Word order and information structure in New Testament Greek

Kirk, A.

Citation

Kirk, A. (2012, November 21). *Word order and information structure in New Testament Greek*. *LOT dissertation series*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/20157

Cover Page

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/20157 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Kirk, Allison
Title: Word order and information structure in New Testament Greek
Issue Date: 2012-11-21

Chapter 2. The question of basic word order

1 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is the respective position of the subject (S), verb (V) and object (O) in main clauses in New Testament (NT) Greek. All permutations of these elements are found. An example of each order is given in the examples in (1)-(6). These examples are not given in context for the moment, but some will be further discussed in Section 4 and in Chapter 3.

(1) SVO clause
Abraàm   egénne:sen
Abraham.NOM.SG.M   beget.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT
tòn   Isaák
D.ACC.SG.M   Isaac.ACC.SG.M
'Abraham was the father of Isaac'
Ἀβραὰμ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαάκ   (Mt 1:2)

(2) VSO clause
megalúnei   he: psuk^hé: mou
exalt.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT   D.NOM.SG.F   soul.NOM.SG.F   my.GEN.SG
tòn   kúrion
D.ACC.SG.M   lord.ACC.SG.M
'My soul exalts the lord'
Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον   (Lk 1:46)

(3) SOV clause
hai   aló:pekes   p^ho:leoùs
D.NOM.PL.F   fox.NOM.PL.F   hole.ACC.PL.M
ék^housin
have.3PL.PRES.IND.ACT
'The foxes have holes'
Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν   (Mt 8:20)

(4) OVS clause
toútous   toùs   dó:deka   apésteilen
these.ACC.PL.M   D.ACC.PL.M   twelve   send.forth.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT
ho   Ie:soûs
D.NOM.SG.M   Jesus.NOM.SG.M
'Jesus sent forth these twelve'
Τούτους τοὺς δώδεκα ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς   (Mt 10:5)

(5) VOS clause

épempsen	pʰílous	ho	hekatontárkʰe:s
send.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT	friend.ACC.PL.M	D.NOM.SG.M	centurion.NOM.SG.M

'The centurion sent friends'

ἔπεμψεν φίλους ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης   (Lk 7:6)

(6) OSV clause

taûta	gàr	pánta	tà	étʰne:
these.ACC.PL.N	PCL	all.ACC.PL.N	D.NOM.PL.M	nation.NOM.PL.M

toû	kósmou	epize:toûsin
D.GEN.SG.M	world.GEN.SG.M	seek.3PL.PRES.IND.ACT

'For, the nations of the world seek all these [things]' /
'For, all the nations of the world seek these things.'[13]

ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητοῦσιν   (Lk 12:30)

The goal of this chapter is to determine what the basic, or unmarked word order is. In Section 2 I discuss the notion of basic or unmarked word order. There are many different ways to view basic word order, and different methodologies are employed in determining it.

In Section 3 I present the previous work on basic or unmarked word order in NT Greek: Rife 1933, Friberg 1982, Davison 1989, Terry 1993 and Taylor 1994. They show conflicting results and take different stands. In this section I point out some methodological issues that influence the results of these studies. I stress the varying degrees of weight placed on frequencies of occurrence, and the choice of the clauses under investigation.

In Section 4, I present my own survey of word order in main clauses in four books: Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation. The idea is to create a pool of clauses that share basic syntactic properties, in order to formulate generalizations about their distributions. In 4.2 I give the breakdown of word orders among the clauses that meet the criteria specified in 4.1 and Appendix I. There is considerable variation among books. Particularly, VSO is frequent in Matthew, Luke and Revelation but absent in First Corinthians. Accordingly, SOV and OVS are more significant in First Corinthians than the other books.

In 4.3 I focus on neutrality. I find that SVO and VSO are both found in neutral contexts, where there is no topic or focus connected with a particular element. In 4.4 I draw generalizations about non-neutral clauses. Particularly, SVO, SOV, OSV and OVS clauses show several marked characteristics, some of which are also discussed in Friberg (1982, Chapter 3) and Davison (1989). Thus, certain SVO and VSO

---

[13] The strong quantifier *pánta*, as well as the demonstrative *taûta* are neuter plural forms, and could be either nominative or accusative. Since the DP *tà étʰne:* "the nations" is also neuter plural, it is not entirely clear whether the quantifier modifies the demonstrative object, or the DP subject. The two translations given represent the two different readings. All bible translations take the first translation given under the example, and the example is glossed this way.

clauses constitute neutral clauses, and certain SVO clauses are clearly marked. In this chapter I employ the somewhat vague term "emphasis" when describing certain marked constituents and refine this in Chapter 4.

In Section 5 I present the conclusions from the chapter.

2 The notion of basic word order

In the typological tradition, languages are characterized into types according to their basic word orders. It has been claimed that every language has a single dominant, or basic word order (Steele 1978: 587). Some take the language's basic word order to be the one that occurs with the highest frequency (Greenberg 1966), and some factor in various notions of neutrality (see Comrie 1989; Croft 1990; Dryer 1995, 2007). Under these criteria, one order is neutral and the other(s) marked in some way.

Markedness theory, very generally, concerns the characterization of linguistic objects as binary opposing categories, for example, a nasal versus non-nasal sound, or singular versus plural. The marked form is in some way more complex than the unmarked; it has an extra feature, or an extra morpheme, possibly corresponding to a more specified meaning or limited distribution (see the introduction in Eckman, Moravcsik & Wirth 1986). Markedness theory has been a widespread notion across various domains of linguistics. It has been a central part of generative phonology (see Chomsky & Halle 1968) and generative syntax. In syntax, markedness has been seen in terms of deviation from a parameter in the Principles and Parameters framework (Chomsky 1981), or in terms of a filter, i.e., a constraint on the grammar (Chomsky & Lasnik 1977). In more current minimalist syntax, the marked-unmarked opposition is discussed in terms of syntactic derivations (see Roberts 2007: Chapter 3; Roberts & Roussou 2003: Chapter 5). Markedness theory is also central to Optimality Theory (OT) phonology and syntax. In these frameworks, markedness constraints are ranked on a hierarchy, which is subject to cross-linguistic variation. For example, see Costa (2001) for an OT account of subject verb inversion in Romance languages. Markedness is also central to many nongenerative functional grammar approaches (see Dik 1989; Givón 1990; Gundel *et al* 1988).

Definitions of markedness differ immensely in the literature (see Haspelmath 2006 for a summary of twelve senses of markedness, and a critique of the term). I discuss three of these definitions of markedness that can be applied to the domain of word order in 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3. While some of them refer to surface orders, some of them refer to syntactic structures. In 2.4 I discuss the role of pragmatics, or information structure in determining basic word order.

2.1 Textual rarity

One definition of markedness refers to rarity in texts (Greenberg 1966), given in (7). By this definition, an infrequently found word order is necessarily marked. In this approach, frequency of occurrence is correlated with neutrality.

(7) The neutral order is the most frequent order.

The traditional Greenbergian method takes into account clauses which contain the major sentence elements: a subject, a verb and an object. Notice that for a null subject language such as NT Greek (see Chapter 3, Section 4), clauses with overt subjects are in the minority compared with clauses that have no subjects. Therefore, examining clauses with a subject, a verb and an object already runs counter to the definition in (7). In principle, two conclusions can be drawn from this. One could say that the neutral word order of subject, verb and object is not a good research criterion for NT Greek (as well as older Greek). The other option is to say that the frequency criterion is not well-founded as a criterion for neutrality. As I discuss below, many authors take the latter view (see, for example, Brody 1984; Dryer 1995), and I also take this view here.

2.2   Distributional markedness

Another definition describes markedness in terms of distributional restrictions (Haspelmath 2006: 36). Applied to the domain of word order, this would lead to the following definition in (8).

(8) Distributional markedness
    If a word order A occurs in restricted environments, and a word order B occurs elsewhere, word order B is unmarked. Word order B is   the   default word order.

There are many varieties of distributional restrictions. For example, as Comrie (1989: 88-89) discusses, in some dialects of French, SVO is predominant in main clauses, subordinate clauses and relative clauses, but in questions, VSO orders occur. Thus, VSO occurs in the restricted environment of questions, and SVO elsewhere. Similarly, SVO is predominant when the subject and object are noun phrases and proper names, and various strong pronouns. With clitic pronominal objects, however, SOV occurs. SOV is distributionally marked. In these cases, SVO clauses are also the most frequently used, so there is no discrepancy between markedness based on frequency and markedness based on distribution.
    However, Dryer (1995) argues that it is not always the case that distributionally restricted word orders appear with lower frequency than the neutral word order. A case in point is found in Brody (1984). She argues that Tojolabal (a Mayan language) has the basic word order VOS, although it occurs much less frequently than SVO in discourse. The claim is that SVO sentences are pragmatically marked, and that a pragmatically marked order cannot be basic. Under the assumption that the basic word order is the pragmatically unmarked order, Dryer's (1995) methodology is to characterize the distributional restrictions on word orders, singling out particular environments in which certain word orders occur. He defines these environments based on pragmatic distinctions. The order that can't be defined

as occurring in a certain pragmatic environment is the basic word order. The studies just mentioned conclude that frequency is not an important factor in determining basic word order.

