How To Do Things with (ἐ)κείνος and αὐτός in Tragedy: Initial Suggestions

Anna Bonifazi

1 Aim and Origin of the Present Contribution

This chapter offers an input on the pragmatics of (ἐ)κείνος and αὐτός, mainly when they are used as anaphoric markers and, in a few cases, as deictic markers.¹ The target corpus is formed by Classical tragedies, where anaphoric references are third-person references, that is to say, other characters than the 'I'-'you' present on stage, i.e. people who are absent at a given moment staged in the performance: people who have disappeared, who are going to appear later, or even dead people.

This paper selects investigation materials and pursues selected results: on the one hand, (ἐ)κείνος and αὐτός are selected out of other third-person pronouns used in Classical Greek (e.g. οὗτος, σφ- forms) because their grammar (in terms of language use) still needs additional considerations; on the other hand, the readings that I am about to offer cannot claim any general conclusions as they apply to very few passages. In other words, this contribution presents preliminary analyses, and the thoughts being put forward invite expansion through future research and more systematic investigations.

However limited the evidence may be, the theoretical back-up relies on considerable work in linguistics from the second half of the 1970s. Moreover, parallels in modern literary texts as well as in other Ancient Greek genres do not fail to provide significant cases. The present argument does not start from classical Greek drama language or from ancient Greek grammars but aims at importing concepts and ideas from outside ancient Greek, in line with other chapters in this volume. The overarching goal is to view the skilful usages of these words by Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides as part of a bigger set of usages, that is, what literary genres offer also in modern times; most of all, they will be observed in the light of general linguistic studies on how we process anaphoric markers in order to understand each other.

1 In view of upcoming analyses and for the sake of coherence, I shall focus on αὐτός accompanying third-person references (i.e. I do not consider αὐτός accompanying 'I' or 'you' references).

Section 2 singles out central concepts in relevant pragmatic and cognitive accounts of anaphora, including studies on pronouns in narrative texts. Section 3 proposes instances from modern literary texts confirming but also expanding on general contemporary assumptions, and it draws conclusions about the methodology of textual analyses. Section 4 recaps points from my previous work on (ἐ)κεῖνος and αὐτός. Section 5 offers a pragmatic and cognitive reading of (ἐ)κεῖνος and αὐτός in several tragic passages. Section 6 closes the investigation with a summary and future research directions.

2 Anaphora Processing: Current Understanding

Since the end of the 1970s, researchers from Linguistics, Psychology, and Artificial Intelligence have questioned the idea that the interpretation of a pronoun involves the search for earlier words (see e.g. Grosz 1977, Clancy 1980, Brown and Yule 1983). Nowadays, most theories of anaphora processing highlight the cognitive operations and the psychological factors influencing our comprehension of anaphoric markers. Concepts that are crucial in this respect regard how accessible a referent is (e.g. Ariel 1990, Fretheim and Gundel 1996), or how active an entity is in one's consciousness (Chafe 1996). For example, we may prefer to use 'light' recalls for entities that are already active or 'in focus' in the recipient's mind, e.g. 'she', and heavy recalls for entities that are inactive and are about to be activated again, e.g. 'this girl' (cf. Cornish 1999). A further relevant term is anadeixis (see e.g. Fossard et al. 2012): instead of a clear-cut distinction between anaphora and deixis, we may think of a continuum from retrieving referents in our mind out of the extralinguistic context (deictic pole) to retrieving referents in our mind out of previous discourse (anaphoric pole).

Equally profitable are studies on the interface between reference management and people's perspective, starting from investigations on logophoricity (i.e. dealing with reflected or reported points of view) and free reflexive/indirect markers (reflexives whose verbal antecedent resides outside of the host clause), e.g. Hagège (1974), König and Siemund (2000). A seminal work on positive and negative attitudes of speakers towards referents recalled by means of demonstratives is Lakoff (1974), although the author calls the phenomenon 'emotional deixis'. More recently, Hinterwimmer and Bosch (2016) discusses German demonstratives and perspective taking, and Dancygier (2008) reads pronouns as part of viewpoint configurations: a phenomenon that may encompass the personal viewpoint of characters as well as authorial design about large portions of texts.

Finally, relevant research has been focusing on the role of anaphoric markers in elaborated texts or narratives: Fox (1987) discusses anaphora in popular English narratives, Daneš (1990) the stylistic relevance of anaphoric choices, Baker (1995) locally free reflexives in Jane Austen, Conte (1996) anaphoric ‘encapsulation’ (recapping ‘this’ and the like), and Emmott (1997) participant tracking and contextual frames. Clancy (1980) and Hofmann (1989), among others, stress the relationship between discourse structure and anaphoric choices. Illuminating contributions on anaphora processing and participant tracking in Latin literature encompass Bolkestein and van de Grift (1994) and Kroon (2007).

All these works address the pragmatic and cognitive relevance of anaphoric markers, which I summarise in terms of their illocutionary force, their ‘doing things’, in Austin’s terms: what speakers convey by uttering them, and how they signal what is going on in the discourse. Instances of illocutionary force include what characters or authors may imply, such as ‘by uttering this marker I signal that this person is already active in my mind’, ‘as I utter this marker let me express what I think of/how I see that person’, or what the position in the ongoing discourse may imply, such as ‘a new episode is starting’ or ‘a turning point in the story is about to involve the referent’.

3 Hints from Modern Literary Texts

Actual instances of anaphoric markers representing choices rather than mechanical coherence tools can be found everywhere; for the present purposes, I shall draw the reader’s attention towards a sample of passages from German and English literary texts.² The first passage is relevant to ancient Greek tragedy because it is from a play written in meter.

[1] G.E. Lessing *Nathan der Weise* (1779), Act 1, Scene 1 (ed. Bark [1954: 12]³)

Daja ... Ihre ganze Seele war / Die Zeit her nur bei Euch—und ihm.
Nathan Bei ihm? / Bei welchem Ihm?

2 The following analysis is part of my research that I have presented in recent papers (University of Stuttgart, Linguistics department, December 2017; University of Padua, Conference on qualitative and quantitative methods for the study of modern literatures, June 2018; University of Birmingham, Poetics and Linguistics Association Conference, July 2018; University of Poznań, Cognitive Linguistics Conference, October 2018). I am grateful to the respective (and very diverse) audiences for their fruitful feedback.

3 Tr. Taylor (<http://www.fullbooks.com/Nathan-the-Wise1.html>).

Daja ... Her thoughts [Reha's] have only been with you—and him.
 Nathan And HIM? What him?

The referent of German 'ihm' is the young Templar who rescued Recha (Nathan's daughter and a close friend of Daja) from a terrible fire. In Daja's mind, he is a fully active entity, whereas Nathan does not know him yet, which is why he raises an anaphora-resolution question: 'Bei welchem Ihm?'/ 'With which "he"?'. This discrepancy of knowledge at the onset of the play triggers curiosity about the person that looks so dear to the protagonist's daughter and enhances everyone's attention to a character that is still absent from the scene.

