

Anna Bonifazi*

5 *Autós* and the center-periphery image schema

Abstract: The chapter suggests that the traditional interpretation of headless and non-nominative forms of *autós* as regular third person pronoun can be at least partially revised. An image schematic interpretation of *autós* implying a center and a periphery allows us to account for its various syntactical, semantic, and pragmatic meanings in a structured way. The analysis of several passages from prose and poetry provides cognitive input to the study of anaphor processing and of viewpoint phenomena. It also confirms the necessity of considering discourse units beyond the sentence level to make sense even of single words.

Keywords: CENTER-PERIPHERY image schema; *autós*, third person pronouns; intensifiers; cognitive projections; metaphorical and metonymic extensions of meaning; visual field; social rank; discourse prominence; bodies; ancient Greek

5.1 Introduction

The tale of Arion and the dolphin in Herodotus' *Histories* (1.24) is a self-contained episode that, like many others, reveals the historian's ability to tell a good story as well as his attention to paradigmatic methods of inquiry (see Cobet, 1971: 145–151; Gray, 2001; Munson, 1986). Scholarly commentary on this tale normally focuses on historical or encyclopedic information about the great musician Arion, the type of music that he performs from the deck, and the way in which the tyrant of Corinth, Periander, discovers the truth about what happened. Among the discourse strategies that make the episode a good (and memorable) piece of storytelling, the pronouns Herodotus uses to refer to Arion deserve attention. The musician undoubtedly is the protagonist throughout the story; however, he is recalled by different lexical markers, in accordance with different implications arising from the host sentences.

The tale is reported through the voice of the Corinthians and thus features a series of infinitive constructions. Arion, the protagonist, is invariably referred to in the accusative case of pronouns – first by adjectival *toûton* at the beginning of the tale¹ (1.24.1); then by the weak demonstrative *tón* (1.24.2; 1.24.5; 1.24.6), the reflexive marker *heôutón* (1.24.4) and *min . . . heôutón* (1.24.5); and finally by *autón* and *autòn . . . min* (1.24.3, 1.24.4, and 1.24.6). Two of these occurrences of *autón* can be explained through established grammatical accounts of *autós* (see section 3). At 1.24.4, *autón* occurs in

*Warm thanks to the editors and to Greg Membrez for their perceptive feedback.

1 See Bonifazi, Drummen, de Kreij, 2016: IV.3§124 on *hoûtos* at the beginning of a new discourse move in Herodotus.

indirect speech, and refers to the speaking ‘I’ Arion (*Aríona . . . paraitésasthai, . . . periideîn autòn* ACC.M.SG . . . *aeîsai*, “Arion begged them that they watch him singing”).² At 1.24.3, *keleúein tous porthméas ê autòn* ACC.M.SG *diakhrâsthai min . . . ê ekpēdân es tēn thálassan tēn takhístēn*, ‘The seamen order that he either kill himself or jump into the sea at once’, *autón* functions as a reflexive marker accompanying the pronoun *min*. The remaining two occurrences of *autón*, however, are less straightforward. In neither case is it immediately clear what motivates the choice of the form *autón* over *tón* or *toûton* or *ekeînon*. The two related passages narrate Arion’s attempt to get his own life spared (1), and his safe arrival ashore after the miraculous ride on a dolphin’s back (2):

- (1) *ouk ôn dê peíthein autòn* ACC.M.SG *toútoisi, allà keleúein tous porthméas* (Her. Hist. 1.24.3)
 ‘[He (*tón*) begs this, that he gives them the money, and [his] life is spared.] Then, **he** does not persuade [them] with these words, but the seamen order that . . . ’.³
- (2) *apobánta dê autòn* ACC.M.SG *khōréein es Kórinthon sùn tēi skeuēi* (Her. Hist. 1.24.6)
 ‘[They say that a dolphin picked him (*tón*) up, and brought him to Tainaron.] As **he** dismounted, he made his way to Corinth, with the singing costume’.

In each case, the context makes clear that Arion is already “active”, to use Chafe’s term denoting the status of an entity being “in focus” in one’s consciousness.⁴ Therefore, there is no need to recall the referent in a particularly strong way. Yet Herodotus equally could have chosen another third person pronoun instead of *autós*. Why *autós*, then? In (1) and (2), *autós* can be interpreted as a pronoun marking the referent as the focal center, surrounded by an explicit (in (1)) and implicit (in (2)) focal periphery. In (1), the pronoun marks Arion as being at the center of the narrators’ (i.e., the Corinthians’) attention, while the seamen function as peripheral items; in (2) Arion is set off from people and objects/animals: he is still wearing the singing costume,⁵ but

² On *autós* and *ekeînos* in indirect discourse, see especially Bakker, 2006: 100–101. The translations of these Herodotean passages, as well as of Sappho (4) and of Thucydides (18) are my own.

³ On *ôn dê* in Herodotus, see Bonifazi, Drummen, de Kreij, 2016: IV.3§79 and IV.5§80.

⁴ See Chafe, 1996: 40 words distinguishing between “active,” “semiaactive,” and “inactive” states of ideas: “Accessibility . . . is best understood in terms of degrees of activation in consciousness. At least three degrees are necessary to explain what we find in language . . . Ideas can be said to be either active, semiaactive, or inactive. An active idea is one that is in a person’s focus of consciousness at the moment. A semiaactive idea is one that is in peripheral consciousness, as with something on which consciousness was focused a few moments before but which has in the meantime receded from the fully active state. An inactive idea is one that is neither active nor semiaactive. It might be in long-term memory, or might never have entered consciousness before”.

⁵ The singing costume is such a prominent feature of Arion, that in this relatively short episode it is mentioned four times, i.e. *en tēi skeuēi pásēi*, 1.24.4; *pâsan tēn skeuēn*, and *sùn tēi skeuēi pásēi*, 1.24.5; *sùn tēi skeuēi*, 1.24.6.

he is alone, with nobody else around, and without the dolphin.⁶ Neither *tón*, *toûton* or *ekeînon* conveyed this sense.

This article links the use of *autós* as seemingly an unmarked third-person pronoun to the CENTER-PERIPHERY image schema described by cognitive linguists. I argue that the skeletal scenario of a core and an edge underpins the polysemy of and the different constructions involving *autós* in archaic as well as in classical texts (prose and poetry). After briefly introducing the theory of image schemas in cognitive linguistics, and the CENTER-PERIPHERY schema in particular, I survey some relevant accounts of the syntax and the semantics of *autós*, including Ekkehard König's, according to which intensifiers in different languages evoke a center and a periphery (even if in non-cognitive terms). After discussing my previous contribution to pragmatic readings of *autós* in Homer, and in particular in the *Odyssey*, I move on, in the core of the paper, to illustrate how occurrences of anaphoric *autós* in different genres reflect the CENTER-PERIPHERY image schema through various semantic, cognitive, and pragmatic implications.

