Textual deixis and the 'Anchoring' Use of the Latin Pronoun hic

[Link to publication](#)

TEXTUAL DEIXIS AND THE 'ANCHORING' USE OF THE LATIN PRONOUN *HIC*

Caroline Kroon
The Amsterdam Centre of Ancient Studies and Archaeology,
University of Amsterdam
c.h.m.kroon@uva.nl

Abstract

This article evaluates the results of prior research on anaphoric reference in Latin, and tries to account for the various observations within a single explanatory framework. This framework combines insights from cognitive linguistic theory and from ongoing empirical research on the linguistic marking of discourse organization in Latin. After a brief discussion of recent cognitive linguistic views on the relation between deixis and anaphora, I concentrate on the various uses of the Latin demonstrative *hic* in Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The examples discussed show that *hic*'s deictic aspect of proximity can be discerned in all its uses, the variety of which can best be described in terms of a 'cline', running from canonical deixis to canonical anaphora, with various stages of anadeixis in between.

Keywords

discourse organization – deixis and anaphora – linguistic anchoring devices - anaphoric pronouns - Latin *hic*

## 1.	Introduction[1]

One of the central issues in the study of anaphora is concerned with the problem of anaphoric distribution in discourse. In general, languages have various devices to establish reference to a given entity (e.g. definite noun phrases, various types of demonstrative and anaphoric pronouns, zero expression), but what factors exactly determine the speaker's choice of an appropriate anaphoric form in an actual discourse situation, is still a matter of debate. As for

---

Latin, the rise of discourse functional and cognitive linguistic approaches has provided a considerable number of new insights into the workings of anaphoric reference and the referential forms available, which, in turn, have given rise to interesting new research questions.[2] Although it is generally agreed in the studies involved that understanding anaphoric reference requires an analysis which takes the wider linguistic context into consideration, and that referential choice may be somehow dependent on the activation level of the referent in the memory of speaker and addressee (according to the assumed principle that the more firmly a referent is established in the prior discourse, the less elaborate or 'heavy' coding material it requires[3]), it remains difficult to fully explain, let alone predict, the distribution of the specific anaphoric forms in examples like (1) below.

(1) *laurus* erat tecti medio in penetralibus altis

   sacra comam multosque metu servata per annos,   760

   quam pater inventam, primas cum conderet arces,

   ipse ferebatur Phoebo sacrasse Latinus,

   Laurentisque ab *ea* nomen posuisse colonis.

   huius apes summum densae (mirabile dictu)

   stridore ingenti liquidum trans aethera vectae   765

   obsedere apicem

   'In the midst of the palace, in the high inner courts, stood *a laurel* of sacred foliage, preserved in awe through many years, *which* lord Latinus himself was said to have founded and dedicated to Phoebus, when he built his first towers; and from *it* he gave his settlers their name Laurentes. In the top of *this* tree, wondrous to tell, settled a dense swarm of bees, borne with loud humming across the liquid air' (Verg. *A*. 7.59-66)[4]

In this example the new discourse topic *laurus* ('laurel tree') is expressed, as expected, by means of a full nominal phrase (NP), emphatically placed at the beginning of the clause and verse. The two anaphoric forms that are subsequently chosen for further reference to the tree

---

[2] See especially Bolkestein (2000), which contains a useful overview of earlier research and sets the agenda for future research. More recent studies are e.g. Bolkestein (2002), Pinkster (2005), Joffre (2010), Kroon (2009, 2010).

[3] This principle has been formulated on the basis of e.g. the seminal study by Givón (1983). For comparable views within the framework of Accessibility Theory, see Ariel (1990, 2001).

[4] The translations of the examples in this article are mostly taken from the editions of the Loeb Classical Library, with slight adaptations where needed.

(the relative pronoun *quam*, and the anaphoric pronoun *ea*) seem to be in accordance with the activation level theory referred to above. However, the use of the relatively 'heavy' demonstrative pronoun *huius*, following on the relatively 'light' anaphoric pronoun *ea*, seems to be at odds with those activation level theories which define the accessibility of a referent in terms of topic continuity and referential distance, that is, theories with a strictly text-linear assessment of the degree of accessibility. As already observed by Bolkestein (2000), in order to understand the distribution of anaphoric forms in examples like (1), and especially the use of *huius* in line 65, we obviously need a more sophisticated definition of 'accessibility' or 'activation level', based on a more sophisticated idea of how discourse is organized, both in a linear way (involving the linear information structure of a text) and in a hierarchical way (involving the rhetorical-hierarchical structure of a text as it is construed from increasingly larger functional units of discourse).

This article is meant to illustrate how recent developments in the field of (cognitive) discourse linguistics can be of use in furthering our understanding of the Latin system of anaphoric reference, and of referential choice in actual discourse situations. More specifically, I will investigate the use of the Latin demonstrative *hic* ('this (one)') as an anaphoric device in narrative discourse, thereby incorporating the results of earlier research, especially by Bolkestein (2000), de Jong (1996), Pennell Ross (1996), Joffre (2010), and Kroon (2010). I will try to account for the various observations on *hic* in these studies within a single explanatory framework, based on recent theoretical views on anaphora and on ongoing empirical research on discourse phenomena and discourse organization in Latin texts.

The discussion will inevitably address the much disputed issue of the specific contribution of the semantic deictic aspect of 'proximity' of *hic* in its so-called anaphoric, intra-textual use. By applying insights from recent cognitive linguistic theories to a specific corpus of Latin narrative texts, I will show that the anaphoric, intra-textual use of *hic* is essentially related to its deictic, extra-textual use. This view will be corroborated by pointing to an intermediate group of instances in my corpus that appear to display characteristics of both uses. By looking at instances of anaphoric *hic* in actual discourse I intend, moreover, to provide answers to such questions as what types of structures and concepts we need in our discourse theories in order to account for the use of anaphoric *hic* in the Latin corpus involved. As such, the article can be seen as the counterpart of my earlier study on the Latin demonstrative *ille* (Kroon 2009), which can also be used as an anaphoric device, but which, on account of its different deictic orientation ('remoteness' instead of 'proximity'), appears to be used in markedly different discourse constellations.

Previous research on anaphoric reference and referential choice in Latin has been based mainly on Caesar, or on prose in general. The present article seeks to evaluate and complement the existing picture by extending the research to Latin epic poetry, a genre that has not yet been systematically taken into account as far as anaphoric reference is concerned, but has recently been studied intensively for other discourse phenomena (mainly the use of tenses), and for issues of discourse organization in general.[5] The text corpus underlying the observations in the present article consists of Virgil's *Aeneid*, and of a number of stories taken from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.[6] Since I am particularly interested in the anaphoric use of *hic* in narratives, I left out of my investigations all instances of *hic* in (non-narrative) speeches. I did include instances of *hic* in indirect speech, but these appeared to be remarkably infrequent. Both the adnominal (adjectival) and the pronominal (substantive) instances of *hic* were taken into account. In the discussion below I will focus on the use of *hic* in Virgil, with references to Ovid where applicable.