The second passage features a supposedly ungrammatical use of an anaphoric reflexive marker:

[2] J. Austen *Sense and Sensibility* (ed. Copeland [2006: 160])

Could he [E.F.] ever be tolerably happy with Lucy Steele; could he, were his affection for **herself** [Elinor] out of the question, with his integrity, his delicacy, and well-informed mind, be satisfied with a wife like her—illiterate, artful, and selfish?

Austen's use of indirect reflexive markers (see 'herself' in this passage with reference to Elinor) can be fully understood only in the light of large discourse domains, such as the chapters of *Sense and Sensibility* hosting [2], where Elinor's perspective is predominant.

The final passage shows a case of blurred distinction between anaphora and what Bühler calls 'Deixis am Phantasma' (1934: 121–140).

[3] Agatha Christie, *The Bloodstained Pavement* (2008: 340)

'If anyone sees those bloodstains—'

I submit that, in this short crime story, Christie's use of the adjective 'those' to recall some stains of blood that have been mentioned earlier in the discourse, may suggest a momentary visualisation of the stains (almost deictically) invited by the speaker—an old fisherman—to keep everyone's attention on them. Not by chance do they represent a decisive detail in the development of the story.

From the analysis of anaphoric markers encompassing not just third-person pronouns but all types of nouns phrases used to recall somebody/something in large discourse domains such as a crime story or an entire novel a few methodological points emerge:

- a) The individual form may have a local function—justified by the host clause or small discourse unit—and a global function—inviting the processing of referents as they evolve throughout complex narrations, or as they are mentioned at different points of the articulation of discourse.
- b) Local functions never rely exclusively on the anaphoric form; they emerge from the understanding of the co-text as well, along with its syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features; by the latter, I mean the illocutionary force of a whole clause together with the illocutionary force of the single anaphoric marker.
- c) Like particles and tenses, anaphoric markers are particularly discourse sensitive and multifunctional.

4 Input from Pragmatic and Cognitive Readings of (ἐ)κεῖνος and αὐτός in Pindar and in Homer

In previous work of mine,⁴ I challenge a few canonical assumptions about (ἐ)κεῖνος and αὐτός. For example, I attempt to demonstrate that, in Pindar and in Homer, not only the nominative cases but also non-nominative cases of both markers may convey emphasis. This emphasis comes from a range of implied meanings inferable from local and global context. I also offer counterexamples to the following two rules: ‘far antecedent’ for (ἐ)κεῖνος and ‘immediately preceding’ referent for αὐτός (esp. Bonifazi 2009, 2010, 2012). I also explore the strongly visual potential of (ἐ)κεῖνος (Bonifazi 2004, 2012: 40–68) and the image schema—a cognitive notion referring to skeletal structure—that possibly overarches all the meanings and syntactic functions of αὐτός (Bonifazi 2019). The first three chapters of Bonifazi (2012: 13–183) combine the analysis of local as well as global contexts by the means of the analysis of the distribution, position, and multi-functions of Odysseus-as-κεῖνος and Odysseus-as-αὐτός throughout the *Odyssey*.⁵

As a way of recapping my readings, I shall list the range of implications that I see up to now behind the use of the two markers in lyric as well as in epic. Along with the surrounding co-text, (ἐ)κεῖνος pronoun and (ἐ)κεῖνος adjective

4 Bonifazi (2004, 2009, 2010, 2012, and 2019).

5 On pages 19–40 of the same monograph, I preface the analysis with a section inspired by current linguistic accounts of third-person pronouns, titled ‘Alternative readings of third-person pronouns: accessibility of the referent, narrative functions, and pragmatic impact’. Then, I test the main ideas on the poem of the *Odyssey*, and I make a case for an anaphoric reading of ἄνδρα (Odyssey 1.1).

in noun phrases can suggest physical distance, intersubjective distance, emotional distance (to the degree of stigmatisation in the negative sense and of veneration in the positive sense); it can invite visualisation (possibly in relation to PIE **ke*) and/or a connection between the mind's eye and the sight (appearance) of someone.

Along with the surrounding co-text, αὐτός adjective (in attributive or predicative position), pronoun, and indirect reflexive suggests a centre evoking (implicitly or explicitly) periphery: one vs. many; chiefs vs. subordinates (see Latin *ipse*); gods vs. humans; persons vs. animals; body vs. body adornments/weapons;⁶ aloneness; one's inner part; one's true self; one's identity (deictically); discourse prominence; cognitive sameness ('still in focus').

Do (ἐ)κείνος and αὐτός passages in tragedy let us infer anything similar, or do they mean something different?

5 Things Done by Uttering (ἐ)κείνος and αὐτός on Stage

5.1 (ἐ)κείνος for the Dead: Intersubjective (Physical) Distance and Reverence

The following passage from *Alcestis* features a double anaphoric choice (ἐ)κείνος with reference to the dead (in 866 as a pronoun, in 867 as an adjective connoting the dwelling of the dead).

[4] Euripides *Alcestis* 861–867⁷

ἰώ, στυγναὶ πρόσσοδοι, στυγναὶ δ' ὄψεις χήρων
μελάθρων. ἰώ μοί μοι. αἶ αἶ.
ποῖ βῶ; ποῖ στή; τί λέγω; τί δὲ μή;
πῶς ἂν ὀλοίμαν;
ἦ βαρυδαίμονα μήτηρ μ' ἔτεκεν.
ζηλῶ φθιμένους, κείνων ἔραμαι,
κείν' ἐπιθυμῶ δῶματα ναίειν.

Oh, how gloomy
are the entrances, how gloomy the sight
of this bereaved dwelling. Oh! Alas, alas!

6 These contrasts already appear in Wagnon 1880 (with no reference to cognitive linguistics).

7 The Greek texts of Euripides follow Diggle (1981–1994); those of Sophocles Lloyd-Jones and Wilson (1990); those of Aeschylus Page (1972).

Where should I go? Where should I stay? What should I say? What
 should I not say?
 How I wish I would perish!
 Really, my mother bore me luckless.
 I admire the dead, I long for those ones,
 those dwellings are the ones I love to stay in.⁸

As his beloved wife dies in his place, Admetus falls into a state of desperation and laments his own misery at the funeral procession. By stating that he longs for ‘those ones’ and ‘those dwellings’, he not only expresses physical and inter-subjective distance towards entities that are no longer part of ‘this’ world, but also reverence, just as in *Odyssey* 1–4, where the most frequent pronoun used for Odysseus (uttered exclusively by characters) is (ἐ)κεῖνος, which recalls the absent and perhaps already dead hero.⁹ In this passage certain general grammatical characteristics of (ἐ)κεῖνος turn out to be disregarded or even irrelevant: the emphasis provided by the repetition of the form does not relate just to the nominative but also to the genitive and the accusative case (κεῖνων, 866, and κεῖνα, 867). Moreover, in line 866, the verbal antecedent immediately precedes the anaphoric marker, which, conventionally, is not supposed to be the case.