2.3   Markedness in a generative framework

Haspelmath (2006:36) discusses markedness as deviation from a default parameter setting, referring to the Principles and Parameters framework (Chomsky 1981). As I mentioned in Chapter 1, within the Principles and Parameters framework the common language primitives are given by Universal Grammar (UG). Language-specific parameters are acquired by children during the acquisition period, and these parameters are the source of language variation.[14] One of these is the head directionality parameter (see, for example Baker 2001). English is a typical example of a head-initial language (VO) language, while Japanese is head final (OV).

There are examples where the head directionality of a language is not reflected in what would be considered to be the most basic types of clauses according to (7) and (8) above, i.e., main clauses. One example is German. While SVO orders are very common in main clauses, OV occurs in subordinate clauses. Therefore, taking frequency and distribution into consideration, SVO would be more basic than SOV. However, it has been shown that in main clauses, the verb moves to C°, the Complementizer head. The absence of verb movement in subordinate clauses is due to the fact that the C° position is unavailable, already being occupied by the complementizer (den Besten 1983). German is normally treated as an SOV language. Under this view, the basic or unmarked word order of a language can be stated as in (9).

> (9) Unmarked word order is the order that reflects the head directionality of the language.

If Kayne's (1994) theory is adopted, there is no head directionality parameter. Kayne proposes that X-bar theory is not a primitive of UG, but that the Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA) is. The LCA restricts hierarchical phrase structure to asymmetric c-command relations (specifier-head-complement) by way of a direct mapping of asymmetric c-command to linear order. The LCA then asserts that the basic word order of every language is SVO, if basic word order is understood as an underlying order.

In more recent minimalist approaches to parametric syntax, markedness has been defined in terms of simplicity of derivations (see Roberts 2007, Chapter 5; Roberts & Roussou 2003: 201) define simplicity as in (10).

---

[14] For a critique of this view, see Newmeyer (2004), see Roberts & Holmberg (2005) for a reply to this, and see Baker & McCloskey (2007) for a discussion of methodological issues and goals in the fields of typology and syntax.

(10)   Given two structural representations R and R' for a substring of
        input text S, R is simpler than R' if R contains fewer formal feature
        syncretisms than R'.

Feature syncretism refers to more than one formal feature occurring in a particular
structural position. Here formal features include φ-features like person and number,
Case features, as well as features that trigger movement (the [EPP] feature as
defined in Chomsky 2001).[15]

2.4   The role of information structure

It is well known that word order in many languages is affected by information
structure, the division of labour between discourse units such as topic and focus, as I
introduced in Chapter 1, Section 2. Such languages are often called discourse-
configurational (see É.Kiss 1995). It is fairly well accepted that dialects of Greek
that pre-date Koine fall into this category (see Devine & Stephens 2000; Dik 1995).
Pragmatic considerations are central to proposals that examine word order as both a
surface and a non-surface phenomenon. For example, in the functional framework
employed in Dik (1995), the surface word order Topic-Focus-V-Remaining
Elements is the unmarked word order of Herodotus's Greek (an Ionic dialect from
the fifth century BC). This refers to the fact that this is the most commonplace
surface order of elements, appearing most frequently. Thus, the definition in (7) is
most important.

  Pragmatic considerations play a very different role in approaches that examine
word order as not only a surface phenomenon. In current generative frameworks,
information structure is encoded in the syntax in some way or another. Therefore, a
given surface word order can result from a derivation in which a Topic or Focus
feature is present, in that syntactic dislocation of an element with particular topic or
focus status is motivated by such a feature (see Brody 1990; É.Kiss 1998, Rizzi
1997, *et seq*). A derivation (or syntactic numeration) in which a Topic or Focus

---

[15] Roberts & Roussou (2003) propose that the presence of an extra EPP feature
makes the representation more complex. Therefore, a derivation in which an item is
moved is more complex than one in which there is no movement. The hierarchy in
(i) is given as a markedness scale, where > means 'more marked than'.

  (i) $F^*_{Move/Merge} > F^*_{Move} > F^*_{Merge} > F$

F is the least marked option, having no feature that takes part in Merge, Agree (and
hence not Move). F^*_{Merge} is more marked, since there are two elements being
merged, which both have phonological matrices. F^*_{Merge} is less marked than F^*_{Move}
because the former lacks the EPP feature driving movement. Finally, $F^*_{Move/Merge}$ is
the most complex, since it involves the merging of two phonological feature
matrices, as well as the [EPP] feature.

feature is present is marked in comparison to one in which there is no such extra feature. Accordingly, the utterance yields a meaning with a particular division of labour of topic and focus, and is felicitous only in certain pragmatic contexts. A neutral string can then be defined as in (11), and its corresponding derivation as in (12).

(11)   Definition of a neutral clause:
        A clause in which no element has a special topic or focus interpretation

(12)   Derivation of a neutral clause
        A clause in which no element is derived through topic or focus movement.

Note that the definitions in (11) and (12) do not imply that the marked order(s) will be less frequent than the unmarked. The most frequently found order in a text could be a pragmatically marked order, involving pragmatically driven syntactic operations. It depends on what kind of information is being recorded in a text. It is possible that a given text contains no neutral context. In a language where information structure is reflected through word order to a large extent, then the word order that is unaffected by information structure would be absent. Therefore, the definition of basic word order that one takes on directly affects the methodology taken to determine it.

The different notions of basic order have resulted in different claims made about the basic word orders of many languages. For example, take Modern Greek (MG). Like NT Greek, MG allows all permutations of subject, verb and object, and SVO and VSO are predominant. Phillipaki-Warburton (2008, and elsewhere) and Roussou & Tsimpli (2006) claim that VSO is a pragmatically neutral word order, since it appears in contexts where there is no topic or focus on a particular constituent, thus adhering to the definition in (11). Similarly, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998) argue that SVO clauses involve topicalized subjects, thus VSO is the more basic order, adhering to the definition in (12). However, Greenberg (1966: Appendix 1, pg. 107-108) classifies MG as an SVO language, since he found the order more frequently in texts, adhering to the definition in (7).

In this thesis, I take on the definition in (11) for a neutral clause, and the one in (12) for the derivation that produces (11). Therefore, frequency is not an important factor in my investigation, and a surface string as such is not necessarily a homogeneous class. The goal of the preliminary study I present in Section 4 is to get an idea of which orders occur when certain elements are pragmatically marked. As I show therein, SVO is the most frequent word order, and hence would be the basic word order in the Greenbergian sense. However, as I show in 4.3, both SVO and VSO are used when there is no topic or focus on a particular constituent. Therefore, these are both neutral orders from the pragmatic perspective discussed around (11). Furthermore, as I discuss in Chapter 3, many SVO clauses involve subject topicalization (see also Friberg 1982, Chapter 3). Therefore, the surface order SVO is not basic from the perspective in (12).

2.5   Summary

In summary, one line of research treats the basic word order of a language as a surface phenomenon. Within this typologically oriented setting, there are different criteria for markedness, or neutrality. In the Greenbergian tradition the most frequently found order is basic. Others, such as Dryer, focus more on the environments in which certain orders occur, i.e., distributional facts. Another line of research, within the generative framework relates basic word order to parameter settings, syntactic structures or formal features on functional heads.

Before proceeding with the presentation of my own word order investigation, I first give an overview of the conclusions from previous studies on NT Greek clausal word order. The conclusions are not all in consensus, and I discuss how the different notions of basic word order discussed above, along with the different methodologies taken, influence the conclusions.

3   Previous work on NT Greek basic word order

NT Greek word order is discussed in NT Grammar books. Blass, Debrunner & Funk (1961: 471) state that "the verb or nominal predicate with its copula stands immediately after the conjunction (the usual beginning of a sentence); then follow in order the subject, object, supplementary participle, etc.". They suggest that VSO is the most natural word order. This statement is qualified with the statement that V-initial clauses particularly in Mark are due to Semitic influence.[16] Robertson (1934: 417) agrees that the predicate often comes first, but claims that this is so because as a general rule, "the predicate is the most important thing in the sentence".

Aside from traditional grammar books, there have been some linguistic studies on NT Greek clausal word order: Friberg (1982, Chapter 3), Davison (1989), Rife (1933), Terry (1993) and Taylor (1994).

