The distribution of long-distance anaphor ἑωυτόν in Herodotus

In this talk I will discuss the distribution of the Ancient Greek reflexive pronoun $\dot{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\dot{o}\nu$ when it takes a non-local antecedent. This phenomenon may be illustrated briefly by means of a comparison between English and Ancient Greek. In English, sentence (1a) 'Every soldier thought that the king admired **himself**' cannot mean anything other than *Every* soldier thought that the king admired the king'. Should one wish to say that the king admired the soldiers, a personal pronoun instead of a reflexive pronoun must be used, like in (1b) 'Every soldier thought that the king admired **him.**' These facts are not self-evident at all, which becomes clear if we compare (1a) and (1b) with an equivalent in Ancient Greek:

(2) ἐδόκεε τε ἕκαστος ἑωυτὸν θεήσασθαι βασιλέα

'Every soldier thought that the king admired him.' (Herodotus, Hist. 8.86).

Sentence (2) is about a group of Persian soldiers, each of whom thinks that the king admires him. As we see, the meaning of (2) corresponds to the English of (1b). The form of (2), however, corresponds to (1a), since it features the reflexive pronoun $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon\tau\dot{o}\nu$ 'himself'. Thus, the two languages have different ways of expressing anaphoric relationships. In Ancient Greek, in contrast to English, the reflexive pronoun $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon\tau\dot{o}\nu$ may apparently have an antecedent in a higher clause, even if there is a potential antecedent in its own clause (such as $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\alpha$ in our example). Then again, the reflexive pronoun is not obligatory in this context, since we also find pronouns $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\dot{o}\nu$ or $\dot{\epsilon}$ in similar sentences.

What are the rules governing the use of the Greek reflexive pronoun $\dot{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\tau\dot{o}\nu$ when it refers to an antecedent in a higher clause? As I will show, the grammars of Greek (e.g. Kühner-Gerth 1898; Goodwin 1916; Humbert 1945; Smyth 1984) are not in agreement about the rules, nor are they very precise. However, if we consider this phenomenon from a crosslinguistic perspective, and consider such cases of $\dot{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\tau\dot{o}\nu$ as so-called Long Distance Anaphora, it becomes possible to describe their distribution more accurately. In this talk I will consider the phenomenon of LDA in Ancient Greek from a generative linguistic perspective, focusing on the data in Herodotus' *Histories*. In the first half of my talk I will show that the theory by Reuland (2001), following up on Reinhart and Reuland (1991; 1993) explains the distribution of $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu\tau\dot{o}\nu$ and $\mu\nu\nu$ quite well. In this account, there are two different types of LDA, which appear in three different domains (the local clause; the boundary of the first finite clause and everything beyond it). An LDA may be licensed by the mechanisms of syntactic chain formation and logophoricity in these domains respectively.

In the second part of the argument I will consider the exceptions – cases in which we would expect $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu\tau\dot{o}\nu$ in Herodotus, on the basis of the account by Reuland (2001), but we find $\mu\nu\nu$ or $\alpha\dot{\nu}\tau\dot{o}\nu$ instead. It will be argued that there are two semantic factors that may *block* the option of using long-distance $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu\tau\dot{o}\nu$ in these cases. I argue that in Ancient Greek an intervening subject between the anaphor and a higher subject NP may constitute a barrier, which gets in the way of a long-distance interpretation of the anaphor, in two different situations. In the first of group of sentences I will discuss LDA $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\nu\tau\dot{o}\nu$ would in theory be licensed, but its use would result in a so-called 'garden path' sentence. The second blocking factor is based on the notion of semantic control and builds on to the work of Givón (1980). As will be shown, this explanation of exceptions in terms of blocking effects finds typological support.

The account of $\dot{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon\tau \acute{o}\nu$ in the *Histories* which I will present may be seen as a modification and further clarification of the work done on anaphors by grammarians of Ancient Greek; at the same time, by evaluating Reuland's generative linguistic theory using data from Ancient Greek (which, as far as I know, has not been done), I aim to contribute to that field of scholarship.

Bibliography

Givón, Talmy. "The Binding Hierarchy and the Typology of Complements." *Studies in Language* 4 (1980): 333-377.

Humbert, Jean. Syntaxe Grecque. Paris: Librairie Klincksieck, 1945. 59-68.

Kühner, Raphael and Bernhard Gerth. Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre. Hannover & Leipzig: Hannsche Buchhandlung, 1898. 554-575.

Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland. "Anaphors and Logophors: An Argument Structure Perspective". *Long Distance Anaphora*. Eds. Jan Koster and Eric Reuland. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991. 283-321.

---. "Reflexivity." Linguistic Inquiry 24.4 (1993): 657-720.

Reuland, Eric. "Primitives of Binding." Linguistic Inquiry 32.3 (2001): 439-492.

Smyth, Herbert W. *Greek Grammar.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1920. Rev. ed. by Gordon M. Messing 1984. 13th edn. 298-310.