5.2 Cumulative (ἐ)κεῖνος for Ajax: Blaming, Reverence, and Projected Lament

Within the range of implied meanings of (ἐ)κεῖνος in tragedy, blaming (derived from a negative sense of distance) is well represented in *Ajax*, although commentaries hardly pay attention to this lexical choice and its recurrence. Ajax has to be reproached for what he has done, and yet his heroic figure is predominant in his life and afterlife. I suggest that the twelve occurrences of (ἐ)κεῖνος for Ajax in the homonymous play reflect a mix of implied meanings that match his controversial figure and the mixed feelings of people towards him. These meanings include blame, the reconnection of the characters’ and the audience’s mind’s eyes with his presence, and reverence. Moreover, in the frame of hero-cult but also independently, (ἐ)κεῖνος may be seen as a way to avoid pronouncing someone’s name, while the referent is clear in everybody’s mind.¹⁰

8 The translations of [4] and [9] are mine.

9 As for (ἐ)κεῖνος uttered in contexts of laments, see Bonifazi (2012: 41–57).

10 For an overview of scholarship pro and contra hero-cult reflected in *Ajax*, see Finglass (2011: 47–51).

The play includes 25 occurrences of (ἐ)κεῖνος (16 times without the epsilon) in masculine singular forms.¹¹ Ajax takes the lion's share with twelve of them (see the following table). The other referents are his father Telamon (437, 472, 1303), Teucer (567, 798), Odysseus (113), Hector (1032), Eurysaces (513), someone who thinks differently from Teucer (1039), χρόνος (933), and three times in almost contiguous lines 'the inventor of war and weaponry' (1195, 1198, 1199).

Here is a synopsis of the instances with Ajax as the referent throughout the play:

<i>Line</i>	<i>Form</i>	<i>Speaker</i>	<i>Local co-text</i>
6	κεῖνου	Athena	scanning his fresh tracks
20	κεῖνον	Odysseus	tracking that one
28	ἐκεῖνω	Odysseus	all lay responsibility to that one
220	κεῖνου ... τάνδρός	Tecmessa	victims as sacrifices made by that man
271	άνήρ ἐκεῖνος	Tecmessa	that man, frenzied, ...
275	κεῖνος	Tecmessa	that one is subjected to anguish
285	κεῖνος	Tecmessa	that one, in the dead of night ...
755	ἐκεῖνον	Messenger	to see that one alive
762	κεῖνος	Messenger	that one was foolish also earlier
783	άνήρ κεῖνος	Messenger	that man does not exist any longer
795	ἐκεῖνον	Messenger	to keep that one in his tent
991	άνήρ κεῖνος	Chorus	that man had asked for the care of his child

I shall solely comment on these occurrences that illustrate, along with their co-text, the inferable speakers' attitudes or show how different anaphoric markers in the same passage are meaningful choices rather than metrical alternatives.

11 An additional occurrence, *κάκεῖνον* in 1035, refers to the girdle that Ajax had once given to Hector; Achilles later used it to drag Hector's corpse around Troy. Finglass (2011: 430), in line with other scholars, considers lines 1028–1039 spurious; interestingly, one reason is the apparently awkward anaphora resolution of the pronoun: 'κάκεῖνον looks back five lines for its referent, a fault not eased by the syntactic compression and interposed nouns'. Independently of whether those lines are spurious or not, I submit that the relatively remote verbal antecedent of *κάκεῖνον* is not necessarily a problem: anyone would easily retrieve 'that girdle' in connection to Hector's story rather than in connection to previous textual referents; in other words, the referent may be activated through the memory of another known discourse separate from the present one.

[5] Sophocles *Ajax* 25–31 (Odysseus speaking)

ἐφθαρμένας γὰρ ἀρτίως εὐρίσκομεν
 λείας ἀπάσας καὶ κατηναρισμένας
 ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτοῖς ποιμνίων ἐπιστάταις.
 τήνδ' οὖν ἐκείνῳ πᾶς τις αἰτίαν νέμει.
 καὶ μοί τις ὅπτηρ αὐτὸν εἰσιδὼν μόνον
 πηδῶντα πεδία σὺν νεορράντῳ ξίφει
 φράζει τε κἀδήλωσεν ...

For we recently found all the cattle, our plunder, dead—yes, slaughtered by human hand—and with them the guardians of the flocks. Now, all men lay responsibility for this crime to him. And further, a scout who had seen him bounding alone over the plain with a newly-wet sword reported to me and declared what he saw.¹²

In line 28, Odysseus stresses the guilt of Ajax as collectively attributed to him ('that one'). Odysseus is also a good candidate for indirectly conveying his own personal hatred, or at least emotional distance towards Ajax. A further element of this passage that lends support to the non-neutral choice of the anaphoric marker is the occurrence of αὐτόν in the following line (29). A 'plain third-person pronoun' reading thereof would miss the pragmatic implication of aloneness conveyed by αὐτόν, which is further reinforced by μόνον.¹³

The next passage confirms that the discourse strategies behind using both (ἐ)κεῖνος and αὐτός for a referent that is fully in focus must go beyond the 'simple' necessity of recalling Ajax.

[6] Sophocles *Ajax* 271–276 (Tecmessa speaking)

ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος, ἥνικ' ἦν ἐν τῇ νόσῳ,
 αὐτὸς μὲν ἦδεθ' οἷσιν εἴχετ' ἐν κακοῖς,
 ἡμᾶς δὲ τοὺς φρονούντας ἡνία ξυνών·
 νῦν δ' ὥς ἔληξε κἀνέπνευσε τῆς νόσου,
 κείνός τε λύπηι πᾶς ἐλήλγεται κακῇ
 ἡμεῖς θ' ὁμοίως οὐδὲν ἦσσον ἢ πάρος.

12 Translations of the *Ajax* are from Jebb (1907).

13 See section 4 and Taillardat (1987) about isolation and unity as components of the semantic nucleus of αὐτός.

That man, while afflicted, found joy for himself in the dire fantasies that held him, though his presence distressed us who were sane. But now, since he has had pause and rest from the plague, he has been utterly subjected to lowly anguish, and we similarly grieve no less than before.

Behind the unquestionable emphasis of *άνήρ ἐκεῖνος* (i.e. *ὁ άνήρ ἐκεῖνος*) in 271 (see also 783 and 991, where the same anaphoric expression is uttered by the messenger and the chorus respectively), I see Tecmessa's tragic despair and torment adding to the negative evaluation of Ajax' sickness. The additional description applying to 'that man', *αὐτὸς μὲν* and *ἡμᾶς δέ* (272–273), reflects the cognitive image schema centre-periphery: the basic relation is between Ajax-the-centre and 'us'-the-periphery.¹⁴ *κεῖνός τε* [...] *ἡμεῖς θ'* in 275–276 retrieves the juxtaposition of 'he' and 'us', this time, however, to lament what is common to both, namely sorrow and grief (see the *τε ... τε* construction).