3.1   Friberg (1982, Chapter 3)

Friberg (1982, Chapter 3) provides a rich survey of NT Greek clausal word order. Friberg's data come from all books of the NT, and include the attested relative positions of the subject and verb, the verb and object, and the subject and object. He

---

[16] See Maloney (1979) and references therein for arguments that V-initial orders are due to Semitic influence in the gospel of Mark. The issue of Semitic influence is not a crucial factor for the current discussion. This is related to the fact that frequency does not play a very important role in my study. Frequency does not determine grammaticality. The high frequency of VSO could in some way be due to Semitic influence, however what is important for this chapter is that VSO is a possible order in NT Greek. It was also a possible order in older Classical dialects, and Homeric Greek, so one would not want to say that it is an innovation due to Semitic influence.

concludes that Koine Greek has the unmarked clausal order of VSO, based on cumulative evidence from strings of VS, VO and SO. His strategy is to identify the marked word orders, and rule these out as basic. The one that is most difficult to characterize in terms of markedness is the basic order. This is in the spirit of Dryer's (1995) strategy, as discussed in Section 2. This also corresponds to the fact that frequency does not play such a large role in determining the basic word order. Although SV orders are much more common than VS, VS is nonetheless the unmarked order.

Friberg discusses four ways in which the orders OV, OS and SV are marked, and calls them syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and stylistic markedness. In the discussion of OV orders, by syntactic markedness he refers to relativized objects in relative clauses and questioned objects in *wh*-questions, which obligatorily occur preverbally. Friberg also characterizes the preverbal placement of objects in negative sentences as syntactic markedness.

Notions such as focus, emphasis, contrast and topicalization are treated as semantic markedness. Topicalization is particularly important in his discussion of SV orders (Friberg 1982: 197-204), accounting for a large number of the preverbal subjects. These notions are normally treated as pragmatic in generative and functional linguistic literature, and I follow this tradition.

Although I treat sequences of OV and OS somewhat differently than Friberg, I come to a similar conclusion in terms of SV orders. Many of them can be shown to involve subjects that serve a topic function.

3.2   Rife (1933) and Terry (1993)

Rife (1933) illustrates a study of word order in the translation Greek of the Old Testament, with the purpose being to examine to what extent word order can be used as a tool in identifying translation Greek. He contrasts word orders in some Homeric and Classical Greek texts with word orders in Old Testament translation Greek, finding that VSO sequences are far more common in translation Greek than Classical and Homeric. He also provides a comparison with the original Koine Greek of the NT, using Romans (attributed to Paul), Acts (attributed to Luke) and the Gospels.

Terry (1993, section 5.3) focuses on word order in First Corinthians, a letter attributed to Paul. He takes the raw numbers in Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts and Romans from Rife (1933: 350). Terry adds their percentages and the numbers and percentages from First Corinthians. Table 1 is taken from Terry (1993, section 5.3).

Book	VSO	SVO	SOV	VOS	OSV	OVS
Matthew	12.5% (n=1)	62.5% (n=5)	12.5% (n=1)	- (n=0)	- (n=0)	12.5% (n=1)
Mark	16.7% (n=3)	50% (n=9)	22.2% (n=4)	- (n=0)	5.6% (n=1)	5.6% (n=1)
Luke	23.1% (n=9)	48.7% (n=19)	20.5% (n=8)	5.1% (n=2)	- (n=0)	2.6% (n=1)
John	- (n=0)	40.4% (n=4)	30% (n=3)	10% (n=1)	20% (n=2)	- (n=0)
Acts	13.3% (n=6)	68.9% (n=31)	2.2% (n=1)	2.2% (n=1)	2.2% (n=1)	11.1% (n=5)
Romans	- (n=0)	40% (n=4)	50% (n=5)	- (n=0)	- (n=0)	10% (n=1)
1 Cor.	- (n=0)	52.9% (n=9)	23.5% (n=4)	5.9% (n=1)	5.9% (n=1)	11.8% (n=2)

Table 1: Rife (1933), Terry (1993)

Terry argues against Friberg's claim that VSO is the basic word order. One major criticism is that he finds no VSO in First Corinthians. For Terry frequency is more important than it is for Friberg. In First Corinthians, SVO and SOV are very common. Terry asserts that if it is possible to assign a basic word order to a 'synthetic' language like Koine Greek, then it is either SVO or SOV. By synthetic, Terry refers to a language in which grammatical relations such as subject and object are marked through case rather than sentence position. Thus, Terry assumes that languages mark grammatical relations in either of these two ways, and not both, based on the traditional assumption that the presence of rich inflectional morphology allows word order to be free.

Terry criticizes Friberg's (1982) stand that SVO sequences involve topicalization of the subject, stressing the fact that some VSO sequences have subjects that are topics. The major argument is that subjects are usually clausal topics anyway, and they should warrant no form of dislocation.

3.3 Davison (1989)

Davison (1989) carries out a study on frequency and neutrality in Luke, Acts and Paul's letters. He takes all of the Pauline letters as a whole, which includes Romans and First Corinthians, among others. He compiles Luke and Acts into one category, representing Luke's Greek. The numbers are given in Table 2.

	Paul	Luke, Acts
VSO	8	20
SVO	17	56
SOV	9	8
VOS	2	4
OVS	3	6
OSV	1	1
Total	40	95

Table 2: Davison (1989:25)

Rife and Davison come up with similar results for Luke and Acts (if the two are added together in Table 1). The results are also similar if you count Romans and First Corinthians in table 1 and compare it to the first column in Table 2. This is a bit strange since Paul's writing includes more books than just these two. It is possible that there are very few other viable clauses in the rest of these letters. In any case, the two report counting the same types of clauses: declarative clauses where the subject and object are substantive (Rife 1933:250), and declarative clauses with nominal subjects and objects (Davison 1989:24). The authors' criteria must be slightly different, however, because the numbers are not exactly the same. The criteria are not described in detail. Davison finds SVO to be significantly higher in frequency than VSO, however notices that SVO clauses sometimes involve pragmatically marked subjects, particularly subjects that are emphasized or just mentioned. With a cautionary tone, he concludes that the basic word order is an alternation between SVO and VSO.

3.4   Taylor (1994)

Taylor (1994) provides a diachronic word order study, focusing on the change from head-final (SOV) to head-initial (SVO) in Greek. Since the parametric change in headedness is the focus of her paper, the position of the finite verb with respect to the object is the most important thing. The relative position of the subject and verb in head-initial orders is not prominent in the discussion.

Taylor includes data from Acts as a representation of Koine Greek, and gives the statistics summarized in Table 3. She divides the clauses into verb-final (which includes SOV and OSV), verb-medial (which includes SVO and OVS) and verb-initial (which includes VSO and VOS). She includes clauses that do not necessarily contain both subjects and objects. Constituents such as PPs, objects and subjects are referred to as X, or Y. In Table 3, the numbers are given in brackets, with the total instances below each clause type, and the combined total in the bottom row.

Verb-final	Luke
SXv	.07 (7)
XYv	.01 (1)
Total	.08 (8)
Verb-medial	
SvX	.56 (57)
XvS	.05 (5)
XvY	.01 (1)
Total	.62 (63)
Verb-initial	
vSX	.25 (25)
vXY	.06 (6)
Total	.31 (31)
N	102

Table 3: Taylor (1994:10)

Taylor's results are not really comparable to the others', since her criteria are very different. For instance, she includes all tensed clauses, not only declaratives. In her data there are questions, relative clauses and other subordinate clauses. And, as just mentioned, the clauses do not need to have both subjects and objects. Taylor excludes pronominal arguments, but includes proper names as arguments. And, as I discuss in section 4.1 below, she includes clauses with participial or 'empty' noun subjects. This factor likely makes her percentage of SVO higher.

Taylor argues that Koine Greek is a head-initial SVO language, based entirely on frequency of occurrence.

3.5   Section summary

To sum up this section, there is no clear consensus as to the basic, or neutral word order in NT Greek. NT grammar books assign a basic word order of VSO, however, there is a proviso that some VSO is due to Semitic influence. Friberg (1982, Chapter 3) concludes that VSO is the most neutral order, focusing heavily on pragmatics and less so on frequency. Davison (1989) concludes that the basic word order is an SVO-VSO alternation, based on frequency and pragmatic neutrality. Terry (1993) argues against Friberg (1982), arguing that SVO and SOV are the most basic orders.

Some of the studies discussed narrow it down to two (SVO and VSO for Davison and SVO and SOV for Terry). It is unclear what it means for a language to have two basic word orders, and this has to do with the lack of clarity involved in the notion of basic word order, as discussed in Section 2.

It is important to note that when an author puts a lot of weight on frequency of occurrence, it is very important to define the types of clauses under investigation. As mentioned in 3.3, in none of the previous studies are the clauses included in the tables described in detail. It is unclear what Davison considers to be a nominal, and what Rife considers to be a substantive.

