

Treating Greek *o eaftos mu* as a regular anaphor: Theoretical Implications.

Nikos Angelopoulos & Dominique Sportiche

Abstract

Binding theory Condition A must be so formulated as to accommodate the range of behaviors exhibited by anaphors crosslinguistically. In this respect, the behavior of the Modern Greek anaphor *o eaftos mu* is theoretically important as it has been reported to display a number of unusual distributional properties, thus leading to treatments by Iatridou (1988) or Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) different from that of standard anaphors represented by English *himself* and thus requiring a rethinking of the classic Condition A descriptive generalization and its theoretical derivation. This paper revisits the distribution of this expression documenting that previous discussions are subject to a confound as this expression is not always a reflexive, and it may have a logophoric usage. Controlling for the non-anaphoric usage of *o eaftos mu* as well as for logophoricity and relying on new data surveys, we conclude that when anaphoric, it is in fact a well behaved standard anaphor from the point of view of the standard Condition A (akin to Chomsky 1986). These surveys support some aspects of the empirical picture presented in Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) but not others. It does support an important conclusion of theirs, namely that this expression is allowed as nominative subject, but in derived subject positions only. This in turn leads to a number of new (theoretical) consequences and predictions: (a) the ability of anaphors to function as nominative subjects can be reduced to differences in their internal structure (Greek *o eaftos mu* \neq English *himself*), (b) an influential theoretical innovation made in Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) which takes the reflexivization mechanism to be *self* incorporation as a general solution to why *self* induces reflexive readings cannot be maintained as a general mechanism underlying anaphor binding in Greek.

1 Introduction

This paper studies the distribution of the Greek expression *o eaftos mu* ‘lit. the self mine’. It focuses on four syntactic contexts in which the distribution of *o eaftos mu* was argued in previous literature to be problematic for the standard Condition A because, it was claimed (cf. Iatridou 1988, Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 1999 i.a.) (a) it is disallowed

as dative object in double object constructions, (b) it is disallowed as genitive dependent of a noun, (c) it is - non standardly - allowed as nominative subject, (d) it is disallowed in adjunct positions. We examine each case separately and show that despite superficial evidence pointing in the opposite direction, *o eaftos mu* can receive a standard anaphor treatment. First, it is in fact allowed as a dative indirect object. Second, genitive *o eaftos mu* is indeed disallowed but only when interpreted as a possessor; it is otherwise allowed. The possessor prohibition exemplifies a broader, not fully understood restriction, also found in English, and thus is not specific to Greek *o eaftos mu*. Third, regarding nominative *o eaftos mu*, we present new data confirming a generalization in Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1995, 1999), namely that it is only allowed in derived subject positions differing from the English reflexive that is never allowed as a nominative anaphor. But pace Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999), we propose that nominative *o eaftos mu* can be analyzed as licensed via standard reconstruction (of A-movement) into a syntactic position lower than its antecedent. Moreover, building on the observation of Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1995, 1999) that English *himself* behaves like a modified pronoun while nominative *o eaftos mu* has the internal structure of a regular DP, we show that a reconstruction approach to the distribution of nominative anaphors derives why English disallows, but Greek allows such anaphors and thus sheds new light on the distribution of nominative anaphors. Fourth, we show that it can in fact appear inside adjuncts. Indeed, reflexives can typically be used anaphorically as plain anaphors (subject to Condition A) or logophorically (superficially not subject to Condition A). We show *o eaftos mu* is allowed in non-argument positions qua plain anaphor e.g. adjuncts, or coordinate structures, from where incorporation movement is strictly disallowed (pace Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 1999 and Patel-Grosz 2013). This has two consequences. First, regarding the reflexivization mechanism involved, we argue that a movement analysis of *o eaftos mu* in terms of *self*-incorporation as in Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999), Spathas (2010) and Patel-Grosz (2013) cannot be maintained. Second, the (partial) ungrammaticality *o eaftos mu* gives rise to in so-called *snake*-sentences e.g. *Mary saw a snake next to herself*, cannot be reduced to the adjunct status of the locative PP. The above conclusions take into account the previously noted fact (cf. Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 1999) that *o eaftos mu* has a ‘reified’ usage meaning *the self* (see also Safir 1996) which is not anaphoric. This existence of this usage creates an analytical confound that needs to be controlled for. We show first that these non-anaphoric usages are more pervasive than originally thought, not limited to syntactic contexts in which *o eaftos mu* is modified, e.g. by adjectives (pace Patel-Grosz 2013). Simple diagnostics systematically used in our investigation tease these usages apart from the anaphoric/logophoric ones.

This paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 contrasts the usages of *o eaftos mu* and shows that once the ‘reified’ use is excluded, this expression behaves (in part) as a plain anaphor in the requisite sense. In all subsequent sections the ‘reified’ use is controlled away from. Furthermore, in section 3, we introduce two diagnostics that will also allow us

to control away from possible logophoric usages of *o eaftos mu* when this is necessary. In section 4.1, we report new survey data demonstrating that dative *o eaftos mu* is allowed undermining an appeal to *self* incorporation. Section 4.2 concludes that the distribution of genitive *o eaftos mu* is consistent with its status as a non logophoric reflexive, eliminating the need to appeal to aspect of predicate based theories of Condition A. Both sections thus diverge in their conclusions from the treatment Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) propose for dative and genitive *o eaftos mu*. Section 5 shows that the distribution of *o eaftos mu* in argument and adjunct PPs supports the conclusions of sections 4.1 and 4.2. In section 6, we corroborate Anagnostopoulou and Everaert’s (1999) conclusion that there are anaphoric instances of nominative *o eaftos mu* allowed in derived subject positions. Unlike Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999), we argue that this fact derives from nominative *o eaftos mu* satisfying Condition A via reconstruction into its base position and we derive why this is not available in English. This section also discusses why the evidence presented in previous literature against this conclusion is in fact inconclusive. Section 7 presents arguments that *o eaftos mu* must be bound as a whole (*pace* Iatridou 1988). Section 8 briefly discusses a competition account between *o eaftos mu* and a different anaphoric expression of Greek, namely, *o idhjos*. Section 9 concludes.