Example [7] shows that the implications of uttering *κεῖνος* may additionally concern the discourse function of the hosting unit.

[7] Sophocles *Ajax* 282–287 (Chorus and Tecmessa)

- Χο. τίς γάρ ποτ' ἀρχή τοῦ κακοῦ προσέπτατο;
 δῆλωσον ἡμῖν τοῖς ξυναλγοῦσιν τύχας.
 Τεκ. ἅπαν μαθήσῃ τοῦργον, ὡς κοινωνὸς ὦν.
κεῖνος γάρ ἄκρας νυκτός, ἡνίχ' ἔσπεροι
 λαμπτήρες οὐκέτ' ἦιθον, ἀμφοῖνες λαβῶν
 ἐμαίετ' ἔγχος ἐξόδους ἔρπειν κενάς.

- Ch. In what way did the plague first swoop down on him? Tell us who share your pain how it happened.
 Tek. You will hear all that took place, since you are involved. In the dead of night when the evening lamps were no longer aflame, he seized a two-edged sword and wanted to leave on an aimless foray.

By means of *γάρ*, Tecmessa starts the narrative of Ajax' mad actions.¹⁵ The use of *κεῖνος* cannot be explained due to the far antecedent, be it in the text or in the mind: the hero is in fact the focus of the chorus' and Tecmessa's attention

¹⁴ See section 4 and Bonifazi (2019).

¹⁵ In its discourse function, this *γάρ* resembles *γάρ* that starts embedded narratives in Homer (on which see de Jong 1997 and recently Bonifazi et al. 2016: 11.3 §§ 20–32) and in Herodotus and Thucydides (see Bonifazi et al. 2016: 1V.3 §§ 109–110).

and discourse at least since the entrance of Tecmessa at line 201. Rather, I see two co-existing functions of κείνος: one is the mental visualisation of Ajax in the setting of the report (*Deixis am Phantasma*), the other is a strong recall of the referent at the onset of a new discourse units (we would call this the beginning of a new paragraph).¹⁶

The last passage features Αἴανθ', ἐκείνον and αὐτόν: all referring to Ajax in three contiguous lines.

[8] Sophocles *Ajax* 752–762 (the messenger speaking)

θεις εἶπε κάπ' ἐσκηψε παντοίαι τέχνηι
εἶρξαι κατ' ἡμαρ τοῦμ' φανὲς τὸ νῦν τόδε
Αἴανθ' ὑπὸ σκηναῖσι μῆδ' ἀφέντ' ἑάν,
εἰ ζῶντ' ἐκείνον εἰσιδεῖν θέλοι ποτέ·
ἐλᾷ γὰρ αὐτόν τήνδ' ἔθ' ἡμέραν μόνην
δίαις Ἀθάνας μῆνις, ὡς ἔφη λέγων.

The prophet [= Calchas] then addressed him [= Teucer] and strictly commanded him to use every possible resource to keep Ajax inside his tent for the duration of this day that now shines on us, and to prevent him from moving about if he wished ever to look on him alive. For this day alone will the anger of divine Athena lash at him.

Teucer is the implied grammatical subject of the εἰ clause in 755; nevertheless, the participle ζῶντα suffices to recall Ajax in the object position (see Αἴανθ' at 754 in the same grammatical function). Then, ἐκείνον looks like an unnecessarily heavy pronoun.¹⁷ However, if we consider the entire host clause, ἐκείνον seems to be linked to the semantic sphere of seeing ('to look on him', εἰσιδεῖν). I advocate the reading of the following αὐτόν as keeping Ajax as the centre of everyone's attention and possibly hinting at the corporeal side of his persona as Athena lashes at him (more below on αὐτός and one's body). 'Lashing' is to be understood metaphorically, but it is as if αὐτόν keeps the physicality of the action; in other words, it matches the frame of the source.¹⁸

16 See section 2 and Hofmann (1989).

17 Jebb (1907: ad 755) comments: 'ἐκείνον, where we might have looked for the less emphatic αὐτόν, since Αἴαντα has so lately preceded'; by quoting a passage from Andocides where ἐκείνον occurs shortly after the proper name of the referent, Jebb concludes that it is an Attic idiom.

18 I am grateful to Douglas Cairns (personal communication) for drawing my attention to

It is difficult to judge whether these twelve instances of (ἐ)κεῖνος representing Ajax are enough to produce a resonance effect for the actors on stage and the audience.¹⁹ My point is that at least they share two pragmatic, cognitive, and poetic aspects: a. all of them mentally (if not visually) reconnect everyone to Ajax' presence when he is not on stage, with the exception of 991, as the chorus utters ἀνὴρ κεῖνος right before Teucer addresses Ajax' dead body; b. on the whole, they compress a network of references to what he has done: they recall his isolation/distance and his death; furthermore, they project, from the very beginning (in a proper tragic style), the dimension of lament that will accompany the performance until his burial. Perhaps there is a link between this anaphoric strategy and the thematic (and visual?) centrality of a dead Ajax.²⁰

5.3 *Epiphanic (ἐ)κεῖνος*

As the chorus of elderly citizens of Colonus enters the stage and sings (Soph. *OC* 118–137), Antigone and a blind Oedipus hide in the sacred grove of the Eumenides, but afterwards they come forward, and at that point Oedipus talks:

[9] Sophocles *Oedipus at Colonus* 137–140

Oi. ὄδ' ἐκεῖνος ἐγὼ· φωνῇ γὰρ ὁρώ,
τὸ φατιζόμενον.

Xo. ἰὼ ἰὼ,
δεινὸς μὲν ὁράν, δεινὸς δὲ κλύειν.

Oe. Here I am; I can see with the sound,
as they say.

Ch. Oh! Oh!
Fearful to see, fearful to hear!²¹

the general possibility that metaphorical expressions 'attract' to the source frame other linguistic features than themselves.

19 The name 'Ajax' appears 39 times in the play; however, it is a vocative case twelve times, which reduces the references to him in third person to 27 occurrences. On a side note, nothing prevents us from hypothesising that uttering the proper name of a hero may in turn hint at a series of implied meanings, not so different from what happens with anaphoric markers.

20 On the interpretive problems about the visibility of Ajax on the *ekkyklēma*, see in particular Meineck (2006); on ambiguities regarding the scene settings of the play, see Finglass (2011: 11–20).