4 Word order in Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation

4.1 Introduction

This section shows the results of my own survey of word order in main clauses in the NT. I first collected a pool of clauses from four books: Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation. The strategy is to examine clauses that are syntactically similar. Therefore, I look at clauses that meet some descriptive criteria. I limit it to clauses with subjects, verbs and objects. Out of this pool of clauses, I first look for neutral clauses in the sample (based on the definition in (11) above), and second, look at clauses that have very evident pragmatically marked properties. These properties are shown to correlate with particular word orders to an extent.

The reason for the limitation to four books is basically practical. It is time-consuming to collect the data manually.[17] I have chosen four books from different authors in order to get an idea of whether there are major differences among authors that would warrant postulating different grammars for them. The choice of First Corinthians as a representation of Paul is particularly motivated by Terry's (1993) results concerning this book (see subsection 3.2 above). For my purposes, it is important to re-evaluate the evidence brought by Terry, in particular, the absence of VSO.

In 4.3 I focus on the most neutral clauses found in this pool. I find that SVO and VSO both occur in neutral environments while the other orders do not. In 4.4, I concentrate on some of the ways in which particular word orders are marked. I am able to form generalizations concerning O-initial clauses, SOV clauses and SVO clauses. VSO and VOS are more difficult to generalize over. In the case of VOS, this is largely due to the fact there are few attestations.

For my purposes, it is necessary to examine clauses that are syntactically similar, and so I keep various constants steady. These constants concern the clause type, the arguments, and the position of the clause with respect to other clauses. Here I list the most important criteria for the clauses counted, and encourage the reader to look to Appendix 1 for a detailed description of what is included and excluded, illustrated with examples.

- **The clause is a main clause assertion**

In this sample there are no questions, and no relative or other subordinate clauses.[18]

---

[17] These data were collected manually, and there is therefore a possibility of error.

[18] This is not a completely straightforward matter in the NT. For example, the complementizer *hóti* (ὅτι) introduces both causative subordinate clauses ("because" clauses) and indirect speech ("that" clauses). In the NT, it also frequently occurs with direct speech, as in (ii).

This is because questions and subordinate clauses have different structures than main clauses, and this difference is reflected in terms of word order in many languages.

I include clauses with imperative verbs, as long as they contain overt subjects. These are third person imperatives, such as the SOV clause in (13).

(13)   3rd person imperative (included)
       hékastos   tè:n   heautoû   gunaîka
       each.NOM.SG.M D.ACC.SG.F own.GEN.SG   wife.ACC.SG.F
       ek^héto:
       have.3SG.PRES.**IMPV**.ACT
       '(Because of immoralities), let each man have his own wife.'
       (διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας) ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω
                                          (1 Cor 7:2)

- **The clause contains a finite verb and an overt subject and object**

The clauses in this survey are limited to transitive clauses, with overt subjects and objects. For details and illustrations of the types of verbs and the types of elements that are counted as overt arguments, see Appendix 1, sections II and III, respectively. There is one restriction on arguments that I mention here in the main text:

- **The subject and object are not participial forms**

The example in (14) is adapted from Taylor (1994, note 6) (I have re-transliterated and re-glossed it, but kept her bracketing and translation). She includes this clause in her survey, and others like it.

(ii) eîpen   gàr   hóti   t^heoû   eimi
    said.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT PCL   that   god.GEN.SG.M be.1SG.PRES.IND.ACT
    huiós
    son.NOM.SG.M
    'For he said, 'I am the Son of God'.'
    εἶπεν γὰρ ὅτι Θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός   (Mt 27:43)

In (i), the speech verb inflects for 3rd person, while the "embedded" verb *eimi*, "I am" is in the 1st person. The referents of the verbs are the same. *Hóti* does not function as a complementizer introducing indirect speech, but as a quotative conjunction. The clause containing the reported speech is not necessarily syntactically subordinate. In any case, I haven't found this use of *hóti* in a clause that meets all of the other criteria.

(14) [proidò:n   ] elále:sen   perì
forsee.NOM.SG.M.PRES.PART.ACT talk.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT about
tê:s   anastáseo:s   toû   Kʰristoû
D.GEN.SG.F resurrection.GEN.SG.F D.GEN.SG.M   Christ.GEN.SG.M
'He foreseeing talked about the resurrection of Christ.'
προϊδὼν ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ   (A 2:31)

In (14) the nominative participial *proidò:n* "foreseeing" precedes the MC verb *elále:sen* "he talked", but there is no expressed subject of either clause. Taylor refers to this construction as a participial clause with an empty noun.

Based on the translation provided, the participle itself seems to be rendered as a reduced relative clause subject, "he foreseeing", or, "the one foreseeing", but the description of the construction and the bracketing suggests that a null argument is assumed inside the brackets. This would be equivalent to English "He, foreseeing, talked about the resurrection of Christ", which is definitely a possible reading of this sentence (see the Douay Rheims, Weymouth and Youngs Literal Bible translations for this rendering of the participle).

Since it is not straightforward that the participle is the subject of the finite clause, and in fact, it is highly likely that it is not, I do not include these types of clauses in my survey. In order to be consistent, I exclude all clauses with participial Ss or Os.

4.2   The breakdown of word orders

The breakdown of word orders from Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation are summarized in Table 4. For the corresponding citations, see Appendix 2.

	Matthew	*Luke*	*1 Cor*	*Revelation*	**total**
SVO	52[19]	14	8	11	85
VSO	7	13	0	12	32
SOV	2	5	13	1	21
OVS	3	1	5	0	9
VOS	0	3	1	0	4
OSV	0	1	2	0	3
total	64	37	29	24	

Table 4: Word orders in Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation

---

[19] 38 of the 52 SVO clauses in Matthew come from the genealogy list at the beginning of the book.

There is considerable variation among books. I find that in Luke, SVO and VSO are almost equally attested with a substantial number of SOV clauses. VOS, OVS and OSV are also found. Revelation is largely SVO and VSO, with one attestation of SOV. In Matthew I find a very high total of SVO clauses, and VSO is also significantly attested. There are a few OVS and SOV clauses. Interestingly, VSO is absent in First Corinthians, as also found by Terry (1993) (see Table 1, subsection 3.2). SOV is predominant, and SVO and OVS are also significantly attested.

The question of variation across books is an interesting one, but it goes beyond the scope of this chapter and this thesis. I assume that all of the orders are grammatical in all of the dialects. The fact that VSO is absent in First Corinthians does not indicate that it was ungrammatical in Paul's dialect. As Davison (1989) and Terry (1993) note, VSO is found in other Pauline epistles. The absence of VSO in First Corinthians is taken to be coincidental.

My results from Matthew and Luke are significantly different from Rife's, and likewise my results from First Corinthians are significantly different from Terry's. In general, I have more total tokens, and in Luke, I find a smaller difference between SVO and VSO. These differences are due to the different criteria for clauses counted. I presume that I am more free with respect to what counts as an argument (see Appendix 1, section III for my criteria concerning arguments).

As I discussed in section 2.3, the frequencies are not the determining factor of basic word order in this chapter. A relevant example of the necessarily cautionary weight put on frequencies is the genealogy list at the beginning of Matthew. 38 of the 50 SVO clauses in Matthew are listed sequentially here. If we apply statistics to determine the relative percentages of SVO and, for example VSO, it is roughly 81% compared to 11%. But if the genealogy had been shorter, with only 5 clauses, all else being equal the percentage of SVO decreases to 61% and VSO raises to 23%. If there were no list at all, the percentage of SVO would be 54% and VSO roughly 27%.

In the next sub-section I concentrate on distinguishing neutral clauses from clauses that are pragmatically marked in terms of topic and focus.

4.3   Neutral clauses

Identifying a neutral clause is very difficult in a dead language. There is no possibility of carrying out elicitations designed to determine the neutral word order, and no negative evidence. This means that even if we can find a neutral environment in the text, we can only predict whether or not a word order other than the one attested would also be felicitous in this context. On top of this, there is no access to intonation, which is a valuable tool for identifying foci and topics, and distinguishing them from one another, and classifying their various sub-types (see, for example, Szendröi 2002, 2003; Frascarelli 2000; Frascarelli & Hinterhöltz 2007; Gryllia 2008).

To compensate for the lack of intonational cues and possibility of elicitation, I look at two environments where it is relatively safe to say that the subject is not a topic nor a focus.

At first glance, generic sentences might appear to constitute neutral clauses since the subject of a generic statement does not refer to any salient individual in the discourse. However, the generic sentences in the NT tend to appear in environments of contrast (often contrast through comparison). More specifically, one generic term is predicated, and directly following this statement, a comparative (contrasting) generic term is predicated. The predicates are either the same or different. The example in (15) shows a pair of generic sentences in which the subjects are "husband" and "wife" (literally "man" and "woman"). Only the first of the two is glossed and transliterated, and the second is given in Greek and English.

