

Rosemarie Lühr (Jena)

## Information Structure in Ancient Greek

### 1 Introduction

As word order and intonation play an important part in the information structure of many languages we concentrate on these phenomena, although “Über die in den modernen Sprachen höchst bedeutsame Satzmelodie lässt sich in einer nur schriftlich überlieferten Sprache wie dem Griechischen kaum etwas Sicheres sagen”<sup>1</sup> (it is hardly possible to say something for sure about sentence melody in a language known only from written record such as Ancient Greek, although sentence melody is of great importance in modern languages). It is known, however, that Ancient Greek has a pitch accent with a high or low tone. When a word or word group is emphasized the high tone must be strengthened, too.<sup>2</sup> Therefore we conclude that the focus exponents of focalized units were prosodically marked, and that de-focalized units were prosodically unmarked as they are in modern Indo-European languages.

Next I give a brief sketch of Ancient Greek word order as it is outlined in Ancient Greek school grammars:

- a) Enclitics and low-stressed words preferably occur in the second position of a sentence (the so-called Wackernagel-position).
- b) Negation normally appears either at the beginning of the sentence or immediately in front of the verb.
- c) When a word is emphasized it can be separated from its constituent. This phenomenon is called Hyperbaton<sup>3</sup>.
- d) The verb of the matrix clause shows a tendency towards a position in the middle of the sentence: we find the orders subject – predicate – object, object – predicate – subject (in the case of an emphasized object), the order adverbial – predicate – subject.
- e) If a sub-clause of a complex sentence is emphasized it is usually placed at the beginning of the sentence.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bornemann, E., and E. Risch (1974: 162).

<sup>2</sup> For Old Indian cf. Wackernagel, J. (1896: 284); for Greek cf. Botinis, A. (1998).

<sup>3</sup> Krisch, Th. (1998); Devine, A. and Stephens, L. (2000).

<sup>4</sup> Bornemann, E., and E. Risch (1974: 162f.).

Helma Dik (1995) published a study of Ancient Greek word order under a functional view. According to her, the word order is “discourse configurational”<sup>5</sup> and is compared to Hungarian by her in that respect. Dik says that Ancient Greek sentences consist of two pragmatically “marked” preverbal slots, followed by the predicate position and the pragmatically “unmarked” post-verbal positions. The pragmatically “marked” preverbal slots are defined as the topic position (P1) and the focus position (P0). The topic is seen as an aboutness topic.

- (1) P1    P0    V    X  
       topic focus verb pragmatically unmarked rest

Contrary to Hungarian with its fixed verbal position even for unmarked verbs, the verb in Ancient Greek is subject to movement, so that it can occur in the focus position (P0) or in the topic position (P1).<sup>6</sup> Serious objections to Dik’s description of Ancient Greek word order have been raised by Dejan Matić (2003: 578ff.). His investigation of Xenophon’s *Anabasis* showed that only 49% of the sentences (i.e. 746 out of the total of 1523 sentences) follow Dik’s pattern. The remaining 51% deviate in that the post-verbal elements are not pragmatically unmarked but are post-verbal foci.<sup>7</sup>

We do not doubt Matić’s observations. But he mainly investigated sentences with only one predicate. If sentences with more than one predicate are taken into account, the distribution of topic and focus must be called into question anew. This paper will explore complex sentences with embedded infinitives in Ancient Greek and will describe the discourse pragmatic function of the infinitives within their clauses. A suitable text corpus is Thucydides’ *History of the Peloponnesian War*,<sup>8</sup> because this author uses nominalized infinitives very frequently, especially in his speeches<sup>9</sup>. Causal constructions with *διά* plus substantivized infinitive<sup>10</sup> in the accusative are most frequent. As a consequence, this paper concentrates on the discourse pragmatic function of such infinitives.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Kiss, K. É. (1995: 2001).

<sup>6</sup> Another difference with Hungarian is the already mentioned Hyperbaton: Not only constituents but even larger units can fill this pragmatically determined position of Ancient Greek.

<sup>7</sup> Further problems are:

More than two units may occur in front of the verb forming complex left periphery.

Some units occur between the focus and the verb. Matić calls them intruders.

<sup>8</sup> The following examples are taken from Behrendt (1886).

<sup>9</sup> Behrendt, G. (1886: 21).

<sup>10</sup> 63 *διά*-infinitives are found among a total of 292 infinitives.

## 1.1 On the function of the Ancient Greek articles of nominalized infinitives

In Ancient Greek the infinitival constructions often have articles. Let us therefore ask what functions they have. As the article in Ancient Greek is a sign for the anaphoricity of the nominal just like in German, it might be that article + infinitive characterize a topic (i.e. the unit might express a previously mentioned or inferable object<sup>11</sup>). On the other hand, the article is a means to form nominalizations and nominalized infinitive constructions that mostly occur in the genitive or dative case, but obligatorily after prepositions. Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. (1990: § 398) say that speakers consider the article in combination with the infinitive as “ein Mittel, den inflexiblen Infinitiv zu flektieren”<sup>12</sup> (a means to inflect the infinitive). Thus, given that the article is not a sign for the anaphoricity of the nominalized infinitive but a means of inflexion, the infinitive construction might very well occur in focus positions.

## 1.2 German causal constructions and their discourse-pragmatic potential

Before we turn to Ancient Greek causal *διὰ*-infinitives we will first outline German causal constructions with the conjunctions *weil* (*because*) or *denn* (*for*), which have been better described. They are complex with respect to their propositional as well as to their illocutionary potential.

- (2) a. Nichts ist (nur DEShalb) besser, (nur) weil es GRÖsser ist.<sup>13</sup>  
 Nothing is only THEREfore better only because it BIGger is  
 ‘Nothing is better only for the reason that it is bigger’
- b. Peter muss (DEShalb) zu Hause sein, weil es REGnet.  
 Peter must THEREfore at house be because it RAINs  
 ‘Peter must stay at home because it rains’
- c. Bist du (DEShalb) böse, weil ich mich verSPÄtet habe?  
 Are you.sg THEREfore angry because I myself reTARded have  
 ‘Are you angry because I came back late?’
- d. Vertrauen Sie diesem Mann nicht bloß (DEShalb), weil ich ihn KENne.  
 Trust you this man not only THEREfore because I him know  
 ‘Don’t trust this man only because I happen to know him.’
- (3) a. Der MOtor ist kaputt. # Weil das LÄMPchen nicht mehr brennt.<sup>14</sup>  
 The ENgine is broken because the LAMP.dimin. not more shines  
 ‘The motor is broken because the little lamp doesn’t shine any more’
- b. Peter muss zu HAUse sein. # Weil es REGnet.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lühr, R. (2005).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Schwyzer, E., and A. Debrunner (1950: 361).

<sup>3</sup> Capital letters express the pitch-accent syllable.

<sup>4</sup> # marks the intonation break.

- Peter must at home be because it rains  
 'Peter must stay at home because it rains'
- c. Ist sie WIRTschatswissenschaftlerin? # Weil sie sich so gut in InvestiTIONen auskennt.  
 Is she eCONomy-scholar because she herself so well in inVESTments out-knows  
 Is she a professor of economy? because she is so well up in investments.'
- d. Vertrauen Sie diesem Mann NICHT. # Weil ich ihn KENne.  
 Trust you this man not because I him know  
 'Don't trust this man because I happen to know him.'

The sentences in (2) and (3) differ with respect to prosody. The sentences in (3) have a focus pitch accent in both the main clause and the subordinate clause, and an intonation-break between the clauses. This leads us to the conclusion that the sentences are not prosodically uniform. The sentences in (2) either form one phonological phrase with the only focus pitch accent in the causal subordinate clause, or, when cataphoric *deshalb* (*for the reason - that*) is inserted in the main clause, it has its own pitch accent in addition. The intonation phrase of all sentences under (2) in the latter formulation is, however, also uniform.<sup>15</sup>

The sentences in (2) and (3) also differ as to the meaning of the causal connector. Only in (3) can *weil* be replaced by *denn*.<sup>16</sup> *Weil* in (2) causally connects two propositions. *Weil / denn* in (3) do not refer to the proposition, but to the illocution of the subordinate clause.<sup>17</sup> (It is of crucial importance to scrutinize the Ancient Greek  $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ -Infinitives in relation to this difference). Let us explain the illocutionary difference between (2) and (3) by comparing (2b) with (3b):

(2b) says: The rain is the reason for Peter's being at home by necessity. [This implicates: Peter is never out in rainy whether.] Therefore, the causal subordinate clause in (2)(b) is called illocutionary dependent.

