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Abstract

It is well known that direct objects of transitive verbs can be omitted in Greek in occurrences in which they refer to definite antecedents (hence the definition of ‘definite referential Null Objects). Under what conditions omission can occur has never been the topic of any detailed study. Based on previous research on Latin, and on extensive analysis of Greek texts, I try to describe these conditions. It turns out that there are constructions where omission is the rule (e.g. with conjunct participles), and thus must be regarded as syntactically conditioned. Other occurrences are best explained as a matter of high topicality and low communicative dynamism of the omitted objects.

0. Introduction.

The purpose of the present paper is to describe the conditions under which definite referential N(ull direct) O(bjects) can occur in Ancient Greek. In order to define the topic of this article, let’s start by comparing the following two examples:

(1) 

toiÏi de\decion hÄen erwdio\n e\ggj o\doi\b P allaj ÚqhnaÎn: toi\d' ouk idon 
Ø, of\qai moi\si nu\kta di' of\nai\n, al la\kl a\gcantoj a\ious an \Ø, 
“Athena sent them a heron to the right of their route: they could not see it in the dark night, but heard it screaming”, Il. 10.274-276;

(2) 
ProtouÆaa aÆcas qai h\maj=of\n kai\v \kouÆein kai\ca\b a ai\bqa\nes qai 
tue\v\ca\b de\vi\hfo\aj episthm\n autou\ajou o\aj e\ca\b 
“They began to see or hear or use the other senses we must somewhere have gained a knowledge of abstract or absolute equality”, Pl. Phaedo 75b.

In example (1) we find three clauses with transitive verbs, all sharing the same direct object. The direct object, erwdion, ‘a heron’, is phonologically realized only in the first of the three clauses, with the verb hÄen, ‘she sent’. In the second and third clauses, with the verbs idon, ‘they saw’, and a\ious an, ‘they heard’, we find occurrences of definite referential NO’s. In English, a language which does not allow NO’s under these conditions, one must add pronominal objects to make the translation grammatical. Note that the omitted constituents play a syntactic role, similar to phonologically realized ones, as shown by agreement of the predicative participle kl a\gcantoj, ‘screaming’, with the omitted direct object.¹

¹ Note that the participle is inflected in the genitive, because the verb akouêin, ‘to hear’, is a transitive verb that takes the genitive; see below, § 1.2.
In example (2), forms of the same two verbs occur, but they are used in a different way. As we can see from the English translation, no pronominal objects need to be supplied. In fact, there is a semantic difference between the two couples of verbs, both in Greek and in English: these are verbs that have two different predicate frames, a bivalent (transitive) and a monovalent (intransitive) one. In the terminology of Mittwoch (1982), they can denote either an achievement (‘to see/hear something’), or an activity (‘to see/hear’). In traditional grammars, monovalent use of transitive verbs is often referred to as ‘absolute’.

Note that in cases where I speak of intransitive (or absolute) use of transitive verbs, one may prefer to speak, following Fillmore (1986), of ‘indefinite null objects’. In any case, it must be kept in mind that not all transitive verbs can be used intransitively, or, to put it differently, not all transitive verbs allow indefinite objects. The possibility of being used in two different ways really appears to be connected with the existence of two groups of transitive verbs. Of these two groups, one has both a bivalent and a monovalent predicate frame, while the other only has the bivalent one (i.e. the latter group is constituted of transitive verbs which can only denote achievements).

The topic of the present paper is constituted uniquely by definite referential NO’s (hence simply NO’s), such as those demonstrated by means of example (1). While valency change is a semantic property of groups of verbs, possible occurrence of NO’s appears to be connected with the type of pronominal system of a specific language, and the occurrence of other null arguments, notably of Null Subjects, as I will argue below.

Although NO’s have been the topic of a fairly rich number of recent publications, little attention has been paid to their occurrence in the classical languages; in particular, to my knowledge, no research has been specifically devoted to Ancient Greek. The present paper intends to offer a preliminary survey of the problem: more research is needed in order to clarify all constraints on syntactically conditioned NO’s, especially in cases where their antecedent is not itself a NO. Since the primary purpose of my investigation is expository, I will not be using any formal theoretical framework, although I will refer to studies from different backgrounds.

Some Greek data have been discussed in van der Wurf (1997), in an attempt to assess the status of NO in Proto-Indo-European. However, since the aim of the paper was to establish whether NO’s can be reconstructed for PIE, there is no thorough discussion of their conditions of occurrence, neither in Greek nor in the other Indo-European languages.

---

2 On NO’s in Latin, see Luraghi (1997), where I have surveyed the existing literature. See also Luraghi (1998c).
3 For a typological evaluation of the Greek data, see Luraghi (forthcoming a).
4 My examples (of which only a part is quoted in this article) are drawn from the following corpus: Homer: Iliad, Odyssey; Herodotus: Histories, books 1, 2, 3; Plato: Symposium, Apology of Socrates, Crito, Phaedo, Protagoras; Demostenes: speeches 4, 6, 9, 10 (Philipics); Lysias: speeches 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; Isocrates: Helena and Panegyricon; New Testament: the four Gospels.
Before going further into this discussion, I will briefly summarize a number of problems raised by Ancient Greek (§ 1). Section 2 is devoted to syntactically conditioned occurrences, i.e. cases where the occurrence of a NO is obligatory. In § 3 I will survey discourse conditioned occurrences of NO, and will show the difference, in pragmatic terms, between NO’s and other types of anaphora. Section 4 contains a discussion of the data analyzed in § 2 and 3, and § contains the conclusions.

1. Some properties of anaphora in Ancient Greek

1.1. Types of antecedent

NO’s, as other anaphoras, must refer back to a recoverable antecedent; the latter need not be a direct object, as shown in the following examples:

(3) su|del{suggenes qai meh moi, kaidi datai Q, efug[e kaiouk haei hsaj, deur de|ei|lagiej Q, oi|anoqj esti|ei|lagintouj kol a|sewj deomenouj all'ou) maeqhe|swj

“but you avoided associating with me and instructing me, and were unwilling to do so, but you hale me in here, where it is the law to hale in those who need punishment, not instruction”, Pl. Apol. 26a;

(4) o(de|hmpi|aj a|paftw|n, thn gnw|h|n a|pepenme Q,

“having satisfied the expectations of all, he dismissed them”, Xen. An. 1.7.8;

(5) ou|ga|t oi|ama qemite|ei|dai aheai ni|onj ah|dir|l|u|polxe|a|noj bl a|ptes qai. a|pokteine|e|e Q, menta|ai|awj hae|tel a|seien Q, hae|t|in|we|q|eien Q,

“for I believe it's not God’s will that a better man be injured by a worse. He might however perhaps kill him, or banish him, or disfranchise him”, Pl. Apol. 30d.