2 *O eaftos mu*: Sometimes anaphoric, sometimes not

We first distinguish between the reflexive use of the expression *o eaftos mu*, where it behaves anaphorically, and its non-anaphoric use in which it receives what Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) calls following Safir (1996) ‘the reified substantive reading.’ As we show, the first use conforms to the expectations of it being subject to Condition A, while the second behaves as a run-of-the-mill DP. The first use requires a local c-commanding antecedent. The second use is not subject to these requirements, and can be used freely as an argument, internal or external, of different predicates (*pace* claims made in Patel-Grosz 2013). It retains its literal interpretation referring to the *self*, an abstract entity, and is thus, as we illustrate, subject to distributional restrictions regarding what can be predicated of it.

2.1 *O eaftos mu* with no antecedent or a non-local one

As Horrocks (1994, 94) reports, (1) illustrates the existence of instances in which *o eaftos mu* does not require the presence of a grammatically realized, overt or covert, antecedent.

- (1) **O eaftos tu ftei.**
the self.NOM his.GEN be.responsible.3SG
‘His self is responsible.’

Horrocks (1994, (14))

But in such a case, the expression *o eaftos tu* means ‘his self’, and has what Safir (1996, (557)) calls the reified substantive reading that crucially arises ‘[...] when the SELF is conceived of as a ‘disembodied’ abstract part.’ The antecedent of the pronoun is contextually determined, and need not be a logophoric center: this sentence need not report the antecedent’s point of view (see Charnavel 2019 for background). It can for example express the speaker’s opinion about the matter.¹ Now note that (1) is not a fixed expression/idiom in which non-anaphoric *o eaftos mu* is licensed exceptionally. This is shown in (2) where similar occurrences of non-anaphoric *o eaftos mu* are shown to be possible with different verbs.

- (2) a. Se aftin tin dhiadikasia ton pio simadiko rolo tha ton peksi **o eaftos tu**.
 in this the process the most important role will 3SG.M.ACC play.3SG the self.NOM his.GEN
 ‘In this process, his self will play the most important role.’
- b. O monos adipalos se aftin tin periptosi ine **o eaftos tis**.
 the only opponent in this the case be.3SG the self.NOM her.GEN
 ‘The only opponent in this case is herself.’

Notice also that non-anaphoric *o eaftos mas* is not limited to particular syntactic positions. In (2a) and (2b), it is used as an external argument, a causer, of *pezi* ‘plays’ and *dhimiurghi* ‘creates’. In (3) and (4), *o eaftos mu* is an argument of a verb and a noun respectively:

- (3) a. Pada iparhi i anagki ja kati pu kseperna **ton eafto mas**.
 always exist.3SG the need for something that exceed.3SG the self.ACC our.GEN
 ‘There always exists a need for something that exceeds our selves.’
- b. Katheti kenurjo pu veltioni **ton eafto mas** tha prepi na apoteli ena anapospasto
 anything new that improves the self.ACC our.GEN will must na constitute.3SG an integral
 komati tis zois kathe anthropu.
 piece the life.GEN every human.GEN
 ‘Anything new that improves our selves must constitute an integral part of the life of all people.’
- (4) Tis pjo skotines plevres **tu eafthu tu** katafere na tis anakalipsi mia
 the more dark sides.NOM the self.GEN his.GEN managed.3SG na 3PL.F.ACC discover.3SG a.FEM
 psihologhos mono meta apo epta sinedhries.
 psychologist.FEM only after from seven sessions

¹ Following a reviewer’s suggestion, we also tested the acceptability of sentences such as (i) below. This sentence was tested as uttered in two different contexts, shown below, where George, the antecedent of the reflexive, is either an empathy locus (see Charnavel 2019 for why expressions such as ‘poor’ etc., can mark empathy loci), or an attitude holder respectively (see Charnavel 2019 for reasons why either license logophoric uses of the reflexive). The sentence was judged as ungrammatical in both contexts (Average 1.4/5) by six native speakers who were asked to provide a judgment on the basis of a 1-5 Likert scale (with 1 the worst and 5 the best). This behavior of *o eaftos mu* corroborates our conclusion that non-anaphoric *o eaftos mu* does not instantiate a logophoric usage.

Contexts: #1: Poor George all these days he is in such a difficult situation; #2: George believes that he is in such a difficult position.

- (i) O eaftos tu tha prepi na ine se poli dhiskoli thesi.
 the self.NOM his.GEN will must na be.3SG in very difficult position
 ‘His self must be in a very difficult position.’

‘A psychiatrist managed to discover the darkest aspects of himself only after seven sessions.’

And *o eaftos mu* retains the same interpretation as above in cases where it has a non-local antecedent:²

- (5) Ja tin pragmatopiisi aftu tu taksidju, hriazete na pro_i provume se ena alma/ stadhio pu tha
for the realization.ACC this the trip.GEN be.necessary.3SG na we proceed to a jump/ stage that will
apeleftherosi **ton eafto mas_i** apo fovus ce eksoterikus paraghodes.
release.3SG the self.ACC our.GEN from fears and external factors
‘For the realization of this trip, it is necessary for us to proceed to a stage which will release our selves
from fears and external factors.’
- (6) Afu skeftika arketa ja tin proodho tis Marias_i s-tis sinedhries mas, katalava
after thought.1SG enough about the progress.ACC the Maria.GEN in-the sessions ours understood.1SG
oti anakalipsa tis pio skotines plevres **tu eaftu tis_i** meta apo efta sinedhries.
that discovered.3SG the most dark aspects the self.GEN her.GEN after from seven sessions.ACC
‘After I thought enough about Maria’s progress in our sessions, I understood that I discovered the darkest
aspects of her self after seven sessions.’

Such instances must be distinguished from other cases, which do not mean ‘the self’ but act as reflexives, denoting what their antecedent denotes. As the literature reports and we will confirm, such instances behave like anaphors. However, the literature does not systematically distinguish between these two cases. One way to make the distinction is to keep track exactly of the semantic contribution of *o eaftos tu* via context, which is not always straightforward however, particularly with human antecedents. Another is to investigate the properties of this expression when the ‘reified’ use is excluded. There are two ways to exclude it. One way is to limit antecedents, if there are any, to inanimates, which do not have a ‘self’. The other is to capitalize on the meaning ‘the self’ references, an abstract entity, and the fact that only certain properties consistent with its abstract status, can be predicated of it. Predicating concrete properties (height, weight, color, etc.) of *o eaftos tu* will guarantee the non-reified/ anaphoric use. And as we will now see, in such cases, *o eaftos tu* behaves anaphorically.

