An LFG analysis of the Latin logophoric reflexive

The Latin reflexive *sē* very often shows up in reports of speech or thoughts where it refers to the one whose speech or thoughts are reported. Research on long-distance reflexives has documented reflexive pronouns with a similar distribution in many languages, but there is substantial disagreement on how best to explain this.

One problem that is particularly relevant with Latin data in mind, is the relation to logophoric pronouns, which are specialised pronouns for referring to the one whose words or thoughts are reported. The distribution of logophoric pronouns appears to be determined by discourse structure and the presence of certain lexical items that introduce reports. This also seems to be the case for the Latin reflexive in reports. At the same time, the Latin reflexive is subject to syntactic restrictions (standardly formulated as binding principles) in canonical reflexive structures. It is not immediately clear how to reconcile these two sides of the Latin reflexive pronoun.

I sketch an analysis within Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) that exploits LFG's multiple correspondence architecture to separate syntactic and non-syntactic restrictions on *sē*. In canonical reflexive structures, *sē* is subject to restrictions that follow from LFG's binding theory. As a 'logophoric reflexive', it is subject to similar syntactic restrictions, but its logophoric 'function' is contingent on the presence of a logophoric predicate introducing a report. Its presence in the syntactic structure lexically introduces an interface with extra-syntactic constraints, which in turn can determine the reference of the reflexive.

This simple model can account for most tokens of *sē* in samples of Classical Latin text but leaves behind a residual group that apparently requires a different explanation. The properties of such reflexives are hard to identify due to their low frequency, but similar data is known both from other languages with 'logophoric reflexives' and from languages with logophoric pronouns, suggesting that the domain for 'logophoric reflexives' does not correspond exactly to reports of speech or thoughts.