In (3) two transitive verbs, didaskein, ‘to instruct’, and eisagein, ‘to sue’, have NO’s; the antecent is the dative pronominal form moi, governed by the intransitive verb suggenes qai, ‘to associate with’. In (4) the NO of apopenme, ‘he dismissed’, has as its antecedent the genitive apftwn, ‘of all’. Finally, in (5) we find three occurrences of NO’s, with the verbs apokteinein, ‘to kill’, etel auinein, ‘to banish’, aliran, ‘to dishonor’; the antecedent of all three is the dative aheaini ahdri\ for a better man’, which occurs with the expression geniton ei|dai, ‘to be legal’.

Another interesting example is

(6) au|ta|e|egwe|speu|somai ei|jux|il haei, i'ai o|trw|w Q, pol emia|ein
“but I will hasten to Achilles, that I may urge him on to do battle”, II. 15.401-402.

where the antecedent of the NO is a complement of a preposition.

In example (7), we find a NO which refers back to a direct object in the genitive:5

(7) autoj gar aiousa qeou=kai the drakon Ø, aetn
   “I myself heard the goddess and saw her before me”, II. 24.223.

The verb eisde/rkomai, ‘to see’, ‘to look at’, is found two more times in Homer (Od. 9.146 and 19.476), with an accusative object; here, aetn is an adverb.

1.2. Non-accusative direct objects

Another question raised by Ancient Greek concerns the morphological case of the omittable constituents. Note that I am still speaking of direct objects only, and not of other possible second arguments. As a matter of fact, in Ancient Greek one finds a number of non-accusative second arguments that behave syntactically as direct objects, in the sense that they can be made the subject of passive verbs, as shown in the following examples:

(8) oj ahti\men doul wn epoi\hs aj el euq\ef ouj Pe\rsaj ei\hai, ahti\de\ja\xes qai up' ajl wna\jxein ap\ant w
   “for you have made the Persians free men instead of slaves and rulers of all instead of subjects of any”, Hdt. 1.210.2;

(9) oj(\del Pe\rsai ta\j te\dn\Sa\f dj e\x\on kai\aut\on Kroi\son exwgrhs an, a\j\c\anta e\j\ea\t\ses\kes\ka\de\ka\ka\tes\ses\kes\ka\de\h\n\n\n   “The Persians gained Sardis and took Croesus prisoner. Croesus had ruled fourteen years and been besieged fourteen days”, Hdt. 1.86.1.

In example (8) the verb aJxein, ‘to rule’, occurs twice, once as a passive, with an agent phrase, up' ajl wn, ‘by others’, and the second time as active with a direct object, ap\ant w, ‘everyone’. The possibility of being passivized shows that non-accusative complements of such verbs are in fact direct objects.6 Example (9) contains an occurrence of aJxein used intransitively.

Apparently verbs with genitive objects behave in the same way as verbs with accusative objects with respect of omission, too. Omission of a genitive object is found in example (2), with

5 See the next section on non-accusative direct objects.
6 On the passive of verbs that take non-accusative objects, see Conti Jiménez (1998).
a) kousan; note further that in (1) the participle klaγksantoj, which refers to the omitted object is inflected in the genitive (cf. example (37) below, with predicative participles in the accusative).
An example with no predicative participle is

(10) th=j pol ewj, d' ouf wj a(ouʃhj ai$ xrwj=kai\kakwj=oi(men ajxousi $, kai\ turannousi $,

“But since that base and shameful capture of the city, the latter have been its rulers and tyrants”, Dem. 9.62.

Note that here the antecedent of the NO is in the genitive because it occurs in a genitive absolute construction. Interestingly, the NO is shared by two coordinated verbs, of which not only ajxousi, but also turannousi, ‘they are the tyrants’, usually take the genitive.

The extent to which all verbs with non-accusative objects should be considered transitive verbs is discussed. While possible passivization dates back at least to Homer for verbs which govern the genitive, verbs with dative objects are found in the passive only from Herodotus onward. This is the case of the verb xrapnai, ‘to use’. Note that this verb allows omission, as shown in

(11) fanerw=j de\ peri\ pantwn dial el unehon ajneis qai\ ta\ peri\ th=j anqrwpou-

“he denies, in face of the settlement clearly made on every point, that we agreed to share the woman between us”, Lys. 4.1.

1.3. Types of pronominal objects

In Ancient Greek personal pronouns display an opposition between full forms, which are stressed and can occur in any position in the sentence, and reduced forms, which do not bear independent accent. Unaccented forms are enclitic, so they cannot occur in sentence initial position. In grammatical descriptions of Greek, such pronouns, as well as other words and particles that never occur sentence initial, are called ‘postpositives’. As the enclitics of most ancient Indo-European languages, these unaccented forms follow Wackernagel’s law, albeit not rigidly, i.e. they are placed after the first accented word in the sentence. Wackernagel’s clitics are also called P2 clitics.

In all literary dialects of Ancient Greek, we find for first person singular a distinction between accented forms (eme/acc., emou=gen., emoi=dat.) and clitic forms (me, mou, moi), the latter also following Wackernagel’s Law. Second person singular pronouns have P2 clitic forms that are

8 See Dover (1970: 12-13).
homophonous to the accented ones, but they are consistently written without accent also follow Wackernagel’s Law. In Homer and partly in Herodotus (Ionic) there are a number of enclitic forms for third person that do not occur in Attic prose, which constitutes the bulk of Greek sources. Both Homer and Herodotus make extensive use of the enclitic form min for third person singular in all three genders (in Herodotus au-ton is also regularly found); furthermore, in Homer an unaccented form of the reflexive pronoun ε is sometimes used as anaphoric pronoun for third person. The normal anaphoric third person pronoun in Attic-Ionic prose is au-ton, which may well have had unstressed variants, but is virtually always written as accented. The anaphoric function of au-ton developed out of its demonstrative function in preclassical time already; so au-ton is sometimes found as anaphoric pronoun in Homer, too. Finally, in Homer P2 clitic forms of reflexive pronouns are found in the plural, too, and they function as anaphoric third person pronouns, just as in the singular. De-emphatic forms of au-ton does not consistently follow Wackernagel’s Law, but they share with other de-emphatic pronouns the constraint that they never occur in sentence initial position.