2.2 Predicate Restrictions

The assumption that non-anaphoric *o eaftos mu* is a plain DP that refers to an abstract entity finds support in interpretive restrictions it exhibits as a subject of certain predicates. These restrictions are illustrated with non locally bound *o eaftos mu* in (7) and (8).

- (7) a. O Jorghos_i theori/ siniditopiise oti **o eaftos tu_i** ine endiaferon/ mistirios.
the George.NOM believe.3SG realized.3SG that the self.NOM his.GEN be.3SG interesting mysterious
‘George believes/realized that his self is interesting/ mysterious.’

² In (5), the antecedent of the reflexive is the silent subject of the verb, indicated as pro.

- b. * O Jorghos_i theori/ siniditopiise oti **o eafos tu_i** ine psilos/ hodros.
 the George.NOM believe.3SG realized.3SG that the self.NOM his.GEN be.3SG tall fat
 ‘George believes/realized that his self is tall/ fat.’
- (8) a. O psychologhos ipe ja tin Maria_i oti vriski **ton eafos tis_i** harismatiko.
 the psychiatrist.NOM said.3SG for the Maria that find.3SG the self.ACC her.GEN charismatic
 ‘The psychiatrist said about Mary that he finds her self charismatic.’
- b. * O psychologhos ipe ja tin Maria_i oti vriski **ton eafos tis_i** hlomo.
 the psychiatrist.NOM said.3SG for the Maria that find.3SG the self.ACC her.GEN pale
 ‘The psychiatrist said about Mary that he finds her self pale.’

(7) and (8) only differ with respect to the grammatical functions of *o eafos mu*, reflected in the case it receives, nominative and accusative respectively. (7a) and (8a) feature more instances of non-anaphoric *o eafos mu* and show that properties of non-concrete objects such as *endiaferon/ mistirios* ‘interesting/ mysterious’ or *harismatiko* ‘charismatic’ are compatible with its meaning, i.e one’s abstract *self*. In (7b) and (8b), *o eafos mu* can only be an anaphor. Non-anaphoric *o eafos mu* is precluded because predicate as *psilos, hodros, hlomos* ‘tall, fat, pale’ cannot be predicated of the abstract entity it expresses. Given this, (7b) and (8b) are ruled out as violations of Condition A because *o eafos mu* is not locally bound. Now note that in syntactic configurations where Condition A can be satisfied, *o eafos mu* is entirely compatible with properties of concrete objects, as e.g. being fat or pale. This is illustrated in (9a) and (10a). (9b) and (10b) is consistent with *o eafos mu* being an anaphor in the previous examples.

- (9) a. O Adreas_i theori **ton eafos tu_i** hodro.
 the Adreas.NOM consider.3SG the self.ACC his.GEN fat
 ‘Adreas considers himself fat.’
- b. * [I mitera [tu Adrea_i]] theori **ton eafos tu_i** hodro.
 the mother.NOM the Adreas.GEN consider.3SG the self.ACC his.GEN fat
 ‘Adreas’s mother considers himself fat.’
- (10) a. O Adreas_i vriski **ton eafos tu_i** hlomo simera.
 the Adreas.NOM find.3SG the self.ACC his.GEN pale today
 ‘Adreas finds himself pale today.’
- b. * [I mitera [tu Adrea_i]] vriski **ton eafos tu_i** hlomo simera.
 the mother.NOM the Adreas.GEN find.3SG the self.ACC his.GEN pale today
 ‘Adreas’s mother finds himself pale today.’

In conclusion, as previous literature reports, *ton eafos tu* is indeed an anaphor when the ‘reified’ interpretation is excluded. In what follows, we are systematically controlling away from this usage. In the next section, we discuss how we can also control away from logophoricity, which in turn is going to allow us to concentrate on the pure reflexive, anaphoric reading.³

³ In (iia), the context favors a reified usage of *o eafos mu*, as suggested by the fact that it can be licensed without a c-commanding antecedent.

3 Logophoricity

Reflexives of different languages have been shown to have a logophoric usage in addition to their standard anaphoric one (cf. Charnavel 2019 i.a.). Under the logophoric usage, a reflexive can be exempt from the standard Condition A (cf. Charnavel and Sportiche 2016 i.a.). Just like the reflexives of different languages, *o eaftos mu* may thus have a logophoric usage too. Given this possibility, we now present two diagnostics to control away from a possible logophoric usage of *o eaftos mu* when this is relevant. These diagnostics are based on properties of logophors cross-linguistically documented in Charnavel (2019), and properties of the Greek expression *o idhjos* (lit. the same) in contexts where it is used as a logophor (Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 2013). Specifically, (a) logophors do not require a c-commanding antecedent, (11a) (= Charnavel and Zlogar 2016, (4b)), and (b) they allow split-antecedents, (11b) (= Bryant and Charnavel 2020a, (8b)).⁴

- (11) a. Anonymous posts about herself_i on the internet hurt Lucy_i's feelings.
 b. Mary_i told John_k that her son looks up to people like themselves_{i+k}.

Charnavel and Zlogar (2016) argue that in (11a), the psychological expression *feelings* allow the speaker to empathize with *Lucy*. Based on this, they conclude that *Lucy* is an empathy locus, and so it can license the reflexive as a logophor (see Charnavel 2019 for discussion on why empathy loci can license a logophor). Note also in the same example that being embedded within a DP, the antecedent of the reflexive, *Lucy*, does not c-command the logophor illustrating the fact that logophors can be licensed without a c-commanding antecedent (cf. a above). In (11b), the reflexive is a logophor licensed by two antecedents, *Mary*, an attitude holder, and *John*, an empathy locus, a fact that also suggests that the logophor accepts split-antecedents (cf. b above).

On the other hand, if the context is different in such a way that the reified usage is less accessible, as in (iib), *o eaftos mu* has the anaphoric usage and so it requires a c-commanding antecedent.

- (ii) a. [I psiholoji [tis Elenis_i]] vriskun ton eafto tis_i merikes fores poli astathi/ mistirio/ idhietero.
 the psychologists.NOM the Eleni.GEN find.3PL the self.ACC her.GEN some times very unstable mysterious peculiar
 'Eleni's psychologists sometimes find herself unstable/mysterious/peculiar.'
 b. * [I ghonis [tis Elenis_i]] vriskun ton eafto tis_i merikes fores poli astathi/ mistirio/ idhietero.
 the parents.NOM the Eleni.GEN find.3PL the self.ACC her.GEN some times very unstable mysterious peculiar
 'Eleni's parents sometimes find herself unstable/mysterious/peculiar.'