2.   Theoretical preliminaries

In Joffre (2010) it is claimed that the opposition between *hic* and *ille* in their anaphoric, textual use cannot be explained in terms of different positions on a spatio-temporal proximity scale, with *hic* referring to an antecedent that is at a short distance in the text, and *ille* to an antecedent that is at a more remote distance. Rather, according to her, they signal the way in which the speaker construes his discourse, *hic* being an indicator of continuity, *ille* of rupture: "la deixis ne sert pas à decrier la réalité, mais à indiquer la manière dont l'énonciateur organise son discours" (Joffre 2010: 571). Although I basically agree with this description, which, in various wordings, has also been put forward in earlier studies on Latin anaphora (especially de Jong (1996), Pennell Ross (1996), and Bolkestein (2000)), I intend to give a slightly more nuanced account of the matter, which, in contrast to Joffre's account, does full justice to the deictic aspects of the demonstratives, by applying them to other dimensions than that of strict (text-linear) referential distance.[7] In order to do so, first some theoretical

---

[5] E.g. Pinkster (1999), Adema (2005, 2007, 2008), Kroon (2007, 2010), Torrego (2010) .

[6] The Ovid sample contains the following ten stories from books 2, 4, 6, and 8: Mercury, Herse and Aglauros *Met*. 2.708-832; Pyramus and Thisbe *Met*. 4.55-166; Hermaphroditus and Salmacis *Met*. 4.288-388; Niobe *Met*. 6.146-312; Lycian Farmers *Met*. 6.313-381; Procne and Philomela *Met*. 6.424-674; Scylla and Minos *Met*. 8.6-151; Althaea and Meleager *Met*. 8.414-532; Philemon and Baucis *Met*. 8.611-724; Erysichthon *Met*. 8.738-878.

[7] We may also refer here to Bakker (2010), who discusses deictic pronouns in Ancient Greek along more or less the same lines.

preliminaries may be in order.

2.1.   *Deixis, anaphora, and anadeixis*

Following de Jong (1996), and in contrast with Joffre (2010), I claim that the more specific deictic aspect of proximity can also be discerned in the textual, anaphoric uses of *hic*. This view is in accordance with current cognitive linguistic theory, which assumes that canonical deixis on the one hand, and anaphora on the other, are not to be seen as mutually exclusive procedure types, but as special instances on a *cline of indexical reference*. Cornish (2010, 2011) distinguishes between three, interrelated, referring procedures with an indexical function:[8]

Referring procedures with an 'indexical' function (Cornish 2010, 2011)
(i)   canonical anaphora
(ii)   canonical deixis
(iii)   anadeixis

Canonical anaphora and canonical deixis can be seen as the opposite ends of a scale of indexicality, with anadeixis occupying a midway position in between these two extremes.

canonical deixis   anadeixis   canonical anaphora

Canonical anaphora, as expressed by, for instance, unaccented pronouns like Latin *is* and by zero pronouns, can be seen as an instruction by the speaker to the addressee to merely *continue* a previously established focus of attention, which will now serve as the given 'ground' for some new discourse representation, that is, a new conception of an already existing and presently activated referent in discourse memory. Anaphora in this sense is, as Cornish (2010: 212) puts it, a procedure for creating new discourse representations by integrating old ones. The use of an anaphoric pronoun presupposes that its intended referent is already known to the addressee and at the forefront of his mind. As such, this referent may receive the weakest form of coding.

---

[8] The term 'indexical' refers to the function of pointing directly to the circumstances or co-text in which an utterance takes place.

Canonical deixis, on the other hand, can be seen as an instruction to the addressee to direct his attention towards something in the spatio-temporal context of the utterance (the direct environment of the speech event), which may then, in a next stage, serve as the 'ground' for building up some discourse representation. Whereas in the anaphoric procedure the ground for a new discourse representation is derived from an already established discourse representation, in the deictic procedure this ground (and focus of attention) first has to be created. In other words, in the case of canonical anaphora the referent is already present and activated in the discourse memory of speaker and addressee, whereas in the case of prototypical deixis a new referent is thereby introduced into the discourse.

There may, however, also be a certain degree of overlap between these two procedures. This is what we find in the case of anaphorically used demonstratives like Latin *hic* ('this'; 'this one') and *ille* ('that'; 'that one'), which appear to do both jobs (establishing *and* continuing a focus of attention) at the same time, in a procedure that has been labeled *anadeixis* by Cornish and others (e.g. Cornish 2010, 2011). As compared to the purely anaphoric expressions, the anadeictic expressions may be assumed to have more specific indexical properties. This view is in line with the earlier observations by de Jong (1996), who in the context of his discussion of Latin *hic* and *ille* described the borderline between deixis and anaphora as a fluent one.

2.2   *'Remoteness' and 'proximity' in terms of regions of focal attention in discourse memory*

In order to understand the specific deictic aspect involved in the use of a demonstrative anaphor like *hic* or *ille*, we might conceive of discourse memory (which is the locus of the discourse representations) as a mental space in which the objects are objects of knowledge. According to, for instance, Janssen (2004), this mental space may be divided into a *region of focal referential concern* to the interlocutors (with objects that are, so to speak, mentally 'close' to them), and a *region of disfocal referential concern* (with referents that are mentally 'further away'). It is in this way that spatio-temporal proximity – as it is associated with *canonical* deixis - can be related to the mental, psychological proximity associated with *ana*deixis: the discourse context does not only include a *physical* space (the direct spatio-temporal environment of the interlocutors), but also a *mental space* (the discourse memory of speaker and addressee). Both of these spaces can be scanned, the former with a physical eye,

the latter with a mental eye.[9]

This cognitive perspective of mental spaces may help us to understand the particular anaphoric uses of Latin *ille* and to relate them to *ille*'s canonical deictic use. When anaphorically used, *ille* indicates that the referent currently belongs to a region in discourse memory that is somehow of disfocal concern to the speaker and addressee and is therefore perceived as 'far'. This psychological remoteness of the referent requires an emphatic (re)introduction in the discourse, by means of a relatively strong anaphoric device. In narrative, *ille* is most often used to re-direct the addressee's attention to a referent that is essentially activated, but has temporarily not been the main focus of attention. In Kroon (2010) this procedure is called 'topic promotion'. An example is (2) (see Kroon 2010: 121):

(2) Dixerat$_\emptyset$. *ille* Iovis monitis immota tenebat

lumina et obnixus curam sub corde premebat.

'*She*$_\emptyset$ [Dido, zero reference] ceased. *He* [Aeneas, *ille*] by Jove's command held his eyes steadfast and with a struggle smothered the pain deep within his heart.' (Verg. *A*. 4.331-332)

In this example, *ille* is used to signal that the camera, so to speak, shifts away from the entity that has been in focus for a while (Dido, who has just delivered a speech), to the other entity present in the scene, Aeneas, who has also been present in the scene during Dido's speech, but not as the main focus of the narrator's attention.

Far less often, but fully explainable in the same terms of focal and disfocal concern, is the use of *ille* for what in Kroon (2010) has been labeled 'topic demotion'. This particular use of *ille* involves a discourse constellation in which, by the use of the distal demonstrative *ille*, a currently focal referent is now 'downgraded' to a disfocal status. This is the case in examples like (3) (cf. Kroon 2009 for more examples):

---

[9] As Bolkestein (2000: 109) observes, many of the older Latin manuals already hint at such an extension of the concept of spatial deixis to the mental domain.

(3) dixerat$_\emptyset$, atque *illam* media inter talia ferro

    conlapsam aspiciunt comites, ensemque cruore

    spumantem sparsasque manus. it clamor ad alta   665

    atria: concussam bacchatur Fama per urbem.