5.2 The image schema CENTER-PERIPHERY

Image schemas are “skeletal structures representing spatial configurations and/or the various forces that affect a human body” (Dancygier & Sweetser, 2014: 22). Instances discussed in the cognitive linguistics literature include REMOVAL, CYCLE, ITERATION, PART-WHOLE, BALANCE, ATTRACTION, IN-OUT, FULL-EMPTY, PATH, UP-DOWN, FRONT-BACK, and CENTER-PERIPHERY.⁷ Their main function is to let us map spatial structures onto conceptual structures, and their skeletal nature makes them useful in a variety of contexts (Oakley, 2007: 215–217). Cognitive linguistics establishes particularly fruitful links between certain image schemas and polysemous lexical or morphological items: the range of (literal as well as metaphorical) meanings of a word, or the range of grammatical constructions involving a word can be explained on the basis of overarching image-schematic patterns and their transformations. For example, Pauwels (1995) argues that the image schema of Containment can account for the metaphorical usages of the English verb *put*, including those “profilng an inferred destination, as in *put in a good word for me*” and those “profilng a loss of control, as in *put out a statement*”. Other examples include the image-schematic structures underlying the different meanings of Spanish *por* and *para* (Delbecque, 1995), and

⁶ To keep a human being separate from other human beings and animals is relevant to the use of *autós* already in Wagnon, 1880, see section 5.

⁷ Image schemas have been originally explored in Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; early relevant works include Johnson, 1987; Lakoff, 1987; Lakoff & Turner, 1989. An updated list of image schemas appears in Croft & Cruse, 2004: 45.

image-schematic invariance through semantic changes of the Russian instrument marker *om* (Smith, 1999).

Image-schematic structuring is not confined to the micro-level of language, however. It is also involved in broader constructions such as extended metaphors, story plots, and even writing styles. For example, Turner (1996: 28–31) points out how pervasively stories' events may reflect the image schema PHYSICAL FORCE DYNAMICS or the image schema MOVEMENT ALONG A PATH. Freeman (1999) analyzes the figurative language of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra* by identifying not only the conceptual metaphors involved, but also the image schemas blended with those metaphors, i.e., CONTAINER, LINKS, and PATH. Freeman (2002), meanwhile, connects different image schemas to different uses of poetic imagery in the works of Robert Frost and Emily Dickinson. Kimmel (2008) sees various image schemas at work in the macro-structure(s) of narratives.

In classical studies, Pagán Cánovas (2011) has considered the image schema of EMISSION in relation to the complex metaphorical structure underlying the representations of Eros the Archer, and Apollo/Death as Grim Archer throughout ancient Greek literature. Especially relevant to the present investigation is Short's (2013) image-schematic analysis of the multiple meanings of the Latin preposition *dē*. The author argues for a minimal image schematic scenario constituting the meaning of *dē*: a trajector (dynamic entity) moves from one landmark (static entity) to another landmark (cf. Zlatev, 2007: 327–328). The landmark of destination coincides with the position of the observer, who thus perceives the trajector moving from the landmark of departure toward herself. In this sense, the image schema “entails inherent perspectivization” (Short, 2013: 384). This skeletal scenario provides the inferences that are connected to the various senses of the Latin preposition: the indication of a source point or original material, separation from something, downward motion, motion toward something, a completion process, and more. The image schematic account in question provides an explanation for the various meaning extensions of the preposition, while helping, at the same time, the interpreter/reader to disentangle the network of conceptual metaphors and metonymies being employed.

Several features of image schemas are relevant to my analysis. First is the principle of “figure/ground segregation” that characterizes “gestalts”, perceptual wholes (Evans & Green, 2006: 65). Human beings isolate the figure (a dominant shape) from the ground (elements of a scene appearing in the background). Image schemas involve minimal structures, such as a gestalt structure, which are subject to figure/ground construal.⁸ A second concept is that of “structured polysemy”, as presented in Nikiforidou (1991: 150). The article unpacks the multiple metaphorical extensions of genitive constructions in ancient and modern Greek as well as in other Indo-European

⁸ About “figure” and “ground” being similar concepts to “trajectory” and “landmark” respectively, see Talmy, 2000 and Levinson, 2003.

languages. “Structured polysemy” expresses the idea that the conceptual metaphors underlying the various semantic and pragmatic implications of a construction relate to each other in a complex but organized network. Also, synchronic polysemy plays a role in understanding diachronic semantic changes (Nikiforidou, 1991: 163, 168, 192–193).

The following fundamental aspects concerning the CENTER-PERIPHERY schema in particular, and, more generally, the cognitive semantics of space, are equally relevant. As described by Johnson (1987: 124–25) the CENTER-PERIPHERY schema involves a physical or metaphorical core and edge. The distance between the core and the edge may vary; so Kimmel (2005: 289) remarks that the image schemas “CENTER-PERIPHERY, NEAR-FAR, SCALE, and FORCE co-occur in the bodily experience of being a center of force which decreases with distance in a scalar fashion, like when a hand is extended”. Finally, Talmy (2005: 207–212) examines various categories pertaining to spatial components of scenes. Individual spatial components may reflect spatial categories such as dimension (bi-dimensional or tri-dimensional relations), number (e.g., ‘between’ requires a ground consisting of two objects), motive state (motion vs. stationariness), state of boundedness, and type of geometry. The latter deals with rectilinear vs. radial geometry (e.g., ‘away’ relates to the former, while ‘out’ relates to the latter). In turn, “radial” may refer to motion along a radius as well as around a central point. The circumcentric type can be applied to a curved periphery, to a line following a curved path, and to a rotating object (Talmy, 2005: 209–210).

5.3 The syntax and the semantics of *autós*

Autós has been called the “prototypical intensifier” in ancient Greek (see Mocciano, 2014: 247; Puddu, 2005: 207). Standard accounts hold that in the classical Greek *autós* reveals its intensifying function only as an adjunct: in attributive position, it conveys “sameness” (like Latin *idem*), whereas in predicative position it conveys “selfness” (like Latin *ipse*). *Autós* also works as intensifier when it occurs with names, with pronouns such as *min*, *nin*, *he/hé*, *hoi*, *sph-* forms, with first and second person pronouns, and even “headless”, that is, without any focus constituent, but only in the nominative case. In non-nominative cases, *autós* alone functions as a regular third person pronoun. Mocciano (2014: 248) notes that in classical Greek *autós* contributes to a new paradigm of reflexives: the former reflexive pronoun *hé* is combined with oblique cases of *autós* to produce *heaut-* forms (*heout-* in Herodotus) or compressed *haut-* forms.

Puddu (2005: 213) remarks that the use of intensifiers as anaphoric markers is cross-linguistically peculiar: only classical Greek seems to use the same lexical item for an intensifying and a plain anaphoric function. I would add that scholarship records certain usages of *autós* in archaic and classical texts that in fact do not fit the canonical account mentioned above. For instance, in a section devoted to indirect

reflexives – a reflexive marker occurring in a dependent clause whose referent is the subject of the main clause – Smyth (1920: 305) notes that oblique cases of *autós* may be used instead of *heautoû*. Powell (1934: 173) mentions “confusing oblique cases” of *autós* in Thucydides referring to the main subject, and, most of all, notes the role of editors in emending non-reflexive forms of *autós* given by manuscripts by adding rough breathing (1934: 160–162). Finally, Chantraine (1953: 157) observes that in the Homeric poems *autós* sometimes corresponds to a reflexive marker even though it shows no syntactic reflexivity. All of this suggests that at least up to Thucydides grammatical rules and the interpretation of a reflexive sense do not necessarily go together.

As for the semantics of *autós*, two considerations must be recognized, which I will associate with the results of my image schematic reading (see Bonifazi, 2012: 133–134). First, according to Taillardat (1987: 77–79), one of the basic semantic components of *autós* is a sense of separation and distinction. The meanings ‘alone’, ‘without anything else’, and the *exclusive* intensifying function (as in *I always wash my clothes myself*, on which see below) stem from this fundamental sense. Second, according to Sadoulet (1984: 62–63) *autós* makes somebody/something the primary entity which a text talks about. Argumentative prominence and discourse topicality thus constitute the level at which *autós* singles out people and objects.