(15) he: gunè: toû   idíou
     D.NOM.SG.F   woman.NOM.SG.F   D.GEN.SG.N   own.GEN.SG.N
     só:matos   ouk   exousiásdei
     body.GEN.SG.N   NEG   control.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT
     allà   ho   anè:r
     but   D.NOM.SG.M   man.NOM.SG.M
     '(Let the husband give the benevolence she is due: and likewise also the wife unto the husband.) The wife does not control her own body,   but rather the husband. (And similarly, the husband does not control his own body, but rather the wife).'
     (τῇ γυναικὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἀποδιδότω, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρί.) ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει ἀλλὰ ὁ ἀνήρ· (ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει ἀλλὰ ἡ γυνή.)   (1 Cor 7:4)

In the glossed clause in (15), the subject *he: guné:* "the wife" precedes the object *toû idíou só:matos* "her own body", which in turn precedes the negated verb *exousiásdei* "controls".[20] The subject is corrected with the phrase "but rather the husband". In other words, the husband controls the wife's body. The following unglossed clause has a parallel word order, the difference being that "the husband" is the subject, and is corrected by the phrase "but the wife". As shown by the context preceding the glossed example, the generic terms "husband" and "wife" are salient in the discourse.

Aside from the fact that these terms are salient in the immediate discourse, the generic statements in (15) are contrastive. Contrast is a notion very closely tied to focus and topic (see Vallduví & Vilkuna 1998; Neeleman et al 2009). In this particular instance, the subjects form a contrastive set. They are therefore good candidates for contrastive topics. I discuss this notion further in Chapters 3 and 4. For the purposes of the present discussion, I note that I have not found a generic statement that does not involve contrast or comparison with preceding or following clauses.

In what follows I illustrate the two most neutral contexts I have found. The first

---

[20] I consider objects to have a patient theta role of a transitive verb. Therefore, not all objects show accusative case. In (15), the verbs occurs with genitive objects (see Appendix 1, Section II for details).

context is what I call a situational sentence. It is a backgrounded clause that occurs in the midst of a narrative, describing the mental state of some participants in the discourse. In this environment, both SVO and VSO are found, while the other orders are not. In order to narrow it down further, I departed from the pool of clauses given in Table 4 (Section 4.2), specifically looking for a broad focus question-answer pair. I find one close candidate, which occurs in SVO order, however the object is a pronoun.

4.3.1   Context I: situational sentences

By 'situational sentence', I refer to a backgrounded clause that occurs in a narrative, describing participants' psychological state. This is a neutral environment in the sense that the subject is not under presentational focus, it is not previously introduced nor resumed later in the discourse, and finally is not compared or contrasted with the subject in a parallel clause.

The subjects refer to psychological states, the verbs describe the act of this state taking over and the objects refer to the participants that are affected by the states.[21] Two examples are given in (16) and (17). In the VSO clause in (16), the subject is *pʰóbos* "fear" and in the VSO in (16), the subject is *ékstasis* "amazement".

(16)   VSO clause
élaben   dè   pʰóbos   pántas
seize.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT PCL   fear.NOM.SG.M   everyone.ACC.PL.M
'And everyone became afraid, (and began to glorify God, saying, 'A great prophet is risen up among us' and, 'God has visited his people').'
ἔλαβεν δὲ φόβος πάντας (καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες ὅτι Προφήτης μέγας ἠγέρθη ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ὅτι Ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ).   (Lk 7:16)

(17)   SVO clause
kaì ékstasis   élaben   hápantas
and amazement.NOM.SG.F seize.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT everyone.ACC.PL.M
'And everyone became amazed, (and they began to glorify God, and they were filled with fear, saying, 'We have seen strange things today').'
Καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας (καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν, καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες ὅτι Εἴδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον).
(Lk 5:26)

---

[21] Notice that this construction is not typical of Modern European languages, and literal English translations of (16) and (17) sound odd. It is a specific use of the verb *lambano:* (λαμβάνω) "take" and these clauses are in a sense idiomatic and from this perspective, not good representatives of neutral clauses. However, the active subjects, i.e., the states, are morpho-syntactically equivalent to other subjects, so I take these clauses on a par syntactically with the other clauses in my survey.

The clauses in (16) and (17) occur in similar environments. They both occur directly after the descriptions of miracles performed by Jesus, which resulted in a sick person being healed (in (Lk 5:26), and a dead person being revived (in Lk 7:16).[22] In both contexts, the following discourse resumes the strong quantifier objects.

There is one structural difference between (16) and (17). While (16) contains the second position particle *dé* "and", (17) is initiated with *kaí*. The two have a similar function in these clauses, in that they are both conjunctions. There is no generalization that can be drawn over the V-initial clause with *dé* versus the S-initial clause with *kaí*. In the situational sentence in (18) below, the second position particle *gár* occurs following the preverbal subject *tʰámbos* "amazement".[23] [24]

(18) SVO clause
    tʰámbos   gàr   periésken
    amazement.NOM.SG.M   PCL   surround.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT
    autòn   kaì   pántas   toùs   sùn   autô:i
    him.ACC.SG.M   and   all.ACC.PL.M   D.ACC.PL.M   with   him.DAT.SG.M
    'For, he became astonished, and all those with him, (at the catch of fish that they took).'
    θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτὸν καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ (ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἔχθύων ὧν συνέλαβον)   (Lk 5:9)

4.3.2   Context II: the answer to a broad focus question

One test employed in the literature to elicit neutral sentences is to ask a question with broad focus, such as "What happened?" (see Dik 1978; Li 1976; Costa 2001). The answer to this question does not place narrow focus on any of the constituents. A felicitous answer to this question in English has the order SV(O) as in (19), while a felicitous answer in Modern Greek appears with the VSO order, as in (20) from Roussou & Tsimpli (2006: 318).

(19) a. What happened?
       b. John repaired my computer

---

[22] I do not take the fact that the clauses are uttered after astonishing events to indicate that they are pragmatically marked in the relevant sense. The important thing is that there is no topic or focus on any given word.

[23] The object in (18) is a heavy constituent, consisting of a pronoun conjoined with a complex DP. It is well known that constituent weight often affects word order. What is relevant for the present discussion is the relative positions of the subject, particle and verb.

[24] The example in (18) indicates that the presence of a second position does not consistently result in the preverbal placement of the verb. However, this is not to say that the larger pragmatic context of (18) is the same as that of (16).

(20)   a. Ti egeneto?
       b. Episkevase o   Janis ton ipolojisti mu.
           repaired.3S the John the computer mine

Unfortunately, none of the clauses in Table 4 occur in this context. However, I have found one possible candidate for a broad focus question answer pair. The clauses that constitute the answers do not fit all of the criteria set out in Appendix 1. This conversation is given in (21); the question in (a), the answer in (b) and the context in Greek and English in (c).

(21)   a. Question:
           Pô:s éstai   toûto;
           how   be.3SG.FUT.IND.ACT   this.NOM.SG.N
           'How will this be, (since I haven't been with a man)?'   (Lk 1:34)
       b. Answer:
           Pneûma   hágion   epeleúsetai
           sprit.NOM.SG.N holy.NOM.SG.N   come.upon.3SG.FUT.IND.MID
           epì   sé   kaì   dúnamis
           upon   you.ACC.SG   and   power.NOM.SG.F
           hupsístou   episkiásei   soi
           highest.GEN.SG.M   shadow.3SG.FUT.IND.ACT   you.DAT.SG
           'The holy ghost will come upon you and the power of the highest will overshadow you.'   (Lk 1:35)
       c. Context in Greek and English:
           εἶπεν δὲ Μαριὰμ πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον, Πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω; καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ
           Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι·
           'Then Mary said to the angel, How will this be, since I haven't been with a man? And the angel answered and said to her, "The holy spirit will come upon you, and the power of the highest will overshadow you;"   (Lk 1:34-35)

The question in (21a) is uttered by Mary, after the angel has told her a few verses above that she will bear a child named Jesus. She asks how this would come about, stating that she has not been with a man, which seems to add an element of surprise or disbelief. There are two answers to this question, given in (21b). The first does not contain a transitive verb, and so only the subject and verb are present, in the order SV. The second contains a transitive verb and the sequence is SVO. However, the object is the pronominal clitic *soi*.

Perhaps the question in (21a) is not an ideal broad focus question, since it is a rhetorical question. Nonetheless, the answer seems to take the question seriously.

4.3.3   Context 3: Introductions to parables

Many parables in the bible begin with the introduction of some unspecified person,

and the story told about him is used metaphorically, as a lesson. Introductions to parables are similar to out of the blue utterances, in that none of the arguments are known in the discourse. Out of the clauses that meet the criteria set out in Appendix 1, I have only found the order SVO in parable introductions in Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation.

The SVO clause in (22) begins the parable of the Unwilling Guests (see also Lk 15:11, the introduction to the parable of the Prodigal Son).