An interesting question is whether these pronouns constitute instances of ‘special’ clitics. In the terminology of Zwicky (1977), special clitics are pronominal clitics which have special placement rules, and do not share the distribution with the corresponding accented pronouns. Special clitics are highly grammaticalized forms of pronouns, that share part of the properties of pronominal affixes, and the anaphoric functions of free pronouns, i.e. they have some features of free forms, and some of bound forms. Special clitics have no freedom of placement and occur in fixed order, much in the same way as affixes. This is the case in the Romance languages, where clitics meet the conditions for being considered ‘special’ clitics:

a) they have special placement rules, being obligatorily are hosted by the verb, from which they cannot be separated;

b) they do not share the distribution of free forms, for examples because left dislocated constituents trigger clitic doublement, as in

9 On Wackernagel’s Law in Ancient Greek see Luraghi (1990) and (1998a).
10 Of course, diacritics have been added relatively late in Greek spelling conventions.
11 On the accentuation of plural forms, see Schwyzer (1950).
12 This form is found as an archaisms in later poetry, where the corresponding Doric form nin also occurs.
13 On the accentuation of this pronoun, see Schwyzer (1950: 191). According to Schwyzer (1950: 190), the nominative autós is never used as anaphoric pronoun in Classical Greek; such use is only attested starting with the late koine.
14 Wackernagel (1892: 366) only mentions possible placement of the genitive in second position; given the prosodic difference of au-ton from the other clitics, and also its later origin as third person anaphoric pronoun, its occurrence early in the sentence must rather be viewed as a consequence of its conveying old information.
15 See Bossong (1998) for an assessment of the status (clitics or affixes?) of the Romance clitics.
where the occurrence of \(l(e)\) is obligatory with normal intonation and the clitic could not be replaced by an accented pronominal form.

It must be mentioned that in Greek Wackernagel’s Law, although well attested, was not very strict: enclitic pronouns in particular could be placed in different positions after several accented words/constituents, where they created prosodic breaks in the sentence that were exploited for stylistic and pragmatic purposes (see Luraghi, 1990). This tendency became increasingly widespread after Homer. Most important, Ancient Greek pronominal clitics do not appear to have a different distribution with respect to accented pronouns. In other words, their function is the same as the function of free pronouns; they are not grammaticalized to such an extent that they should be considered partly affixes. Greek clitic and accented pronouns differ only in the degree of communicative dynamism; the fact that clitics cannot occur in sentence initial position, while accented pronouns can, is a consequence of their low communicative dynamism, by which they cannot be emphatic or bear contrastive focus. It follows that Greek pronominal clitics cannot be considered ‘special’ clitics, as those of the Romance languages.¹⁶

2. Syntactically conditioned cases of omission

Although it is commonly believed that omission of the direct object is not syntactically determined in the classical languages,¹⁷ there are contexts where omission is the rule. One such context in Ancient Greek is constituted by the extremely frequent occurrences of a conjunct participle that shares the same direct object with its governing verb, which I will analyze in § 2.1.

In Luraghi (1997) I have shown that the occurrence of a NO is virtually obligatory in Latin in coordinated sentences that share the same direct object. Coordination is a context that triggers omission in Greek, too, as I will show in § 2.2.

Finally, as a third case of syntactically conditioned NO’s we find the question and answer pattern already examined in van der Wurff (1997); I will briefly comment on such occurrences in § 2.3.

2.1. Conjunct participles

¹⁶ Languages with special clitics usually do not allow NO’s, as I have shown in Luraghi (forthcoming a).
¹⁷ As for example in Mulder (1991).
The conjunct participle is a very frequent construction in Ancient Greek. It consists of one or more participles that depend on another verb form which has the same subject.\textsuperscript{18} It has been noted that the conjunct participle occurs where an adverbial or a paratactic construction could also occur (Pompei, 2000). English equivalents of such constructions are coordinated sentences or gerunds: in fact, it can be argued that the high frequency of conjunct participles in Ancient Greek is a way to put up with the absence of an adverbial verb form (gerunds, or ‘converbs’, see Pompei, 2000, and Luraghi, forthcoming b).

A well known fact about conjunct participles is that the subject, shared by the governing verb and the participle, if expressed, can only occur once, much in the same way as the subject of coverbs, when it is coreferential with the subject of the main verb.\textsuperscript{19} A less known but nevertheless equally regular feature is that, in the case that both the conjunct participle and the governing verb are transitive and share the same direct object, the direct object, too, can only be expressed once. The difference between the syntax of subjects and of direct objects of conjunct participles lies in the fact that the subject of the conjunct participle must be coreferential with the subject of the governing verb (in fact this is the condition that allows the occurrence of the construction), while the direct object of a conjunct participle may be coreferential with the direct object of the governing verb, but this is not a necessary condition.

Example (13) contains a series of conjunct participles; of these, the first shares the direct object (\textit{thn po\i\ n}, ‘the city’) with the governing verb, which implies a NO. The second and third participles, \textit{apoktei\aj}, ‘having killed’, and \textit{e\cel\ as\aj}, ‘having banished’, are governed by \textit{e\l\ xe}, he got hold’. The three verb forms have different direct objects, all overtly expressed:

\begin{quote}
(13) \textit{ta\w\ me prw=ta trix=va\sa\ moi\n \textit{thn po\i\ n} to\sa\i\ \textit{a\d\l\ feo\si\i\ Panta\g\w\\E\k\\i\\j\c\ Sulo\s\ w\t\i\ d\i\ ehe\i\\e\\j\\i\, m\e\\a\ \d\e\\l\ t\h\o\n\n m\e\\a\ \u\t\w\ha\ \textit{apoktei\\a\aj} ,\t\h\o\n\d\l\\e\v\n\w\d\e\\r\n\o\n Sulo\s\ w\t\a\ \textit{e\\l\ as\aj} e\l\ xe\ p\a\s\a\n S\a\m\o\n}
\end{quote}

“(Cambises) divided the town into three parts, and he shared it with his brothers P. and S.. Later, he killed one of them, banished the younger one, and got hold of the whole Samos”, Hdt. 3.39.

Other examples of NO’s with conjunct participles are the following:

\begin{quote}
(14) \textit{\o\l\w\j to\w\s\w\h\a\i\, tou\w\a\ \textit{a\d\l\ feo\\u\k\a\t\a\l\ u\sa\j k\o\me\i\j\j\i\},}
\textit{“so that he would untie his brother’s body and would take it away”, Hdt. 2.121\gamma;}\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{18} Conjunct participles can also refer to a non-subject constituent, but such occurrences do not concern the present discussion.

\textsuperscript{19} See below, example (17). English gerunds and their governing verbs can, albeit infrequently, have different subjects; this does not hold in general for converbs in all languages, see Nedjalkov (1995) on ‘same subject converbs’.  