21 The translation is from Jebb (31900).

ἐκεῖνος in 138 is more than just a deictic marker (ὅδε already fulfils the deictic role of pointing to the referent). Ruijgh (2006: 160) sees in this combination of ὅδε + ἐκεῖνος a “type of ‘present revelation’”. ἐκεῖνος has an epiphanic quality in itself, which results from the combination of co-occurring cognitive operations dealing with vision and memory: someone/something appears to the speaker, and the speaker, visually (re-)connects this someone/something to a referent that is in her mind. The visual component is essential.²²

5.4 αὐτός for Corpses

It is well known that on the onset of the *Iliad*, αὐτούς refers to the corpses of heroes that are fed to the dogs (*Il.* 1.4). Homeric poetry features other instances where αὐτός implies ‘body’ (i.e. someone’s body without weapons or anything else) and ‘alone’ (i.e. without anything else around), which makes Taillardat (1987: 77–79) argue for separation and distinction as its basic semantic components. The following utterance by Orestes in *Libation Bearers* seems to keep the epic implication of ‘dead body’:

[10] Aeschylus *Libation Bearers* 903–904

Op. κρίνω σε νικᾶν, καὶ παραινεῖς μοι καλῶς.
ἔπου, πρὸς αὐτὸν τόνδε σὲ σφάξαι θέλω.

Or. (to Pylades) I judge you the winner; you have advised me well.
(to Clytemnestra) Follow me. I want to slay you right next to that man.²³

I let the reader notice that Sommerstein’s translation ‘right next to that man’ fails to translate both the allusion to Aegisthus’ corpse and the deixis. I interpret this phrase to mean ‘next to this corpse’.

22 See e.g. Eur. *El.* 581 ἐκεῖνος εἰ σύ; 1222 ἦ γὰρ σὺ κείνος; 1178 τόδ’ ἔστ’ ἐκεῖνο, καὶ μάλ’ ἀθλίως ἔχον with reference to Electra’s visual perception of Orestes (in line 1178, the object is the urn containing Orestes’ ashes). See also Homer *Odyssey* 24.321 κείνος μὲν δὴ ὅδ’ αὐτὸς ἐγώ, πάτερ, δν σὺ μεταλλᾷς (the ultimate revelation of Odysseus in front of his father) and Sappho fr. 31.1 Voigt φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἵσος θέοισιν (on which see Nagy 1990: 201 n. 110).

23 The translation is from Sommerstein (2008).

5.5 *αὐτός* Implying 'Someone's Body' as well as Discourse Prominence

Let us go back for a moment to *Ajax*. Ajax wants to take his leave of his son after giving him his shield (529–577). Example [11] shows different ways in which Eurysaces is referred to over the stichomythia in lines 529–545 when the child is unquestionably the topic of the conversation (presumably a fully active referent in Tecmessa's and Ajax' mind). In order to refer to Eurysaces, Sophocles could have used other phrases, other pronouns (such as τοῦτον), or nothing (null anaphora, given that direct objects are part of the pro-drop characteristics of ancient Greek). Instead, after the 'priming' mention παῖδα τὸν ἐμόν (530), he has Tecmessa and Ajax use δύστηνος (533) and four times αὐτόν (531, 538, 542, 545).²⁴

[11] Sophocles *Ajax* 530–545

- Αι. κόμιζέ νύν μοι παῖδα τὸν ἐμόν, ὥς ἴδω.
 Τε. καὶ μὴν φόβοισί γ' αὐτὸν ἐξελυσάμην.
 Αι. ἐν τοῖσδε τοῖς κακοῖσιν; ἢ τί μοι λέγεις;
 Τε. μὴ σοί γέ που δύστηνος ἀντήσας θάνοι.
 Αι. πρέπον γέ τ' ἂν ἦν δαίμονος τοῦμοῦ τόδε.
 Τε. ἀλλ' οὖν ἐγὼ 'φύλαξα τοῦτό γ' ἀρκέσαι.
 Αι. ἐπήνεσ' ἔργον καὶ πρόνοιαν ἦν ἔθου.
 Τε. τί δῆτ' ἂν ὥς ἐκ τῶνδ' ἂν ὠφελοῖμί σε;
 Αι. δός μοι προσειπεῖν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ τ' ἰδεῖν.
 Τε. καὶ μὴν πέλας γε προσπόλοις φυλάσσεται.
 Αι. τί δῆτα μέλλει μὴ οὐ παρουσίαν ἔχειν;
 Τε. ὦ παῖ, πατήρ καλεῖ σε. δεῦρο προσπόλων
 ἄγ' αὐτὸν ὅσπερ χερσὶν εὐθύνων κυρεῖς.
 Αι. ἔρποντι φωνεῖς, ἢ λελειμμένωι λόγων;
 Τε. καὶ δὴ κομίζει προσπόλων ὅδ' ἐγγύθεν.
 Αι. αἶρ' αὐτόν, αἶρε δεῦρο· ...

- Aj. Then bring me my son, so that I may see him.
 Tek. But in my fear I released him from my keeping.
 Aj. Because of these troubles of mine? Or what do you mean?
 Tek. Yes, for fear that somehow the poor child would get in your way, and die.

24 I shall not discuss the vocative ὦ παῖ and the second-person pronoun σε (541), even though they refer to the child as well; as deictic markers they interrupt the focus on him in third person.

- Aj. Yes, that would have been truly worthy of my destiny.
 Tek. Well, at least I took care to avert that disaster.
 Aj. I approve of your action and of your foresight.
 Tek. How, then, can I serve you, as things stand now?
 Aj. Let me speak to him and see him face to face.
 Tek. Oh, yes—he is close by, watched by our servants.
 Aj. Then why is his presence delayed?
 Tek. My child, your father calls you. Bring him here, servant, whichever of you is guiding his steps.
 Aj. Is the man coming? Or has he missed your call?
 Tek. Here now one of the servants approaches with him.
 Aj. Lift him; lift him up here.

I interpret this exceptional concentration of αὐτός for the same referent as a pragmatic signpost for two implications: a. the discourse prominence of the child (centre opposed to the periphery made of other people); b. the focus on Eurysaces' body, as the respective co-texts indicate: 'releasing him from keeping' (531), 'speaking and seeing him' (538), 'bringing him' (542), and 'lifting him' (545).

5.6 Cumulative αὐτός for *Hippolytus*: Centrality and Relevance of the Body

The combination of discourse prominence, centre-and-periphery, and the relevance of the body is what characterises the use of αὐτός with *Hippolytus* as the referent in Euripides' homonymous tragedy. Out of twelve masculine singular forms of αὐτός used in third-person (two extra times, the marker is used in first or second person, 'I αὐτός and 'you' αὐτός), nine occurrences have the protagonist as the referent. Here is a synopsis of the occurrences throughout the play:

Line	Form	Speaker	Local co-text
54	ἄμ' αὐτῶι	Aphrodite	The κῶμος following him
895	αὐτόν	Theseus	Poseidon will send him to Hades
899	αὐτός	Chorus	He <i>ipse</i> is here
1084	αὐτόν	Theseus	Drag him away
1166	αὐτόν	Messenger	His own chariot destroyed him
1172	αὐτόν	Theseus	The cudgel of Justice struck him
1187	παρ' αὐτόν	Messenger	We set the horses beside him

(cont.)