In (3b) the speaker cites the rain only as a piece of circumstantial evidence for his argument. [This implies: The rain need not be the reason for Peter's being at home.] Therefore, the causal subordinate clause in (3b) is called illocutionary independent.

Let us illustrate illocutionary independence once more by example (3a): (3a): The speaker bases his argument on the circumstantially independent fact that the lamp does not burn. [This implies: The state of the lamp did not cause the break of the motor.]

<sup>15</sup> Cf. „Satzteilwertigkeit“ and „Satzwertigkeit“ as used by Harweg (Kanyshewa, T., and Tregubenkow, G. (1958: 325ff.); Thim-Mabrey, Ch. (1982)).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Kang, Ch. (1960: 60f.).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Bierwisch, M. (1980); Brandt, M. (1990), Brandt, M., and Rosengren, I. (1991); Kang, Ch. (1996: 64f.).

Whereas the propositional content of the connector *weil* in (2) expresses the causal relation between the two propositional clauses, we cannot yet interpret the connectors *weil / denn* in (3) on the basis of its propositional content, but only by means of the illocutionary force of the subordinate clause supported by further contextual knowledge.

We have to add, however, that the propositional content of the connector *weil* in (2) is pragmatically underspecified. It occurs mainly in three different kinds of speech acts. These pragmatic interpretations for prepositional *weil* are: Reasons, grounds (cf. example (4)), explanation (cf. example (5)), justification (cf. examples (6) and (7)):

- (4) Ich habe gekündigt, weil ich von einer anderen Firma ein besseres Angebot bekommen habe.  
 Meine Kündigung begründe ich mit dem besseren Angebot.  
 I resigned because I got a better offer from another company.  
 I gave the better offer as the reason for my resignation.
- (5) Der Dollarkurs steigt, weil die Zinsen in den USA hoch bleiben.  
 Das Steigen des Dollarkurses wird mit den hohen Zinsen erklärt.  
 The exchange rate of the US dollar rises, because the interest rates in the US stays on a high level.  
 The rise of the exchange rate is explained by the high interest rates.
- (6) Ich habe Hans geschlagen, weil er mich gehänselt hat.  
 Ich rechtfertige das Schlagen mit dem Hänkeln.  
 I hit John because he teased me.  
 I justify my hitting of John by reference to his teasing.

But one may also justify the use of a mere expression in a sentence (cf. example (7)) or even of an action (cf. example (8)).

- (7) Der Kaiser hatte Luitward aus dunkler Herkunft emporgehoben. Denn er war eines Hufschmieds Sohn.  
 Ich rechtfertige den Ausdruck 'dunkle Herkunft' damit, dass er eines Hufschmieds Sohn war.  
 The emperor lifted up Luitward from his obscure origin. For he was the son of a blacksmith.  
 I justify the use of the expression 'obscure origin' by reference to the fact that he was the son of a blacksmith.

- (8) A speaker slaps an addressee's ear and justifies his action with the words:

Because you told me a lie.

Iregubenkow, G. (1958: 325ff.); Thim-Mabrey, Ch. (1982)).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Kang, Ch. (1960: 60f.).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Bierwisch, M. (1980); Brandt, M. (1990), Brandt, M., and Rosengren, I. (1991); Kang, Ch. (1996: 64f.).

Illocutionary independent *weil* / *denn* has two speech-act variants: argumentation (cf. example (3a)) and assumption (cf.(3c))<sup>18</sup>.

- (3) a. Der Motor ist kaputt, weil das Lämpchen nicht mehr brennt.  
 Ich benutze die Tatsache, dass das Lämpchen nicht mehr brennt, als Grundlage für das Argument, dass der Motor kaputt ist.  
 ‘The motor is broken because the little lamp doesn’t burn any more.’  
 I use the fact that the little lamp does not burn any more as the basis for the argument that the engine is broken.
- (3) c. Ist sie Wirtschaftswissenschaftlerin? Weil sie sich so gut in Investitionen auskennt.  
 Ich benutze ihre Investitionskennntnis als Grundlage für die Vermutung, dass sie Wirtschaftswissenschaftlerin ist.  
 ‘Is she a professor of economics? because she is so well up in investments.’  
 I use her knowledge of investment matters as basis for the assumption that she is a professor of economics.<sup>19</sup>

The pragmatic paraphrases of the sentences (3a), (3c), and (4) to (7) show that the type of speech act can best be derived from the performative formulae “I give reasons..., I explain ..., I justify ...; I argue ...” The surface syntax of German *weil*-clauses may be ambiguous between their reference to the proposition or to the illocution without the intonation structure (cf. (2b) and (3b)). As Thucydides, however, wanted to convince his readers of his judgements about the Peloponnesian War it is most probable that he mostly used propositional two-place causal connections with the illocutionary force of an explanation: The explanation supports the truth claim of the judgement in the matrix clause.<sup>20</sup>

These findings on German causal constructions can help us to formulate questions for the analysis of Thucydides’ *διό*-constructions:

1. Can the pragmatic potential of Ancient Greek sentences be used to analyse their information structure?
2. Can we figure out specific properties in Thucydides’ diction that are implied by information structure?
3. Do the two illocutionarily different kinds of causal constructions undergo information-structural variation in Ancient Greek? Is each sub-clause varied separately or is the complex sentence varied as a whole?<sup>21</sup>
4. What can be concluded from the function of the article in Ancient Greek?

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Kang, Ch. (1996: 155).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Pasch, R. (1983) (1989).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Klein, J. (1987: 65).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Fehrmann, D. (2004: 313).

## 2 Analyses of Ancient Greek complex sentences

### 2.1 διά-infinitives in the postverbal focus domain

#### 2.1.1 Illocutive **dependent explanations** of a proposition

In most cases, the διά-infinitive is an illocutionarily **dependent explanation** of a proposition. It appears at the end of the sentence and is part of the information structure of the whole sentence.

- (10) a. I 37,2/3  
καὶ ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν  
and ART-NOM.SG.F state-NOM.SG.F their-GEN.PL.M  
ἅμα αὐτάρκη  
at the same time independent-NOM.SG.F  
θέσιν  
(with regard to) position-ACC.SG.F  
κειμένη  
situated PRT.PRES.MED.NOM.SG.F  
παρέχει αὐτοῦς  
allows-3.SG.IND.PRES.ACT them-ACC.PL.M  
δικαστὰς ὧν βλάπτουσί  
judges-ACC.PL.M REL-GEN.PL.M they damage-3.PL.IND.PRES.ACT  
τινα μᾶλλον ἢ κατὰ  
in something-ACC.PL.N more-ADV than into  
ξυνθήκας γίνεσθαι,  
contracts-ACC.PL.F enter-INF.PRES.MED  
‘Moreover, the insular and independent position of this state causes them to be arbitrary judges of the injuries they do to others instead of being judges appointed by mutual agreement’ (Smith)  
(‘und ihre Stadt mit ihrer unabhängigen Lage erlaubt ihnen (den Kerkyren) auch, selber die Richter ihrer Opfer zu sein statt an Verträge gebunden’)  
(Landmann)
- b. διὰ τὸ ἥκιστα ἐπὶ τοῦς  
because of ART-ACC.SG.N hardly-ADV at ART-ACC.PL.M  
πέλας ἐκπλέοντας μάλιστα  
nearby travelling out-PRT.PRES.ACT.ACC.PL.M especially-ADV  
τοῦς ἄλλους ἀνάγκη  
ART-ACC.PL.M others-ACC.PL.M out of need-ADV  
καταίροντας δέχεσθαι.  
putting in-PRT.PRES.ACT.ACC.PL.M receive-INF.PRES.MED

'owing to the fact that they resort very little to the ports of their neighbours, but to a very large extent receive into their ports others who are compelled to put in there' (Smith)

,weil sie kaum auswärts fahren, aber fast alle notwendig bei ihnen anlegen und Aufnahme suchen.' (Landmann)

In (10a') and (10b') we add the information-structural analysis for (10a) and (10b).

