Latin long-distance reflexives are actually indexicals

The Latin reflexive *se* can, under certain conditions, refer to a constituent outside of its minimal clause, a phenomenon often referred to as *long-distance reflexivity*. This usually occurs when the reflexive is embedded within a complement of a speech or thought predicate as in (1), or when it is a part of a longer stretch of indirect speech. Long-distance reflexives (LDRs) are also attested in relative clauses and adverbial clauses outside of such complements, but this is rather uncommon. As the same lexical item is used both for local and long-distance reflexivity, it would be reasonable to expect that a unified approach could capture both uses. Benedicto 1991 tries out such an approach on Latin, drawing on GB-style binding theory. In my talk I will argue that there are strong empirical reasons against considering Latin long-distance reflexives as syntactically bound pronouns. Based on data collected from the *PROIEL corpus* and the grammatical literature, I will try to show that Latin long-distance reflexives are not syntactically constrained in the same way as local reflexives are. Notably, antecedents of long-distance reflexives need not be subjects, but can occur in a wide range of syntactic configurations: In (2), the antecedent is embedded within a prepositional phrase, in (3) it is deeply embedded within a noun phrase.

I will argue that Latin LDRs are *logophors*, i.e. pronouns which occur in clauses reporting the discourse, thoughts or emotions of a sentence-internal protagonist, and which refer to the person whose attitude or emotion the clause expresses (cf. Culy 1994). The antecedent is often the superordinate subject, e.g. when the logophor occurs in the complement of an active speech or thought verb, but it can also be a constituent in another syntactical configuration.

Following Schlenker 2003 I analyze logophors as a special kind of indexical pronouns, with a semantics parallel to first-person pronouns. In direct discourse, a first person pronoun refers to the agent of the utterance or thought context. In reported clauses, logophors have the same function, referring to the agent of the reported thought or communication event. This approach readily explains the lack of syntactic constraints on antecedents to Latin LDRs, as their reference is retrieved from the context rather than from some sort of syntactic binding mechanism.

This analysis may also capture a good number of the attested examples of LDRs in relative clauses and adverbial clauses, as many of these seem to imply some sort of thought report. However, not all of these examples are equally easy to account for: LDRs also occur in clauses which do not have a reported interpretation, e.g. in the indicative relative clause in (4). I tentatively suggest that such clauses express *empathy*, the external speaker's identification with a sentence-internal protagonist, and that LDRs may refer to this protagonist. Empathy-oriented LDRs would not be a quirk of Latin: This phenomenon is also attested in another logophoric language, namely Japanese (c.f. Oshima 2007).

1 Examples

(1)   ***Ubii**$_i$*   *...*   *magnopere*   *orabant*   *[ut*   ***sibi**$_i$*   *auxilium*   *ferret].*
     Ubii.nom   greatly   entreat.imperf.ind   that   **refl.dat**   help.acc   bring.imperf.subj
     The Ubii (a tribe) entreated with insistance that he should bring **them** help.' (Caes. B.G. 4.16.5)

(2)   *Vos*   *ex*   ***M. Favonio**$_i$*   *audistis*   *[Clodium*   ***sibi**$_i$*
     You.nom.pl   from   **Marcus.abl Favonius.abl**   hear.perf.ind.2p.pl   Clodius   **refl.dat**
     dixisse   *...*   *[periturum*   *Milonem]]*
     say.perf.inf   die.fut.inf   Milo.acc
     'You have heard from **Marcus Favonius** that Clodius had said to **him** that Milo would die' (Cic. Mil. 44)

(3)   *Elogium*   *recitasti*   *de*   *testamento*   *Cn.*   *Egnati*   ***patris**$_i$*
     clause.acc   recite.perf.ind.2p   from   testament.abl   Gnaius.gen   Egnatus.gen   **father.gen**
     ...   *[idcirco*   ***se**$_i$*   *exheredasse*   *filium]*
        therefore   **refl.acc**   disinherit.perf.inf   son.acc
     'You read a clause from **the father** of Gnaius Egnatus [which said] that **he** therefore had disinherited his son' (Cic. Clu. 135)

(4)   ***Epaminondas**$_i$*   *...*   *ei*   *[qui*   ***sibi**$_i$*   *ex*   *lege*   *praetor*
     Epaminondas.nom   him.dat   who.nom   **refl.dat**   from   law.abl   praetor.nom
     successerat]   *exercitum*   *non*   *tradidit.*
     succeeded.pluperf.ind   army.acc   not   transfer.perf.ind
     '**Epaminondas** did not transfer the army to the one who had succeeded **him** as a praetor according to the law.' (Cic. inv. 1.55)

2 Bibliography

E. Benedicto. 1991. Latin long-distance anaphora. In J. Koster and E. Reuland (eds.), *Long-distance Anaphora*, p. 171-184, Cambridge, CUP. **C. Culy**. 1994. Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics* 32:1055-1094. **D.Y. Oshima**. 2007. On emphatic and logophoric marking. **PROIEL corpus**. University of Oslo: Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Arts and Ideas. *http://foni.uio.no:3000/ Research on Language and Computation* 5:19-35. **P. Schlenker**. 2003. A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26: 29-120.