5.4 Intensifiers evoking a center and periphery

In a typological account of intensifiers across languages, König (1998: 5; and see also 1991: 87–88) describes the basic semantics of intensifiers in these terms: “They evoke alternatives to the referent of their focus”; moreover, “the set of alternatives is characterized as periphery (entourage) of a centre constituted by the referent of the focus”. He identifies the following set of conditions for *X* (the referent of the focus) to be related to *Y* (a periphery):

- a. *X* has a higher rank than *Y* on a real-world hierarchy;
- b. *X* is more important than *Y* in a specific situation;
- c. *X* is identified relative to *X* (kinship-terms part-whole, etc.);
- d. *X* is the subject of consciousness, centre of observation, etc”. (König, 1998: 6).

For example, in *The Queen herself will come to the final*, the Queen is the center by virtue of being high in rank, the relevant periphery being made up by the subordinates or entourage (König, 1998: 5–6). Evoking a set of alternatives works particularly well for adnominal intensifiers (i.e., with a small, noun-phrase scope, and semantically inclusive, as in *the Queen herself*). However, it holds also for adverbial intensifiers (i.e., with larger, clause scope, and semantically exclusive, as in *I always wash my clothes myself*): in that case, the referent of the focus is “the interested party for the action mentioned in the sentence . . . as opposed to possible alternatives” (König,

1998: 7). In a later piece on the same topic, König (2001: 749) reinforces the idea by adding a drawing resembling Saturn surrounded by a ring: Saturn represents X, the referent of the focus, while the ring represents Y, the periphery.

Two more findings in König's works are crucial for the present argument. First, cross-linguistic variation concerning adnominal and adverbial intensifiers consistently follows the Animacy Hierarchy: namely, human proper nouns > human common nouns > animate common nouns > inanimate common nouns. An intensifier combined with a noun phrase at a certain point of the hierarchy can combine with noun phrases to the left (König, 1998: 12; 2001: 754). A second anthropocentric aspect is the semantic development of intensifiers in different languages from nouns referring to body parts.⁹ König sees in the semantic changes of intensifiers as a process of "metaphorical extension: a structure of the body which distinguishes centre and periphery is imposed on social groups . . . [I]t seems plausible that intensifiers were originally only used with persons of high rank in all languages" (König, 1998: 12).

5.5 *Autós* in Homer, and the link to *au-* adverbs and particles

Wagnon (1880: vi) defines the basic function of *autós* as follows: "The fundamental function of the pronoun *autós* consists in opposing someone to someone else, and in shedding a lively and striking light on this person, therefore [being] separate from what surrounds him. [[L]a fonction fondamentale du pronom *autós* consiste à opposer une personne à d'autres, et à présenter à l'esprit sous un jour vif et frappant cette personne, ainsi détachée de ce qui l'entoure]". Given this basic function, Wagnon (1880: 107) then groups usages of *autós* into several categories, including: *autós* in opposition to others (divided into five subgroups: father vs. other members of the family; military chief vs. other members of the army; individual vs. horses or chariots; Hector as *autós*; the Greeks vs. their ships); *autós* referring to bodies and to corpses; *autós* referring to the object itself distinct from its parts or ornaments; *autós* meaning 'alone'; *autós* meaning 'the same'; *autós* suggesting the value that owners attach to objects; *autós* suggesting the identity of a person who performs contrasting actions; *autós* suggesting complete identity, i.e., that of divinities; the anaphoric meaning; the reflexive meaning.

These categories generally match not only König's notions of center and periphery, but also my pragmatic readings of *autós* constructions in the *Iliad* as well as in the *Odyssey* (Bonifazi, 2012: 138–145). In the Homeric poems, the referent of *autós* is regularly singled out visually (*qua* prominent among other people participating in a scene), or socially (*qua* higher-rank), or thematically (*qua* prominent in the

⁹ Such as 'body', 'soul', 'hand', 'head', 'marrow', and 'eye'. See König, 1998: 12; 2001: 756; Puddu, 2005: 90–92.

discourse). *Autós* may also work as indirect reflexive marker (2012: 145–149), and as a marker of someone’s identity (2012: 150–153). *Autós* meaning ‘the same’ invites the audience to maintain visual attention on somebody/something just mentioned (2012: 153–155). The pragmatic aspects of these meanings reside in the link between the use of the word and its discourse implications beside the syntax of the host clause. These aspects can be connected to the use of adverbs lexically bound, such as *autíka*, *autós*, *aútis*, *aúthi/autóthi*, and, most of all, to the visual and narrative functions of *aû*, *aûte*, and *autár*. The connections between *autós* and *aû*, *aûte*, and *autár* in particular, concern the metanarrative intention to isolate, to separate scenes, subjects, and list entries being narrated in sequence. They also relate to the anaphoricity expressed at the level of performance, as the primary narrator use these markers to introduce new information either about already mentioned entities, or within the same overarching narrative frame.

The investigation of the use of *autós* with Odysseus as the referent throughout the *Odyssey* (2012: 155–183) leads to further findings. The hero is recalled by means of the pronoun *autós* (in any grammatical case) in situations where his physical position or his actions are set against the position or the actions of the companions. His being at the center of everyone’s attention in the second part of the poem is more than once interwoven with allusions to his identity – the allusions being in turn a sophisticated play involving the stance of some characters as well as the primary narrator’s and the audience’s. The result is a picture of the use of anaphoric *autós* that disproves the common equivalence to a plain third-person pronoun.

The next section of the present work aims to show that processing anaphoric *autós* can involve cognitive operations and inferences very similar to the standard understanding of intensifying or emphatic *autós*, in Homer and later. As I will suggest below, this view is informed by – and informs – the pragmatics not only of the immediate co-text, but also of the ongoing discourse beyond the sentence level.

5.6 The CENTER-PERIPHERY scenarios evoked by *autós*: Linguistic evidence in and beyond Homer

König argues that intensifiers in several languages evoke a set of alternatives, whether explicitly mentioned or just implied. Although König does not mention the cognitive linguistic notion of image schemas, his explanations and accompanying illustration harmonize with an image-schematic understanding of the basic meaning of intensifiers. In what follows, I interpret the metaphorical extensions mentioned by König in terms of the skeletal structure CENTER-PERIPHERY, and I identify further metaphorical extensions. However, unlike König, I focus exclusively on ancient Greek *autós*, and on the grammatical usage of *autós* that is commonly considered non-intensifying, namely anaphoric *autós*. This deserves some explanation.