- a'.<sup>22</sup> und ihre Stadt (die) ... unabhängig (in Bezug auf ihre) Lage gelegen (ist)  
 [ TOP<sup>23</sup> ]  
 ihnen (zu sein) RICHTER über die, die sie in etwas schädigen erlaubt  
 MEHR als dass sie an VERTRÄGE gebunden sind  
 [ ]  
 b'. weil KAUM<sup>24</sup> bei den NAHE Hinausfahrenden besonders die ANDEREN  
 [ I-TOP ] [ ]  
 aus Not Anlandenden aufgenommen werden  
 [CF]

In (a) καὶ ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν ... αὐτάρκη θέσιν κειμένη 'and their town (which) ... (is) situated independently with regard to its position' is a topic. The finite verb παρέχει (allows) is the comment together with the units standing at its right αὐτοὺς δικαστὰς ὧν βλάπτουσί τινα μᾶλλον ἢ κατὰ ξυνθήκας γίνεσθαι 'them (to be) judges over those they damage in something more than to enter into contracts'.<sup>25</sup> The focus is **medial presentational focus** with three emphasized constituents, δικαστὰς, μᾶλλον and ξυνθήκας. But within the **medial** focus, the phrase μᾶλλον ἢ κατὰ ξυνθήκας γίνεσθαι constitutes a contrastive focus domain induced by the comparative focus-sensitive particle meaning "but ... not"<sup>26</sup>, for the sense of this comparative construction is: 'but they do not conclude contracts'. The sentence triggers the expectation that both alternatives hold simultaneously, but one expectation is denied.<sup>27</sup> Two interpretations seem possible: Firstly, an "implicative concessive reading": Via *aber* [the] "2<sup>nd</sup> conjunct [is] in contrast to [the] assumed inference from [the]

<sup>22</sup> The analysis of the information structure is given in German, for German word order comes closer to Ancient Greek word order than English word order does.

<sup>23</sup> Only Aboutness Topics are called Topics; cf. Steube, A. (2004: 16); but cf. Lambrecht, K. (1994)

<sup>24</sup> Elements that belong together are underlined.

<sup>25</sup> Matic, D. (2003: 587).

<sup>26</sup> cf. Sudhoff, St., D. Lenertová, and K. Alter (2004: 162) on German NICHT under representational focus in a bridge contour.

<sup>27</sup> cf. Umbach, C. et al. (2004: 283).



1<sup>st</sup> conjunct”.<sup>28</sup> This means that the expectation resulting from the first conjunct αὐτοὺς δικαστὰς ὧν βλάπτουσί τινα directly contradicts the proposition in the second conjunct ἢ κατὰ ξυνθήκας γίνεσθαι: ‘The Corcyraeans are judges of the injuries they do to others, but (nevertheless) they are not appointed by mutual agreement’. Secondly, a “contrastive reading adding the adversative evaluation of the conjuncts” can be assumed: ‘The Corcyraeans are judges of the injuries they do to others, but they are not appointed by mutual agreement’. (a) is also an example for n-tuples of foci, which need not alter the focus domain.<sup>29</sup>

Comparing (b) with (a), the infinitive construction διὰ τὸ ἥκιστα ἐπὶ τοὺς πέλας ἐκπλέοντας μάλιστα τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνάγκη καταίροντας δέχεσθαι (literally ‘because at those hardly travelling out nearby especially the others putting in out of need are received’) has an illocutionary force on its own. It can be translated into German by means of *denn*. Note that the cataphoric pro-adverbial *deshalb* cannot be inserted in the translation of the preceding sentence.

As far as the information structure of the whole sentence is concerned, the infinitival construction is the focus of the backgrounded remainder of the matrix clause.<sup>30</sup> It is part of the postverbal focus domain. The infinitival construction answers the question ‘why can the Corcyraeans be arbitrary judges of the injuries they do to others instead of being judges appointed by mutual agreement?’ On the other hand, the infinitival construction has its own information structure. The position of **its** focus has to be attested with respect to the position of the non-finite verb which can – in principle – be in a pre-INFL- or in a post-INFL-position. In (b), the **medium focus is in a postverbal position**. The phrase μάλιστα τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνάγκη καταίροντας contains the focus-sensitive particle μάλιστα. The connection between this phrase and the preceding phrase ἥκιστα ἐπὶ τοὺς πέλας ἐκπλέοντας, literally: ‘hardly at those travelling out nearby’ (‘kaum bei den nahe Hinausfahrenden’<sup>31</sup>) is established by the expression τοὺς ἄλλους ‘the others’, which bears a contrastive accent. It refers to a contextually given quantity. The alternative quantities “those who travel out hardly nearby” and “those who travel out far away” are subquantities of the contextual hyperquantity “distance”,<sup>32</sup> functioning as a Common Integrator in the sense of Lang<sup>33</sup>. For that reason, the phrase ἥκιστα ἐπὶ τοὺς πέλας ἐκπλέοντας is best described as a so-called I-

<sup>28</sup> Lang, E., and C. Umbach (2002); Steube, A. (2004: XVI).

<sup>29</sup> Steube, A. (2001a: 236).

<sup>30</sup> Vgl. Pasch, R. et al. (2003: 137).

<sup>31</sup> In Greek, the rule that focus particles must be in a position as close to the focus as possible (Büring, D. and Hartmann, K. (2001)) does not hold.

<sup>32</sup> Umbach, C. (2004: 177ff.).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Lang, E. (1976); Lang, E., and C. Umbach (2002: 152).

Topic outside of the focus domain.<sup>34</sup> In German information structure, we would speak of a Bridge Contour in such a case. The Bridge Contour has two pitch accents, a rising one on the I-Topic, and a falling one in the domain of the normal presentational focus.<sup>35</sup> As it can be maintained that such contrasting expressions had a special intonation contour in Ancient Greek as well, the concept of the I-Topic is maintained for Ancient Greek. Besides, the function of the superlative of ἥκιστα at the beginning of the sentence is remarkable. It is a focalizer of the separated πέλας in the I-Topic construction<sup>36</sup> and forms a *hyperbaton*<sup>37</sup>. Thus, it may be stressed as well.

(11) contains the propositional causal connector with the speech act of an explanation, too.

(11) I 70,8

- a. καὶ ταῦτα                    μετὰ    πόνων                    πάντα                    καὶ  
and this-ACC.PL.N with    hardships-GEN.PL.M    all-ACC.PL.N and  
κινδύνων                    δι'    ὅλου                    τοῦ  
dangers-GEN.PL.M during whole-GEN.SG.M ART-GEN.SG.M  
αἰῶνος                    μοχθοῦσι,  
life-GEN.SG.M    they bring about -3.PL.IND.PRES.ACT  
καὶ ἀπολαύουσιν                    ἐλάχιστα                    τῶν  
and they enjoy -3.PL.IND.PRES.ACT    least of all-ADV    ART-GEN.PL.N  
ὑπαρχόντων  
things at hand-PTC.PRES.ACT.GEN.PL.N  
'In this way they toil, with hardships and dangers, all their life long; and  
least of all men they enjoy what they have' (Smith)  
(‘Und mit all dem [von Kampfeshandlungen] plagen sie sich unter Mühen  
und Gefahren ihr ganzes Leben lang und genießen kaum, was sie haben’)  
(Landmann)
- b. διὰ                    τὸ                    ἀεὶ                    κτᾶσθαι  
because of ART-ACC.SG.N    always-ADV    seek more-INF.PRES.MED  
καὶ μήτε    ἑορτῆν                    ἄλλο τι  
and and not holiday-ACC.SG.F (as) something else-ACC.SG.N  
ἡγεῖσθαι                    ἢ    τὸ                    τὰ  
regard-INF.PRES.MED    than ART-ACC.SG.N ART-ACC.PL.N  
δέοντα                    πρᾶξαι  
duties-PRT.PRES.ACT.ACC.PL.N    have done-INF. AOR.ACT

<sup>34</sup> Steube, A. (2003: 165).