This suggests that the deviance of (iia), as opposed to the well-formedness of (iib), is pragmatically driven; normally, the only person to have access to 'self' is one's self or a person, like a psychologist, but not one's parents, whose job is to understand one's self.

⁴ Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (2013) claim that anaphors do tolerate split antecedents as in their (31), from Okada (1998), repeated below:

- (iii) John is talking with Mary about interesting and important political ideas, while Bill_i is talking with Sue_j only about themselves_{i+j}.

This example is not controlled for a logophoric usage of the reflexive. Once it is, e.g. by using inanimate reflexives among other ways - cf. Charnavel (2019) for extensive discussion - it becomes clear that non logophoric reflexives disallow split antecedents.

Greek uses an expression, namely, *o idhjos*, which can be anteceded, just like the logophors in (11), long-distance (cf. Iatridou 1986). In previous literature, it been shown that *o idhjos* exhibits distinct properties depending on its syntactic position, subject or object, or whether it is emphatic or not, (cf. Varlokosta and Hornstein 1993). Within the context of the current paper, we focus on the distribution of non-emphatic *o idhjos* in object positions, and, more specifically, in contexts where it is licensed as a logophor via a perspectival antecedent. In these contexts, it has been observed that *o idhjos* can be licensed in the absence of a c-commanding antecedent (cf. Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 2013). This is illustrated in (12a) (= Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (2013, (56))) where *tu Jani* is an attitude holder, and, thus, licenses *ton idhjo* as a logophor despite the fact that *tu Jani* occupies a position syntactically lower than the subject clause, and, thus, does not c-command *o idhjos*. Furthermore, (12b) shows that *o idhjos* can accept split-antecedents, *o Janis* and *tin Maria*, which in this case are attitude holders and, thus, license *o idhjos* as a logophor.⁵

- (12) a. Oti kanenas den bori na magirepsi kala ektos apo **ton idhio**_i ine mia apo tis pio profates
That noone not can na cook.3SG well except from the same is one of the most recent
apospis tu Jani_i.
opinions the Janis.GEN
'That noone can cook well apart of himself is one of the most recent beliefs of John.'
- b. O Janis_i simfonise me tin Maria_j oti i topiki kinonia ehi aniksi mia megal
the John.NOM agreed.3SG with the Maria.ACC that the local society.NOM has opened a big
agalia ja **tus idhjus**_{i+k} ce tin ikojenia tus.
hug for the same and the family their.GEN
'John agreed with Maria that local society has opened a big hug for them and their family.'

To sum up, we take a reflexive that (a) can be licensed with a non c-commanding antecedent, and (b) can accept split-antecedents to constitute a logophor. So, in what follows, we use (a) and (b) systematically to detect possible logophoric usages of *o eaftos mu*, and control away from them when this is necessary.

4 Oblique *o eaftos mu*

We begin with cases in which our empirical findings are inconsistent with some previously reported data which motivated treating Greek *o eaftos mu* as a non standard anaphor.

4.1 Dative *o eaftos mu*

This section examines the distribution of *o eaftos mu* as a dative indirect object. Dative *o eaftos mu* is reported in previous literature either as less preferred (cf. Holton et al. 1997, 582) or totally ruled out (cf. Anagnostopoulou and

⁵ In an informal survey, (12b) was judged as grammatical (Average 5 out of 5) by six native speakers.

Everaert 1999). This last property would not follow from Condition A, a fact that according to previous literature speaks in favor of a special treatment of *o eaftos mu* in terms of *self*-incorporation, as movement from within datives is typically excluded: dative DPs are islands blocking any kind of movement out of them (including incorporation cf. Baker 1988). Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) takes such device to indicate that the *self* noun of *o eaftos mu* must undergo incorporation; *self* in datives cannot incorporate, counterlicensing the anaphor. In order to figure out whether or not dative *o eaftos mu* is special from the perspective of Condition A, we conducted an informal grammaticality judgment task with 10 participants based on a 5-point Likert scale, 5 the best. The questionnaire comprised the sentence below that was originally extracted from a naturally occurring context, and was modified adding the sentence in parentheses.^{6,7}

- (13) ? Arpakse ta klidja tu spitju ke tu aftokinitu ke (ja na dhi an ine omorfi emfanisiaka
 grabed.3SG the keys the house and the car and for na see.3SG if be.3SG beautiful appearancewise
 me ta cenurja tis ruha) erikse mia teleftea matia **tu eafu tis** s-ton kathrefti.
 with the new her.GEN clothes gave.3SG one last look the self.DAT her.GEN at-the mirror
 ‘She grabbed the keys of the house and the car and in order to see if she was nice in her new clothes, she
 gave one last look at herself in the mirror before leaving from her apartment.’

In (13), the context provided by the sentence in the parentheses ensures that the subject of the verb is interested in how her new clothes fit her appearance, not her abstract entity, thus, precluding the reified usage. In the survey we conducted, this sentence was not judged by any speaker as less good than 3.5 in a 5-point Likert scale with 5 the best (average was 4.1). Note also that *o eaftos mu* cannot be logophoric in this case, as suggested by the fact that it cannot be licensed by a non-c-commanding antecedent, (14a), and it cannot have split antecedents, (14b).

- (14) a. * [O pateras [tis Marias_j]] erikse mia matja **tu eafu tis_i** s-ton kathrefti.
 the father the Maria.GEN gave.3SG a look the self.DAT her.GEN in-the mirror
 ‘Maria’s father gave a look at herself in the mirror.’
 b. * O Jorghos_i ipe oti i Maria_j theli na riksi mia matja **tu eafu tus_{i+j}** s-ton
 the George said.3SG that the Maria want.3SG to give.3SG a look the self.DAT their.GEN in-the
 kathrefti.
 mirror
 ‘George said that Maria wants to give a look at themselves in the mirror.’

⁶ Source: <https://www.wattpad.com/745381136-unravel>

⁷ A reviewer suggests that the slightly degraded status of (13) might be related to the less preferred usage of the dative case with plain DPs in examples such as below:

- (iv) ? Ekane tu fititi mia sizitisi.
 made.3SG the student.GEN a conversation
 ‘She had a talk with a student.’