(22)   SVO clause
   ántʰro:pós   tis   epoíei
   man.NOM.SG.M   INDEF.NOM.SG.M   make.3SG.IMPF.IND.ACT
   deîpnon   méga
   dinner.ACC.SG.N   large.ACC.SG.N
   '(And he said to him), "A certain man made a large dinner, (and invited many people, and he sent his slave on the hour of the feast to those who were invited to say, 'Come, because it's already ready'.")'
   (ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ), Ἄνθρωπός τις ἐποίει δεῖπνον μέγα, (καὶ ἐκάλεσεν πολλούς, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δείπνου εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις, Ἔρχεσθε, ὅτι ἤδη ἕτοιμά ἐστιν.) (Lk 14:16)

4.3.4   Summary

In 4.3 I focused on identifying neutral clauses in Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation. I have avoided contexts of comparison and contrast, and environments where an element is previously mentioned or salient in the discourse. I found that backgrounded clauses with subjects that refer to psychological states, and that are unresumed in the following discourse are good candidates. These alternate between SVO and VSO orders.

I've also found that the answer to a broad-focus question shows the SV(O) order, and that SVO occurs in introductions to parables, where all of the participants are new.

Therefore, both SVO and VSO appear in neutral contexts (although these are difficult to find), however O-initial, SOV and VOS clauses are not found in these contexts.

4.4   Non-neutral clauses

This section focuses on the non-neutral clauses in Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation. There are some pragmatically marked properties that can be generalized across the following word orders: OVS, OSV, SOV and SVO. VSO clauses are more difficult to classify in terms of markedness, as also noted in Friberg (1982: 192). VOS clauses are infrequent and there is no strong generalization concerning information structure that can be made concerning them.

4.4.1   O-initial clauses

4.4.1.1   The object has just been specified

Many O-initial clauses share the property of containing objects that are very salient in the discourse, just having been specified. These often carry demonstratives, such as examples (23) and (24) below.

> (23)   OVS clause
> toútous   toùs   dó:deka   apésteilen
> these.ACC.PL.M D.ACC.PL.M twelve   send.forth.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT
> ho   Ie:soûs
> D.NOM.SG.M   Jesus.NOM.SG.M
> 'Jesus sent these twelve'   (Mt 10:5)
> Preceding context: Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ταῦτα· πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος καὶ Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ, Φίλιππος καὶ Βαρθολομαῖος, Θωμᾶς καὶ Ματθαῖος ὁ τελώνης, Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου καὶ Θαδδαῖος, Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτόν.
> 'And the names of the twelve apostles are these; The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother; Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the publican; James the son of Alphaeus, and Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus; Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.'

Example (23) was shown as (4) above, here given with the preceding context in Greek and English. The context is a listing of the names of the twelve apostles, to which the object in (23) refers. Here the resumptive topic function is particularly clear as it follows a list.

The OSV clause from (6) above also has an object that contains a demonstrative pronoun. It is repeated in context in (24). The object *taûta pánta* "all these things" refers to the things just mentioned: the things the addressee will eat and drink.

> (24)   OSV clause
> taûta   gàr   pánta   tà   ét^hne:
> these.ACC.PL.N PCL   all.ACC.PL.N   D.NOM.PL.N nation.NOM.PL.N
> toû   kósmou   epize:toûsin
> D.GEN.SG.M   world.GEN.SG.M   seek.3PL.PRES.IND.ACT
> '(And you, do not seek what you will eat, and what you will drink, and do not be uncertain.) For, the nations of the world seek all these things.'
> (καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε καὶ τί πίητε, καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε·) ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητοῦσιν·   (Lk 12:30)

4.4.1.2   The object is preceded by the particle *kaí*

The other property of objects in O-initial clauses is that they are emphasized, vaguely speaking. A well-known device for emphasis in old Greek is the placement of the focus particle *kaí* directly before the emphasized thing (see Smyth 1984: §2881; Denniston 1954: 323-24). For now, I refer to *kaí* as an additive focus particle (on this notion, see König 1991), but I will refine this later in Chapter 4. Aside from its use as an additive particle, *kaí* is a conjunction initiating clauses and conjoining constituents, meaning "and".

In the OSV clause in (25), the object is directly preceded by *kaí*.

(25)   OSV clause
hoúto:s   kaì   tà   toû   t^heoû
thus   also   D.ACC.PL.N D.ACC.PL.N god.ACC.PL.N
oudeìs   égno:ken
no-one.NOM.SG.M   know.3SG.PERF.IND.ACT
'(For, what man knows the things of man, except the spirit of a man which is in him?) Thus, also the things of God no man knows, (except the spirit of God).'
(τίς γὰρ οἶδεν ἀνθρώπων τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ;) οὕτως καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν (εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ.)   (1 Cor 2:11)

In this instance, *kaí* is not sentence initial, so it is not a conjunction. It directly precedes the object *tà toû t^heoû* "the things of God", emphasizing it. Accordingly, the object is compared to a previously stated and structurally alike object, "the things of man".

4.4.2   SOV clauses

There is a strong tendency for SOV clauses to have emphasized objects. It is difficult to determine the precise nature of the emphasis, but there are a couple of properties that many SOV clauses share, and they seem to be related to focus. These are discussed in the following three subsections. Another generalization concerning SOV clauses is that they are frequently found with the lexical verbs *ék^ho:* "have" and *poiéo:* "do", as discussed in 4.4.2.4.

4.4.2.1   The object contains a reflexive

Particularly in First Corinthians, many SOV clauses show the same pattern of having an object that contains either the adjective (*ho*) *ídios* "one's own", or the reflexive pronoun *heautoû* "of his/her own".[25]

---

[25] Of the 13 SOV clauses I have found in First Corinthians, 7 show this trait. Aside from the three above, the citations are 3:8, 7:4 (containing two tokens), and 10:24.

An example with *ídios* is given in (26). In (26), the subject is the strong quantifier *hékastos*. Specifically, this quantifier can only have a distributive reading like "each". In (26), the quantifier has scope over the object, *tò ídion deîpnon* "his own dinner".

(26) hékastos   gàr   tò   ídion   deîpnon
      each.NOM.SG.M PCL D.ACC.SG.N own.ACC.SG.N dinner.ACC.SG.N
      prolambánei
      take.first.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT
      'For, each man first takes his own dinner (during eating).'
      ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει (ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν)
                                                            (1 Cor 11:21)

The two clauses in (27) show similar semantics and the same word order as the one in (26). Both subjects are forms of the distributive strong quantifier *hékastos*. The objects in this case contain the reflexive pronoun *heautoû* "of his/her own".

(27) hékastos   tè:n   heautoû   gunaîka
      each.NOM.SG.M D.ACC.SG.F own.ACC.SG.F wife.ACC.SG.F
      ekʰéto: kaì   ekáste: tòn
      have.3SG.PRES.IMPV.ACT and each.NOM.SG.F D.ACC.SG.M
      heautoû   ándra   ekʰéto:
      own.GEN.SG.M husband.ACC.SG.M have.3SG.PRES.IMPV.ACT
      '(Because of immoralities), let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband.'
      (διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας) ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω, καὶ ἑκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω.   (1 Cor 7:2)

The reflexive adjectives in (26) and (27) emphasize the possessa. Reflexives such as these are often called emphatic reflexives, or pronominal intensifiers in the literature (see König & Gast 2004). I return to this issue in Chapter 4.

4.4.2.2   The object is preceded by *kaí*

As mentioned above in 4.4.1.2, *kaí* is a conjunction, "and", as well as an additive focus particle, meaning "also" or "even". Two instances of *kaí* in the sequence of *kaí*-X *kaí*-Y, is used to mean "both X and Y", or "not only X but Y" (see Smyth 1984: §2877; Denniston 1954: 323-24).

In the SOV clause in (28) from First Corinthians, the object *tòn kúrion* "the lord" is directly preceded by *kaí*. In the following clause (which is not glossed) the object *he:mâs* "us" is also preverbal, and preceded by *kaí*.

(28)   ho   tʰeòs   kaì   tòn   kúrion
       D.NOM.SG.M   god.NOM.SG.M   also   D.ACC.SG.M   lord.ACC.SG.M
       é:geiren
       wake.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT
       'And God has awoken both the Lord (and will wake us up too, by his
       power).'
       ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ τὸν κύριον ἤγειρεν (καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ διὰ τῆς
       δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.)   (1 Cor 6:14)

It is not entirely clear whether the two *kaí*'s are to mean "both X and Y" or whether the first is an additive focus particle and the second a regular conjunction, that is "God raised up both the lord, and he will raise us up [too]", or whether it is to mean "God raised up even the lord, and he will raise us up".

Regardless of which is the more adequate translation, there is clearly some kind of emphasis on the preverbal O *tòn kúrion* "the lord".