<sup>35</sup> Steube, A. (2001: 7, 17); Steube, A. (2004: 34).

<sup>36</sup> On focalizers in contrastive topics cf. (Hajičová, E. and Sgall, P. (2004: 7)

<sup>37</sup> cf. Krisch, Th. (1998); Devine, A. and Stephens, L. (2000: 4f.)

ξυμφοράν	τε	οὐχ	ἥσσον	ἡσυχίαν
(as) calamity-ACC.SG.F	and	not	smaller-ADV	peace-ACC.SG.F
ἀπράγμονα	ἢ	ἀσχολίαν		ἐπίπονον
untroubled- ACC.SG.F	than	activity -ACC.SG.F		laborious-ACC.SG.F

‘because they are always seeking more, because they think their only holiday is to do their duty, and because they regard untroubled peace as a far greater calamity than laborious activity’ (Smith)

(‘weil sie immer nur erwerben, von keinem anderen Fest wissen, als das gerade Nötige zu tun, und gelassene Muße für kein minderes Unglück halten als die geschäftige Mühsal.’) (Landmann)

(11a’) and (11b’) contain the information-structural analysis of (11a) and (11b).

- a’. und dieses mit Mühen alles und Gefahren durch das GANZE Leben  
           [**TOP**]                  [**TOP**]  
 bringen sie MÜHSAM zustande / und sie **GENIESSEN KAUM**  
   [**I-TOP** ]  
 Vorhandenes
- b’. weil sie **IMMER** erwerben / und nicht für ein **FEST** etwas  
   [**I-TOP** ]]  
**ANDERES** halten als das **NÖTIGE** getan zu haben / (für ein)  
   |<sub>CF</sub>  
**UNGLÜCK** (und zwar für ein nicht) **GERINGERES**) Muße **UNTÄTIGE**  
 [ **I-TOP** ]  
 als Beschäftigung **MÜHSAME**  
 [  |<sub>CF</sub>

Like in (10) the *διά*-infinitive (b) at the end of the sentence belongs to the postverbal focus domain of this clause. One can ask: “Why do they toil, with hardships and dangers, all their life long and least of all men enjoy what they have?”

The phrase *διά τὸ ἀεὶ κτᾶσθαι* in the infinitive construction shows a narrow focus in front of the verbal element *κτᾶσθαι* ‘seek more’: *ἀεὶ* ‘always’. In the following structure, however, the infinitive *ἡγεῖσθαι* divides the phrase *μήτε ἑορτὴν ἄλλο τι ἡγεῖσθαι ἢ τὸ τὰ δέοντα πρᾶξαι* ‘and not regard a holiday as something else than to have done their duty’ into two parts. The preverbal phrase *ἄλλο τι* ‘something else’ correlates with the phrase *ἢ τὸ τὰ δέοντα πρᾶξαι* ‘than to have done their duty’ with focal “duty”, whereby a contrastive meaning occurs. **The element on** *τὸ ἑορτὴν* ‘holiday’ in the next structure has a contrastive function, too. By that a comparison is instantiated, here with a similar situation, such that a substantial alternative to one of the

emphasized parts of a sentence is imagined.<sup>38</sup> Thus *έορτήν* is an I-Topic again. The following structure contains an I-Topic as well, *ξυμφοράν τε οὐχ ἦσσον* literally ‚as a calamity, namely as not a minor one’ in *διὰ τὸ ... ξυμφοράν τε οὐχ ἦσσον ἡσυχίαν ἀπράγμονα ἢ ἀσχολίαν ἐπίπονον* ‚because ... they regard untroubled peace as a far greater calamity than laborious activity’. The verbless focus domain *ἡσυχίαν ἀπράγμονα ἢ ἀσχολίαν ἐπίπονον* closes with the adjectives *ἀπράγμονα* ‚untroubled’ and *ἐπίπονον* ‚laborious’, by which Thucydides supplies the opposite concepts ‚peace’ and ‚activity’ with negative connotations. The meaning of this passage is hard to grasp because the negation is connected with a comparison. In remodelling this construction into a negative sentence as in (10), it yields: ‚they do not regard untroubled peace as a small calamity, but laborious activity’. This means: ‚they regard untroubled peace as a great calamity, but not laborious activity’. Thus an adversivity can be found here,<sup>39</sup> which is referred to by the comparative construction, and the second contrastive expression bears contrastive accent.<sup>40</sup>

The information structure of (a) is remarkable, too. For it shows that in Greek there is also a preverbal broad focus.<sup>41</sup> The preverbal phrase *μετὰ πόνων ... καὶ κινδύνων δι’ ὅλου τοῦ αἰῶνος* ‚with hardships and dangers, all their life long’ forms the focus domain after the referential Aboutness Topic *ταῦτα* ‚this’, which belongs to disconnected *πάντα* ‚all’ – here, a modal adverbial stands after a temporal adverbial, and *ὅλου* is emphasized, which is followed by the verb. But contrary to that, the verb is topicalized in front of emphasized *ἐλάχιστα* in the phrase *ἀπολαύουσιν ἐλάχιστα τῶν ὑπαρχόντων* ‚and least of all men they enjoy what they have’. It may function as I-Topic: ‚they do enjoy hardly what they have’ (cf. colloquial German „Genießen tun sie kaum, was sie haben”).<sup>42</sup>

In (10) and (11) the *διά*-infinitives denote the findings of facts: Another case occurs in:

(12) I 3,3

The following passage precedes:

‘The best evidence of this is given by Homer; for, though his time was much later even than the Trojan war, he nowhere uses this name of all, or indeed of any of them except the followers of Achilles of Phthiotis, who were in fact the first Hellenes, but designates them in his poems as Danaans and Argives and Achaeans.’ (Smith)

(‘Das bezeugt am besten Homer, der doch viel später ist als selbst der Troische Krieg: nirgends nennt er die Gesamtheit so, ausschließlich die Mannen Achills

<sup>38</sup> Buring (1997); Jacobs (1997: 92).

<sup>39</sup> cf. Fehrmann (2004: 308) for the difference between German „aber” and German „sondern”.

<sup>40</sup> Szucsich (2002: 220f.).

<sup>41</sup> However, on preverbal broad focus cf. Matić (2003: 619ff.).

<sup>42</sup> On similar examples cf. Steube (2003: 170).

aus der Phthiotis, die ja auch die ersten Hellenen waren, dafür spricht er von Danaern in seinen Epen und Argeiern und Achaiern.’) (Landmann)

- a. οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ βαρβάρους εἶρηκε  
 not truly and not Barbarians-ACC.PL.M he has designated-  
 3.SG.IND.PF.ACT  
 ‘And he has not used the term Barbarians’ (Smith)  
 (‘So hat er ja auch für die Barbaren kein Wort’) (Landmann)
- b. διὰ τὸ μηδὲ Ἑλληνάς πω, ὡς  
 because of ART-ACC.SG.N and not Hellenes-ACC.PL.M yet as  
 ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, ἀντίπαλον  
 to me-DAT.SG it seems-3.SG.IND.PRES.ACT contrastive-ACC.SG.N  
 ἐς ἐν ὄνομα ἀποκεκρίσθαι  
 in ACC.SG.N one- term-ACC.SG.N be separated off-INF.PF.PASS  
 ‘either, for the reason, as it seems to me, that the Hellenes on their part had not yet been separated off so as to acquire one common name by way of contrast’ (Smith)  
 (‘weil auch die Hellenen, meine ich, noch nicht unter einem gegensätzlichen Namen zusammengefasst waren.’) (Landmann)

- (a’) nicht fürwahr auch nicht (die) BARBAREN hat er benannt  
 [ ]<sub>F</sub>
- (b’) weil auch nicht die **HELLENEN** noch wie mir scheint mit einem  
 [I-TOP ]  
 GEGENSÄTZLICHEN Namen unterschieden wurden

Thucydides explains why Homer does not have a term for the Barbarians yet. He characterizes this justification explicitly as his opinion by ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ: ‘for the reason, as it seems to me, that the Hellenes on their part had not yet been separated off so as to acquire one common name by way of contrast’. Thus, the infinitive represents a presumption. But again, the whole utterance has the illocutionary force EXPLAIN-WHY.