Furthermore, an anonymous reviewer provides the example in (15a) as grammatical, noting that a statue-reading whereby the agent throws water to a statue of herself, is preferable, and that the pure-reflexive reading is more prominent with a PP indirect object, (15b). While we were not able to duplicate this preference with native speakers, we agree that (15a) is a well-formed sentence. Note also that the statue interpretation is a subcase of the anaphoric usage, so the grammaticality of (15a) further supports our claim that anaphoric *o eaftos mu* is available in the dative case.

- (15) a. Erikse ligho nero **tu eaftu tis.**
 threw.3SG some water.ACC the self.DAT her.GEN
 ‘She threw herself some water.’
 b. Erikse ligho nero **s-ton eafto tis.**
 threw.3SG some water.ACC to-the self.ACC her.GEN
 ‘She threw some water to herself.’

We conclude that *o eaftos mu* does not require any special treatment because of its distribution as a dative indirect object. In turn, that the *self* noun of *o eaftos mu* must undergo incorporation into the verb is strongly challenged, since by hypothesis, datives disallow such incorporation.

4.2 Genitive *o eaftos mu*

We now turn to cases as (16) in which *o eaftos mu* is assigned genitive case and is ill formed. Recall throughout this section, the examples are chosen so that only a concrete interpretation of *o eaftos mu* is felicitous.

- (16) *O Jannis_i den anexete [ta pedhia **tu eaftu tu_i**].
 the Jannis.NOM not tolerate.3SG the children.ACC the self.GEN his.GEN
 ‘Jannis does not tolerate the children of himself.’ Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999, (16))

Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) proposes an account of this deviance in terms of the predicate based theory expounded in Reinhart and Reuland (1991). According to this approach, distinct from the classic Condition A approach, an anaphor that functions as an argument of a noun in cases like (16) cannot satisfy Condition A because the anaphor has no coargument it could be covalued with. Reinhart and Reuland (1991) take it that if the reflexive is licensed in such a syntactic context, it can only be a logophor. Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999, 110) argues, however, that *o eaftos mu* differs from the English reflexive in that it “[...] cannot be used as a logophor.” Given this, the deviance of (16) follows. Since the only usage that is in principle allowed by Reinhart and Reuland (1991) in such a syntactic context is the logophoric one, Anagnostopoulou and Everaert’s hypothesis predicts that *o eaftos mu* should never be permitted as the sole argument in ‘picture of DPs’ cases where, again, an anaphor can only be licensed as a logophor under Reinhart and Reuland’s approach. But this prediction is incorrect. In fact, the only

cases of genitive *o eaftos mu* discussed in Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) are as in (16) where it is understood as a possessor. Other instances of genitive *o eaftos mu* with a distinct function are not explored and in fact genitive *o eaftos mu* is fine as the sole argument in ‘picture of DPs’ when it is not a possessor. This is the case in (17), where it is a theme argument denoting what the picture represents: here the pictures depict Eleana. Note in particular that in such examples, neither the implicit agent, the picture taker, nor the possessor, if any, need to be Eleana. In other words, there is no implicit argument that could act as a local, DP internal, antecedent for the reflexive *o eaftos mu*.

- (17) I Eleana_i edhikse ti kaliteres fotografies **tu eafu tis_i** s-ton aderfo tis.
 the Eleana.NOM showed.3SG the best photos.ACC the self.GEN her.GEN to-the brother.ACC her.GEN
 ‘Eleana showed the best photos of herself to her brother.’

We conclude that the correct description of the behavior of genitive *o eaftos mu* in DPs is that it is allowed with a DP external antecedent, unless it is interpreted as a possessor. As a result, this does not require *o eaftos mu* to be treated differently from English *himself*, as the latter, as is well known, exhibits a similar behavior: it is excluded in DPs when it occupies the Saxon genitive position (viz. **John likes himself’s pictures*).⁸ The conclusion that *o eaftos mu* behaves exactly like the English reflexive finds further support in one more fact, namely, that just like the English reflexive, *o eaftos mu* can be used logophorically in ‘picture of DPs’ (cf. Bryant and Charnavel 2020b), and so it can have a non-c-commanding antecedent, (18a), and it can accept split antecedents, (18b).

- (18) a. [I kampania [tu Mitsotaki]_i] proevlepe oti i fotografies **tu eafu tu** tha
 the campaign.NOM the Mitsotaki.GEN predicted.3SG that the photos.NOM the self.GEN his.GEN would
 itan se oles tis stasis ton leoforion.
 be.3PL in all the stops the buses.GEN
 ‘Mitsotakis’s campaign predicted that the photos of himself would be in all the bus stops.’
 b. O Janis_j ipe oti i Eleana_i ithele na dhiksi ti kaliteres fotografies **tu eafu**
 the John.NOM said that the Eleana.NOM wanted na show.3SG the best photos.ACC the self.GEN
tus_{i+j} s-ton aderfo tis.
 their.GEN to-the brother.ACC her.GEN
 ‘John said that Eleana wanted to show the best photos of themselves to her brother.’

5 *O eaftos mu* in locative and adjunct PPs

This section briefly examines aspects of the distribution of *o eaftos mu* in various adjunct positions with particular focus on locative PPs. Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) report the illformedness of the following type of

⁸ English and Greek are not unique in lacking a possessive reflexive. Dutch, German, English and Italian are a few more languages with reflexives that exhibit the restriction illustrated in (16) (cf. Reuland 2011, 167). Reuland notes that these are languages in which definiteness is marked with a prenominal article. On the other hand, if definiteness is marked in a language by a postnominal affix/ clitic or if a language does not mark definiteness at all, possessor reflexives are allowed. We refer to Despić (2015) which verifies Reuland’s generalization in a new body of languages and proposes an analysis for it.

example:

- (19) * O Petros idhe ena fidhi dhipla s-ton **eafto** tu.
 the Petros.NOM saw.3SG a snake next to-the self.ACC. his.GEN
 ‘Petros saw a snake next to himself.’ Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999, (29))

They attribute its deviance to the adjunct status of the locative PP coupled with the requirement that the *self* part of *o eaftos mu* must incorporate to the verb: since adjunct are movement islands (at least for incorporation), this deviance is predicted. However, as noted by two anonymous reviewers, (19) improves if the context makes clear that Petros is looking at himself in a mirror, as in (20).