\textbf{8}
(15)  τοῦτον παίδας διὰ τὸ φανερὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἷς "and having rescued the children, he restored them to their parents", Isocr. Hel. 28.1;

(16)  υἱὸν γὰρ τοῦ άλλον, ἠθέτησεν τὸν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ τόσον αὐτοῦ "your son, old man, is given back according to your wish, and lies upon a bier; at the break of day you shall yourself behold him as you bear him hence", Il. 24.599-601.

Note that in the last example the antecedent of the NO of the participle ἀφενήνω is also a NO, that refers back to the subject of the preceding sentence.

Omission in such contexts is a phenomenon known as ‘argument sharing’. Two highly bound verb forms that share the same arguments have the shared argument(s) only expressed once. Obligatory omission is most common in the case of shared subjects, as for the English gerund:

(17)  saying this, John went out / John went out saying this / *John, went out, he, saying this / *John, saying this, he, went out.

Non-specification of common elements is one of the syntactic features of ‘interlacing’, one of the parameters that define subordinations in the terms of Lehmann (1988: 168). A different occurrence of a NO with a conjunct participle is in example (4), quoted in § 1.2, which is also discussed in van der Wurff (1997: 343). In this type of construction, the object of the main verb is coreferential with part of the direct object of the conjunct participle (with the modifier). Another partly similar example is

(18)  ὥστε κυρία γενομένη τὸ σοφὸν ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν ὑπερήφανα οὐκ ἔφορον σεν ὃς τοῦ ἀλλοῦ γὰρ "that, having been endowed with these great blessings, she did not begrudge them to the rest of the world", Isocr. Pan. 29.

In (18) the antecedent of the NO is again a modifier, but this time a modifier of the NP which functions as subject for both the main verb and the conjunct participle.

In the case that the subject of the participle is not the same as the subject of the main verb, we find the construction commonly called ‘genitive absolute’. When a genitive absolute shares the same direct object with the governing verb, the object may be omitted, as shown in

(19)  καὶ γένος ὡς θαυμάζων ἐφανερῶ ἔφαναι <πατίν> ἡγοῦσαν οἴα, ἐεὐνίκομακ
ou etaitontoj touj, a horwpouj; nh pareidoun Ø, eijdoun a' emaut% deunei dehai:

"in truth, gentlemen, I think it is manifest to all that, had I refused to deliver the men while Nicomachus was asking for them, I should be considered conscious of my guilt", Lys. 7.36.

It must be stressed that, although I have found a number of omissions in contexts such as those of examples (4), (18), and (19), these occurrences must not be confused with conjunct participles as those shown earlier in this section. The syntactic conditions that hold between the antecedent and the NO are different; on the other hand, the number of occurrences that I could find is not big enough and it is certainly possible that more research will show that pronominal objects can also occur in similar examples. In fact, that constructions that do not conform to those shown in (13)-(16) must not be taken to have the same pattern in the occurrence of NO’s is shown by the following example:

(20) ei' pollouj eawn twa epithdeiwan egwa'apanth$aj Siawni, emaxomhn aut% kai eupton auton kai etikon Ø,

"if I, with a number of my associates had gone to meet Simon, fought with him, and beaten him", Lys. 3.38

In (20) we find a conjunct participle, a'panth$aj, ‘having met’, governed by the verb emaxomhn, ‘I fought’; both verb forms share the same second argument and they both take the dative, but the second argument, realized by the NP Siawni with the first verb form is repeated with an overt anaphora, aut% with the second. Since this example is also interesting for the syntax of NO’s in coordinated clauses I will discuss it again in the next section; another example of overt anaphora with different cases in a conjunct participle construction is (33), also discussed in § 2.2.

2.2. Coordination

In Ancient Greek omission of the direct object is normally found in cases of coordination: when two or more coordinated clauses share the direct object, all those that follow the first and are linked by means of the coordinating conjunction kai have NO’s. Some of the examples are better regarded as cases of VP coordination, where a part of the VP is reduced, as in the English translation of (21). In this example, the only difference between Greek and English appears to lie in word order:
(a) *alla/pou auto\(\phi\)n, qum\(\varphi\) jur\(\varphi\)nei kai\(\alpha\)\(\jmath\)w\(\gamma\)e\(i\) 0, “certainly his heart moves and forces him”, *Il.* 15.43.

See also:

(22) *m\(h\)g\(a\)t \(w\)j qew\(\omega\)nomiz\(e\)t\(\epsilon\)kei\(j\)w\(\tau\)a\(\pi\)ar\(\omega\)nta peph\(\gamma\)\(\eta\)nai pra\(\gamma\)\(n\)at\(\alpha\)\(b\)\(\alpha\)\(n\)ata, a\(l\)a\(k\)a\(i\)m\(s\)e\(t\)ij e\(k\)e\(i\)\(j\)n\(\om\)(\i\)n\(k\)ai\(l\)\(\delta\)\(e\)d\(e\)i\(n\) 0, \(w\)j\(\alpha\)\(d\)\(r\)e\(j\) A\(\gamma\)h\(n\)ai\(e\)i, kai\(\\\)\(\varphi\)\(\gamma\)\(e\)i\(\\)n 0, “do not believe that his present power is fixed and unchangeable like that of a god. No, men of Athens; someone hates him, and fears him, and envies him” (or: “hates, fears, and envies him”), *Dem.* 4. 8.

Other occurrences really contain two different coordinated clauses, and omission of the object would be impossible in English:

(23) kai\(\m\)n A\(\gamma\)h\(n\)ai\(e\)i dh\(m\)osih\(\tau\)e\(j\)\(h\)an a\(u\)\(t\)ou=\(h\)\(s\)\(e\) e\(p\)se\(k\)ai\(\varnothing\), eti\(h\)m\(s\)an\(\\)\(\nu\)\(j\)\(w\)j, “the Athenians buried him at public expense on the spot where he fell and gave him much honor”, *Hdt.* 1.30.5

Note that the same constraint holds in Latin, where NO’s normally occur in coordinated sentences, such as

(24) *Caesar exercitum; reduxet et ... in hibernis 0, conlocavit.*

“In Caesar led his army back and lodged it in the winter camp”, *BG* 3.29.3.

In Classical Latin overt pronominal objects in coordinated sentences occur if they are needed for disambiguation or for pragmatic purposes. In (25) the repeated object (*eos*) is emphatic, as shown by its initial position, which implies strong accent, and the fact that it hosts the enclitic conjunction *-que*:

(25) *accepta oratione eorum Caesar obsides; imperat eosque, ad certam diem adduci iubet;* 

“having heard their talk, Caesar asks for hostages and orders to bring them on an established date”, *BG* 5.1.9.1.