In detail, the discourse-pragmatic analysis shows: (a) ‘nicht fürwahr auch nicht die Barbaren hat er benannt’ contains the narrow focus βαρβάρους after the negation and the focus particle οὐδὲ immediately in front of the finite verb εἶρηκε<sup>43</sup>. (b) consists of the preverbal focus domain ἀντίπαλον ἐς ἐν ὄνομα with the focus ἀντίπαλον at the top of the noun phrase in front of the infinitive ἀποκεκρίσθαι: ‘weil auch nicht die Hellenen unter einem gegensätzlichen Namen unterschieden wurden’. The name of the people Ἑλληνάς in the infinitive construction stands in contrast to βαρβάρους, and

<sup>43</sup> cf. Stolterfoht & Bader 2004: 269.

denotes a specification of the inferable concept ‚people’; consequently, it is again an I-Topic.

### 2.1.2 Illocutive **dependent justification** of a presumption

Another type of speech act represents (12). As the use of the optative mood makes evident, a presumption is justified in (12). Thus, the speech act is the two-place ARGUING.

(13) I 84,1

‘And so be not ashamed of the slowness and dilatoriness for which they censure us most’ (Smith)

(‘Auch das Langsame und Zaudernde, das sie uns vorwerfen, lasst euch nicht gereuen.’) (Landmann)

a. σπεύδοντές τε γὰρ σχολαίτερον  
 hurrying-PRT.PRES.ACT.NOM.PL.M PART for slower-ADV  
 ἄν παύσαισθε  
 PART you may have stopped-2.PL.OPT.AOR.MED

b. διὰ τὸ ἀπαρασκευοί  
 because of ART-ACC.SG.N unprepared-NOM.PL.M  
 ἐγχεριεῖν  
 attack-INF.PRES.ACT

‘for speed in beginning may mean delay in ending, because you went into the war without preparation’ (Smith)

(‘Eilt ihr jetzt, so wird sich nur das Ende verzögern, weil ihr ungerüstet angriffet’) (Landmann)

a’. **EILEND** nämlich dürftet ihr LANGSAMER aufgehört haben  
 [ I-Top ] [ ]<sub>CF</sub>

b’. weil ihr UNVORBEREITET angriffet

In (a) there are two pseudo-coordinative structures with the contrastive expressions σπεύδοντες ‘hurrying’ or σχολαίτερον ‘slower’, respectively. Here, the Common Integrator is the conception of speed; again, an “implicative concessive reading” or a “contrastive reading” occurs: ‚you hurry, but (nevertheless) you may delay the ending’ or ‚you hurry, but you may delay the ending’. Thus, σχολαίτερον must bear a contrastive accent. But σπεύδοντες standing at the beginning is emphasized, too. Since it does not belong to the focus domain it is best defined as I-Topic. In (13) the contrastive expressions are located in the matrix clause. On the other hand, ἀπαρασκευοί ‘unprepared’ in (b) is a preverbal narrow focus.

2.1.3 Illocutive **dependent justification** of an exhortation

In the following example the translation with German *darum* makes clear that the διά-infinitive is illocutionarily dependent, too. In this context, the matrix clause is an exhortation. In his speech in the first passage Pericles remembers Athens of its importance:

‘We must bear blows from heaven with resignation, and blows from the enemy with manliness: that has been characteristic of our city in the past, and must not be undermined by your action now.’ (Rhodes)

(„Nein, tragen muss man, was vom Himmel kommt, nach Notwendigkeit, was uns der Feind tut, mit Tapferkeit. Dies ist Sitte in dieser Stadt immer schon gewesen und soll nicht bei euch haltmachen.“) (Landmann)

Because it can be taken for granted that these facts are known, this utterance represents background information. However, (a) contains an I-Topic, the superlative ὄνομα μέγιστον ‘the greatest renown’, to which postverbal ἐν ἀπᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ‘bei allen Menschen’ forms the focus domain.

(14) II 64,3

- a. γνῶτε δὲ ὄνομα  
 recognise-2.PL.IMP.AOR.ACT PART renown-ACC.SG.N  
 μέγιστον αὐτήν  
 greatest-ACC.SG.N she-ACC.SG.N  
 ἔχουσιν ἐν ἀπᾶσιν  
 possessing- PRT.PRES.ACT.ACC.SG.F among all-DAT.PL.M  
 ἀνθρώποις  
 men-DAT.PL.M
- b. διὰ τὸ ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς  
 because of ART-ACC.SG.N ART-DAT.PL.F disasters-DAT.PL.F  
 μὴ εἶκειν, Πλείστα δὲ σώματα  
 not give in-INF.PRES.ACT most-ACC.PL.N PART lives-ACC.PL.N  
 καὶ πόνους ἀνηλωκέναι  
 and burdens-ACC.PL.M have laid down-INF.PF.ACT  
 πολέμῳ  
 in war-DAT.SG.M

‘You must recognise, that <Athens> has the greatest renown among all men because she does not give in to disasters, but has sacrificed the largest number of lives and has undertaken the heaviest burdens in war’ (Rhodes)  
 (‘Vielmehr denkt, dass Athen **darum** so hoch gerühmt ist bei allen Menschen, weil es sich keinem Unglück beugt und so viele Mühsale und Menschenleben in Kriegen drangegeben hat’) (Landmann)

- a'. erkennt aber, dass den **GRÖSSTEN** Namen sie (die Stadt Athen)  
 [ I-TOP ]  
 [darum] hat bei ALLEN Menschen
- b'. weil sie dem UNGLÜCK nicht weicht / die **MEISTEN** Leben und Mühen  
 [ I-TOP ]  
 hingegeben hat im KRIEG

The διά-infinitive expresses new information, viz. Pericles' justification of Athens' renown. Its first structure contains the narrow focus ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς 'the disasters' in front of the negation μή and the infinitive, while the second structure shows again an I-Topic: πλεῖστα δὲ σώματα καὶ πόνους 'most lives and burdens'. In the matrix clause and in the infinitive constructions, the concepts are compatible with each other: ὄνομα μέγιστον 'greatest renown' (ἐν ἀπάσιν ἀνθρώποις 'among all men') or πλεῖστα δὲ σώματα καὶ πόνους 'most lives and burdens', respectively. Here, the Common Integrator is the concept of "dimension" again.

#### 2.1.4 Illocutive **dependent justification** of an expression

Also, justifications of expressions appear illocutionarily dependently and in the postverbal focus domain:

(15) II 11,4

- a. ἄδηλα γὰρ τὰ τῶν  
 uncertain-NOM.PL.N for ART-NOM.PL.N ART-GEN.PL.M  
 πολέμων, καὶ ἐξ ὀλίγου τὰ  
 wars-GEN.PL.M and out of little-GEN.SG.N ART-NOM.PL.N  
 πολλὰ καὶ δι' ὀργῆς αἰ  
 much-NOM.PL.N and out of rage ART-NOM.PL.F  
 ἐπιχειρήσεις γίνονται· πολλάκις τε  
 attacks-NOM.PL.F arise-3.PL.IND.PRES.MED often and  
 τὸ ἔλασσον πλῆθος  
 ART-NOM.SG.N inferior-COMPAR.NOM.SG.N troop-NOM.SG.N  
 δεδιὸς ἄμεινον  
 afraid- PRT.PF.ACT.NOM.SG.N better-ADV  
 ἡμίνατο τοὺς  
 it has repulsed-3.SG.IND.AOR.MED ART-ACC.PL.M  
 πλέονας  
 majorities-ACC.PL.M
- b. διὰ τὸ καταφρονοῦντας  
 because of ART-ACC.SG.N despising-PRT.PRES.ACT.ACC.PL.M  
 ἀπαρασκευόους γενέσθαι.  
 unprepared-ACC.PL.M become-INF.AOR.MED