    '*She$_\emptyset$* ceased; and even as she spoke her handmaids see *her* (*illam*) fallen on the sword,

    the blade reeking with blood and her hands bespattered. A scream rises to the lofty roof;

    rumour riots through the stricken city.' (Verg. *A*. 4.663-666)

In (3), the use of *illam* (instead of, for instance, purely anaphoric *eam*) signals that the referent Dido does remain activated, but is now gradually being moved to a more remote position in the interlocutors' region of focal concern, thus making room for a new entity to come into focus. In this case the perspective shifts to Dido's handmaids and fellow countrymen, whose observations (cf. *aspiciunt*, 'they see') and reactions to Dido's death are described. The impression of the referent Dido being pushed into a more remote position of the interlocutors' attention, is enhanced by the shift to an accusative case form, which may be taken as another signal for the reader that Dido will no longer be the perspective from which the events are being told. Below, in my discussion of *hic*, we will come across another instance of *ille* as a topic demotion device (see example (15)).

      In addition to the use of anaphoric *ille* as a topic promoting and a topic demoting device, there appear to be at least two more discourse constellations in which *ille* in narrative texts can be shown to fully display its deictic aspect of remoteness. In the first, the referent of *ille* is transferred from a temporally and spatially (and therefore also psychologically) distant story world to the *hic et nunc* of the speaker and his audience.[10] The second discourse constellation involves instances of what is usually called the 'recognitional' or 'attitudinal' use of demonstratives, that is, the use of a demonstrative in order to instruct the addressee to seek the intended referent at some remove from the actual speech situation, as part of the interlocutors' shared knowledge ('*that* fellow I saw you with yesterday').[11] Although this recognitional use is quite different from the other uses of *ille* discussed here, the instruction to the addressee is basically the same: to seek (or position, cf. example 3) the intended referent

---

[10] See Kroon (2009: 123-128) for examples from Virgil and Ovid.
[11] See e.g. Himmelmann (1996) and Diessel (1999) for an elaborate discussion of the recognitional use of demonstratives.

in a relatively *remote* region of discourse memory.[12] In section 3 below we will see how the various uses of *hic* in narrative texts can be explained as instructions to seek the intended referent in a *proximal* region of discourse memory.

2.3   Co-textual versus discourse-functional approaches to anaphoric reference

In conclusion of this preliminary theoretical section we may state that the popular *co-textual approach* to anaphoric reference, which explains the phenomenon in terms of backward reference to a specific and explicit antecedent in the previous co-text, is not able to give a full explanation of how anaphoric reference works (see the discussion of example (1) above). More promising appears to be a cognitively-based *discourse-functional approach* to anaphora, advocated by, for instance, McCarthy (1994), Kleiber (1994), Janssen (2004), and a number of recent articles by Cornish (2003, 2006, 2010, 2011). Such a discourse-functional approach assumes that interpreting a given anaphor involves the tracking of certain referents in the interlocutors' evolving *mental discourse model* of the communicative event, rather than in the preceding *text*.

Within this view, an anadeictic expression like Latin *hic* or *ille* is not seen as operating solely at the level of the co-text, but as an instruction to the addressee to search in discourse memory - rather than in the prior co-text - for a proper interpretation of the anaphor. The particular deictic aspect of the pronoun serves as an additional instruction as to the location of the referent in the interlocutors' mental discourse model. It is to be noted that the mental discourse representation searched for may - and often does - involve more than the representation of a single, concrete and explicitly expressed antecedent: it may also contain what has been predicated before of this referent, as well as what could be further inferred from this without being explicitly and linguistically expressed. In order to reinstall a given discourse representation (for that is what speakers actually do by using the anaphoric procedure: reinstalling or recalling a certain discourse representation), we need only mention but little information, the anaphor, which is able to evoke the entire mental construct.[13]

---

[12] In addition to a recognitional use of *ille*, which is quite common, we might perhaps also assume a recognitional use of *hic*, on the basis of examples like Livy 1.5.1: *Iam tum in Palatio monte Lupercal* hoc *fuisse ludicrum ferunt* ('They say that the Palatine was even then the scene of the merry festival of the Lupercalia which we have to-day'). As *hoc* in this example is clearly opposed to *tum*, an analysis in terms of 'temporal proximity' is also possible.

[13] See e.g. *hos* in Virgil *A.* 3.492 (hos *ego digrediens lacrimis adfabar obortis*), which has no single explicit antecedent, but reinstalls the entire discourse representation of Helenus and Andromache having each just delivered a speech. See also *hi* in example (11) below, which does not refer to an explicit textual antecedent either.

3. The use of *hic* in Virgil

We may now turn to Latin *hic*, and try to explain, along the theoretical lines sketched above, its various uses in Virgil's *Aeneid*. I will start the discussion by adducing a few instances that might be seen as close to the canonical deictic use of *hic*, and then turn to its more common anadeictic uses in Virgil. By doing so I also hope to demonstrate that, as far as the phenomenon of indexical reference is concerned, we are indeed dealing with a cline, running from canonical deixis to canonical anaphora, and with various stages of anadeixis in between.

3.1 Canonical deixis in Virgil's Aeneid

Due to the corpus, from which I left out the speeches, it is difficult to find instances of canonical deixis in my material, in the sense of *hic* pointing to an object in the immediate spatial environment of narrator and narratee. There is, however, a group of instances exemplified by example (4) which comes close to this use.

(4) (*description of storm raised by Aeolus*)
   …; insequitur cumulo praeruptus aquae mons.   105
   hi summo in fluctu pendent; *his* unda dehiscens
   terram inter fluctus aperit, furit aestus harenis.

   'Down in a heap comes a sheer mountain of water. *Some* of the seamen hang upon the billow's crest; *to others* the yawning sea shows ground beneath the waves; the surges seethe with sand.' (Verg. *A.* 1.105-107)

The instances in this group all have in common that they are part of a text segment that is presented in the so-called *pseudo-simultaneous narrative mode*.[14] In this mode of presentation, which is characterized by the use of the historical present tense, the *hic et nunc* of narrator and narratee is transposed, so to speak, to the reference time of the story world.

---

[14] According to Adema (2007, 2008) this mode (which she calls the 'Directive mode') is the standard mode of narration in Virgil's *Aeneid.* Other discourse modes in the *Aeneid* include the Report mode (also called Comment mode), Description mode, and Information mode.

This makes it possible for the narrator to point to objects as if they are in his immediate spatio-temporal environment, and as if they subsequently, one after the other, come into the focus of his moving camera. In example (4) above, both groups of people are referred to by *hic*[15], but in other instances in this group we find *hic* paired with *ille*. In the latter case the camera might be assumed not to be moving but to remain in a fixed position, from which it registers both objects that are near and objects that are far from the narrator.[16]

(5) at puer Ascanius mediis in vallibus acri

gaudet equo iamque *hos* cursu, iam praeterit *illos*

'But in the midst of the valleys the young Ascanius glories in his fiery steed, galloping past now *these*, now *those*' (Verg. *A*. 4. 156-157)

A comparable transposed deictic configuration can be observed, although in a slightly different way, in examples like (6), where it is the narrative technique of *embedded focalization* that leads to a shifted mental space. In this case it is not the primary narrator, but a group of embedded focalizers - the Trojans who go sightseeing in the Greek camp - who function as the deictic centre from which the immediate spatial environment is visually scanned, leading to the use of the proximal deictic adverb *hic* ('here') rather than the distal deictic adverb *ibi* ('there'): [17]

(6) …   iuvat ire et Dorica castra

desertosque videre locos litusque relictum:

hic Dolopum manus, *hic* saevus tendebat Achilles;

classibus hic locus, *hic* acie certare solebant.   30

---

[16] In example (5) the shift from *hic* to *ille* appears to underline the speed of Ascanius's horse. Comparable instances with *hi ... illi*, with or without the addition of *iam* or *nunc*, are *A*. 5.441; 6.315; 10.130.
[17] The views on transposed deixis expressed here come close to what Bühler (1982: 22-3) in the early twentieth century referred to as 'deixis at phantasma', i.e. the phenomenon that prototypical deixis can be transposed to the realm of imaginary referents. As in all cases of pointing, 'deixis at phantasma' entails a deictic center, or *origo*, and an indicated line connecting this center to a locus. For the more recent narratological concept of 'embedded focalization', see especially de Jong (1987, 2014).