Similarly in Greek overt pronouns can be found in coordination when they bear special pragmatic functions, as in (26), where the pronoun *ekε\(i\)\(n\)\(h\)n, coreferential with the NP *θ\(h\)n \(\gamma\)\(u\)\(n\)\(a\)\(i\)\(k\)a \(θ\(h\)n \(e\)\(m\)\(h\)n, ‘my wife’, is also contrastive with respect with the direct objects of the clauses that follow (*tou\(j\) pa\(i\)\(d\)\(a\)\(j\) tou\(j\) \(e\)\(h\)\(ou\)j, ‘my children’, and *e\(m\)\(h\)\(a\)\(u\)\(t\)\(h\)on, ‘myself’):
that Eratosthenes had an intrigue with my wife, and not only corrupted her but inflicted disgrace upon my children and an outrage on myself by entering my house”, Lys. 1.4.

In (27) the clause introduced by the coordinating conjunction has an overtly expressed object, ταύθην; note that backward reference to the direct object of the preceding clause need to be clearly indicated by the syntactic nature of the object (the accusative NP τὴν ἀμορφέσταθν, ‘the least attractive’, and the indefinite subject of the conditional clause that follows it):

“For when the crier had sold all the most attractive, he would put up the one that was least beautiful, or crippled”, Hdt. 1.196.3

In both (26) and (27) the overtly expressed pronominals, given their special pragmatic or referential function, are not forms of the anaphoric pronoun αὐτόν, usually de-emphatic, but forms of strongly deictic demonstratives. Reduplication of coreferential direct objects in coordinated clauses with the use of αὐτόν apparently starts in the New Testament, as shown in (28), which also shows that Latin was undergoing a similar change:

“I took him to your pupils, and they could not heal him”, Mt. 17.16;

The above remarks on coordination hold for clauses in which the conjunction καί occurs (for Latin, et or atque). As is well known, however, Greek also made frequent use of other means of interclausal linkage in paratactically conjoined clauses, in the first place of the particles mέν ... δέ. NO’s are frequently found with the other conjunctions as well, at least in non-emphatic contexts, as shown in

-----------------------------

20 Example (28) may cause the wrong impression that the occurrence of an overt anaphora in Latin depends on its occurrence in Greek: however, this is not the case, as I have shown in Luraghi (1998b).
(29) and (30); example (31) contains the adversative conjunction *allá*:

(29) ο(δε)Χειρισθείσον αυτόν εβαισεν, εθεσε ο, δ’ οὐ


(30) ἤστια, μεν στείλαντο, ἐσαν ο, δ’ ἐν ἰδίῳ μελαινήν?

“They furled the *sail*, and stowed it in the black ship”, *Il*. 1.433.

(31) ο(δε)παρείβαιν οι ἀλλὰ κατακτείνειν ο

“(that) they do not allow *snakes* to acces (the area) but kill *them*”, Hdt. 2.75.3;

As argued in Gaeta & Luraghi (2000), the occurrence of NO’s in coordinated clauses is an effect of coordination reduction,21 a cohesion strategy frequently found for subjects. If we have a cursory look to subject-drop and coordination, it appears that Null Subject languages normally do not allow repetition of the same subject in coordinated clauses, unless the second occurrence bears particular emphasis. This holds, for example, for Spanish and for Italian, as shown by the fact that example (32) is ungrammatical with normal (non-emphatic) intonation:

(32) *Giovanni, è uscito di casa e lui, si è avviato verso la scuola*

“It is John that went out and he set out for school”.

On the other hand, the English translation of (32) appears to be acceptable in case of coreference, too, although the variants with omission of the subject in the second clause is also allowed.22 The same would hold for German counterparts of the same examples. Note that neither English nor German are pro-drop languages: therefore, there appears to exist some sort of correlation between ‘habitual’ pro-drop and pro-drop in coordinated clauses.23

When coordination holds between clauses which share a second argument, but this argument is not an accusative object in both clauses, omission is possible, but not obligatory, as shown in (20), partly discussed in § 2.1, and repeated below for convenience:

(20) eiπολλουν εάν εάν εσιθεδείν εδώπαρθαν πάντας αἰώνας


22 On the interpretation of third person pronouns or NS’s in coordinated sentences in English, see Chao (1986).

23 More in general, there appears to be an implication between the occurrence of Null Subjects and the possible occurrence of NO’s, whereby the latter implies the former, see Luraghi (forthcoming a).
“if I, with a number of my associates had gone to meet Simon, fought with him, and beaten him”, Lys. 3.38.

In this example, the verb αἵμαξάμην, ‘I fought’, takes the dative αὐτῷ, the following coordinated clause with the transitive verb ἐγήμπτων, ‘I beat’, does not have a NO, but it is followed by the pronominal object αὐτόν.

Another interesting example in this respect is

(33)  Κλεάρχος, Λακεδαιμονίος οὗτος συγκοιμημένος οὗ τοῦ Κύρος ἥγασθε αὐτόν καὶ διδώσας αὐτῷ δαρίκους

“Clearchus was a Lacedaemonian exile; Cyrus, making his acquaintance, came to admire him, and gave him ten thousand darics”, Xen. An. 1.1.9

Here the NP Κλεάρχος refers to a newly introduced participant, which is the subject of its sentence will be the topic of the paragraph following example (33). The subject of the next sentence is the NP οὗ τοῦ Κύρος; Clearchus is referred to three times, the first by the demonstrative τούτως, often used for recently introduced topics, and then by forms of the anaphoric pronoun αὐτόν. Note that the demonstrative is in the dative and it is the complement of the participle συγκοιμημένος, ‘having met’; the governing verb ἥγασθε, ‘he admired’, is transitive and takes the accusative: the accusative object, though coreferential with the preceding dative, is overtly expressed. In the coordinated clause that follows another form of the anaphoric pronoun, still coreferential with the preceding one and with the demonstrative, is the third argument of the verb διδώσας, ‘he gave’.

2.3. Yes-no questions

In yes-no questions the direct object is omitted in the answer, when it is coreferential with the direct object contained in the question, and the verb alone serves as an answer:

(34)  ζώμεν οὐχ θελεῖ, εἴ, εἴ, ηπι θυμητων, τοὶ μόνοι αὐτον, τοὶ δὲ αὐτῷ; ζώμεν, εἴ, εἴ

“‘now,..., shall we assume two kinds of existence, one visible, the other invisible?’ ‘Let us assume them’”, Pl. Phaedo 79a.