‘War is full of uncertainty, and most frequently attacks are made at short notice, in a moment of passion. Often inferior numbers, afraid for themselves, have gained the upper hand in fighting superior numbers who despised them and so were unprepared.’ (Rhodes)

(‘Denn im Krieg ist alles ungewiss, die meisten Angriffe entstehen rasch und im Zorn, und oft hat die kleinere Schar in ihrer Angst sich besser gewehrt gegen eine Übermacht, die hochmütig nicht mehr auf Bereitschaft hielt.’) (Landmann)

- a'. UNGEWISS nämlich (ist) das der **KRIEGE** / und aus **WENIGEM**  
 [ ]<sub>F</sub> [ **TOP** ] / [ **I-TOP** ]  
 das **VIELE** / und aus **ZORN** die **ANGRIFFE** entstehen / und oft  
 [ ]<sub>CF</sub> [ **I-TOP** ]  
 die **KLEINERE** Schar in ihrer Furcht **BESSER** hat abgewehrt  
 [ **I-TOP** ]  
 die **MEHRZAHL** /  
 [ ]<sub>CF</sub>
- b'. weil sie (die kleinere Schar) verachtend **UNGERÜSTET** waren

The infinitive construction (b) *διὰ τὸ καταφρονοῦντας ἀπαρασκευοῦς γενέσθαι* ‘because in despising (the inferior troop) they became unprepared’ with the narrow focus *ἀπαρασκευοῦς* standing in front of the infinitive *γενέσθαι* justifies the choice of the preceding valuating focus expression *ἄμεινον* ‘better’.

Looking at the information structure of the four coordinative structures in (a) separately, in the verbless first structure the focus is immediately located at the top of the clause:<sup>44</sup> ἄδηλα ‘uncertain’. In the similarly verbless second structure, the noun phrase *τὰ πολλά* ‘many things’ forms a contrast to *ἐξ ὀλίγου* ‘out of little’. Thus, *ἐξ ὀλίγου* functions as I-Topic. The periphrase leads to an implicit negation: ‘Out of little not little arises, but many things’. In the underlying structure, *τὰ πολλά* represents correction by contrastive focus, whereby identical elements are elliptically deleted.<sup>45</sup> In the following we assume an implicit correction by contrast, if these features appear. The same informational structure is documented in the fourth structure. The I-Topic *τὸ ἔλασσον πλῆθος (δεδιὸς)* ‘the inferior troop (afraid of themselves)’ contrasts with focal *τοὺς πλέονας* ‘the majorities’. Again an implicit correction by contrast is given: ‘the inferior troop has not repulsed a smaller one, but a majority’. In both cases the Common Integrator is the conception of “dimension”. Also the prepositional phrase *δι’ ὀργῆς* ‘out of rage’ in the third

<sup>44</sup> cf. Matić 2003: 619ff.

<sup>45</sup> cf. Fehrman 2004: 310.

structure δι ὀργῆς αἱ ἐπιχειρήσεις γίνονται ‘out of rage the attacks arise’ can be considered as I-Topic, as arguments for the beginning of enemy actions or the participation in such affairs are mentioned together with ἐξ ὀλίγου ‘out of little’. But the representational focus is the preverbal ἄμεινον ‘better’.

## 2.2 διὰ-infinitives in the preverbal focus domain

διὰ-infinitives are attested also in preverbal position. As the examples show the infinitives are illocutionarily dependent.

### 2.2.1 Illocutively dependent justification of a proposition

#### (16) II 89,2

The preceding passage reads as follows:

‘I have called you together, my men, because I see you are frightened at the enemy’s numbers, and I do not want you to be afraid where there is no cause for fear.’ (Rhodes)

(‘Da ich euch in Angst sehe, Soldaten, wegen der feindlichen Übermacht, habe ich euch zusammengerufen, weil mir Bängnis fehl am Ort scheint, wo nichts zu fürchten ist.’ (Landmann))

- a. οὔτοι γὰρ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὸ  
 these-NOM.PL.M for first of all-ADV but because of ART-ACC.SG.N  
 προνεκῆσθαι καὶ μηδ’ αὐτοὶ  
 be beaten before-INF.PF.PASS and not themselves-NOM.PL.M  
 οἴεσθαι ὅμοιοι ἡμῖν  
 believe-INF.PRES.MED equal-NOM.PL.M to us-DAT.PL  
 εἶναι τὸ πλήθος  
 be-INF.PRES.ACT ART- ACC.SG.N amount-ACC.SG.N  
 τῶν νεῶν καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ  
 ART-GEN.PL.F ships-GEN.PL.F and not of ART-GEN.SG.  
 ἴσου παρεσκευάσαντο  
 equal (number) they provided themselves-3.PL.IND.AOR.MED

‘First of all, because they have been beaten before, these men do not even themselves believe that they are equal to us, and that is why they have prepared such a large number of ships and have not kept to the same scale as us.’ (Rhodes)

(‘Denn erstens haben die Peloponnesier diese ungleiche Überzahl von Schiffen zusammengebracht, weil sie sich vorbesiegt und selber sich uns nicht gewachsen fühlen’) (Landmann)

- a'. diese nämlich erstens aber, [deswegen] weil sie VORHER besiegt waren  
**[TOP]**  
 und nicht SELBST glaubten, GLEICH uns zu sein, die MENGE der Schiffe  
 und nicht von GLEICHER (Zahl) rüsteten sie für sich  
 I Icf

Phormion tries to give a cause why the Peloponnesians have mobilized such an amount of ships. Thus, the presentational focus of the matrix clause is *πλῆθος* ‘amount’ after the preverbal *διά*-infinitive. This infinitive is part of the focus domain, too. Firstly, it applies to a preceding event: ‘because they have been beaten previously’. After that the adjective phrase *ὄμοιοι ἡμῖν* ‘equal to us’ correlates with the noun phrase *τὸ πλῆθος τῶν νεῶν καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴσου* ‘the amount of ships (which were) not of equal number’. On the one hand the concept of equality as Common Integrator refers to the Peloponnesians, on the other hand to the ships, whereby the number of the ships does not correspond with the number of the Peloponnesians. Again, an “implicative concessive reading” or a “contrastive reading” arises: The first conjunct with *ὄμοιοι* directly forms a contradiction to the second conjunct with *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴσου*. Thus *ἴσου* has a contrastive accent.

### 2.2.2 Illocutively dependent justification of an expression

(17) II 14

- a. πρόβατα δὲ καὶ ὑποζύγια ἐς  
 sheep-NOM.PL.N PART and draught animals-NOM.PL.N to  
 τὴν Εὐβοίαν  
 ART-ACC.SG.F **Euboea**-ACC.SG.F  
 διεπέμψαντο καὶ ἐς τὰς  
 they were sent-3.PL.IND.AOR.MED and to ART-ACC.PL.F  
 νήσους τὰς  
**islands**-ACC.PL.F ART-ACC.PL.F  
 ἐπικείμενας.  
 being situated nearby-PRT.PRES.MED.ACC.PL.F  
 ‘They sent their cattle and beasts of burden to Euboea and the offshore islands.’ (Rhodes)  
 (‘Kleinvieh und Zugtiere sandten sie [die Athener] nach Euboea hinüber und auf die anliegenden Inseln.’) (Landmann)
- b. χαλεπῶς δὲ αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ  
 hard-ADV PART for them-DAT.PL.M because of ART-ACC.SG.N  
 αἰεὶ εἰωθέναι τοὺς  
 always be used-INF.PF.ACT ART-ACC.PL.M  
 πολλοὺς ἐν τοῖς

many people-ACC.PL.M in ART-DAT.PL.M  
 ἀγροῖς διαιτᾶσθαι ἡ  
 country-DAT.PL.M live-INF.PRES.MED ART-NOM.SG.M  
 ἀνάστασις ἐγίγνετο.  
 removal-NOM.SG.F was-3.SG.IND.IPF.MED  
 ‘The removal was a hard thing for them, because the majority had always  
 been used to living in the country.’ (Rhodes)  
 (‘Weil aber die meisten immer das Leben auf dem Lande gewohnt waren,  
 fiel ihnen diese Aussiedlung sehr schwer.’) (Landmann)