'... it is a joy to go and see the Doric camp, the deserted stations and forsaken shore. *Here* the Dolopian bands encamped, *here* cruel Achilles; *here* lay the fleet; *here* they used to meet us in battle.' (Verg. *A*. 2.27-30)

3.2 Anadeixis in Virgil's Aeneid

3.2.1 Contrasts, catalogues, and compartmentalization

Closely related to these instances of canonical, spatial deixis, are instances such as (7). As in (5) above, *hic* is contrasted with *ille*, but the deictic procedure involved is anadeictic rather than canonically deictic, as the referents of the demonstratives have been textually evoked in the prior discourse and are therefore already present and activated in the mental discourse model of the interlocutors.

(7) (*Darus and Entellus engage in a boxing contest*)
    abduxere retro longe capita ardua ab ictu
    immiscentque manus manibus pugnamque lacessunt,
    ille pedum melior motu fretusque iuventa,   430
    hic membris et mole valens; sed tarda trementi
    genua labant, vastos quatit aeger anhelitus artus.

'Raising their heads high and drawing them far back from blows, they spar, hand with hand, and provoke the fray, *the one* nimbler of foot and confident in his youth, *the other* mighty in massive limbs; yet his slow knees totter and tremble and a painful gasping shakes his huge frame.' (Verg. *A*. 5.428-432)

The distribution of proximal *hic* and distal *ille* over the two referents involved seems to be determined here on psychological grounds, by the factor of empathy. As the underdog, who, in the following context, will turn out to be the unexpected winner, Entellus may be assumed to take up a front position in the region of focal concern of the interlocutors. The referent of *hic* is mentally close, so to speak, while the referent of *ille* (Entellus' opponent Darus) is mentally more remote.

12

From this contrastive use of *hic* (*hic* in opposition to *ille*), it is but a small step to an interesting next category of instances of anadeictic *hic*, which I have provisionally labeled 'the use of *hic* in catalogues'. Virgil appears to have a preference for using the demonstrative *hic* in enumerations and other types of lists, to indicate that a new element in the list or row (e.g. *Salius* in example 8 below) is explicitly *anchored* in the previous one (*Nisus*). As such, the pronoun *hic* (here in the dative form *huic*) seems to function as a kind of 'hinge' between the two subsequent items of the enumeration.

(8) (*report of running contest*)

> Primus abit longeque ante omnia corpora Nisus
> emicat et ventis et fulminis ocior alis;
> proximus *huic*, longo sed proximus intervallo,   320
> insequitur Salius; spatio post deinde relicto
> tertius Euryalus.

> 'Away goes Nisus first, and far in front of all darts forth, swifter than the winds or than winged thunderbolt. Next to *him*, but next by a long distance, follows Salius; then, with some space left between them, Euryalus third.' (Verg. *A*. 5.318-322)

The effect of the use of proximal deictic *huic* (instead of, for instance, the anaphoric pronoun *ei*, or a zero reference[18]) at the transition of one item in the list to another, is the impression of a list of well-demarcated items, in which the upcoming item does not come as a surprise but is firmly and explicitly anchored in the prior one. The emphatic re-installment of the current discourse representation by means of *huic* erects, so to speak, a firewall against surprises, (partial) continuity of attention focus being communicatively the preferred situation.[19]

We find quite a few comparable instances of the demonstrative pronoun *hic* in three well-defined passages in the *Aeneid*: the funeral games with its various contests in book 5, Aeneas' visit to the underworld in book 6, and the catalogue of the Latin forces in book 7. These are all passages in which the narrator tells his story in a catalogue-like manner, directing his

---

[18] Note, however, that there are no instances of the dative singular of the anaphoric pronoun *is* (*ei*) in Virgil's *Aeneid*. The same holds for the genitive singular form *eius*, the other case forms (also in the plural) being rare, with the exception of the form *ea*. See also Axelson (1945) and Austin's commentary on *Aeneid* 4 *ad* 479 (Oxford 1955 [1982]).

[19] For the metaphor of a firewall, see Brisard (2002: 265). According to Brisard, the ground has a privileged status "as both the locus of direct experience and the container of general knowledge, which will evolve with us through time as a continually updated and always negotiable repertoire of known or anticipated information. Experientially, the ground keeps the contingency in check of new input coming in at any moment of time".

camera from one item in a (physical and visible) series or row to an immediately following one. Example (9) comes from the scene in the underworld, example (10) from the catalogue of the Latin forces in book 7.[20]

(9)   *Hos* iuxta falso damnati crimine mortis

        'Near them were those on false charge condemned to die' (Verg. *A*. 6.430)

(10)   *Hos* super advenit Volsca de gente Camilla

        'To crown the array comes Camilla, of Volscian race' (Verg. *A*. 7.803)

This typical use of *hic* in 'catalogues' is not an exclusive feature of the narrative style of Virgil. For instance, in the first book of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* we find a significant density of instances of *hic* in chapter 43 on King Servius' division of the Roman citizens into various census classes. A small section of this passage is represented in (11).

(11)   Quinta classis aucta; centuriae triginta factae; fundas lapidesque missiles *hi* secum gerebant; in *his* accensi cornicines tubicinesque in duas centurias distributi; undecim milibus *haec* classis censebatur. *Hoc* minor census reliquam multitudinem habuit.

        'The fifth class was made larger, and thirty centuries were formed. *These* men carried slings, with stones for missiles. Rated with *these* were the horn-blowers and trumpeters, divided into two centuries. Eleven thousand was the rating of *this* class. The class that was assessed at less than *this* contained the rest of the population.' (Liv. 1.43.7-8).

Although not a catalogue in the sense as exemplified in (8) – (10) (i.e. a row of physical and visible persons or objects), it is clear that here Livy is going through a list of items in a fixed order. By each time resuming, by means of a form of *hic*, the current focus of attention (the people of the fifth census class), and by taking this as the anchor for the embedding of a new informational element in the evolving discourse representation, Livy doses the information in a very strict way, presenting the text in a series of clear-cut, interrelated segments. This effect of emphatic compartmentalization of the information would have been lessened (or even lost)

---

[20] Some other examples are *A*. 5.298; 5.834; 7.65; 7.803. See also 10.170 and 179 (in the catalogue of ships in book 10).

if forms of the canonical anaphoric pronoun *is* or zero pronouns had been chosen here. In that case the information in example (11) would be perceived as belonging to one and the same *referential domain* (see Van Vliet 2008). In the text as it stands, however, there seems to be a continuous process of transgressing from one referential domain into another, with the demonstrative *hic* functioning as the mental anchor to which the new thematic block of information can be attached.[21]

In Virgil, this 'compartmentalization style' may sometimes also be observed outside the contexts of catalogues and comparable list-like presentations of the narrative. An example is (12):[22]

(12) (*about Cacus stealing the cattle of Hercules*)
      quattuor a stabulis praestanti corpore *tauros*
      avertit, totidem forma superante *iuvencas*.
      atque *hos*, ne qua forent pedibus vestigia rectis,
      cauda in speluncam tractos versisque viarum   210
      indiciis raptor saxo occultabat opaco.