- (20) O Petros kitahtik-e s-ton kathrefti ce pro_i idhe ena fidhi dhipla s-ton **eafto**
 the Petros.NOM looked.PASS-3SG in-the mirror and saw.3SG a snake next to-the self.ACC.
tu_i.
 his.GEN
 ‘Petros looked at himself in the mirror and saw a snake next to himself.’

This judgement was supported in an informal survey we conducted with five native speakers; the speakers judged (19) as ill-formed (average was 1.9 out of 5) whereas (20) was judged as significantly better (average was 4.2 out of 5). Note also that the reflexive has an anaphoric usage in this case, as can be shown by the fact that in the same context, it requires a c-commanding antecedent, (21a), and does not accept split-antecedents, (21b).⁹

- (21) a. * [I mitera [tu Petru_i]]_j kitakse s-ton kathrefti ce pro_j idhe ena fidhi dhipla
 the mother.NOM the Petros.GEN looked.3SG in-the mirror and she saw.3SG a snake next
 s-ton **eafto** tu_i.
 to-the self.ACC. his.GEN
 ‘Petros’s mother looked at the mirror and saw a snake next to himself.’

⁹ The contrast between (19) and (20) remains to be explained. It may possibly be derived by invoking a competition between the reflexive and the clitic. Under this view, (19) is ruled out because (v) expresses the same meaning with the same form except for the use of a clitic, a weaker form (see Cardinaletti and Starke 1999 for the idea the weaker form is always preferred over a strong one and the extended discussion in Charnavel 2019 or in Bryant and Charnavel 2020a extending it to a pronoun / reflexive competition). Now it turns out that a genitive clitic inside a PP cannot immediately refer to a statue: in the example below where *ton eafto tis* ‘herself’ refers to a statue of Julia Roberts, the genitive clitic in *dhipla tis* ‘next to her’ can only refer to Julia Roberts herself, not her statue.

- (v) O Petros idhe ena fidhi dhipla tu.
 the Petros.NOM saw.3SG a snake next him.CL.GEN
 ‘Petros saw a snake next to him.’
 (vi) I Julia Roberts eno paratiruse ton eafto tis apo makria ksafnika tromakse jati idhe ena fidhi dhipla
 the Julia Roberts while watched.3SG the self.ACC her.GEN from far suddenly got scared.3SG because saw.3SG a snake next
 tis.
 her.CL.GEN
 ‘Julia Roberts was watching herself from far away when she suddenly got scared because she saw a snake next to her.’

Since the genitive clitic cannot refer to the statue in locative PPs (why remains to be understood), *o eaftos mu* can be used in such a context (cf. 20) because it lacks a weaker competitor. Competition thus appears promising but it would of course remain to investigate in detail when and how anaphoric *o eaftos mu* and clitics or weaker forms compete.

- b. *Kitazodas tus idjus s-ton kathrefti, o Janis_i simfonise me ti Maria_j oti to fidhi den
 looking the same at-the mirror the John.NOM agreed.3SG with the Maria.ACC that the snake not
 ine dipla s-**ton eafto tus**_{i+j}.
 be.3SG next to-the self their
 ‘Looking at them in the mirror, John agreed with Mary that the snake is not next to themselves.’

Furthermore, if we consider other adjuncts, they readily tolerate anaphoric *o eaftos mu*. This is exemplified in (22a). In such cases, *o eaftos mu* must, given the interpretation, be a reflexive anaphor, not a logophor, a conclusion corroborated by the fact that it needs a c-commanding antecedent, (22b), and it cannot have split-antecedents, (22c).

- (22) a. O vuleftis_i shimatise kivernisi horis **ton eafto tu**_i mesa.
 the MP.NOM formed.3SG government.ACC without the self.GEN his.GEN in
 ‘The MP formed a government without himself in it.’
- b. * [I mitera [tu vulefti]_i] eftiakse kivernisi horis **ton eafto tu**_i mesa.
 the mother.NOM the MP.GEN made.3SG government.ACC without the self.GEN his.GEN in
 ‘The MP’s mother organized a government without himself in it.’
- c. * I Maria_i ipe oti o vuleftis_j ithele na shimatise kivernisi horis **ton eafto**
 the Maria.NOM said that the MP.NOM wanted.3SG na form.3SG government.ACC without the self.GEN
tus_{i+j} mesa.
 them.GEN in
 ‘Maria said that the MP wanted to form a government without themselves in it.’

These facts again speak against the idea that as part of the reflexivization mechanism, the *self*-noun of *o eaftos mu* must undergo incorporation into the verb (*pace* Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 1999, Patel-Grosz 2013, Spathas 2010, but in agreement with Sportiche 2020), as we would expect all instances of *o eaftos mu* inside adjunct PPs to be ill formed. Of course it remains to explain what the difference is between the adjunct PPs that allow *o eaftos mu* and those that do not but we set this issue aside for future research, as it relies on details about the internal structure of the various locative PPs that fall beyond the scope of the current paper (but see Angelopoulos and Bassel 2019 who argue that the distribution of *o eaftos mu* in locative PPs is consistent with Condition A).¹⁰ This said, remark as a final note that similar challenges are posed for *self*-incorporation by cases in which anaphoric *o eaftos mu* occurs in standard island configurations different than PP adjuncts, for example the second conjunct of the coordinate structure in (23a). As before, *o eaftos mu* needs a c-commanding antecedent, (23b), and it does not accept split-antecedents (28b):

- (23) a. O Janis parighile mia bira ja tin Ann-Mari ce mia ja **ton eafto tu**.
 the John.NOM ordered.3SG a beer.ACC for the Ann-Mari.ACC and one for the self.ACC his.GEN
 ‘John ordered one beer for Ann-Marie and one for himself.’
- b. * [I mitera [tu Jani]_i] parighile mia bira ja tin Ann-Mari ce mia ja **ton**
 the mother.NOM the John.GEN ordered.3SG a beer.ACC for the Ann-Mari.ACC and one for the
eafto tu.
 self.ACC his.GEN

¹⁰ See also Bassel (2018) for the distribution of the Hebrew reflexives in locative PPs.

‘John’s mother ordered one beer for Ann-Marie and one for himself.’