Coupling the intensifying usages with the CENTER-PERIPHERY schema is, I believe, intuitively simple. Constructions involving intensifying *autós* as an adjunct in predicative or attributive position, including *autós* accompanying nouns, personal names or other pronouns such as *min*, *nin*, *he/hé*, *hoi*, *sph-* forms, and first- or second-person pronouns, can be said to embody the CENTER-PERIPHERY schema by virtue of tangible morpho-syntactic characteristics. These characteristics are objectively recognizable, and are what explicitly contributes to the conceptual saliency of a certain entity with respect to other entities. As for *autós* alone in the nominative case, which is acknowledged to be emphatic as well, the combination of agency plus subjectness (and, in Homer, singular forms being far more frequent than plural forms) in a “pro-drop” language, where nominative and accusative pronouns may be omitted (see Puddu, 2005: 14), calls for an equally clear grammatical representation of a foregrounded center. The following three passages exemplify the point:

- (3) *egò dé, ô ándres, ei hōs málista alēthē légousin hoi katégoroi, hup’ autoîn^{GEN.M/F.DU} mèn phēmì toîn theoîn sesôisthai.* (And. *Myst.* 113)
 ‘But I maintain, gentlemen, that even if every word of the prosecution’s story is true, it was **the Goddesses themselves** who saved my life [lit. I have been rescued by the Goddesses themselves]’. (tr. Maidment, 1968).
- (4) *óssa dé moi télessai thûmos imérrei, téleson, sù d’ áuta^{NOM.F.SG} súmmakhos ésson.* (Sappho fr. 1.26–28)
 ‘And what my heart desires to accomplish, please accomplish it, and **you yourself** be my ally’.
- (5) *Atréidēs d’ ebōēsen idē zōnnusthai ánōgen Argeíous· en d’ autòs^{NOM.M.SG} edúseto nōropa khalkón.* (Hom. *Il.* 11.15–16)
 ‘And Atreus’ son cried out aloud and drove the Achaians to gird them, while **he himself** put the shining bronze upon him’.¹⁰

These grammatical configurations of *autós* allow the reader to easily infer Demeter and Persephone in (3), Aphrodite in (4), and Agamemnon in (5) as the centers, while understanding the speaking ‘I’ and the court (3), the singing ‘I’ (4), and Agamemnon’s companions (5) as the periphery.

What seems less intuitive, and is definitely not reflected in general accounts of ancient Greek *autós*, is to consider if and how the image of Saturn and the rings applies to *autós* when it does not accompany any other pronoun, and in non-nominative cases. König does not discuss this, and Puddu limits herself to observing that in a

¹⁰ All translations of Homer are by Lattimore, 1951; 1967.

typological perspective the use of intensifiers as anaphoric markers is peculiar. This is why I confine my analysis to instances of anaphoric *autós* in non-nominative cases. If elements of the CENTER-PERIPHERY image schema are detectable in non-nominative cases, they come from the consideration of the following linguistic aspects: the lexical choice of *autós* over *ekeînos*, *hoûtos*, *hó*, *min*, and all the discourse elements that co-occur beyond the sentence level. Only the joint processing of these aspects allows us to see in *autós* the linguistic embodiment of the CENTER-PERIPHERY schema.

5.6.1 An individual at the center of the visual field, and more individuals around him/her

As I see it, the fundamental CENTER-PERIPHERY scenario evoked by *autós* depicts a figure – the center – radially surrounded by a backgrounded periphery. The center, *qua* figure, is distinct from the periphery *qua* ground. The center is a single or unified entity, while the periphery is multiple. A recurrent realization of this scenario, especially in the Homeric poems, is a situation where the referent of *autós* is put at the center of the visual field being depicted or implied. The periphery is constituted by a plurality of people around this singled-out individual. The visual center metaphorically becomes the center of the joint attention of the author, the internal characters, and the (reading or listening) audience.

- (6) *hîxen d' es klisiên hoû huiéos· énth' ára tôn ge
heûr' hadinà stenákhonta· phîloi d' amph' autòn_{ACC.M.SG} hetâiroi
essuménōs epénonto kai entúnonto áriston·
toîsi d' oîs lásios mégas en klisiēi hiéreuto.
hè dè mál' ánh' autoîo_{GEN.M/N.SG} kathézeto pótnia mētēr,
kheirí té min katérexen épos t' éphat' ék t' onómaze. (Hom. Il. 24.122–27)*
'And she made her way to the shelter of her son, and there found him
in close lamentation, and his beloved companions about **him**
were busy at their work and made ready the morning meal, and there
stood a great fleecy sheep being sacrificed in the shelter.
His honored mother came close to him and sat down beside **him**,
and stroked him with her hand and called him by name and spoke to him'.

At Zeus's behest, Thetis reaches her son Achilles in his tent in order to persuade him to release the corpse of Hector. The narrator depicts the scene by mentioning first Thetis' arrival (*tón ge*, 122, conveying her visualization of the son), the companions' activities, and Thetis's actions before she speaks (*min*, 127, possibly implying a shift in attention from Achilles to Thetis). In lines 123 and 126, *amph'autón* and *anh'autoio* consistently refer to the referent, Achilles, as the center around which things happen, even though he is not the grammatical subject of the relevant clauses. Prepositions

such as *ankhí*, *amphí*, *epí* and *perí* near *autós* frequently encodes the “circumcentric” idea of CENTER-PERIPHERY.

Example (7) features *perí* + *autós*, and includes two variants with respect to example (6): the pronoun is a plural form, and yet it represents a unified center with respect to the periphery constituted by several peoples. Also, the visual field in this case coincides with an implied mental geographical map.

(7) *Amazónes gâr Áreōs mèn tò palaiòn êsan thugatéres, oikoûsai dè parà tôn Thermódonta potamón, mónai mèn hōplisménai sidérōi tôn perí autás_{ACC.F.PL}, prōtai dè tôn pántōn eph’ híppous anabásai . . . árkhousai dè pollōn ethnōn, kai érgōi mèn toûs perí autás_{ACC.F.PL} katadedoulōménai.* (Lys. Orat. 2.4–5)

‘In ancient times were the Amazons, daughters of Ares, dwelling beside the river Thermodon; they alone of the people round about [lit. around **them**] were armed with iron, and they were first of all to mount horses . . . Ruling over many nations, they had in fact achieved the enslavement of those around **them**’. (tr. Lamb, 1930)

The first instance of glorious deeds by the ancestors in sections 3–16 of Lysias’ *Funeral Oration* (devoted to the mythological past of Athens) is the repulse of the invasion by the Amazons. The opening statements about the Amazons rhetorically enhance Athenian superiority by clarifying the positive virtues that make their power stand out: they were the only women to arm themselves, and the first to mount horses;¹¹ furthermore, they had enslaved the peoples around them. Twice *perí autás* serves to put them at the center of the map, and to make them stand out from other peoples.

(6) and (7) show that the perception of a referent being placed at the center of a given space does not hold just for the sentence including *autós*, but it extends to a stretch of discourse having a certain individual (or a group of people) as the central topic. This matches Sadoulet’s (1984: 62–63) conclusion that “It is the referent that is brought to consciousness as quickly as possible. We call it the *first evident* (item) of the contextual idioscosmos [C’est le référent qu’on rappellera le plus vite à la conscience. . . . Nous l’appellons *premier évident* de l’idio-cosme contextuel]”.¹²

The next example profiles the center as involving the sphere of a single human being as opposed to animals (non-human entities) surrounding them (the periphery):¹³

(8) *tís târ tôn ôkh’ áristos eēn sú moi énepe Moûsa*

¹¹ See Todd, 2007: 215–216: “Being the first and/or only people to have done something is normally in the epitaphic corpus a positive virtue predicated of those celebrated . . . This is one of very few occasions when the motif is applied to non-Athenians”.

¹² On *autós* referring to the macrotopic of discourse, see Puddu, 2005: 216–217; see also König, 2001: 755–757 about intensifiers as topic markers.

¹³ For this subsection I draw elements of content from Wagnon, 1880, who groups the meanings *autós* in a way that is highly compatible with the present cognitive reading.

*autôn*_{GEN./M./N.PL.} *ēd' híppōn, hoi hám' Atréidēisin héponto.* (Hom. *Il.* 2.761–62)
 ‘Tell me then, Muse, who of them all was the best and bravest,
 of **the men**, and the men’s horses, who went with the sons of Atreus’.