      '[But Cacus] … drove from their stalls four bulls of surpassing form, and as many heifers of peerless beauty. And *these*, that there might be no tracks pointing forward, he dragged by the tail into his cavern, and, with the signs of their course thus turned backwards, the thief hid them in the rocky darkness.' (Verg. *A*. 8. 207-211)

Instead of continuing the new focus of attention *tauros*/*iuvencas* by means of, for instance, the weaker anaphoric pronoun *eos*, and presenting the subsequent actions of Cacus as one single and continuous referential domain, the narrator for certain reasons chooses to emphatically present the events in two separate stages, as is also clear from the use of the connective particle *atque* ('and') in line 209. The use of *hos* forms an instruction for the addressee not to consider *tauros*/*iuvencas* as an ephemeral element in the discourse representation, but to retain this referent in his region of close focal attention, in order to embed a new discourse representation in this prior one.

A comparable explanation is possible for the use of *hic* in (13), although *hic* is used here in a quite different discourse constellation:

---

[21] A more or less comparable example in Virgil is *A*. 5.73-4.
[22] Comparable examples are *A*. 5.361; 5.378.

(13)   (*Aeneas tries to catch up with Turnus, who is being driven around in his chariot by*
         Iuturna)
         heu, quid agat? vario nequiquam fluctuat aestu,
         diversaeque vocant animum in contraria curae.
         huic Messapus, uti laeva duo forte gerebat
         lenta, levis cursu, praefixa hastilia ferro,
         horum unum certo contorquens derigit ictu.   490
         substitit Aeneas et se collegit in arma

         'Alas, what is he to do? Vainly he tosses on a shifting tide, and conflicting cares call
         his mind this way and that. Against *him* Messapus, who chanced to be carrying in his
         left hand two tough spears tipped with steel, lightly advancing, levels one *of these* and
         whirls it with unerring stroke. Aeneas halted, and gathered himself behind his shield'
         (Verg. *A*. 12.486-491)

The use of *huic* in line 488 can be taken as a sign that we are entering a new referential
domain, which, however, is firmly anchored in the prior one, and keeps Aeneas 'alive' as
participant in the next discourse representation. The second form of *hic* in this example,
horum in line 490, can be explained largely along the same lines. In the syntactically and
informationally quite complex clause in line 488-490 there is an obvious need for
compartmentalization, with the emphatic *horum* functioning as an explicit sign of how the
information in line 490 is to be 'plugged' into the syntactic structure and discourse
representation built up thus far in the sentence. It is significant that there is only one other
instance of the genitive plural *horum* outside the speeches in the *Aeneid*, and that this instance
(*A*. 12.273) functions in much the same way. Here, too, *horum* is used in a syntactically
highly complex sentence, at the transition from an embedded grammatical and referential
domain to a 'higher' domain. In both instances *horum* is emphatically placed in the first
position of the clause and verse. It is to be noted that the constructions are not essentially
different from the common use of 'resumptive' *hic* after a relative clause, an example of
which is given under (14):

(14)   *qui* cursu portas primi inrupere patentis,

        hos inimica super mixto premit agmine turba,   880

        nec miseram effugiunt mortem

        'Upon those who first broke at full speed through the open gates there presses hard a throng of foes, mingling with their ranks, nor do they escape a piteous death' (Verg. *A.* 11.879-881)

Both here and in (13) the pronoun *hic* is clearly used for reasons of processing ease.

3.2.2 Hic *as a marker of the global discourse organization*

The compartmentalizing effect of anadeictic *hic* as discussed in the previous section can also be observed at a more global level of the discourse organization, at major boundaries in the narrative structure. Previous studies have already drawn attention to the fact that referential choice is sensitive to the organization of the discourse as a whole, and that in narrative texts major as well as minor boundaries between segments tend to require a relatively 'heavy' type of anaphoric expression, the assumption being that the more problematic the identification of the referent is, the more coding it will receive (see above, §1).[23]

    In this section I will explore whether and how the occurrence of *hic* at specific types of boundaries in the narrative structure of the *Aeneid* can be explained on account of its particular deictic value, and in line with the uses of *hic* as discussed above. In this respect it is important to realize that 'discourse organization' or 'narrative structure' is not an unequivocal and unproblematic concept, and that we may need to have recourse to various principles and forms of discourse organization in order to explain and understand the use of *hic* in actual discourse, the general hypothesis being that *hic* serves as an anchoring device at the crossing of referential domains.

    One of these principles of narrative structure has been explored and formulated in so-called cognitive models of narrative/episodic structure, such as the influential model developed by Fludernik (1996, 2009) on the basis of Labov (1972). In these models it is assumed that a prototypical narrative episode is composed of a series (a 'cognitive schema') of seven components, usually labeled abstract, orientation, complicating action (or simply:

---

[23] See e.g. Longacre (1983), Fox (1987) and Givón (1993). For Latin see especially Bolkestein (2000; with references to earlier studies), and more recently Joffre (2010) and Kroon (2009, 2010).

complication), peak, evaluation, resolution, and coda.

Prototypical structure of a narrative episode (formulations taken from Allan 2009: 187):[24]

1.   *Abstract*: Point of story or summary of significant events
2.   *Orientation*: Identification of the time, place, circumstances and participants
3.   *Complication*: Build-up of tension
4.   *Peak*: Climax, decisive moment   } Conflict
5.   *Evaluation*: Narrator's comment
6.   *Resolution*: Outcome/result
7.   *Coda*: Closure, bridge to time of narrating

The transition from one segment of the global narrative structure to another may, from a cognitive point of view, be seen as a transition to a new referential domain in discourse memory, which for reasons of coherence may require the explicit resumption of a referent/discourse representation that has been activated in the immediately preceding discourse (in much the same way as in the instances discussed in 3.2.1 above). As we have seen, in Latin narrative the demonstrative *hic* is especially apt for such a job, and we indeed regularly find *hic*, both in the Virgil corpus and in the Ovid corpus, at macro-structural boundaries of this type. Most instances involve the transition from the Orientation stage of the episode (which often involves the 'priming' of a new referent, i.e. bringing the referent and all we need to know about this referent within the mental horizon of the addressee) to the Complication stage, in which the primed referent is now introduced into the narrative proper.[25] The earlier discussed example (1) may serve as an illustration:

(1) *laurus* erat tecti medio in penetralibus altis

    sacra comam multosque metu servata per annos,   60

    quam pater inventam, primas cum conderet arces,

    ipse ferebatur Phoebo sacrasse Latinus,

    Laurentisque ab *ea* nomen posuisse colonis.

    huius apes summum densae (mirabile dictu)

---

[24] See e.g. also Fleischman (1990: 135-154) and Toolan (1998: 136-9). Allan (2009) applies the model to the analysis of Euripidean messenger speeches. It is to be noted that narrative episodes tend to display a recursive structure of Complications, Peaks, and Resolutions, and that not all elements of the schema have to be present. The preferred position of the Evaluation is immediately after the Peak, but other positions are quite common.

[25] For the notion 'priming' as applied to the first discourse-functional position in a referential chain, see Emmott (1997). For Latin, see Kroon (2009: 117-8).