4.4.2.3   The object contains *ho autós*, "the same"

As shown above, reflexive pronouns and adjectives are common in SOV orders, and the objects carry emphasis that seems to be related to focus. Some other SOV clauses include the pronominal form *autós*, accompanied by at least a D, (*ho autós*) meaning "the same *x*".

The subject in (29) is the strong quantifier *pántes* "all people", or "everyone". The object contains the pronominal *autós* "the same", along with the definite article, the adjective *pneumatikòn* "spiritual" and the noun *brô:ma* "food". This means something like "the same spiritual food".

(29)   kaì   pántes   tò   autò
       and   every.NOM.PL.M   D.ACC.SG.N   same.ACC.SG.N
       pneumatikòn   brô:ma   épʰagon
       spiritual.ACC.SG.N   meat.ACC.SG.N   eat.3PL.AOR.IND.ACT
       'And everyone ate the same spiritual food'
       καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν βρῶμα ἔφαγον   (1 Cor 10:4)

The clause in (29) is directly followed by the one in (30). The word order difference is that the head noun of the object DP, *póma* "drink" occurs postverbally.

(30)   kaì   pántes   **tò**   **autò**
       and   every.NOM.PL.M   D.ACC.SG.N   same.ACC.SG.N
       pneumatikòn   épion   **póma**
       spiritual.ACC.SG.N   drink.3PL.AOR.IND.ACT   drink.ACC.SG.N
       'And everyone drank the same spiritual drink'
       καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα·   (1 Cor 10:4)

This is an interesting case, since part of the object is preverbal and part of it postverbal. For this reason, I did not include it in my preliminary survey (see

Appendix 1, Section III). As I show in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6, discontinuous constituents are common in *wh*-questions and relative clauses. Displacement of the *wh*-word or relative pronoun leaves the NP in its canonical position. By analogy, the NP in (30) marks the 'base position' of the objects.

4.4.2.4   SOV with "have" and "do"

Friberg (1982: 181-82) and Davison (1989: 7) note that OV orders are particularly common with the verbs *ékʰo:* "have", "hold" and *poiéo:* "do", "make". As Friberg discusses, the high frequency of OV orders with *ékʰo:* is partly due to many instances of phrases such as *kʰreían ékʰo:* "have need", or "need". As noted in Appendix 1, section II, I have not included these instances in my survey of main clause word orders.

Disregarding instances of complex predicates with *ékʰo:* and focusing on only the clauses fitting the criteria laid out in Appendix 1, I do find quite a few SOV clauses with *ékʰo:* and *poiéo:* in Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation. An example of each is given in (31) and (32).

In (31), the verb *poiéo:* takes an object consisting of *tò autò* "the same thing". This same thing being referred to is introduced in the previous discourse, doing good for those who do good for you.

(31)   SOV clause with *poiéo:*, "do", "make"
        kaì   hoi   hamarto:loì
        also   D.NOM.PL.M   sinner.NOM.PL.M
        tò   autò   poioûsin
        D.ACC.SG.N   same.ACC.SG.N   do.3PL.PRES.IND.ACT
        '(And if you do good for those who do good for you, what kind of grace
        do you have?) Sinners also do the same'.
        (καὶ [γὰρ] ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῆτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιοῦντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν
        χάρις ἐστίν;) καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.   (Lk 6:33)

Notice that in (31), the subject is preceded by *kaí*, and is therefore also marked, as discussed above in 4.4.2.2 and 4.4.1.2.

Example (32) shows an SOV clause with *ékʰo:* "have". It occurs in a series of statements that compares foxes, birds and the son of man, in terms of the homes that they possess. It is specified that foxes have hole and birds have nests, and it is stressed that the son of man has nowhere to lay his head.

(32)   SOV clause with *ékʰo:* "have", "hold"
        hai   aló:pekes   pʰo:leoùs   ékʰousin
        D.NOM.PL.F   fox.NOM.PL.F   hole.ACC.PL.M   have.3PL.PRES.IND.ACT
        'The foxes have holes (and the birds of the air nests; but the son of man
        has nowhere to lay his head).'
        Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν (καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
        κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν
        κλίνῃ.)   (Mt 8:20)

One proposed explanation for the high occurrence of OV with both *ékʰo:* and *poiéo*: is that these verbs are "semantically and impressionistically bland" (Friberg 1982: 181-82). They are there only to fill the grammatical function of connecting the subject and object.

It would be appealing to link the co-occurrence of "have" and "do" with SOV orders to the other observation about SOV clauses; that they often involve focus on the object. In my view, the examples in (31) and (32) are possible under a Topic-Focus interpretation. However, it is not possible to tell without access to intonation.

4.4.3   Non-neutral SVO clauses

As I mentioned in Section 3, Davison (1989) and Friberg (1982) point out that many SVO clauses are pragmatically marked through subject topicalization. This was the major motivation for Friberg's conclusion that NT Greek is a VSO language, and for Davison's claim that both SVO and VSO are basic word orders.

Many SVO clauses are marked through contrast with parallel clauses. Some subjects in SVO clauses have similar status to objects in O-initial clauses, namely that they refer to just mentioned discourse entities. Finally, some subjects in SVO sentences are preceded by the particle *kaí*.

4.4.3.1   Contrast with parallel clauses

The example in (33) illustrates an SVO clause in a contrastive environment, where two generic statements are contrasted with each other.

(33) S-PP-V-O
      ho   agatʰòs   ántʰro:pos
      D.NOM.SG.M   good.NOM.SG.M   man.NOM.SG.M
      ek   toû   agatʰoû   tʰe:saroû   (…)
      from D.GEN.SG.M good.GEN.SG.M treasure.GEN.SG.M
      propʰérei   tò   agatʰón
      bring.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT   D.ACC.SG.N good.ACC.SG.N
      kaì ho   pone:ròs   ek   toû   pone:roû
      and D.NOM.SG.M evil.NOM.SG.M from D.GEN.SG.M evil.GEN.SG.M
      propʰérei   tò   pone:rón
      bring.forth.3SG.PRES.IND.ACT   D.ACC.SG.N evil.ACC.SG.N
      'The good man brings forth a good thing out of the good treasure (of heart). And the evil man brings forth evil from the evil one.'
      ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ (τῆς καρδίας) προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν·   (Lk 6:45; Mt 12:35)

In this example, both the subjects and objects and the PPs are in direct contrast:

good versus evil.[26] The clauses are parallel in terms of word order. The subjects *ho agatʰòs ántʰro:pos* "the good man" and *ho pone:ròs* "the evil man" are initial, followed by the PPs, followed by the VO sequences.

4.4.3.2   The subject has just been specified

SVO clauses are common when the S has just been identified as belonging to a set. Often, a set of entities is introduced as such and then particular members of the set are individually predicated.

A good example of this is the genealogy list at the beginning of Matthew. The clause in (34) was given in the introduction illustrating an SVO clause ((1) above). Here it is given in context.

(34)   SVO clause
Abraàm   egénne:sen
Abraham.NOM.SG.M   beget.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT
tòn   Isaák
D.ACC.SG.M   Isaac.ACC.SG.M
'(This is the book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.) Abraham was the father of Isaac (and Isaac the father of Jacob).'
(Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ.)
Ἀβραὰμ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαάκ, (Ἰσαὰκ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν   Ἰακώβ,)
                                                        (Mt 1:1-2)

The book of Matthew begins with the clauses given under the glossed example in (34). The first clause introduces the book as representing the genealogy of Jesus Christ, who is first specified as being the son of David, and then the son of Abraham. Following this, the complete list is given in chronological order. Abraham is the first to have a son, Isaac. Each clause resumes the object from the previous clause as its subject, ending with David, who begot Jesus. As such, each subject has just been mentioned in the discourse. As mentioned in section 4.2, the list of clauses all appear with SVO orders.

Revelation, Chapter 16 is another environment in which a list of SVO clauses are found, whose subjects have just been introduced as a set. The chapter begins with the following verse, given in Greek and English:

---

[26] The clauses in (33) appear following a statement about a tree and its fruit. The message is taken to be that just as a tree is known by its fruit, a man is known by the fruits of his labour.

(35)   Revelation 16:1
Καὶ ἤκουσα μεγάλης φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ λεγούσης τοῖς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλοις, Ὑπάγετε καὶ ἐκχέετε τὰς ἑπτὰ φιάλας τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν.
'And I heard a great voice out of the temple saying to the seven angels, Go your ways, and pour out the vials of the wrath of God upon the earth.'

The seven angels are already known in the discourse from the preceding chapters. In the verses that follow the one in (35), each of the seven angels empties his 'vial (of the wrath of God)' in various places on the earth. All of these clauses appear with SVO orders, such as the clause in (36).