The above occurrence is quoted from Dressler (1971). Van der Wurff (1997: 341) mentions the fact that this pattern is also found elsewhere in the ancient Indo-European languages, and writes
that what we find here “is not so much that an object is omitted, as that an entire verb phrase or predicate is ellipted under identity with a predicate in the preceding context, with the verb being retained merely to carry the inflectional features”. He compares the above answer with English answers consisting of the auxiliary only, as in

(35) ‘did you go to school yesterday?’ ‘I did’,

and concludes that such occurrences do not contain real NO’s. However, from a wider analysis of possible answers to yes-no questions, one can see that often they contain a constituent only, or a part of it, which is has the highest communicative dynamism in the question, and conveys the most relevant part of the information questioned. Often, this constituent is the verb, but this is not necessarily so, as shown by the first answer in example (36), where the answer consists of the subject ka\kei\noi, ‘they too’ (NO’s in this passage are analyzed in detail in § 3):

(36) all\'a\j\, w\Mel\hte, mh\oi\(e\n\th\ek\kh\hsia?oi\(ek\kh\ hsiastai\dia\fg\e\fo\usi to\j\ newte\fo\j\; h\ka\kei\noi bel ti\b\j\ 0, poi\ousi n\ap\antej; ka\kei\noi. p\antej a\j\a, w\j ej\ikan, A\q\n\n\i\oi k\o\l\u\j k\a\q\o\u\j\ 0, poi\ousi p\ h\\m\em\ou-\eg\w\de\m\hoj\ dia\fg\ei\w\ 0, ou\f\w\l\ e\geij; p\a\u\s\f\o\d\r\a t\a\u\b\a \ell\g\w.

“‘but, Meletus, those in the assembly don’t corrupt the youth, do they? or do they also all make them better?’ ‘They also.’ ‘All the Athenians, then, as it seems, make them excellent, except myself and I alone corrupt them’. ‘That’s exactly what I am saying’” Pl. Apol. 25a.

In the answer to the second question (ou\f\w\l\ e\geij\; , ‘are you saying this?’) the direct object is emphatically repeated together with the verb. This shows that there are no particular constraints on the possible occurrence of the direct object in the answer: simply, overt objects are not used in such contexts, unless they are particularly emphatic.

In this connection, one can still quote the following question and answer:

(37) t\a\u\b\a h\\a\i\a\e\rou\men, Ta\u\b\a nh\ Di\a, w\o\Sw\\o\r\atej

“‘Shall we say that, or what?’ ‘That is what we shall say, by Zeus, Socrates’”, Crito 50c.

The above example is slighlty different from the preceding ones, because it contains a disjunctive question, but it can still demonstrate that any part of the VP can be omitted, either the direct object, as in (34), or the verb itself, as in (37).

This type of omission is only in part syntactically conditioned; more relevantly, omission owes to the tendency to reduce the answer and, if a part of the question is repeated, to limit it to the most
relevant information. We can view this type of reduction as a consequence of a relevance principle. So NO’s in answers to yes-no questions should be regarded as being located in between syntactically conditioned and discourse conditioned NO’s, as I will argue below.

2.4. Degrees of obligatoriness of NO’s

The three types of construction that trigger NO’s, discussed in the above sections, have different syntactic properties, among other things because the degree of syntactic binding found between the verb forms involved in each of them is different.

On the highest level of syntactic binding we find conjunct participles: these verb forms are non-finite and strictly bound to the governing verb, as shown by obligatoriness of subject sharing. When the direct object is shared, too, the occurrence of a NO is obligatory, with no exceptions and it remained so also in late Greek, as shown by the New Testament.

Coordinated clauses are syntactically on the same level as the clause to which they are linked by the coordinating conjunction. From the point of view of anaphoric processes, however, a clause coordinated to a preceding one depends on it, since anaphoric reference can only work backwards. In fact, there are many similarities between coordinated clauses and conjunct participles, at least in narratives, as I have already remarked in § 2.1. Conjunct participles behave in a similar way to adverbial verb forms; they are frequently found in narrative texts in passages where one could also find coordinated clauses: often they convey the same type of information as main verbs (i.e. focal and chronologically ordered); apparently, they are used in the place of parataxis because, as remarked in Thompson (1987: 451), “a strictly linearly organized written narrative text would be not only boring, but hard to attend to”.24 So argument sharing and coordination reduction appear to be closely related phenomena: they are the equivalent of each other with subordinated and coordinated verb forms. The lesser degree of dependency which holds in coordination has as a consequence that obligatoriness of NO’s is not complete, because there can be pragmatic reasons that cause the repetition of the shared direct object by means of an overt pronoun.

On a scale of binding, answers to yes-no questions rank the lowest: questions do require answers, but the latter are only loosely linked to the former, since they do not even belong to the same sentence. Also the degree of obligatoriness of NO’s appear to be the lowest in this last construction.

3. Discourse conditioned cases of omission

24 Lonzi (1991: 588-589), discussing the Italian gerund, remarks that, in spite of its being a subordinated verb form, it shares many
In context of high topic continuity, a direct object can be omitted where it is immediately and unambiguously recoverable from the context. An example is given in (38):

(38)  \text{ehepl hs qende/oi(a} \text{ añf wai/neatoj of qal moi/ to/d' a} \text{ ha/sto} \text{ a kai/ kata\{maj prh{e} xa} \text{nwh: qanatou del} \text{ mel an nef oj } \{\text{ ò; a} \text{ añf ekla} \text{ u} \text{ y en}

“both his eyes were filled with blood; and up through mouth and nostrils he spurted blood as he gaped, and a black cloud of death enfolded him”, \text{II. 16.348-350.}

Here the antecedent of the NO of the verb \text{ añf ekla} \text{ uy en}, ‘enfolded’, is another null argument, i.e. the Null Subject of the preceding verb \text{ prh{e} se}, ‘blow’. The antecedent of the latter is the dative clitic \text{oi}( In this example we do not find any of the syntactic conditions described in sec. 2 for omission. The NO here occurs because of the high topicality of its referent, which makes it readily recoverable from the immediate context (note, among other things, that the NO does not have any other possible antecedent, a fact which obviously helps its recoverability).

More examples of discourse conditioned NO’s are given below:

(39)  \text{e\{hse to\i/áppon ek tou=} \text{o} \text{ V\{tou tou=} \text{w} \text{\{f} \text{ a} \text{ podi doj} } \{\text{Ø, tv=} \text{d' epi} \text{ u}/\text{v nuki\{u \text{ eibeto} }\{.

“..he tied up the horse to the ring on the temple door, as though he were handing it back; but on the following night he contrived to take it away”, \text{Lys. 6.1}

Here, the NP \text{to\i/áppon}, ‘the horse’, the direct object of the verb \text{e\{hse, ‘he tied’, in the first clause, is the object of the participle \text{ a} \text{ podi doj}, ‘leaving’, predicate of a subordinate clause introduced by \text{w} \text{j}, and of the verb \text{uf} \text{ eibeto}, ‘he stole’. The participle is subordinated to the first clause, while the other verb occurs in a clause which is conjoined paratactically to the preceding part of the sentence. The direct object of the three verbs is also the topic of the whole passage, so it need not be repeated.

