actions and past and present in the second pair of clauses. This is a good example of how in the stylized rhetoric of an expert prose-writer the communication of meaning is much more complex and multiple than in "ordinary" language, in which the analysis of topic and focus elements in more straightforward.

For more on Greek word order, good places to start are the introductory chapters in Helma Dik, *Word Order in Ancient Greek: a Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus* (1995) and *Word Order in Greek Tragic Dialogue* (2007), and see also K. J. Dover, *Greek Word Order* (1960) and *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style* (1997). For more technicalities and details, see the remainder of the chapters in the two books of Dik just listed; also A. M. Devine and L. D. Stephens, *Discontinuous Syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek* (2000); Dejan Matić, "Topic, Focus, and Discourse Structure: Ancient Greek Word Order," *Studies in Language* 27 (2003) 573-633; Frank Scheppers, *The Colon Hypothesis: Word Order, Discourse Segmentation and Discourse Coherence in Ancient Greek* (2011); Fulvio Beschi, *Ordine delle parole e struttura sintattica in greco antico: uno studio cartografico alla luce di Thuc. VII, 1-10* (2012).