- a’. Kleinvieh und Zugtiere nach EUBOIA wurden geschickt und auf die  
 INSELN (die) nahe liegend (sind)  
 b’. SCHWER aber ihnen weil **IMMER** gewohnt waren die MEISTEN  
 [ ]<sub>F</sub> [ **I-TOP** ]  
 auf dem LAND zu leben diese Verpflanzung wurde  
 [ **TOP** ]

In (b), one focus of the matrix clause is χαλεπῶς ‘hard’, as the particle δὲ shows. However because the διὰ-infinitive serves as justification of this evaluation, the focus domain must consist of the adjective phrase χαλεπῶς δὲ αὐτοῖς and the infinitive construction. The referential topic ἡ ἀνάστασις ‘this removal’ follows this domain, and the verb stands at the end.<sup>46</sup>

In the διὰ-infinitive, the infinitive phrase αἰεὶ εἰωθέναι ‘always being used’ is a verb topicalization<sup>47</sup> with pleonastic αἰεὶ ‘always’. Here, the whole infinitival VP complement functions as I-Topic.<sup>48</sup> Then the focus accent lies on ἐν τοῖς ἀγροῖς ‘in the country’.

In the same manner:

(18) II 37,1

- a. Χρώμεθα γὰρ πολιτεία οὐ  
 we have-1.PL.IND.PRES.MED for constitution-DAT.SG.F not  
 ζηλοῦση τοὺς  
 emulating-PRT.PRES.ACT.DAT.SG.F ART-ACC.PL.M  
 τῶν πέλας  
 ART-GEN.PL.M (those who are) neighboring-ADV  
 νόμους, παράδειγμα δὲ μᾶλλον  
 laws-ACC.PL.M example-NOM.SG.N PART rather-ADV  
 αὐτοῖ ὄντες

<sup>46</sup> cf. footnote 43.

<sup>47</sup> cf. Matic 2003: 614.

<sup>48</sup> cf. Steube’s (2003: 170) example:

Rote **Rosen** regnen lassen möchte JEDer Verliebte.

- ourselves-NOM.PL.M being-PRT.PRES.ACT.NOM.PL.M  
 τινὶ ἢ  
 somebody-DAT.SG.M than  
 μιμούμενοι ἑτέρους.  
 imitating-PRT.PRES.MED.NOM.PL.M others-ACC.PL.M
- b. καὶ ὄνομα μὲν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔς  
 and name-NOM.SG.N it is true-PART because of ART-ACC.SG.N not on  
 ὀλίγους ἀλλ' ἔς πλείονας  
 ACC.PL.M a few-ACC.PL.M but on many-ACC.PL.M  
 οἰκεῖν δημοκρατία  
 found-INF.PRES.ACT democracy-NOM.SG.F  
 κέκληται  
 it is called-3.SG.IND.PF.PASS

‘We have a constitution which does not seek to copy the laws of our neighbours: we are an example to others rather than imitators of them. The name given to this constitution is democracy, because it is based not on a few but on a larger number.’ (Rhodes)

(‘Die Verfassung, die wir haben, richtet sich nach keinen fremden Gesetzen; viel eher sind wir für sonst jemand ein Vorbild als von anderen abhängig. Mit Namen heißt sie, weil der Staat nicht auf wenige Bürger, sondern auf eine größere Zahl gestellt ist, Volksherrschaft.’) (Landmann)

- a'. wir **HABEN** nämlich eine VERFASSUNG (die) nicht nacheifert die der  
 [ I-TOP ]  
 NACHBARN Gesetze **VORBILD** vielmehr SELBST seiend irgend jemand  
 [I-TOP ] [ ]<sub>F</sub>  
 als nachbildend ANDERE  
 [ ]<sub>CF</sub>
- b'. und der **NAME** aber weil (der Staat) sich nicht auf WENIGE sondern auf  
 [I-TOP ] [ ]<sub>F</sub>  
 VIELE stützt VOLKSHERRSCHAFT wird genannt  
 [ ]<sub>CF</sub>

In (b) the justification of the choice of the expression δημοκρατία ‘democracy’, the διὰ-infinitive, stands in front of this term. The verb follows immediately. The element on top, ὄνομα ‘name’, is emphasized by μὲν ‘it is true’. Therefore, ὄνομα must be regarded as an I-Topic and functions at the same time as subject of the sentence. The infinitive construction itself contains the focus ὀλίγους ‘a few’ and an explicit correction by contrastive focus: πλείονας ‘many’, which is indicated by ἀλλά ‘but’ (“sondern”). Contrast can be found also in (a), as in (10) the focal ἑτέρους ‘the others’ refers to an

alternative quantity evoked previously,<sup>49</sup> viz. focal αὐτοί ‘ourselves’. The general term is something like “people who participate (in a community)”. Also as in (10) the comparative construction with ἢ ‘than’ functions as an implicit negation, but the two conjuncts must be ordered here the other way round: ‘we do not imitate the others, but we ourselves are an example to somebody’. But a community with (b) is the I-Topic at the top of the sentence: παράδειγμα ‘example’ is emphasized by the particle δέ. Finally the first sentence, too, starts with an I-Topic: The predicate itself is topicalized: ‘we do have a constitution’. A further contrast arises by οὐ ζηλούση τοὺς τῶν πέλας νόμους ‘not emulating the laws of (those who are) neighbouring’. Focal πέλας forms the reference point for following αὐτοί ‘ourselves’, whereby this pronoun becomes a contrastive focus.

### 3 Summary

The illustrating examples in paragraph 2 make the following conclusions possible:

1. Only illocutionarily dependent διά-infinitives occur, both preposed and postponed. As speech acts, the διά-infinitives serve as explanations of a proposition, as justification of a presumption, of an exhortation or of an expression.
2. διά-infinitives always have their own information structure. They may be found in the postverbal as well as in the preverbal focus domain of the complex sentence. Consequently, they must themselves be of focal nature, and the articles connected to the infinitives can be nominalization markers only.
3. As Matić pointed out, there are the following positions for focal elements in Ancient Greek: at the beginning of a sentence, or behind a noun at the beginning of a sentence, whereas the narrow foci are mostly found directly before or after the verb. But when a contrastive focus is the only focus in the sentence its position is free. These focus positions hold for the finite as well as for the infinite verb. Consequently, infinitive constructions are informational units with a topic and a focus.
4. Last but not least, Thucydides’ diction is full of contrastive expressions. There are contrastive foci within sentences and at the beginning of the sentence. In the latter position contrastive foci are I-Topics in the bridge contours (they can be nouns, verbs or IPs) and have a representational focus besides themselves. The I-Topics may either have an “implicative concessive reading” with the second conjunct – introduced by *aber* (*but*) – being in contrast to an assumed inference of the first conjunct, or they may have a “contrastive reading with an additional adversative evaluation of the conjuncts”. Further, there are implicit corrections by contrastive focus,

<sup>49</sup> Umbach (2001: 177).

especially with the adjective “the others”, or explicit corrections by contrastive focus with the conjunction *but* (*sondern*). “Distance, speed, dimension, equality, or participation” serve as common integrators. The typically antithetical style of Thucydides has been recognized by other scholars before. How his antitheses work in detail, however, can only be made explicit by an analysis of information structure. The *διά*-infinitives support the antithetical style in nearly every passage of the text: The contrast is spread over the matrix clauses as the dominating speech acts and is justified by the *διά*-infinitives.