(36)  \text{all'a} \text{a, w} \text{Me} \text{lhte, mnoi(enth ekkl hsi\{a\{oi(ekkl hsiastai/dia} \text{ fefousi touj, newte} \text{ ouj;} h\{jke mni bel tipouj }\{, poiousinapantej; ka} \text{ke mni. pantej a} \text{a, w} \text{ e} \text{ bisken, } \text{Aqhnai oi kal ouj ka} \text{aouj }\{, poiousi pl h\{h mni= e} \text{w= de} \\text{ mnoj dia} \text{ fefousi w }\{, oufwj lgej; pa} \text{us fo} \text{dra ta} \text{ute} \text{l egw.}

“‘but, Meletus, those in the assembly don’t corrupt the youth, do they? or do they also all make \text{them} better?’ ‘They also.’ ‘All the Athenians, then, as it seems, make \text{them} excellent, except myself and I alone corrupt \text{them’}. ‘That’s exactly what I am saying’” \text{Pl. Apol. 25a.}
In this passage Socrates is discussing the effects of his education on the Athenian youth. The NP του ἱστορίου, ‘the youth’, occurs as direct object in the first sentence, and functions as antecedent of the NO’s that follow. The first and second NO’s are made recoverable not only by their high degree of topicality, but also by the occurrence of the predicative constituents ἄλλα τιμώρω, ‘better’, and καλοὶ καθαροὶ, ‘good’, which bear agreement with the omitted object; for the third NO, governed by the verb διαφείρω, ‘I corrupt’, there is no such hint and the context alone suffices for its recoverability. Note that the occurrence of a predicative constituent is not by itself enough to trigger the occurrence of a NO, as shown by example (40), taken from the same text:

(40) ἦκαν περὶ ἔτους, οὕτως δοκεῖ εἰς τὸν ἄλλον τιμώρων του, παρενεργοὶ εἰς ἄλλα, εἰς δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἁδραματίους διαφείρων Ο.;

“does it seem to you to be so in the case of horses, that those who make them better are all mankind, and he who injures them some one person?”, Pl. Apol. 25b.

Here, for the sake of his argument, Socrates has moved the discussion from the education of the youth to the instruction of horses. The NP ἰπποῦς, ‘horses’, which occurs within a PP in the first sentence, is resumed by means of an overt anaphora, αὐτοῦ, ‘them’, in the second, because it is a new topic, recently introduced, and it is not going to last much longer (in the next paragraph Socrates swiches back to his main argument). Only the last reference is made through a NO.

It has been remarked in § 1.4 that in Ionic one also finds a clitic, μὲν, for third person. As shown in example (41) its behavior with respect to omission and predicative constituents appears to be the similar to the behavior of αὐτόν:

(41) ἤκαν ταῦτα αὐτὰ παρὰ ἁπάντα 

“Immediately the woman came in, too: Gyges saw her coming in and undressing. As he found himself behind her back, because the woman was going to bed, he stood up and went out. And the woman saw him going out”; Hdt. 1.10.1-2.

In this passage both participants referred to, the woman (Candaules’ wife) and Gyges are topical; however, in the first part of the example we find a NO referring to ἡ γυνῆ, ‘the woman’, while in the second part οἱ ἕρμην, ‘Gyges’, is resumed by the clitic μὲν. Note that in both sentences predicative constituents referring to the direct object also occur. The difference lies in the
pragmatic conditions: while the first event is expected (Candaules, who claimed that his wife was the most beautiful of all women, wanted Gyges to see her naked), the second is unexpected (Gyges was hiding, and both he and Candaules thought that the woman would not see him), and brings about the facts narrated in the rest of the chapter (the woman forces Gyges to kill Candaules and marry her).

A further demonstration of the different pragmatic conditions under which overt anaphoras and NO’s occur can be found in the following example:

(42) Ἠδέi δε/γε, φαμεν, πρωτη/των ἡν τοῦ/ν θεу=ϕημεν εἰ/ύφειαι; Ναια Ἀρι/γενεσι qai αää, ὡ εἰκεν, ανακη/ρυ θη/μην αυθ/ην εἰ/ύφειαι. Εοικεν. Ουκουτεν ει/ειτην λαβοτει αυθη/ν πρωτη/των θη/μεν qai εἰ/όντει θ; εγενο/νενα, ἡπιστα/μενα και ἀπι/ρης qai ... τογατ και/εναι τω/ν εάτιν, ἐλαβοτα του ἐπιστήμην εάιεν και/μάλα ἀπο ὁ/εικεν θ; ήκειν το/ῦντει ἶη/γομεν, ὡ/ν Σιμμία, ἐπιστήμη/ηι, ἀπώλειη ἦν; Παντει/ς δῆπ ὡ/ν, ὡ/ν Ὀλυμπίατει. Εὐδε/γε ὀλοί/αι λαβοτε/ι θ; πρωτη/τε ἐπιγνο/νεοι ἀπω/ί ε/μεν θ; ὑ/τερον δετα/ιη ἀληθής ε/μεν ὡ/ν Πρίησην ἀληθής ε/μεν το/ῦν ἐπιστήμη/ηι θ; ἀ/πο ἤτε χει/σαι ἂν ἰ/ατε α/πώλειην το/ῦν ἰατε/μενοι ἰε/νείνα το/ῦν ἰατε ἰατε/μενοι ἰενείνα το/ῦν ἰατε/μενοι ἰη/σθεν τη/τε ἰατε ἰη/σθεν τη/τε ἰατε ἰη/σθεν τη/τε ἰατε ἰη/σθεν τη/τε ἰατε ἰη/σθεν ... ὡ/ν Σιμμίας; ‘Certainly Socrates’, said he. ‘But, I suppose, if we acquired knowledge before we were born and lost it at birth, but afterwards by the use of our senses regained the knowledge which we had previously possessed...’,” Pl. Phaedo 75c, 75 d-e

In this passage Socrates is putting forth his theory of ideas and of knowledge as recollection. The direct object of the first sentence, ἡν τοῦ/ν θευ=ϕημεν, ‘the knowledge of sameness’, is referred back with the anaphora αυθη/ν also an accusative direct object, in the following two sentences.25 In spite of its topicality, which could make it easily recoverable, the referent is also highly focal, because Socrates is trying to explain the necessity of its existence. A little bit further in the discussion, the NP ἐπιστήμη/ηι, ‘knowledge’, occurs, this time referred back by two NO’s in the following context.26 The second NO, in particular, occurs under similar syntactic conditions as

---

25 The second sentence also contains a reference to ἐπιστήμη/ηι in the form of NO, because it contains two coordinated verb forms (so the NO is syntactically conditioned).
26 The third NO (with ἀπω/ί ε/μεν) again is syntactically conditioned by the occurrence of a conjunct participle construction.
the second occurrence of authh in the first part of the example (compare
Oukou= ei=unh labontej authh pro\tou= gene\=s qai with Ei=le/ge oi=cai la bontej
Ø, pri=\ gene\=s qai). The referent of episthm\=n is still topical, but no longer focal: Socrates has
convinced his ... of the existence of a previous knowledge of abstract concepts, and is now trying to
demonstrate something new (i.e. that what we perceive as new knowledge is recollection).