- c. *I Eleana_i ipe oti o Janis_j ithele na parighili mia bira ja tin
 the Eleana.NOM said.3SG that the John.GEN wanted.3SG na order.3SG a beer.ACC for the
 Ann-Mari ce mia ja **ton eafto tus**_{i+j}.
 Ann-Mari.ACC and one for the self.ACC their.GEN
 ‘Eleana said that John wanted to order one beer for Ann-Mari and one for themselves.’

Such cases are well-formed even though movement is blocked. The c-command facts in (23b) and the ban on split antecedents in (23c) suggests that it is not being like a logophor in such cases. Instead *o eaftos mu* in this case must have the anaphoric usage.

6 Nominative *o eaftos mu*

We now turn to nominative *o eaftos mu* which, remarkably, can be anaphoric. In this case, nominative *o eaftos mu* has the following properties which distinguish it from the non-anaphoric use: (a) it is compatible with properties of concrete objects, e.g. *jimnos*, *vamenos* ‘naked, painted’, (b) it can only occur in derived subject positions (as is reported in Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 1999). Anagnostopoulou and Everaert argue that this latter property cannot be accounted in terms of reconstruction of *o eaftos mu* into its base position and conclude that the licensing of *o eaftos mu* can therefore not be reduced to the standard Condition A. We argue otherwise, reducing the difference between this Greek anaphor and English anaphors like *himself* which cannot be nominative precisely to a difference in reconstructability. This is in part possible because surveys we conducted with native speakers of Greek do not support some of the judgments reported in Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1995). The conclusion is that the anaphoric instances of nominative *o eaftos mu* do not require any special treatment.

6.1 Nominative *o eaftos mu* at first sight

The following examples illustrate a few anaphoric instances of *o eaftos mu* in nominative case. As previously, the presence of predicates *jimnos*/ *vamenos* ‘naked, painted’ or *kodos* ‘short’ precludes the reified use:

- (24) a. **O eaftos mu**_i dhen mu_i aresi jimnos/ vamenos.
 the self.NOM mine.GEN not 1SG.DAT like.3SG naked painted
 ‘Myself is not appealing to me naked/painted.’
- b. Ithela na skefto kati astio ce amesos **o eaftos mu**_i mu_i irthe
 wanted.1SG na think.1SG something funny and immediately the self.NOM mine.GEN 1SG.DAT came
 s-to nu jimnos/ vamenos.
 to-the mind naked painted
 ‘I wanted to think of something funny and immediately myself came to me/my mind naked/ painted.’

- c. **O eafos tu_i** tu_i fenete kodos s-ton kathrefti.
 the self.NOM his.GEN 3SG.M.DAT seem.3SG short in-the mirror
 ‘His self seems to him to be short in the mirror.’

Note first that these cannot be instances of a logophoric usage because nominative *o eafos mu* cannot be licensed by a non-c-commanding antecedent, (25a), and does not permit split-antecedents, (25b).

- (25) a. ***O eafos tu_i** dhen (tis) aresi [tis miteras [tu Jorghu_i]] jimnos/ vamenos.
 the self.NOM his.GEN not 3.SG.DAT like.3SG the mother.GEN the George.GEN naked/ painted
 ‘Himself is not appealing to George’s mother naked/painted.’
- b. ***O Janis_i** pistevi oti i Maria_j theli **o eafos tus_{i+j}** na fenete leptos
 the John.NOM believe.3SG that the Maria.NOM want.3SG the self.NOM their.GEN na seem.3SG thin
 s-tis fotografies.
 in-the photos
 ‘John believes that Mary wants themselves to look thin in the photos.’

Importantly, in its surface position, *o eafos mu* is not c-commanded by its antecedent in (24) raising the question of how exactly Condition A is satisfied. Looking at psych constructions, we propose that the mechanism via which Condition A is satisfied is simply (total) reconstruction.

6.2 Nominative *o eafos mu* and reconstruction

Let us begin with the example below, repeated from previously, which illustrates a Class III psych predicate in the typology of Belletti and Rizzi (1988). Class III predicates as *aresi* ‘appeals to’ take a dative experiencer and a nominative theme as arguments and, as shown below, the theme can corefer with the experiencer (cf. Anagnostopoulou 1999).

- (26) **O eafos tu_i** dhen tu aresi [tu Jorghu_i]_i jimnos/ vamenos.
 the self.NOM his.GEN not 3SG.M.DAT like.3SG the George.GEN naked painted
 ‘George naked/ painted is not appealing to him.’

As usual the presence of *jimnos, vamenos* ‘naked, painted’ precludes the reified usage of *o eafos mu* in this (cf. also 25a), and subsequent examples in this section. Following extensive previous literature (cf. Belletti and Rizzi 1988, 2012, Pesetsky 1995, Landau 2009 i.a.), we assume that the theme enters the derivation lower than the experiencer, as illustrated in the structure below:

- (27) [_{vP} Experiencer [_v [_{VP} V Theme_{Target/SubjectMatter}]]]

The theme *o eafos mu* subsequently undergoes A-movement into its surface position in (26). Since A-movement can totally reconstruct (cf. Fox 2000, Sportiche 2005, Sportiche 2017) binding is possible under total reconstruction

into its base position where it is c-commanded by the experiencer. In what follows, we provide near minimal pairs differing in whether nominative *o eaftos mu* is generated below or above a potential binder and show that binding is permitted only when it is moved from below such a potential binder, as expected if binding is only possible via reconstruction. In order to illustrate this pattern, we examine Class II psych predicates. These are predicates that are ambiguously realized either as eventive or as stative. In both cases, they select an accusative DP argument interpreted as an experiencer and a nominative DP. The nominative DP is construed as an agent or a causer if and only if the psych verb is eventive, whereas it is construed as a theme_{Target/SubjectMatter} if and only if the psych verb is stative (cf. Alexiadou and Iordăchioaia 2014). In Greek furthermore, Alexiadou and Iordăchioaia show that clitic doubling is strictly obligatory with the stative reading (see also Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2019, 11 for similar claims):¹¹