(36)   kaì   ho   deúteros   exék^heen
        and   D.NOM.SG.M   second.NOM.SG.M   pour.3SG.AOR.IND.ACT
        tè:n   p^hiále:n   autoû
        D.ACC.SG.F   vial.ACC.SG.F   his.GEN.SG.M
        'And the second one poured out his vial (into the sea).'
        Καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ (εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν·)
                                                          (Rev 16:3)

The subjects in (34) and (36) most closely resemble contrastive topics, as I discuss in Chapter 4.

4.4.3.3   The subject is preceded by *kaí*

As discussed in 4.4.1.2 and 4.4.2.2 respectively, objects in SOV and O-initial clauses are often found directly preceded by the particle *kaí*, as a form of emphasis. The same is true of subjects in some SVO clauses. An example is given in (37).

(37)   ho:saúto:s   dè   kaì   hoi   heptà
        likewise   PCL   also   D.NOM.PL.M   seven
        ou   katélipon   tékna
        NEG   leave.3PL.AOR.IND.ACT   child.ACC.PL.N
        '(For, there were seven brothers. And the first one took a wife and died, childless. And the second, and the third took her.) And likewise, the seven also did not have children, (and they died).'
        (ἑπτὰ οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος λαβὼν γυναῖκα ἀπέθανεν ἄτεκνος· καὶ ὁ δεύτερος καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν,) ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐ κατέλιπον τέκνα καὶ ἀπέθανον.   (Lk 20:31)

The discussion around (37) is about seven brothers who each had the same wife and all ended up dying with no children. First the brothers are introduced, creating a contrast set. Then, a statement is made about the members. The glossed example is the last of these. In addition to the fact that *kaì* appears as an additive particle preceding the subject, the clause is initiated with the comparative adverb *ho:saúto:s* "likewise".

4.4.4   Summary of marked properties across word orders

Table 5 is a summary of the marked properties of various word orders that I mentioned in this subsection. The table takes into consideration all of the clauses in my sample, not just the clauses illustrated above. For example, VOS clauses are included, although I haven't discussed them, since the one cited in the table (Lk 16:14) is the only one that clearly shows this property. The "Yes" cells include either references to representative examples that I have shown in this section, or citations of clauses that I have not yet illustrated. I discuss the latter in Chapters 3 and 4. Note that the "Yes" cells do not contain citations to all attested examples displaying a given property, only to at least one representative of that property. The "No" cells mean that none of the clauses in my sample display this property.

	SVO	SOV	OVS	OSV	VSO	VOS
S is emphasized	Yes (37)	No	Yes (1 Cor 12:11)	No	No	No
O is emphasized	No	Yes (26)-(29)	Yes (Lk 2:35)	Yes (25)	No	No
S is just specified	Yes (34), (36)	No	No	No	No	No
O is just specified	No	No	Yes (23)	Yes (24)	No	Yes (Lk 16:14)
Contrast with parallel clauses	Yes (33)	Yes (15)	No	No	No	No

Table 5: Summary of marked properties across word orders

In Table 5, I have compiled all forms of emphasis discussed in 4.4. These were further distinguished as follows. In SOV orders, the object is emphasized either with *kaí*, an emphatic reflexive, or emphatic *ho autós* "the same". In O-initial clauses, the object is emphasized either with *kaí*, or *ho autós* (see Lk 2:35 for an example of the latter). In SVO orders, subject is found emphasized with *kaí* (example (37)), as well as *ho autós* (see Mt 3:4).

A subject or object being just specified refers to the specific instances outlined in 4.4.1.1 and 4.4.3.2. An element is just specified if it has just been explicitly introduced. In some cases, it refers back to a list just made (examples (23) and (24)), and some cases it picks out members from an established set (examples (34) and (36)). It may or may not contain a demonstrative pronoun.

It is important to note that not every clause that has the word order sequence associated with marked properties very evidently shows that marked property. The strategy in this section has been to collect a large number of eligible clauses and look for the most revealing clauses with respect to information structure. Clauses that are revealing of markedness tend to carry specific lexical items, for example,

reflexive pronouns in the case of emphatic reflexives, or the particle *kaí* when the argument is emphasized additively. The same goes for object-initial clauses. Some instances are clearer than others. In a context like the one around example (23), where the referent of the object refers to a just mentioned list, and there is a demonstrative pronoun included in the constituent, the resumptive topic function of the preverbal object is very clear.

4.5   Section summary

In Section 4, I showed the breakdown of word orders found in Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation, according to the syntactic criteria laid out in 4.1 and Appendix 1. I found that SVO and VSO are both common orders in Matthew, Luke and Revelation. First Corinthians contains no VSO clause, but many SVO and SOV clauses. I took the lack of VSO in First Corinthians to be coincidental, and assumed that the order is grammatical in Paul's dialect. This is consistent with the methodology I employ, in not regarding frequency of occurrence as an indication of basicness.

In 4.3 I attempted to identify a neutral sentence. To avoid the possibility of topicalization or focusing of the subject, I looked at clauses uttered in the middle of narratives, whose subjects are psychological states. They are not resumed in later discourse nor previously mentioned, and are not under comparison or contrast. These kinds of sentences come in both SVO and VSO orders. In an attempt to distinguish between the two, I sought out a broad focus question answer pair. The question was not the most typical question answer pair. The answer showed the SV(O) order.

In 4.4 I discussed the ways in which SVO, SOV, OVS and OSV clauses are pragmatically or otherwise marked. The pragmatically marked properties characteristic of these word orders are summarized in Table 5 above. As seen from the table, none of the characteristics are found in VSO clauses.

In the discussion of SOV, I also mentioned the fact that SOV orders are common with the lexical verbs *ek^{h}o:* "have" and *poie:o:* "do", noted in Friberg (1982) and Davison (1989). Of course, clauses with these lexical verbs are often found also in various other orders, so it is not a distributional restriction. I noted that this tendency may also be due to information structure. I return to this in Chapter 3.

5   Conclusions

A minor conclusion that I reached in discussing previous research concerns methodology. As I discussed in Section 2, there is no strong consensus as to how basic word order should be defined, and this becomes apparent particularly in languages with a lot of word order variation, even within one clause type. The lack of consensus in previous work regarding basic work order in NT Greek, as discussed in Section 3, illustrates the difficulty. It was noted that the results concerning frequency of occurrence of word orders differ, based on which clauses are counted

in the surveys. When a lot weight is placed on frequency, as in Terry (1993) and Taylor (1994), the precise properties of the clauses considered become very important.

My investigation of main clauses in Matthew, Luke, First Corinthians and Revelation in Section 4 leads me to the conclusion that the frequency with which an order occurs does not correspond to its status as neutral or non-neutral. That is to say, if a word order occurs with a very high frequency, it is not necessarily a neutral order. This is witnessed by the high number of SOV clauses in First Corinthians that have marked objects (see Subsection 4.4.3), as well as the high number of SVO clauses in the genealogy list at the beginning of Matthew (see Subsection 4.2), in which the subjects are pragmatically marked (see Subsection 4.4.3.4). This conclusion is relevant to the methodological concerns brought forth by Dryer (1995) and Brody (1984) concerning basic word order, as I discussed in Section 2.

Another conclusion from this investigation is that SVO and VSO both occur in neutral environments, where neither the subject nor the object is topic or focus material (see Subsection 4.3).

The next conclusion is that many SVO, SOV, OVS and OSV clauses have marked characteristics that can be generalized, as discussed in Subsection 44, and summarized in Table 5. However, it is important to note that not every clause with these word orders clearly displays the marked properties, and that some of the properties are found across various word orders.

Therefore, an important conclusion is that it is not possible to isolate a single NT Greek surface word order, as such, as neutral. For example, as I showed in Subsection 4.3, SVO clauses appear in neutral environments, however as illustrated in 4.4.3, some SVO clauses have pragmatically marked properties (a fact already noted in Friberg 1982 and Davison 1989).

If I were to claim, like Friberg, that VSO is the basic or neutral word order, it is difficult to account for neutral SVO sentences such as those in (17), (21b) and (22) in subsection 4.3. If, on the other hand, I made the claim that SVO is the basic order, it makes VSO orders very difficult to explain, since they do not show any particular type of markedness (see the discussion in Friberg 1982:119). I could conclude, like Davison, that the basic (or neutral) order is an SVO-VSO alternation. That is what the data in (16) and (17) suggest. However, leaving the story like this leaves the duality of SVO unexplained. Why is SVO both neutral and non-neutral?

To carry the basic word order issue further, it is useful to make a distinction between surface positions and syntactic positions. One surface word order can be derived in a variety of ways. This can account for the fact that some surface SVO clauses are pragmatically neutral and some are marked. A neutral SVO clause is the result of a configuration in which discourse features such as topic and focus are not there. A different syntactic configuration that involves discourse features which, according to the assumptions I adopt, drive syntactic movement, results in a non-neutral SVO clause. Considering only surface word order, we cannot properly distinguish neutral from non-neutral orders. The next chapter evaluates the generalizations   from   a   syntactic   perspective.