The Iliadic Catalogue of the Ships concludes with a section on the best of the best, heroes as well as horses. At line 762, *autôn ēd' híppōn* prompts an image schematic scenario, however minimal, with human beings at the center, and horses at the periphery.¹⁴ Analogous cases appear in the *Odyssey*, whenever Odysseus or the companions are referred to by *autós* to single out their action with respect to the ship’s location.

5.6.2 Individuals superior in rank to, or more important than, other people

König’s first two conditions for *X* (the referent of the focus) to be related to *Y* (a periphery) are that *X* has a higher rank than *Y* in a real-world hierarchy, and that *X* is more important than *Y* in a specific situation (see above). This basically instantiates metaphorical transfers from the domain of visual space to the domain of social hierarchies, and then to the domain of prominence in a discourse context. Passages (9)–(11) illustrate social CENTER-PERIPHERY scenarios, while (12) and (13) illustrate contingent and less contingent discourse prominence.

- (9) *hōs nūn Néstorí dôke diamperēs émata pánta*
*autôn*_{ACC./M./SG.} *mèn liparōs gēraskémen en megároisin,*
huiéas aū pinitóús te kai énkhesin eínai arístous. (Hom. *Od.* 4.209–11)
 ‘[Easily recognized is the line of that man, for whom Kronos’
 son weaves good fortune in his marrying and begetting,]
 as now he has given to Nestor, all his days, for **himself**
 to grow old prosperously in his own palace, and also
 that his sons should be clever and excellent in the spear’s work’.

While talking to Peisistratus (Nestor’s son), Menelaus depicts a peaceful and almost idyllic scene featuring Nestor enjoying his elderly life and blessed by excellent sons. *Autós* isolates the most important member of the family, while the sons serve as the periphery (note the particle *au*, which introduces a separate entry). As Wagnon (1880: 5) reminds us, in the *Iliad* this social implication frequently applies to military chiefs as opposed to their men (see, e.g., Agamemnon in (5) above). Note, too, that the gestalt-distinction between figure and ground that operates as part of the CENTER-PERIPHERY

¹⁴ I remind the reader that Arion in (2) is *autós* not only because he is alone, but also because at that point he is without the dolphin.

schema also entails the idea of segregation: several scholars have suggested, not by chance, a sense of *autós* involving aloneness and isolation.¹⁵

Gods are prototypical higher-rank entities in the ancient Greek worldview. Passage (10) represents an instance in formal discourse, while (11) confirms gods-as-centers in irreverent comic contexts.

(10) *prôton mén, ên d' egô, tò mégiston kai perì tôn megístôn pseûdos ho eipôn ou kalôs epseúsato hōs Ouranós te êrgásato há phēsi drásai autôn*^{ACC.M.SG} *Hēsíodos, hó te aû Krónos hōs etimōrésato autôn*^{ACC.M.SG}. (Pl. *Rep.* 377e)

'First, I said, the one who spoke the greatest falsehood about the greatest [gods] did not speak falsely well, when he said that Uranus accomplished the things that Hesiod says **he** did, and what [Hesiod says] Cronus did in turn, that he took revenge on **him**'. (tr. slightly adapted from Marušič, 2005)

I interpret anaphoric *autós* occurring twice in this passage not only as Socrates' way of avoiding ambiguity in the reference to many male individuals, but more specifically as a strategy to draw the attention of his interlocutor to Uranus-the-god-and-father-of-Cronus, whose actions are the central topic of the argument against Hesiod.¹⁶ Any other way to recall him (for example, *tôn theón*, 'the god') would have not achieved the same effect.

The following usage of *autós* deliberately, and meta-poetically, employs the pronoun with referents that are (mockingly) considered higher in rank.

(11) SOCRATES *ô méga semnai Nephélai, phanerôs êkoúsaté mou kalésantos. éisthou phônês háma kai brontês mukēsaménēs theósepton; STREPSIADES kai sébomái g', ô polutímētoi, kai bouólomai antapopardeîn pròs tās brontás· hoútōs autās*^{ACC.F.PL} *tetramainō kai pephóbēmai.* (Ar. *Nub.* 291–94)

'SOCRATES Most stately Clouds, you have clearly heard my summons. (to Strepsiades) Did you mark their voice and, in concert, the bellowing thunder that prompts holy reverence?

STREPSIADES I do revere you, illustrious ones, and I'm ready to answer those thunderclaps with a fart; that's how much I fear and tremble at **them**'. (tr. Henderson, 1998)

Strepsiades echoes Socrates' worshipful attitude towards the Clouds, as if they are goddesses to revere and to fear. The thunders (*brontás*, 294) represent their holy

¹⁵ See, e.g., Monro, 1891: 218; Taillardat, 1987: 77–78. Let us also think of the exclusive implication of "X-self" intensifiers with clause scope (see above).

¹⁶ On the context of this passage see in particular Marušič, 2005.

manifestation (*autás* possibly referring to *brontás* as well as to an implied *nephélas*), but the bodily response of the disciple reverses any sense of veneration.

The next passages ((12) and (13)) instantiate discourse strategies involving *autós* to refer to someone who is a major figure in the context of local circumstances and thoughts (12), and in a broader discourse framework (13).

(12) *toúto dè tò ágos hoi Lakedaimónioi ekéleuon elaúnein dèthen toîs theoîs prôton timōrountes, eidótes dè Perikléa tòn Xanthíppou prosekhómenon autôî [see n. 17] katà tèn mētéra kai nomízontes ekpesóntos **autoû**^{GEN.M/N.SG} rháion <àn> sphísi prokhōreîn tà apò tòn Athēnaíōn. ou méntoi tosoúton élpizon pathēin àn **autòn**^{ACC.M.SG} toúto hóson diabolèn oísein **autôî**^{DAT.M/N.SG} pròs tèn pòlin hōs kai dià tèn ekeínou xumphoràn tò méros éstai ho pólemos. òn gār dunatótatos tòn kath' heautòn kai ágōn tèn politeían...* (Thuc. *Hist.* 1.127.1–3)

‘This then was the curse which the Spartans demanded should be driven out. They pretended that their prime object was to serve the honour of the gods, but in fact they knew that the curse attached to Pericles the son of Xanthippus on his mother’s side, and they thought that if **he** were expelled they would find it easier to deal with the Athenians. Not that they really expected this to happen: their hope was rather to discredit **him** in the eyes of his fellow citizens and make them think that this family circumstance of his would be a contributory cause to the war. He was the most influential man of his day and the leader of the state’. (tr. Hammond, 2009).