> stridore ingenti liquidum trans aethera vectae   65
>
> obsedere apicem

> 'In the midst of the palace, in the high inner courts, stood *a laurel* of sacred foliage,
> preserved in awe through many years, *which* lord Latinus himself was said to have
> founded and dedicated to Phoebus, when he built his first towers; and from *it* he gave his
> settlers their name Laurentes. In the top of *this* tree, wondrous to tell, settled a dense
> swarm of bees, borne with loud humming across the liquid air' (Verg. *A*. 7.59-66)

An analysis of this text fragment in terms of episodic structure enables us to explain the at
first sight problematic use of *huius* in line 65. In the first segment of the episodic structure a
new referent is primed, a laurel tree. This quite extensive priming runs from line 60 through
64, which section as a whole functions as the Orientation of the episode. The Orientation
section has a complex internal structure of its own, with a typical referential chain consisting
of a full NP (*laurus*), relative pronoun (*quam*), and anaphoric pronoun (*ea*).[26] In line 65 a
transition is made from Orientation to Complication: the relatively heavy demonstrative *huius*
forms the signal that we are about to enter a new referential domain which takes its anchor in
the current discourse representation (the now primed referent *laurus*). That we are crossing a
structural border is also clear from the tenses used: imperfect tense forms (*erat*, *ferebatur*) in
the Orientation section, a perfect tense form (*obsedere*) for the incident that starts up the
Complicating action. The motivation for using an anchoring device at this position in the
discourse structure is not essentially different from the one assumed for the occurrence of e.g.
horum in (13) above: in complex structures involving various embedded referential domains,
the need for anchoring devices apparently increases. This anchoring function of *hic* is usually
supported by a front position in clause and verse.[27]

   Examples (15) and (16) are further illustrations of the use of *hic* at the transition from
Orientation to Complication.

---

[26] Comparable examples from the corpus are e.g. *A*. 5.258-262; 11.879-880; 12.270-276.

[27] For *hic*'s preference for a sentence-initial position, see also Bolkestein (2000: 117-124) and Joffre (2010: 56).

(15)   Tantos *illa* suo rumpebat pectore questus:
       Aeneas celsa in puppi iam certus eundi
       carpebat somnos rebus iam rite paratis.   555
       huic se forma dei vultu redeuntis eodem
       obtulit (…)

       'Such were the cries that kept bursting from her heart.
        But now that all was duly ordered, and now that he was resolved on going, Aeneas
       was snatching sleep on his vessel's high stern. In his sleep there appeared to him a
       vision of the god, as he came again with the same aspect (…)' (Verg. *A*. 4.553-7)

In (15), Dido has just delivered a speech and is now being moved to a less central position in the attention of narrator and narratee, as is indicated by the use of *illa* (see the discussion in 2.2 above on *ille* as a signal of topic demotion). In the following line Aeneas is emphatically reintroduced in the discourse by mentioning his name in the first position of the clause and verse. Apparently the narrator starts a new episode here, the first two lines of which clearly have the status of an Orientation: indication of participant, place, circumstances, and the use of the imperfect as the typical tense for Orientations. The Complication follows as soon as line 556, where the demonstrative *huic*, placed in first position of clause and verse, serves as an explicit signal for a boundary in the episodic structure. As in (1), the use of *hic* co-occurs with a shift from imperfect to perfect tense (*obtulit*).

Example (16) contains the famous description of Fama in book 4 of the *Aeneid*:

(16)   Extemplo Libyae magnas it *Fama* per urbes,
       Fama, malum *qua* non aliud velocius ullum:
       mobilitate vigetØ viresque adquiritØ eundo,   175
       parva metu primo, mox sese attollitØ in auras
       ingrediturØque solo et caput inter nubila conditØ.
       illam Terra parens ira inritata deorum
       extremam, ut perhibent, Coeo Enceladoque sororem
       progenuit ….   180
       (*9 lines with a description of Fama's appearance and nature; references to Fama by
       means of zero expressions and actual present tense forms*)

> *haec* tum multiplici populos sermone replebat
>
> gaudens, et pariter facta atque infecta canebat: 190

'At once *Rumour* runs through Libya's great cities – Rumour the swiftest of all evils. Speeds lends her strength, and she wins vigour as she goes; small at first through fear, soon she mounts up to heaven, and walks the ground with head hidden in the clouds. *Her*, 'tis said, Mother Earth, provoked to anger against the gods, brought forth last, as sister to Coeus and Enceladus, …..(*9 lines with a description of Fama's appearance and usual behavior; references to Fama by means of zero expressions and actual present tense forms*)

Now exulting in manifold gossip, *she* filled the nations and sang alike of fact and falsehood' (Verg. *A*. 4.173-190)

In (16) a new episode starts with the priming of a new referent, personified *Fama* (Rumour). Again, this priming (in the Orientation section) is quite elaborate and takes up as many as 16 lines, in which the narrative proper is temporarily suspended and the narrator even swaps the narrative discourse mode for an information mode with actual present tense forms. Like in example (1), the Orientation section has a complex internal structure, with a prototypical referential chain in which a full NP (*Fama*) is subsequently followed by an anaphoric pronoun (the relative *qua*) and a number of zero references, only once interrupted by a form of *ille* for indicating a (temporary) topic shift in line 178. The occurrence of *haec* in line 189 (again at the first position of clause and verse) is a strong signal that we are leaving the Orientation stage and now finally enter a Complication. The adverb *tum* ('then') and the use of past tenses after a series of actual present tenses are other signs of the occurrence of a major boundary in the episodic structure: after an elaborate priming of the referent Fama, which even took us temporarily out of the story world proper, the use of *haec* invites us to re-enter this story world, and to anchor the upcoming information in the now elaborately updated discourse representation of Fama.

Although the transition from an Orientation to a Complication appears to be a quite natural habitat for anaphoric *hic* in my epic corpus[28], it is not excluded at other boundaries in the narrative structure, as can be seen in example (17), taken from the episode of the death of Priam in book 2 of the *Aeneid*. Here, the use of *hic* (adnominally used in the word group *haec*

---

[28] The Ovid sample also contains a number of examples of anaphoric *hic* after an elaborate priming of the referent in the preceding context. An example is e.g. Ov. *Met*. 8.451-461.

finis) accompanies the transition from the Conflict of the episode to a Coda-like section, the latter of which nicely counterbalances the Abstract section at the beginning of the episode (*forsitan et Priami fuerint quae fata requires*, 'perchance, too, thou mayst inquire what was Priam's fate', *A.* 2.506).

(17)   …   hoc dicens altaria ad ipsa trementem   550
        traxit et in multo lapsantem sanguine nati,
        implicuitque comam laeva, dextraque coruscum
        extulit ac lateri capulo tenus abdidit ensem.
        haec finis Priami fatorum, *hic exitus* illum
        sorte tulit Troiam incensam et prolapsa videntem   555
        Pergama, tot quondam populis terrisque superbum
        regnatorem Asiae.

'So saying, to the very altar stones he drew him, trembling and slipping in his son's streaming blood, and wound his left hand in his hair, while with the right he raised high the flashing sword and buried it to the hilt in his side.

    Such was the close of Priam's fortunes; *such the doom* that by fate befell him – to see Troy in flames and Pergamus laid low, he who was once lord of so many tribes and lands, the monarch of Asia.' (Verg. *A.* 2.550-557)

By using a form of *hic* in combination with a 'summarizing' abstract noun (*finis*, *exitus*), the narrator reinstalls in discourse memory the representation of the entire preceding episode (the entire mental construct), for reasons of wrapping up and providing his personal evaluation of the events. This seems also to be the case in (18), which cannot be described in terms of a transition from Conflict to Resolution/Coda (or some other transition between the elements of a prototypical episodic structure), but in which we can still observe a clear boundary in the narrative structure, marked by a form of *hic* in a front position of the clause and verse:[29]

(18)   (*Sinon has just finished his speech*)

---

[29] It is relevant to remind here that the *Aeneid,* in contrast to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, is not structured as a concatenation of individual episodes, each displaying some sort of prototypical structure as discussed here. Although such embedded episodes with a more or less prototypical structure do occur (e.g. the episode of Priam's death in book 2, or the episode of Nisus and Euryalus in book 9), most of the text consists of subsequent complications with intermittent reorientations, evaluations, embedded speeches, etcetera.