Line	Form	Speaker	Local co-text
1236	αὐτός	Messenger	He, entangled ...
1265	αὐτόν	Theseus	Bring him

Each of these occurrences is meaningful if we take only the local co-text into account. Lines 54 and 1187 (including ἄμ' αὐτῶι and παρ' αὐτόν respectively) feature a centre-periphery construction: in 54 the κῶμος of the servants (periphery) is following *him* (centre) as soon as he returns from the hunt; in 1187 the servants (again, the periphery) prepare the chariot with the horses (periphery) beside the master (the centre). In 1084, 1166, 1172 (metaphoric action), 1236, and 1265, the semantic relevance of Hippolytus' body simply emerges from the semantics of the host clause ('drag him away', 'the chariot destroyed him', 'the cudgel struck him', 'he, entangled ...', and 'bring him' respectively). I link these occurrences to the thematic relevance of the male body in pain:²⁵ just as the visualisation of dying bodies comes to the fore with gripping details in other plays, the tragedy of Hippolytus cannot prescind from the reported spectacle of his disfigured body. Perhaps the most striking of these passages is 1169–1172 where Theseus is eager to learn from Poseidon how he wrecked Hippolytus:

[12] Euripides *Hippolytus* 1169–1172

Θη. ὦ θεοί, Πόσειδόν θ'· ὡς ἄρ' ἦσθ' ἐμὸς πατήρ
 ὀρθῶς, ἀκούσας τῶν ἐμῶν κατευγμάτων.
 πῶς καὶ διώλετ'; εἰπέ, τῶι τρόπῳ Δίκης
 ἔπαισεν αὐτὸν ῥόπτρον αἰσχύναντά με;

Th. (*stretching out his arms, palms upward, in prayer*) Merciful gods! So after all you are truly my father, Poseidon, since you heard my prayer! How did he perish? Tell me, how did the cudgel of Justice strike him for dishonoring me?²⁶

²⁵ See in particular Hawley (1998).

²⁶ The translations of the *Hippolytus* are from Kovacs (1995).

The question πῶς καὶ διώλετ' (1171) shows no encoding of the grammatical subject, which tells us that Hippolytus is fully in focus in Theseus' mind. This makes the following αὐτός significant: within the metaphorical expression 'the cudgel of Justice stroke him' αὐτός is almost required if the intended referent is Hippolytus' body.²⁷

The remaining instances occur in the following passage:

[13] Euripides *Hippolytus* 887–900

- Θη. ... ἀλλ', ὦ πάτερ Πόσειδον, ἃς ἐμοί ποτε
ἀράς ὑπέσχου τρεῖς, μιᾷ κατέργασαι
τούτων ἐμὸν παῖδ', ἡμέραν δὲ μὴ φύγοι
τήνδ', εἴπερ ἡμῖν ὥπασας σαφεῖς ἀράς.
Χο. ἄναξ, ἀπεύχου ταῦτα πρὸς θεῶν πάλιν,
γνώσῃ γὰρ αὖθις ἀμπλακῶν· ἐμοὶ πιθοῦ.
Θη. οὐκ ἔστι. καὶ πρὸς γ' ἐξελῶ σφε τήσδε γῆς,
δυοῖν δὲ μοίραιν θατέραι πεπλήξεται·
ἢ γὰρ Ποσειδῶν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἄϊδου δόμους
θανόντα πέμψει τὰς ἐμὰς ἀράς σέβων
ἢ τήσδε χώρας ἐκπεσὼν ἀλώμενος
ξένην ἐπ' αἶαν λυπρὸν ἀντλήσει βίον.
Χο. καὶ μὴν ὅδ' αὐτὸς παῖς σὸς ἐς καιρὸν πάρα
Ἴππόλυτος· ...

- Th. ... But, father Poseidon, those three curses you once promised me—
with one of them kill my son, and may he not live out this day, if
indeed you have granted me curses I may rely on.
Ch. My lord, I beg you by the gods, take back your prayer! For you will
learn in time that you have made a mistake. Take my advice!
Th. It cannot be. And what is more, I shall banish him from this land,
and of two fates one shall strike him: either Poseidon, honoring my
curses, will send him dead to the house of Hades or being banished
from here he will wander over foreign soil and drain to the dregs a
life of misery. [*Enter Hippolytus by Eisosdos B.*]
Ch. Look! Your son Hippolytus is here himself, a timely arrival!

27 Something similar happens in line 761; see above, section 5.2.

In this excerpt, Hippolytus is primed in 889 (ἐμόν παιῖδα) and recalled in 893 by the means of σφε. Then, Theseus formulates two alternatives for ruining his son's life. In the first, we find αὐτόν, whereas in the alternative there is no marker for Hippolytus (null anaphora; see the finite verb ἀντλήσει, 898, and the two participles ἐκπεσών ἀλώμενος, 897). The full accessibility of Hippolytus as the referent from 889 through 900 makes αὐτόν in 895 useless unless something else is implied by its use. The semantics of the host clause disambiguates the sense: what Theseus wishes is that Poseidon sends *his dead body* to Hades.

The later αὐτός (899) is, conversely, a deictic marker of identity: the chorus points to Hippolytus (see καὶ μὴν and ὅδε) by denoting him (παῖς σός), calling him (Ἰππόλυτος), and confirming his identity (αὐτός, 'in person').

5.7 αὐτός as a Reflexive Marker

Towards the end of the Cassandra's long scene in *Agamemnon* (1172–1330), the prophetess announces her own imminent death by setting forth a contradiction that is in line with further shocking predictions about Agamemnon and about Orestes.²⁸

[14] Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 1322–1323

Κα. ἄπαξ ἔτ' εἰπεῖν ῥῆσιν ἢ θρήνον θέλω
ἐμόν τὸν αὐτῆς ...

Ca. I would make one speech more, or it may be a dirge—my own.²⁹

Fraenkel (1950: ad 1323) writes: 'By adding ἐμόν τὸν αὐτῆς Cassandra points to the peculiarity of her situation, for it is in itself contrary to the nature of things that anyone should sing or speak his own dirge.' Indeed, his translation captures the paradox by inserting a dash before ἐμόν τὸν αὐτῆς. My point is that αὐτῆς in this peculiar construction emphatically refers to Cassandra's own self ('mine, of myself').³⁰ The cognitive and pragmatic implication of αὐτός in this case resides

28 On this as a 'mad-scene', see especially Schein (1982).

29 The translation is from Fraenkel (1950).

30 Pearson (1910: ad loc.) provides further Euripidean examples of what he calls a 'loosely added genitive' after ἐμόν. While the Loeb edition (by Smyth; see Sommerstein 2008) has αὐτῆς with rough breathing, not only Fraenkel but also Denniston and Page (1957) and West (1990) have αὐτῆς with smooth breathing, thus indirectly acknowledging the form as being in line with archaic reflexive usages of αὐτός with smooth breathing (e.g. *Odyssey* 4.247), and at the same time as distinct from the more common ἐμαυτόν.

in the reference to the centre (Cassandra *herself*) as indirectly opposed to others for whom the dirge may be sung (periphery).