### References

- Behrendt, G. (1886): Über den Gebrauch des Infinitivs mit Artikel bei Thucydides. Berlin (Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Programm des Sophiengymnasiums zu Berlin).
- Bierwisch, M. (1980): Semantic structure and illocutionary force, In: M. Bierwisch, J. Searle, and F. Kiefer (eds): *Speech act theory and pragmatics*. Dordrecht.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner (1990): *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Bearb. von Friedrich Rehkopf. <sup>17</sup>Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bornemann, E., and E. Risch (1974): *Griechische Grammatik*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Moritz Diesterweg.
- Botinis, A. (1998): Intonation in Greek. In: D. Hirst (ed.): *Intonation systems. A survey of twenty languages*. Cambridge: University Press, 288-310.
- Brandt, M. (1990): Weiterführende Nebensätze. Zu ihrer Syntax, Semantik und Pragmatik(=Lunder germanistische Forschungen 57). Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Brandt, M., and I. Rosengren (1991): Zur Handlungsstruktur des Textes. *Sprache und Pragmatik* 24, 3-46.
- Büring, D., and K. Hartmann (2001): The syntax and semantics of focus-sensitive particles in German. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 19, 229-281.
- Devine, A. M., and L. Stephens (2000): *Discontinuous syntax. Hyperbaton in Greek*. New York, Oxford: OUP.
- Dik, H. (1995): *Ancient Greek word order*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Fehrmann, D. (2004): Prosody in contrast. In: A. Steube (ed.): *Information structure. Theoretical and empirical aspects* (= *Language, Context, and Cognition* 1). Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 307-343.
- Hajičová, E., and P. Sgall (2004): Degrees of contrast and the topic-focus articulation. In: A. Steube (ed.): *Information Structure. Theoretical and empirical aspects*. (= *Language, Context, and Cognition* 1). Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1-13.
- Hartmann, K. (2005): Focus constructions in Hausa. In: V. Molnár and S. Winkler (eds): *Information structure and the architecture of grammar: A typological perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Jacobs, J. (1997): I-Topikalisierung. *Linguistische Berichte* 168, 91-133.

- Kang, C.-U. (1996): Die sogenannten Kausalsätze des Deutschen. Eine Untersuchung erklärenden, begründenden, rechtfertigenden und argumentierenden Sprechens. Münster/New York: Waxmann.
- Kanyschewa, T., and G. Tregubenkow (1958): Zur Frage der Intonation in einigen Typen des zusammengesetzten Satzes im Deutschen. Zeitschrift für Phonetik und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft 11, 323-343.
- Kiss, K. É. (1995): Discourse configurational languages. Oxford: OUP.
- Kiss, K. É. (2001): Discourse configurationality. In: M. Haspelmath., E. König, and W. Oesterreicher (eds): Language typology and language universals. Vol. 2, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1442-1455.
- Klein, J. (1987): Die konklusiven Sprechhandlungen. Studien zur Pragmatik, Semantik, Syntax und Lexik von BEGRÜNDEN, ERKLÄREN-WARUM, FOLGERN und RECHTFERTIGEN (= Germanistische Linguistik 76). Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Krisch, T. (1998): Zum Hyperbaton in altindogermanischen Sprachen. In: W. Meid (ed.): Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen. Akten der X. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Innsbruck, 22.-28. September 1996. Innsbruck, 351-384.
- Lambrecht, K. (1994): Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents. Cambridge / MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Landmann, G. P. (1960[2002]): Geschichte des Peloponnesischen Krieges. Übersetzt und hg. Zürich: Artemis & Winkler.
- Lang, E. (1976): Erklärungstexte. In: F. Daneš and D. Viehweger (eds): Probleme der Textgrammatik (= studia grammatica 11). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 147-181.
- Lang, E., and C. Umbach (2002): Kontrast in der Grammatik: spezifische Realisierungen und übergreifender Konnex. In: Steube (ed.): 145-186.
- Lühr, R. (2005): Der Einfluß der klassischen Sprachen auf die germanische Grammatik. In: G. Meiser (ed.): Sprachkontakt. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Halle, 341-362.
- Matić, D. (2003): Topic, focus, and discourse structure. Ancient Greek word order. Studies in Language 27,3, 573-633.
- Pasch, R. (1983): Die Kausalkonjunktionen „da“, „denn“ und „weil“: drei Konjunktionen – drei lexikalische Klassen. Deutsch als Fremdsprache 20, 332-337.
- Pasch, R. (1989): Adverbialsätze – Kommentarsätze – adjungierte Sätze. Eine Hypothese zu den Typen der Bedeutungen von *weil*, *da* und *wenn*. In: W. Motsch (ed.): Wortstruktur und Satzstruktur (= Linguistische Studien des ZISW: Reihe A – Arbeitsberichte 194). Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR; Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft, 141-158.
- Pasch, R. u.a. (2003): Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Linguistische Grundlagen der Beschreibung und syntaktische Merkmale der deutschen Satzverknüpfungen (Konjunktionen, Satzadverbien und Partikeln). Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.



- Rhodes, P. J. (ed.) (1988): Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian War. Book 2. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Schwyzler, E., and A. Debrunner (1950): Griechische Grammatik. 2. Bd. München: Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Smith, C. F. (ed.) (1991): Thucydides. History of the Peloponnesian War. Book I and II. London [u.a.]: Heinemann (The Loeb classical library 108).
- Steube, A., and A. Späth (2002): Semantik, Informationsstruktur und grammatische Modularität. In: A. Steube (ed.): Sprachtheoretische Grundlagen der Kognitionswissenschaft: Sprachliches und nichtsprachliches Wissen (= Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 79). Leipzig, Universität Leipzig, 235-254.
- Steube, A. (2001): Grammatik und Pragmatik von Hutkonturen. In: A. Steube (ed.) Kontrast – lexikalisch, semantisch, intonatorisch. (= Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 77). Leipzig, Universität Leipzig, 7-29.
- Steube, A. (2001a): Correction by contrastive Focus. *Theoretical Linguistics* 27, 215-249.
- Steube, A. (ed.) (2002): Sprachtheoretische Grundlagen der Kognitionswissenschaft: Sprachliches und nichtsprachliches Wissen (= Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 79). Institut für Linguistik: Universität Leipzig, 213-233.
- Steube, A. (2003): Bridge contours in German assertive main clauses. In: W. Abraham and L. Molnárfi (eds): *Optionality in syntax and discourse structure – Aspects of word order variation in (West-)Germanic and other Indo-European languages*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter (*Folia Linguistica* 37), 163-190.
- Steube, A. (ed.) (2004): *Information structure. Theoretical and empirical aspects*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter (*Language, Context, and Cognition* 1).
- Steube, A. (ed.) (2004a): *Grammatik und Kontext: Zur Interaktion von Syntax, Semantik und Prosodie bei der Informationsstrukturierung*. (= Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 81). Leipzig: Institut für Linguistik, Universität Leipzig.
- Steup, J. (1967): Thucydides. Erklärt von Johannes Classen. Bibliographischer Nachtrag von R. Stark, Bd. VI, 5. Aufl., Dublin/Zürich: Weidmann.
- Stolterfoht, B. and M. Bader (2004): Focus structure and the processing of word order variations in German. In: A. Steube (ed.) (2004), 259-275.
- Sudhoff, St., D. Lenertová, and K. Alter: Zur Charakterisierung von Bezugskonstituenten der betonten Fokuspartikel *auch* im Deutschen. In: A. Steube (ed.) (2004a), 159-179.
- Szucsich, L. (2002): Informationsstruktur in komplexen russischen Sätzen. In: Steube (ed.) 2002: 213-233.
- Thim-Mabrey, C. (1982): Zur Syntax der kausalen Konjunktionen *weil*, *da* und *denn*. *Sprachwissenschaft* 7, 197-219.

- Toepel, U., and K. Alter (2004): On the independence of information structural processing from prosody. In: A. Steube (ed.) (2004): *Information structure. Theoretical and empirical aspects (= Language, Context, and Cognition 1)*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 227-240.
- Umbach, C. (2001): Restriktion der Alternativen. In: A. Steube (ed.) (2001b), 167-198.
- Umbach, C. et al. (2004): Intonational patterns in contrast and concession. In: A. Steube (ed.) (2004): *Information structure. Theoretical and empirical aspects (= Language, Context, and Cognition 1)*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 277-305.
- Wackernagel, J. (1896): *Altindische Grammatik, I: Lautlehre*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.