> *His lacrimis* vitam damus et miserescimus ultro.
>
> 'To these tears we grant life and pity him besides.' (Verg. *A*. 2.145)

With *his lacrimis* Sinon's entire speech is wrapped up and given a 'summarizing' label under which it can now be stored in discourse memory. Such labels may be merely a summary (cf. an expression like *his dictis*, 'by these words'), but, as here, may also convey a subjective interpretation or evaluation of the narrator. As a whole the word group serves as the anchor on the basis of which a new discourse representation can be built.[30]

This type of resumptive, recapitulating function of *hic*, which is typical of its adnominal use, has also been discussed by Bolkestein (2000: 121-2), who draws attention to the fact that the anaphoric pronouns *is* and *qui* in her sample, as well as the demonstrative *ille*, are notoriously lacking in this function. Absolute ablative constructions of the type *his dictis* ('these words said') or other participle constructions (e.g. *hoc dicens*, 'this saying'; see ex. 17 above, l.550) work in the same way.[31] An example is (19):

(19)   (*after having narrated a sailing race and the distribution of prizes, the narrator starts a new episode*)

    hoc pius Aeneas *misso certamine* tendit

    gramineum in campum

    'This contest sped, loyal Aeneas moves to a grassy plain' (Verg. *A*. 5.286-287)

4.   The use of *hic* in narrative texts: *reculer pour mieux sauter*

In this article, I undertook to demonstrate how recent developments in the field of (cognitive) discourse linguistics can be of use in furthering our understanding of the Latin system of anaphoric reference, and of referential choice in actual discourse situations, concentrating on the 'anaphoric' use of the demonstrative *hic* in Virgil's *Aeneid*. I argued that in order to give an integrative account of the use of *hic* in this corpus, we have to do full justice to the semantic aspect of proximity of *hic*, which can also be shown to be present in its textual, anaphoric uses. This is in accordance with current cognitive linguistic theory, which regards deixis and anaphora not as mutually exclusive procedure types, but as special instances on a

---

[30] Some random other examples are 4.456 (*hoc visum*); 5.596 (*hunc morem cursus atque haec certamina*).

[31] For the use of *hic* in absolute ablative constructions, see Bolkestein (2002).

cline of indexical reference. In this context, the concept of anadeixis was introduced (Cornish 2010, 2011). In the case of anadeictic reference (anaphoric reference by means of demonstratives, like Latin *hic* and *ille*), the semantic deictic aspects of proximity and remoteness are to be taken as pertaining to positions in mental space, with proximal demonstratives (like Latin *hic*) pointing to a region of focal referential concern of the interlocutors, and distal demonstratives (like Latin *ille*) to a region of disfocal concern.

Starting from these theoretical assumptions, I passed, in my discussion of Latin *hic* in the *Aeneid*, from its purely deictic uses (in the transposed configurations of pseudo-simultaneous narrative, and of embedded focalization) to instances where canonical deixis borders on anadeixis. This latter group of instances involves the use of *hic* as a means to indicate that the narrator's camera swerves from one item in a (physical and visible) row to the immediately following one, yielding the effect of a well-ordered and demarcated series, in which, by re-installing the preceding item, the next item in the list does not come as a surprise, but seems to be emphatically 'anchored' in the prior one (*hic* in catalogues). This same procedure of anchoring, with the same effect of emphatic compartmentalization of the information, can also be observed outside the context of real catalogues, whenever the narrator feels the need to explicitly dose and segment the information, in contexts of apparent *continuity* of the information. The *hic*-anaphor resumes the current state of the discourse representation (i.e. the information in the region of current focal concern of the interlocutors), and, as such, serves as a consolidation in order to make a new informational jump forwards: a communicative strategy which we might call *reculer pour mieux sauter* (cf. also Joffre 2010).

This procedure of *reculer pour mieux sauter* may obtain at a quite local level of the text (even within the boundaries of a grammatical sentence, cf. examples 13 and 14) or at a global level of the text, at major boundaries in the discourse structure. In the final section of the article I discussed a number of examples where *hic* is found as a consolidating and summarizing device at major boundaries in the episodic structure (e.g. from Orientation to Complication), or at major shifts in the mode of presentation (e.g. from narrative to comment, or from information to narrative). In all these instances *hic* occupies a fronted position in the clause and verse and seems to serve as a beacon for canalizing the incoming new information. By tracing the forms of *hic* in the text, it appears to be possible to identify the major structural knots in the discourse organization.

In this article I have not addressed the issue of the interchangeability of *hic* and the canonical anaphoric pronoun *is*, the latter of which is not used frequently in the *Aeneid* (cf. note 18). On the basis of earlier research on other Latin authors, for instance de Jong (1996)

and Bolkestein (2000), we might, however, hypothesize that forms of *is* are used when the anaphoric reference obtains within one and the same referential domain, whereas *hic* preferably occurs at the transition to another referential domain.[32] In examples like (20) below it might therefore be impossible to replace *hos* in l.372 by *eos*, considering that in the clause starting with *cum procul* we return from a digression (lines 367-371, demarcated as such by the adverb *interea* and the use of the imperfect tense) to the main story line of the events of Nisus and Euryalus, whom we left in line 366, but who in line 372 are resumed in the discourse by means of *hos*.

(20)   …. excedunt castris et tuta capessunt.

interea praemissi equites ex urbe Latina,

cetera dum legio campis instructa moratur,

ibant et Turno regi responsa ferebant,

ter centum, scutati omnes, Volcente magistro.   370

iamque propinquabant castris murosque subibant

cum procul *hos* laevo flectentis limite cernunt

'They leave the camp and make for safety. Meanwhile horsemen, sent forward from the Latin city, while the rest of the force halts drawn up on the plain, came bringing a reply to king Turnus – three hundred, all bearing shields, with Volcens as leader. And now they were nearing the camp and coming under the wall, when at a distance they see *the two* turning away by a pathway to the left;' (Verg. *A*. 9.366-372)

The use of *eos* instead of *hos* would have been felt here by the reader as an instruction to seek the intended referent within the confines of the same referential domain (the digression section), wrongly leading to the identification of the referent of *eos* with the subject of the immediately preceding sentence (Volcens and his horsemen). The choice of *hos* here implies a consolidation of the referents Nisus and Euryalus, who apparently – as we retrospectively

---

[32] An exception to this tendency seems to be formed by the use of *is* in the nom. masc. sing., which is quite often found at the boundary of referential domains (9 instances in my sample, most of them in the form *isque*). See e.g. *A*. 6.684: [Orientation] *pater Anchises … lustrabat … recensebat …* [complication] *Isque ubi …. vidit Aeneam,* [*dicit*]. The use of the nom. masc. sing. *hic*, by contrast, is relatively rare in this position: in books 2, 4, 5, and 6 there are only two pronominal instances of the nominative form *hic*: the contrastive pair *hic … ille* discussed in example (7), and *A*. 4.198. One explanation might be that the use of a demonstrative expression type to draw attention to a continued subject would be a kind of overkill, even at major boundaries in the discourse structure. Note that in *A*. 4.198 *hic* continues a non-subject.

have to conclude as readers – have never been removed from the region of focal concern.