5.8 *αὐτός for Someone's (Actual) Identity, and the Incorporation of Multiple Perspectives*

The final cognitive and pragmatic illocutionary force of αὐτός that I consider draws from the subtle interplay between Odysseus-in-disguise to the eyes of many and Odysseus-the-actual-one through αὐτός in the second part of the *Odyssey*.³¹ There, uttering αὐτός as an anaphoric marker can be associated with different referents-in-the-mind, such as the hero in disguise or the hero recognised; this reveals the following co-existing cognitive and pragmatic possibilities: αὐτός can imply the reference to the person just mentioned in the discourse; it can convey someone's specific perspective adopted about the referent (for example, 'X the real one'); finally, it can retrieve the deictic value of αὐτός to point to someone's identity (*ipse*, as in *Hippolytus* 899, in [13]) or sameness between speaker and the referent of αὐτός. All these possibilities are alluded to, for example, in the following exchange between Electra and Orestes in Euripides' *Electra*:

[15] Euripides *Electra* 274, 276, 278–280, 282

Ορ. τί δῆτ' Ὀρέστης πρὸς τὰδ', Ἄργος ἦν μόληι;
[...]

Ορ. ἐλθὼν δὲ δὴ πῶς φονέας ἂν κτάνοι πατρός;
[...]

Ορ. ἦ καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ μητέρ' ἂν τλαίης κτανεῖν;

Ελ. ταῦτῳ γε πελέκει τῷ πατὴρ ἀπώλετο.

Ορ. λέγω τὰδ' αὐτῷ, καὶ βέβαια τὰπὸ σοῦ;
[...]

Ορ. φεῦ· εἴθ' ἦν Ὀρέστης πλησίον κλύων τὰδε

Or. Then what should Orestes do about this, if he comes to Argos?
[...]

Or. But if he does come, how might he kill his father's murderers?
[...]

Or. And would you dare, with him, to kill your mother?

El. Yes, with that same axe by which my father died.

31 Bonifazi (2012: 127–184).

Or. Am I to tell him this, and that your purpose is steadfast?

[...]

Or. Ah! Would that Orestes were nearby, to hear that!³²

Into the mouth of Orestes-in-disguise, Euripides puts an explicit reference to Orestes-the-real-one as the former envisions the latter's hypothetical arrival ('Αργος ἦν μόλις, 274). Likewise in 282, Orestes-in-disguise wishes that Orestes-the-real-one is near and is able to hear the current exchange. However, in two lines that occur in between, Euripides lets Orestes-in-disguise use αὐτός ambiguously: in Electra's perspective the anaphoric marker means 'Orestes, the referent I just mentioned'; in the audience's perspective it means 'the real Orestes, who is currently talking to her; they are the same persons'; in Orestes' perspective, it means 'Hey, I am exactly him, I am Orestes myself'.

Overall, this passage shows that αὐτός can be uttered to do several things at once such as connecting referents at the level of discourse coherence and suggesting sameness as well as someone's identity to different people, therefore implying the adoption (and the revelation) of multiple perspectives at once.

6 Conclusion

By taking contemporary accounts of how we process anaphoric markers into account as well as pragmatic and cognitive readings of third-person pronouns in modern literary texts as well as in ancient Greek lyric and epic, it is possible to see what (ἐ)κεῖνος and αὐτός do in tragedies, at least in some passages. The similarities in language use that I see across ancient Greek lyric, epic, and drama reinforce the idea that these key words are the result of meaningful choices rather than metrically convenient solutions. Objections regarding the value of interpreting what words do not say explicitly are answered by stating that *everything* we understand from words (more so from poetic words) comes from our inferences (however well-read) about what they meant, individually and in context.

The pragmatics of (ἐ)κεῖνος and αὐτός in tragedies reside in the inferences that they invite on multiple levels: about the status of referents in the mind of the speaker(s), about personal or intersubjective attitudes towards them, and about how the discourse unfolds (transitions/no transitions; global narrative

³² The translation is from Kovacs (1998).

trajectories). They may carry their own illocutionary force (e.g. αὐτός meaning 'someone's body') and/or participate in the broader illocutionary force of the host unit (e.g. 'I long for κείνοι' conveying a positively-oriented distance between mortals and special persons). Their force may reside in multiple functions carried out at once. This is not different from the multiple functions that individual deictic markers may fulfil (let us think of the multiple co-working readings of the referents of 'we' in the Queen's 'We are the champions'). Finally, individual occurrences of (ἐ)κείνος and αὐτός can remind the audience of overarching implicatures (conventional as well as conversational) concerning the same character through different scenes or moments of the play, allowing us to appreciate different facets or, conversely, invariant thoughts associated with a specific character.³³

As I close this paper, I would like to raise a few questions for further (much-needed) research. How many times is Ajax recalled as οὔτος in the Sophoclean play? When and how does αὐτός occur in open recognition scenes and disguise situations? What is the frequency of (ἐ)κείνος in laments and in choral songs? Are the discussed as well as other anaphoric markers in drama connected to someone's perspective or some intersubjective (traditional) perspective in particular? How are (ἐ)κείνος and αὐτός used in comedy? I hope this contribution will stimulate more work on such questions or at least foster awareness of the linguistic and poetic relevance of (ἐ)κείνος, αὐτός, and possibly all anaphoric expressions in Greek drama.

Acknowledgements

The author warmly thanks Gunther Martin and all the organisers of a highly stimulating conference.

References

- Ariel, M., (1990), *Accessing Noun-phrase Antecedents*, London/New York.
 Baker, C.L., (1995), 'Contrast, Discourse Prominence, and Intensification, with Special Reference to Locally Free Reflexives in British English', *Language* 71, 63–101.
 Bark, J., (1954), *G.E. Lessing, Nathan der Weise*, Munich.

33 The consideration of all these aspects could correspond to more attention to the occurrence and repetition of (ἐ)κείνος and αὐτός in commentaries as well as in translations.