To the eyes of the Spartans, Pericles represents a pivotal figure, certainly not to be followed or respected, but still crucial; by means of the several uses of *autós* in these lines, Thucydides makes sure that we infer the thematic importance of Pericles in the mind of the Spartans (forms of *hoútos*, for example, would have led to different inferences).¹⁷ Interestingly, towards the end of the passage we find *tèn ekeínou xumphoràn*, where the use of *ekeínos* for a referent that is already fully in focus, and is otherwise recalled through *autós*, is noteworthy. This supports a point that I make elsewhere (Bonifazi, 2009; 2012): lexically differentiated third-person pronouns are not interchangeable; rather, they are chosen in their form to achieve communicative

¹⁷ The first *autôî* in the passage, actually, refers to *ágos*, the curse. A different but related instance of *autós* in Thucydides with Pericles as the referent shows how editorial (and grammatically biased) choices may alter the linguistic evidence of anaphoric *autós*. The famous “obituary” of Pericles (2.65) opens with these words: *ho Periklés légōn epeirátō toûs Athēnaíōus tēs te es **hautòn**^{ACC.M.SG} orgēs paralúein kai apò tòn paróntōn deinōn apágein tèn gnómēn* ‘With this sort of argument Pericles tried to dispel the Athenians’ anger against **himself** and to lead their thought away from the terrible conditions of the present’, tr. Hammond, 2009. Jones writes *hautón* (reflexive marker), while the MSS give *autón* (smooth breathing). Smyth, writing in 1920, comments on this passage by taking *autón* into account, just as Classen, 1863: 106 did much earlier.

goals and effects that may be local as well as global; they are linguistic items that are particularly discourse-sensitive. In this case, *ekeînos* reveals the renown of Pericles and emotional distance towards his circumstance, that is to say, what the Spartans could tell the other fellow Spartans, or what the other fellow Spartans could perceive, or both. In the closing general statement, I read a further variation: the absence of the grammatical subject conveys the status in focus of Pericles in the mind of the historian, who embraces the statesman's perspective (note the reflexive marker *heautón*).

- (13) *epeî kai autós_{NOM.M.SG} emempsámēn éstin hà en têi xungraphêi tôn Alexándrou érgōn, allà autón_{ACC.M.SG} ge Aléxandron ouk aiskhúnomai thaumázōn.* (Arr. *Anab.* 7.30.3)

So, while I **myself** have censured some of Alexander's acts in my history of them, I am not ashamed to express admiration for Alexander **himself**. (tr. Brunt, 1983).

Although here we find a nominative case accompanying an 'I' verb form ('I Arrian *autós*'), and *autós* in the accusative case accompanying Alexander's name, this passage, which opens the very final statements of the *Anabasis*, shows the potential of *autós* on a larger scale. Arrian singles out himself from other historians (an implicit periphery), and singles out the king of Macedon from other rulers (a parallel implicit periphery) to put both at the center of the entire work. Moreover, by choosing the same marker, he achieves – linguistically – what he has been striving to do throughout the work: to consider himself “the literary counterpart of Alexander” (Bosworth, 1988: 34).

5.6.3 Bodies without additional objects such as arms; corpses

In the CENTER-PERIPHERY schema, the distance between core and edge is not specified. I include in this group cases where *autós* refers to someone's body without inanimate objects being worn or used at a certain moment – that is to say, where the distance between core and edge is greatly reduced. Here we turn to meanings of *autós* that provide a link to the etymology of several intensifiers in IE languages (see n. 9 and passage 14). Examples (15) and (16) flag the not infrequent habit of using *autós* to mean 'corpses'. In general, this word's meanings related to bodies and corpses reflect a metonymic transfer, from the (third) person to the person's physical body, alive or dead.

- (14) *TECMESSA kai dè komízei prospólōn hód' engúthen.*

AJAX aîn' autón_{ACC.M.SG}, aîre deúro. (Soph. *Aj.* 544–545)

'TECMESSA Here comes the servant bringing him near.

AJAX Lift him, lift him up here'. (tr. Garvie, 1988).

These words are part of an exchange on the stage. Ajax has asked Tecmessa repeatedly to bring his son Eurysaces to him. Eventually, the child appears on the scene accompanied by a servant. During the exchange (530-545) the child is recalled via *autós* no less than four times (531, 538, 542, before the reported occurrence). The prominence of Eurysaces-*autós* does not rest just on his being everyone's center of attention but more specifically on the handling of his body.¹⁸

The association between *autós* and corpses can be found at the outset of the *Iliad*:

- (15) *pollàs d' iphthímous psukhàs Áidi proíapsen*
*hērōōn, autòis*_{ACC.M.PL} *dè helória teúkhe kúnessin*
oiōnoísí te pási. (Hom. *Il.* 1.3–5)
 '[Achilles' anger] hurled in their multitudes to the house of Hades strong souls of heroes, but gave **their bodies** to be the delicate feasting of dogs'.¹⁹

Tragic language seems to keep this association, as the following utterance by Orestes shows:

- (16) ORESTES *krínō se nikân, kai paraineís moi kalôs.*
*hépou, pròs autòn*_{ACC.M.SG} *tónde sè spháxai thélō.* (Aesch. *Lib.* 903–904)
 'ORESTES (to Pilades) I judge you the winner; you have advised me well.
 (to Clytemnestra) Follow me. I want to slay you right next to **that man**'. (tr. Sommerstein, 2008).

Next to *autón* referring to Aegisthus' corpse, the deictic marker *tónde* points to its appearance on the stage.

In these passages, the implicit periphery is constituted by what would typically be found around a living body in the genres in question: arms or personal objects. This brings us to the next major (metonymic) meaning extension, when the image schematic core and edge apply to the inner part of a person, one's consciousness, one's "inner" identity.

¹⁸ The same play at line 1132 features a CENTER-PERIPHERY schema embodied through word order: Teucer considers impious that Menelaus does not want to bury the dead, and Menelaus replies that indeed it is not good to bury one's own enemies: *toús g' autòs*_{NOM.M.SG AUTOGEN.M/N.SG} *polemíous· ou gàr kalón.*

¹⁹ See Bonifazi, 2012: 141–142 and 2012: 147 for Iliadic instances of the formulaic expression 'the arms clanked upon him [*ep' autôi*]' said of falling (and injured) heroes.

5.6.4 The internal self; subject of consciousness; one's true identity; proximity to the speaking "I"

In certain usages, the schema's basic topographical configuration of radial geometry is maintained, but the unified figure becomes interpreted as one's inner part, one's consciousness. This means that the CENTER-PERIPHERY image schema can account also for *autós* as an indirect reflexive marker. As the core is not visible (and not immediately recognizable), the periphery coincides with anything external to this nucleus. The sense of "self" as someone's truest core paves the way for meanings related to "true" identity, and the proximity to the speaking 'I' uttering *autós*.

Let us first pair two instances, one from the *Odyssey*, and one from Thucydides, attesting to the same phenomenon: namely, that *autós* has reflexive meaning, though it cannot correspond syntactically to a reflexive.

- (17) *autàr hó g', ópbra mèn autôi*^{DAT.M/N.SG} *amúnesthai ésan ioí,*
tópbra mnēstérōn hēna g' aiei hōi enī oikōi
bálle tituskómenos. (Hom. *Od.* 22.116–18)
 'Odysseus, while he still had arrows left to defend **him**,
 kept aiming at the suitors in his house; and every
 time he hit his man'.

- (18) *pánta dē pantakhóthen autoús*^{ACC.M.PL} *elúpei te kai perieistēkei epī tōi*
gegenēménōi phóbos te kai katáplēxis megístē dē. (Thuc. *Hist.* 8.1.2)
 'Everything everywhere was distressing **them**, and turned out for the worse after
 what had happened. (Their) fear and consternation were truly considerable'.