Although in (20) *hos* appears to be the most natural choice, and *eos* (and also *illos*) would be highly unlikely in the particular discourse constellation involved, it has to be emphasized that we are still dealing here with a narratorial choice, and not with a grammatical rule. The choice of *hic* (instead of e.g. a form of *is* or another referential expression) may be the outcome of a variety of discourse motivations and constellations, and can never be predicted, only, at best, explained.

I finally want to emphasize that I in no way want to pretend that the observations in this article are all entirely new: many of them have been made earlier, in the context of other authors and genres, and as the result of other research questions. I do hope, however, that the article gives a good impression of the state of the art in this field of research, and that the integrative account presented here may contribute to a better understanding, not only of how anadeictic reference (and especially anadeictic *hic*) works in Latin, but also, in a more general way, how coherent and communicatively effective discourse is construed.

REFERENCES

Adema, S.M. 2005. *The Tense of Speech Indications in Vergil's Aeneid*, in: Calboli, G. (ed.) *Latina Lingua!* (Roma), 419-431

Adema, S.M. 2007. *Discourse modes and bases in Vergil's* Aeneid, in: Allan, R.J., Buijs, M. (eds.) *The Language of Literature. Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Leiden), 42-64

Adema, S.M. 2008. *Discourse Modes and Bases. A Study of the Use of Tenses in Vergil's Aeneid* (PhD Thesis, VU University Amsterdam)

Allan, R.J. 2009. *Towards a typology of the narrative modes in Ancient Greek. Text types and narrative structure in Euripidean messenger speeches*, in: Bakker, S., Wakker, G. (eds.) *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (Leiden), 171-203

Ariel, M. 1990. *Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents* (London)

Ariel, M. 2001. *Accessibility Theory. An overview*, in: Sanders, T., Schilperoord, J., Spooren, W. (eds.) *Text Representation. Linguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia), 29-87

Axelson, B. 1945. *Unpoetische Wörter: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache* (Lund)

Bakker, E.J. 2010. *Pragmatics: speech and text*, in: Bakker, E.J. (ed.) *Blackwell's Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Malden), 151-167

Bolkestein, A.M. 2000. *Discourse organization and anaphora in Latin*, in: Herring, S. et al. (eds.) *Textual Parameters in Older Languages* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia), 107-137

Bolkestein, A.M. 2002. *Resumptive ablative absolute phrase in Latin*, in: Shalev, D., Szawicky, L. (eds.) *Donum Grammaticum: Studies in Latin and Celtic Philology and Linguistics in Honour of Hannah Rosén* (Louvain-la-Neuve), 51-63

Brisard, F. 2002. *The English present*, in: Brisard, F. (ed.) *Grounding. The Epistemic Footing of Deixis and Reference* (Berlin/New York), 251-297

Bühler, K. 1990 [1934]. *Sprachtheorie* (Jena)

Bühler, K. 1982. *The deictic field of language and deictic words*, in: Jarvella, R.J., Klein, W. (eds. and trans.) *Speech, Place, and Action* (London), 9-30 [abridged translated version of Part 2 of Bühler's *Sprachtheorie* (1990 [1934]), esp. chapters 7 and 8]

Cornish, F. 2003. *The roles of (written) text and anaphor type distribution in the construction of discourse*, Text 23(1), 1-26

Cornish, F. [2]2006. *Discourse Anaphora*, in: Brown, K. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of language and Linguistics* (Oxford), 631-638

Cornish, F. 2010. *Anaphora: Text –based or discourse-dependent? Functionalist vs. Formalist accounts*, Functions of Language 17(2), 207-241

Cornish, F. 2011. *'Strict' anadeixis, discourse deixis and text structuring*, Language Sciences 33(5), 753-767

Diessel, H. 1999. *Demonstratives. Form, Function and Grammaticalization* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia)

Emmott, C. 1997. *Narrative Comprehension. A Discourse Perspective* (Oxford)

Fleischman, S. 1990. *Tense and Narrativity: from Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction* (Austin)

Fludernik, M. 1996. *Towards a 'Natural' Narratology* (London/New York)

Fludernik, M. 2009. *An Introduction to Narratology* (London/New York)

Fox, B. 1987. *Discourse Structure and Anaphora* (Cambridge)

Givón, T. 1983. *Introduction*, in: Givón, T. (ed.) *Topic Continuity in Discourse. A Quantitative Cross-Language Study* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia), 5-41

Givón, T. 1993. *English Grammar II* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia)

Himmelmann, N.P. 1996. *Demonstratives in narrative discourse: a taxonomy of universal uses*, in: Fox, B. (ed.) *Studies in Anaphora* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia), 205-254

Janssen, T. 2004. *Deictic principles of pronominals, demonstratives, and tenses*, in: Brisard, F. (ed.) *Grounding The Epistemic Footing of Deixis and Reference* (Berlin/New York), 151-193

Joffre, M. 2010. *Cohérence textuelle et deixis; Le jeu hic/ille dans la prose latine*, in: Anreiter, P., Kienpointner, M. (eds.) *Latin Linguistics Today. Proceedings of 15ᵗʰ International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Innsbruck April 2008* (Innsbruck), 561-574

Jong, I.J.F. de. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam)

Jong, I.J.F. de. 2014. *Narratology and classics: a practical guide* (Oxford)

Jong, J.R. de. 1996. *The borderline between deixis and anaphora in Latin*, in: Rosén, H. (ed.) *Aspects of Latin* (Innsbruck), 499-510

Kleiber, G. 1994. *Anaphores et pronoms* (Louvain-la-Neuve)

Kroon, C. 2007. *Discourse modes and the use of tenses in Ovid's* Metamorphoses, in: Allan, R.J., Buijs, M. (eds.) *The Language of Literature. Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Leiden), 65-92

Kroon, C. 2009. *Text structure and referential choice in narrative. The anaphoric use of the Latin demonstrative* ille, Belgian Journal of Linguistics 23, 115-131

Kroon, C. 2010. *Anaphoric Reference and referential choice in Ovid's* Metamorphoses, in: Anreiter, P., Kienpointner, M. (eds.) *Latin Linguistics Today. Proceedings of 15ᵗʰ International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Innsbruck April 2008* (Innsbruck), 579-593

McCarthy, M. 1994. Is*, this *and* that, in: Coulthard, M. (ed.) *Advances in Written Text Analysis* (London), 266-275

Labov, W. 1972. *Language in the Inner City* (Philadelphia)

Longacre, R. 1983. *The Grammar of Discourse* (New York)

Pennell Ross, D. 1996. *Anaphors and antecedents in narrative texts*, in: Rosén, H. (ed.) *Aspects of Latin* (Innsbruck), 511-52

Pinkster, H. 1999. *The present tense in Virgil's Aeneid*, Mnemosyne 52(4), 705-717

Pinkster, H. 2005. *The use of* is *and* ille *in Seneca Rhetor*, in: Kiss, S., Mondin, L., Salvi, G. (eds.) *Latin et Langues Romanes Études de linguistique offertes à József Herman* (Tübingen), 57-64

Toolan, M. 1998. *Language in Literature. An Introduction to Stylistics* (London)

Torrego, M.E. 2010. *Función textual y literaria de la voz pasiva en* la Eneida *de Virgilio*, in: González Castro, J.F., de la Villa, J. (eds.) *Perfiles de Grecia y Roma. Actas del XII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos* (Madrid), 195-227

Van Vliet, S. 2008. *Proper Nouns and Pronouns. The Production of Referential Expressions in Narrative Discourse* (PhD Thesis, Tilburg University)