- Bolkestein, A.M. & Grift, M. van de, (1994), 'Participant Tracking in Latin Discourse', in J. Herman (ed.), *Linguistic Studies on Latin*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 283–302.
- Bonifazi, A., (2004), 'κείνος in Pindar: between Grammar and Poetic Intention', *Classical Philology* 99, 283–299.
- Bonifazi, A., (2009), 'Discourse Cohesion through Third Person Pronouns: the Case of κείνος and αὐτός in Homer', in G. Wakker & S. Bakker (eds.), *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*, Leiden/Boston, 1–19.
- Bonifazi, A., (2010), 'Anaphoric Pronouns αὐτός and κείνος in Homer: a Cognitive-pragmatic approach', in I. Putzu, G. Paulis, G. Nieddu, & P. Cuzzolin (eds.), *La morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia. Atti del VII Incontro internazionale di linguistica greca, Cagliari 13–15 settembre 2007*, Milan, 97–114.
- Bonifazi, A., (2012), *Homer's Versicolored Fabric: the Evocative Power of Ancient Greek Epic Word-making*, Washington, D.C./Cambridge, Mass.
- Bonifazi, A., (2019), 'Autos and the Center-Periphery Image Schema', in W.M. Short & E. Mocciaro (eds.), *The Embodied Basis of Constructions in Greek and Latin*, Berlin, 126–148.
- Bonifazi, A., Drummen, A., & Kreij, M. de, (2016), *Particles in Ancient Greek Discourse. Five Volumes Exploring Particle Use Across Genres*, Washington, D.C. <http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/6391> (31/03/2020).
- Brown, G. & Yule, G., (1983), *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge.
- Bühler, K., (1934), *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*, Jena.
- Chafe, W., (1996), 'Inferring Identifiability and Accessibility', in Fretheim and Gundel, 37–46.
- Christie, A., (2008), *Miss Marple and Mystery. The Complete Short Stories*, London.
- Clancy, P.M., (1980), 'Referential Choice in English and Japanese Narrative Discourse', in W.L. Chafe (ed.), *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*, Norwood, 127–202.
- Conte, M.-E., (1996), 'Anaphoric Encapsulation', in W. de Mulder and L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Coherence and Anaphora*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1–10.
- Copeland, E., (2006), *Jane Austen, Sense and Sensibility*, Cambridge.
- Cornish, F., (1999), *Anaphora, Discourse, and Understanding*, Oxford.
- Dancygier, B., (2008), 'Personal Pronouns, Blending, and Narrative Viewpoint', in A. Tyler, Y. Kim, & M. Takada (eds.), *Language in the Context of Use: Discourse and Cognitive Approaches to Language*, Berlin, 167–182.
- Daneš, F., (1990), 'On the Stylistic Relevance of the Choice of Anaphoric Expressions', *Rivista di Linguistica* 2, 121–139.
- Denniston, J.D. & Page, D.L., (1957), *Aeschylus, Agamemnon*, Oxford.
- Diggle, J., (1981–1994), *Euripidis fabulae*, 3 vols., Oxford.
- Emmott, C., (1997), *Narrative Comprehension*, Oxford/New York.
- Finglass, P.J., (2011), *Sophocles, Ajax*, Cambridge.

- Fossard, M., Garnham, A., & Wind Cowles, H., (2012), 'Between Anaphora and Deixis ... The Resolution of the Demonstrative Noun Phrase "that N"; *Language and Cognitive Processes* 27, 1385–1404.
- Fox, B., (1987), 'Anaphora in Popular Written English Narratives', in: R.S. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse: Outcome of a Symposium, Eugene, Oregon, June 1984*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 157–174.
- Fraenkel, E., (1950), *Agamemnon*, vol. 3, Oxford.
- Fretheim, T. & Gundel, J.K. (eds.), (1996), *Reference and Referent Accessibility*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Grosz, B., (1977), *The Representation and Use of Focus in Dialogue Understanding. Technical Report 151*, SRI International, Menlo Park.
- Hagège C., (1974), 'Les pronoms logophoriques', *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 69, 287–310.
- Hawley, R., (1998), 'The Male Body as Spectacle in Attic Drama', in L. Foxhall & J. Salmon (eds.), *Thinking Men: Masculinity and its Self-representation in the Classical Tradition*, London/New York, 83–99.
- Hinterwimmer, S. & Bosch, P., (2016), 'Demonstrative Pronouns and Perspective', in P. Grosz & P. Patel-Grosz (eds.), *The Impact of Pronominal Form on Interpretation*, Berlin/New York, 189–220.
- Hofmann, T.R., (1989), 'Paragraphs & Anaphora', *Journal of Pragmatics* 13, 239–250.
- Jebb, R.C., (31907 [1868]), *Sophocles, Ajax*, Cambridge.
- Jebb, R.C., (31900 [1885]), *Sophocles, Oedipus Coloneus*, Cambridge.
- Jong, I.J.F. de, (1997), 'Τὰς Introducing Embedded Narratives', in A. Rijksbaron (ed.), *New Approaches to Greek Particles*, Amsterdam, 175–186.
- König, E. & Siemund, P., (2000), 'Locally Free Self-forms, Logophoricity, and Intensification in English', *English Language and Linguistics* 4, 183–204.
- Kovacs, D., (1995), *Euripides*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Mass./London.
- Kovacs, D., (1998), *Euripides*, vol. 3, Cambridge, Mass./London.
- Kroon, C., (2007), 'Anaphoric Reference in Latin Epic. Discourse functions of Referential Choices in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*', paper given at the XIV Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Erfurt.
- Lakoff, R., (1974), 'Remarks on This and That', *Chicago Linguistic Society* 10, 345–356.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. & Wilson, N.G., (1990), *Sophoclis fabulae*, Oxford.
- Meineck, P.W., (2006), 'Ancient Drama Illuminated by Contemporary Stagecraft: some Thoughts on the Use of Masks and *Ekkyklēma* in Ariane Mnouchkine's *Le Dernier Caravansérail* and Sophocles' *Ajax*', *American Journal of Philology* 127, 453–460.
- Nagy, G., (1990), *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*, Baltimore.
- Page, D.L., (1972), *Aeschlyi septem quae supersunt tragoediae*, Oxford.
- Pearson, A.C., (1910), *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus, translated by W. Headlam*. Cambridge.

- Ruijgh, C.J., (2006), 'The Use of the Demonstratives ὅδε, οὗτος and (ἐ)κεῖνος in Sophocles', in I.J.F. de Jong & A. Rijksbaron (eds.), *Sophocles and the Greek Language: Aspects of Diction, Syntax and Pragmatics*, Leiden/Boston, 151–162.
- Schein, S.L., (1982), 'The Cassandra Scene in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*', *Greece & Rome* 29, 11–16.
- Sommerstein, A.H., (2008), *Aeschylus*, vol. 2, Cambridge Mass./London.
- Taillardat, J., (1987), 'A propos de grec αὐτός: ipséité, identité, anaphore', *Lalies* 5, 75–86.
- Wagnon, A., (1880), *Le pronom d'identité et la formule du réfléchi dans Homère, dans les poètes tragiques et chez les Doriens*, Geneva.
- West, M.L., (1990), *Aeschyli Tragoediae*, Stuttgart.