Odysseus in (17) and the Athenians in (18) are the referents of *autós*. They are also the subjects of consciousness of the respective contents: in (17) the narrator adopts Odysseus' viewpoint by mentioning the arrows still available to protect him (and his body!) while striking as many suitors as possible in his own house (*hoi enī oikōi*). In (18) Thucydides reveals his strategy in the description of Athens' reaction to the defeat in Sicily (8.1): his access to the psychological state of the Athenians makes the readers perceive their desperation directly.²⁰

The next instances show that the Homeric narrator, Euripides, and Xenophon play with the use of *autós* on a cognitive-pragmatic level of communication. Out of a seemingly neutral reference to a third-person pronoun, a special alignment is established between the speaking 'I' and the external audience – the internal characters participating in the verbal exchange are not necessarily engaged in the full significance of the pronoun. In the perspective of a CENTER-PERIPHERY schema, the

²⁰ More on this point, and on *dē* in this passage in Bonifazi, Drummen & de Kreeij, 2016: IV.5 § 38.

figure is distinct from the periphery in epistemic terms. The center is someone's inner self whose identity can be recognized and enjoyed only by those who share enough knowledge, while the periphery is someone's outer part, backgrounded because less revealing or not revealing at all to the eyes of unaware characters.

- (19) *eúkheto d' ex Ithákēs génos émmenai, autàr éphaske*
Laértēn Arkeisiádēn patér' émmenai autôi^{DAT.M/N.SG.} (Hom. *Od.* 24.268–69)
 'He announced that he was by birth a man on Ithaka,
 and said that his [lit. to **him**] father was Laertes, son of Arkeisios'.

Odysseus-in-disguise is reporting to his father news of Odysseus by pretending he once hosted Odysseus in a remote land. With the words *Laértēn patér' émmenai autôi* the identity of the person in disguise is revealed to the external audience, without necessarily sounding revealing to Laertes, the interlocutor. The implied epistemic correspondence "that person is the same as the one who is speaking" invites a blending of third and first person. A similar effect of proximity to the speaking 'I' is achieved in the following lines, which Orestes addresses to Electra, still unaware of his real identity:

- (20) ORESTES *ê kai met' autoû*^{GEN.M/N.SG.} *mētér' àn tlaîēs ktaneîn;*
 ELECTRA *tautôi ge pelékei tòi patèr' apóleto.*
 ORESTES *légō tád' autôi*^{DAT.M/N.SG.} *kai bébaia t'apò sou;* (Eur. *El.* 278–80)
 'ORESTES Would you really endure, with **him [your brother Orestes]**, to kill your mother?
 ELECTRA Yes, with the very axe which killed our father!
 ORESTES Am I to tell **him** this? Is it sure on your side?' (tr. Cropp, 1988)

For Electra 'he'-Orestes is epistemically in the background, whereas for the spectators and for us he is in the foreground, he is on the scene *himself*.

My final example of this type of scenario illustrates an analogous interplay, but with a reversed situation concerning the participants. Xenophon manages to talk about himself in such a way that the characters co-present in the scene share full knowledge of his identity, whereas the relation of sameness between Xenophon-the-soldier and Xenophon-the-narrating 'I' is grammatically screened off to readers by means of the use of *autós* in third person.

- (21) *ên dé tis en têi stratiâi Xenophôn Athēnaîos, hôs ou̓te stratēgòs ou̓te lokhagòs ou̓te stratiótēs òn sunēkolou̓thei, allà Próxenos autòn*^{ACC.M.SG.} *metepémpsato oíkothen xénos òn arkhaiòs· hupiskhneîto dè autô*^{IDAT.M/N.SG.} *ei élthoi, phílon autòn*^{ACC.M.SG.} *Kúrôi poiésein* (Xen. *Anab.* 3.1.4)
 'There was a man in the army named Xenophon, an Athenian, who was neither general nor captain nor common soldier, but had accompanied the expedition

because Proxenus, an older friend of his, had sent **him** at his home an invitation to go with him; Proxenus had also promised **him** that, if he would go, he would make **him** friend of Cyrus'. (tr. Brownson, 1998)

This interplay goes on in subsequent sections (during the account of Xenophon's meeting with Socrates in 3.1.7, and at the beginning of the description of the dream in 3.1.11–12), until grammar makes the overlap explicit. Third-person *autós* turns into 'I' at the beginning of the famous monologue: *euthùs epeidè anēgérthē prôton mèn énnoia autô_{DAT.M/N.SG}i empíptei· tí katákeimai*; 'Firstly, on the moment of his awakening, the thought occurred to **him**: 'Why do I lie here?' (3.1.13).

The transfer from a circumcentric inner point of oneself to the assimilation to 'I' can be explained in cognitive terms. The image schema CENTER-PERIPHERY holds when *autós* accompanies 'you' markers beside third-person markers just as it does with 'I' markers; however, *autós* may flag the subjectivity of the speaking 'I' (e.g., referring to the speaker in indirect speech) even without any co-occurring 'I' marker. This can happen by virtue of a cognitive projection that perspectivizes one's consciousness: the circumcentric space is projected onto the "zero-point of utterance" (Lyons, 1977: 682), and the result is a conceptual integration, or blending, of the two conceptual structures.

5.7 *Autós*-objects and referents "just mentioned"

Analysis reveals that there is no fundamental difference in the treatment of inanimate referents. A CENTER-PERIPHERY scenario is equally applicable, especially when the *autós*-object in question is the topic of more than one sentence,²¹ when the context makes it the center of attention of the narrating 'I' (if not of the local participants as well), and when the constitutive part of an object is kept distinct from its peripheral parts.²² Of course, further investigation may reveal that not just in the Homeric poems, but also in later texts *autós*-objects occur much less frequently. If this turns out to be the case, we would have macro-level grammatical evidence of the CENTER-PERIPHERY schema's structuring effects: *autós*-people numerically are the center, while *autós*-objects are the periphery. Furthermore, in usages of *autós* with referents evoked only for the speaker/writer to move on to new salient pieces of information about other referents – the quintessential "plain" third-person pronoun – the CENTER-PERIPHERY schema appears equally involved. The relevant metaphorical extension is based on the

²¹ A Platonic example is in *Symposium* 175d, where *autó* recalls a special thought that had made Socrates stop while walking, together with Aristodemus, towards Agathon's place.

²² A Homeric example of that is in *Il.* 6.243, where *autós* refers to the inner part of Priam's palace, after the mention of its beautiful cloister walks.

hinging role of discourse “old” vs. discourse “new” information. When a referent “just mentioned” or “mentioned above” is recalled via *autós*, *autós* invites the audience to keep the focus, however momentarily, on that referent already in mind. This “old” information works as a center, as a hinge. Only from that can the surrounding new information and new referent – the periphery, which in turn may become the center against further new referents in subsequent discourse – be understood.

5.8 Conclusion

This paper posits that the image schema CENTER-PERIPHERY is the skeletal cognitive configuration underlying not only usages of *autós* as an intensifier, but also various usages of anaphoric *autós*. My sample has not exhausted the totality of usages of “anaphoric” *autós*, at the very least because it does not include post-classical instances (with the exception of Arrian). Nevertheless, it suggests that the traditional interpretation “regular third person pronoun” can be at least partially revised.

My analysis points to the following advantages of an image schematic interpretation of *autós*. First, the polysemy of lexical markers becomes “structured polysemy”. The chain of metaphorical and metonymic extensions allows us to see the logic of the relation between seemingly opposed meanings: centers and peripheries may cooperate or may be contrasted to each other, and projected onto visual locations as well as onto mental abilities of recognition; centers may attract attention, but may also coincide with hidden nuclei, or even with old information on which new discourse is built. Second, perceptual facts are shown to be stronger and deeper than chronological syntactic and semantic variation. For example, this image schematic reading of *autós* provides a link between anaphoric *autós* and indirect reflexive uses of *autós*. At the same time, the structured polysemy under consideration provides links up with etymology, and a diachronic continuum between visual structures and discourse structures. Third, the idea of a cognitive basic spatial configuration is what realizes and ultimately justifies the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic variation of the uses of *autós*.