Given their high degree of context dependency, and the fact that they are used as cohesive device
in contexts of topic continuity, NO’s are particularly frequent in procedural texts, as shown in the
following example from27

(43) επειτά τὸ ἀνθρώπινον σμυρνην ἀκήρατο τετράμερην καὶ κατ’ ἡμέραν μεῖον
καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀλτικῷ, πλησίω τεράτου ὑπέρ στρατού ὑπὸ τῶνποιό ἀντέχει ταριξεύουσι τὸ
ἔφρωκτον ἀντέχει ἡμέραν ἐν ἀποκαλύπτοι αὐτὸ τόπον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐνήμερον ἀπὸ τῶν
τῶν ἐποίησαν, ὅπως
“After doing this, they conceal the body for seventy days, embalmed in saltpetre; no longer
time is allowed for the embalming; and when the seventy days have passed, they wash the
body and wrap the whole of it in bandages of fine linen cloth, anointed with gum, which the
Egyptians mostly use instead of glue”, Hdt. 2.86;

(44) Εἰρίζεται δέ των πατριαίων προτερέας αἰώναν αἰώνος οὐκεταίρον, τοῦτον
ἐπείδη τὸν ἀλλοτρίον ἀνθρώπον ἐκ φυσικοῦ
πρᾶγμα τὸ οἰκείον, ποιεῖσαν τὰς ἐςθάλεοις ἀνθρώπον ἀγάμον καὶ ἔντον ἐν ἀποκαλύπτοι τὸν ὑπὸ ἐποίησαν
καὶ τὸν ἐν ἠμέραν ἐν τῶν ἐποίησαν, ἀπὸ τῶν
“Furthermore, there are three tribes in the country that eat nothing but fish, which they catch
and dry in the sun; then, after throwing it into a mortar, they pound it with pestles and strain
everything through linen”, Hdt. 1.200.

4. Discussion
From the data discussed in § 1 and in the examples quoted in § 2 and 3, we can set up the following
scale of phonological heaviness for anaphoras functioning as direct objects:

accented pronoun (anaphoric, deictic) > de-emphatic pronoun or clitic (anaphoric) > Ø

27 Procedural texts, such as recipes, or other types of instructions, often contain NO’s even in languages, such as English, that do not
normally allow them, see Massam & Roberge (1989).
which is reminiscent of the scale of phonological size for more or less topical elements in Givón (1983: 18):

\[\text{Scale of phonological size}\]
more continuous/accessible topic
zero anaphora
unstressed/bound pronouns (agreement)
stressed/independent pronouns
full NP’s
more discontinuous/inaccessible topic

The iconicity principle underlying this scale must be simple: “the more disruptive, surprising, discontinuous or hard to process a topic is, the more coding material must be assigned to it”.

From the point of view of a language like English, which has no NO’s, it is interestingly to explain the difference between the latter and de-emphatic pronouns: for English de-emphatic pronouns fulfil the functions of Greek clitics and NO’s.

In the first place, the distribution of NO’s in a language which does not mark the direct object on the verb is necessarily limited, because their interpretation requires an unambiguous context and a uniquely recoverable antecedent. Under this respect, the occurrence of NO’s is much more limited than the occurrence of Null Subjects, the subject being mostly indicated by verbal agreement in Greek.

Besides, examples such as (41) and (42) show that de-emphatic pronouns rank in fact higher in a scale of topic discontinuity, as predicted by Givón’s schema. Consequently, de-emphatic forms or clitics can be used to refer back to focal information, provided it is not emphatic or contrastive. In case of emphasis or contrast, accented pronouns are used.

Grammatically conditioned NO’s can be viewed as special, grammaticalized cases of discourse conditioned ones. Note that syntactically conditioned NO’s, being shared by two or more strictly connected verb forms, have highly predictable antecedents. A demonstration of this lies in the degrees of obligatoriness discussed in § 2.4, whereby NO’s are increasingly obligatory according to the degree of binding that holds in the specific construction that triggers them. In answers to yes-no questions, in which the linkage between question and answer is not grammaticalized, NO’s are habitually found as a consequence of a relevance principle, rather than of syntactic constraints. In coordinated clauses NO’s are the rule, but overt anaphoras can occur, in the case they are contrastive or emphatic. Finally, with conjunct participles NO’s are obligatory; conjunct participle also display the higher degree of grammaticalization in the linkage of the verb forms or clauses
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involved (the participle is marked as dependent verb form, which does not happen in coordination, where the verb forms involved are of the same type).

One can conclude that the higher the degree of grammaticalization of the linkage between two verb forms, the more obligatory the NO: to say it differently, omission of shared direct objects is a manifestation of the degree of grammaticalization of linkage.

5. **Summary and conclusions**

In the preceding sections I have shown some of the conditions that partly trigger, or allow, the omission of a direct object in Ancient Greek. I have argued that occurrences of NO’s can be divided into two types, i.e. syntactically conditioned and discourse conditioned. The data show that the difference between these two types is partly scalar: in fact, NO’s are completely obligatory only with conjunct participles, a construction which displays a highly grammaticalized linkage to the main clause. In coordinated clauses NO’s are the rule, but overt anaphoras can be found under special pragmatic conditions. Finally, answers to yes-no questions provide a border case between syntactically conditioned and discourse conditioned NO’s. So we can set up the following scale:

**Degrees of obligatoriness of NO’s:**

- conjunct participles (object sharing)
- syntactically conditioned coordinated clauses (coordination reduction)
- answers to yes-no questions
- discourse conditioned high topicality and low focus

I have also argued that de-emphatic forms differ from NO’s essentially because they are used to encode material which is topical and at the same time carries focus.

As I have shown in § 1, NO’s can have a variety of different antecedents, not only direct objects. However, syntactic conditions appear to hold only between a NO and its antecedent when the latter is a direct object. More research is needed on syntactic conditions holding between NO’s and other types of antecedents, as well as on genitive absolutes and other types of participal constructions, as those in examples (4) and (18).
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