Furthermore, on a meta-scientific level, this analysis confirms the necessity of considering discourse units beyond the sentence level to make sense even of single words. The results contribute to the study of image schemas in literary texts. And finally, they can impact text translation, future developments of anaphor processing in ancient Greek, and our understanding of viewpoint phenomena.

Bibliography

Bakker, E. J. (2006). The syntax of *historiē*: How Herodotus writes. In C. Dewald & J. Marincola (Eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus* (pp. 92–102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bonifazi, A. (2009). Discourse cohesion through third-person pronouns: The case of *keinos* and *autos* in Homer. In S. Bakker & G. Wakker (Eds), *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (pp. 1–19). Leiden: Brill.
- Bonifazi, A. (2012). *Homer's Versicolored Fabric: The Evocative Power of Ancient Greek Epic Word-Making*. Washington DC and Cambridge, MA: Center for Hellenic Studies and Harvard University Press.
- Bonifazi, A., Drummen, A., & de Kreij, M. (2016). Particles in Ancient Greek Discourse. Five Volumes Exploring Particle Use Across Genres. Hellenic Studies Series, Washington DC. <http://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/6391>.
- Bosworth, A. B. (1988). *From Arrian to Alexander. Studies in Historical Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brownson, C. L. (1998). *Xenophon. Anabasis*. With introduction and translation revised by John Dillery. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brunt, P. A. (1983). *Arrian. Anabasis Alexandri Books V-VII, Indica*. With introduction and translation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chafe, W. (1996). Inferring identifiability and accessibility. In T. Fretheim & J. K. Gundel (Eds), *Reference and Referent Accessibility (37–46)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chantraine, P. (1953). *Grammaire Homérique. Tome II, Syntaxe*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Classen, J. (1863). *Thukydides. Buch 2*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Cobet, J. (1971). *Herodots Exkurse und die Frage der Einheit Seines Werke*. *Historia Einzelschriften*, 17. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Croft, W. & Cruse, D. A. (2004). *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cropp, M. J. (1988). *Euripides. Electra*. With introduction, translation, and commentary. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Dancygier, B. & Sweetser, E. (2014). *Figurative Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delbecque, N. (1995). Towards a cognitive account of the use of the prepositions *por* and *para* in Spanish. In E. H. Casad (Ed), *Cognitive Linguistics in the Red-Woods: The Expansion of a New Paradigm in Linguistics* (pp. 249–318). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Evans, V. & Green, M. (2006). *Cognitive linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Freeman, D. C. (1999). 'The rack dislimns': Schema and metaphorical pattern in *Antony and Cleopatra*. *Poetics Today*, 20, 443–460.
- Freeman, M. H. (2002). Momentary stays, exploding forces: A cognitive linguistic approach to the poetics of Emily Dickinson and Robert Frost. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 30, 73–90.
- Garvie, A. F. (1988). *Sophocles. Ajax*. With Introduction, Translation, and Commentary. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Gray, V. (2001). Herodotus' literary and historical method: Arion's story (1.23–24). *The American Journal of Philology*, 122, 11–28.
- Hammond, M. (2009). *Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War*. With introduction and notes by P. J. Rhodes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henderson, J. (1998). *Aristophanes. Clouds – Wasps – Peace*. With introduction and translation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination, and Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kimmel, M. (2005). Culture regained: Situated and compound image schemas. In B. Hampe & J. E. Grady (Eds), *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 285–311). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kimmel, M. (2008). Image schemas in narrative macrostructure: Combining cognitive linguistics with psycholinguistic approaches. In J. Auracher & W. van Peer (Eds), *New Beginnings in Literary Studies* (pp. 158–184). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

- König, E. (1991). *The Meaning of Focus Particles: A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- König, E. (1998). Toward a typology of intensifiers (emphatic reflexives). In B. Caron (Ed), XVI Congrès International des Linguistes (pp. 1–16). Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- König, E. (2001). Intensifiers and reflexive Pronouns. In E. König, M. Haspelmath, W. Oesterreicher, W. Raible (Eds), *Language Typology and Language Universal*, Vol. 2 (pp. 747–760). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. & Turner, M. (1989). *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamb, W. R. M. (1930). *Lysias*. With introduction and translation. London: Heinemann.
- Lattimore, R. (1951). *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lattimore, R. (1967). *The Odyssey of Homer*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Levinson, S. C. (2003). *Space in Language and Cognition: Explorations in Cognitive Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maidment, K. J. (1968). *Minor Attic Orators in Two Volumes*. Vol. 1: Antiphon; Andocides. With introduction and translation. Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press and Heinemann.
- Marušič, J. (2005). How poets should speak about gods. Plato: *Republic II 377e6–378a1*. https://www.academia.edu/364679/How_Poets_should_Speak_about_Gods_Plato_Republic_II_377e6-378a1
- Mocciaro, E. (2014). Intensifiers. In G. Giannakis (Ed), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 2 (pp. 246–250). Leiden: Brill.
- Monro, D. B. (1891). *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Munson, R. Vignolo (1986). The celebratory purpose of Herodotus: The story of Arion in *Histories* 1.23–24. *Ramus*, 15, 93–104.
- Nikiforidou, K. (1991). The meanings of the genitive: A case study in semantic structure and semantic change. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 2, 149–205.
- Oakley, T. (2007). Image Schemas. In D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 214–235). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pagán Cánovas, C. (2011). The genesis of the arrows of love: Diachronic conceptual integration in Greek mythology. *The American Journal of Philology*, 132, 553–579.
- Pauwels, P. (1995). Levels of metaphorization: The case of *put*. In L. Goossens (Ed), *By Word of Mouth: Metaphor, Metonymy, and Linguistic Action in a Cognitive Perspective* (pp. 125–158). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Powell, J. E. (1934). Studies on the Greek reflexive: Thucydides. *The Classical Quarterly*, 28, 159–174.
- Puddu, N. (2005). *Riflessivi e Intensificatori: Greco, Latino e le altre lingue indoeuropee*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- Sadoulet, P. (1984). Les significations de *autós* en grec. *Lalies*, 4, 61–5.
- Short, W. M. (2013). Latin *De*: A view from cognitive semantics. *Classical Antiquity*, 32, 378–405.
- Smith, M. B. (1999). From instrument irrealis: Motivating some grammaticalized senses of the Russian instrumental. In K. Dzivirek, H. Coats, C. M. Vakareliyska (Eds), *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*. Vol. 7, The Seattle Meeting (pp. 413–433). Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Smyth, H. W. (1920). *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sommerstein, A. H. (2008). *Aeschylus. Oresteia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Taillardat, J. (1987). A propos de grec *autós*: ipséité, identité, anaphore. *Lalies*, 5, 75–86.

- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Vol. 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Talmy, L. (2005). The fundamental system of spatial schemas in language. In B. Hampe & J. E. Grady (Eds), *From Perception to Meaning: Image Schemas in Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 199–234). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Todd, S. C. (2007). *A Commentary on Lysias, Speeches, 1–11*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Turner, M. (1996). *The Literary Mind: The Origins of Thought and Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wagnon, A. (1880). *Le Pronom d'Identité et la Formule du Réfléchi Dans Homère, Dans les Poètes Tragiques et Chez les Doriens*. Geneva: Carey.
- Zlatev, J. (2007). Spatial semantics. In D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics* (pp. 318–50). Oxford: Oxford University Press.