- (28) a. O Jorghos (tin_i) stenohorise tin Maria_i (skopima/ ghrighora).
the John.NOM 3SG.F.ACC saddened.3SG the Maria.ACC on purpose fast
‘John annoyed Maria on purpose/fast.’
- b. I katastasi tis miteras tu *(ton_i) stenohorise ton Jorgho_i
the state.NOM the mother.GEN his.GEN 3SG.F.ACC saddened.3SG the George.ACC
(*skopima/*ghrighora).
on purpose/fast
‘The state of his mother saddened George (*on purpose/*fast).’ modified from Alexiadou and
Iordăchioaia 2014, (19b)

The verb in (28a) is eventive, as suggested by the fact that it is compatible with an event-oriented modifier, namely, *ghrighora* ‘fast’. The nominative subject of the verb is an agent, and so the verb is compatible with the agent modifier *skopima* ‘on purpose’. In contrast, as noted by Alexiadou and Iordăchioaia (2014), the non-agentive (inanimate) subject in (28b), that is, *i katastasi tis miteras tu* ‘his mother state’ is not an agent or a causer. Instead, it ‘[...] is understood as a prolonged homogeneous object of emotion whose perception triggers a prolonged psychological state in the experiencer.’ Now since the experiencer is in a state, the psych verb in this case is stative too, and so it resists modification by the agentive modifier, *skopima* ‘on purpose’, and the eventive one, *ghrighora* ‘fast’. As noted, clitic doubling of the experiencer is obligatory only in (28b) under the stative usage of the verb. On the other hand, the verb is eventive in (28a), and, as shown, clitic doubling is optional.

¹¹ Interestingly, Clitic Doubling of the experiencer is not allowed if the nominative theme undergoes relativization, just as shown below:

- (vii) I spudhes *(tin) endiaferun tin Maria.
the studies.NOM 3SG.F.ACC interest.PL the Maria.ACC
‘Maria is not interested in studies.’
- (viii) [I spudhes pu (*tin) endiaferun tin Maria] ine i anthropistikes.
the studies.NOM that 3SG.F.ACC interest.3PL the Maria.ACC are the humanities.NOM
‘The studies that Mary is interested in are the humanities.’

Examples (29) and (30) below show that if the nominative DP is a reflexive, the experiencer must obligatorily be clitic doubled, showing that the psych verb must be used statively:

- (29) a. ***O eaftos tu_i** (jimnos) aidhiasi/ provlimatizi ton Jorgho_i.
the self.NOM his.GEN naked disgust.3SG trouble.3SG the George.ACC
‘Himself naked disgusts/troubles George.’
- b. **O eaftos tu_i** (jimnos) ton aidhiasi/ provlimatizi ton Jorgho_i.
the self.NOM his.GEN naked 3SG.M.ACC disgust.3SG trouble.3SG the George.ACC
‘George is disgusted/troubled with himself naked.’
- (30) a. ***O eaftos tu_i** (jimnos) enohli ton Jorgho_i.
the self.NOM his.GEN naked annoy.3SG the George.ACC
‘Himself naked annoys troubles George.’
- b. **O eaftos tu_i** (jimnos) ton enohli ton Jorgho_i.
the self.NOM his.GEN naked 3SG.M.ACC annoy.3SG the George.ACC
‘George is annoyed with himself naked.’

This pattern of data follows if, as is standard for the eventive case, the agent/causer subject is associated with a position as highest argument of the VP, thus above the theme, and is thus not in position to satisfy condition A under reconstruction, when reflexive.

- (31) [_{VP} Agent/Causer [_{v'} v [_{VP} Experiencer [_{v_{exp}} [_{VP} V]]]]]

In the stative case on the other hand, the reflexive is associated with an argument position lower than that of the theme as in (27), is subsequently moved and can totally reconstruct under this theme. In sum, a nominative reflexive is licensed if and only if it has moved from under a potential binder, and is thus able to reconstruct, if needed.

The contrast in (30) was confirmed in a questionnaire run with fifteen native speakers of Modern Greek. The questionnaire was based on a 5-point Likert scale, 5 the best. The results, reported below, show that the structure in (30b) is the only one that is accepted by the speakers with a nominative reflexive.¹²

	Nominative DP argument	
<i>O eaftos mu</i>	(30a)	(30b)
Survey Results	Average=1.5, Standard Deviation=0.73	Average=4.7, Standard Deviation=0.45

Table 1: Nominative Anaphors.

¹² The presence or absence of the predicate, *jimnos*, did not change the judgments of the speakers about binding.

These conclusions can be corroborated by considerations independent from reflexives, namely pronominal binding patterns. Just like reflexive binding in psych verb constructions, a possessive pronoun hosted in the nominative DP argument of a Class II psych verb can be bound by a QP experiencer only if the latter is clitic doubled, supporting the postulated structural analysis:^{13,14}

- (32) a. *Ta pedhja tis_i enohlun tin kathe mitera_i.
the kids.NOM her.GEN annoy.3PL the every mother.ACC
‘Her kids annoy every mother.’
- b. Ta pedhja tis_i tin enohlun tin kathe mitera_i.
the kids.NOM her.GEN 3SG.F.ACC annoy.3PL the every mother.ACC
‘Every mother is annoyed with her kid.’

6.3 Greek vs. English anaphors

We concluded that an anaphoric nominative *o eaftos mu* being allowed only as a derived subject can be accounted for under the assumption that *o eaftos mu* is licensed via reconstruction into its base position.

But if this is correct, why is this that the English counterpart of the Greek nominative anaphors cases are ill formed? This we propose can be attributed to the difference in internal structure between English reflexives and Greek reflexives: as Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1995) argues, the latter are regular DPs, while the former are (modified) pronouns. And pronouns can be independently shown never to (totally¹⁵) reconstruct when A-moved, unlike regular DPs, albeit they do when A-bar moved. Greek anaphors have a transparent structure since they are composed exactly like regular DPs, the head noun simply being *eafto/self* instead of some other common noun.

¹³ Pronominal binding by the experiencer into nominative theme is also possible in the corresponding Italian constructions (cf. Belletti and Rizzi 1988).

¹⁴ An anonymous reviewer points out the following well formed example:

- (ix) To mono pragma pu enohli ton Giani_i ine o eaftos tu_i gimnos
the only thing.NOM that bother.3SG the John is the self.NOM his.GEN naked
‘The only thing_k that t_k annoys John is himself naked.’

This example might be taken to undermine the hypothesis that *o eaftos mu* requires a local c-commanding antecedent but in fact the opposite is true. A full discussion is beyond the scope of this article but note that that this example belongs to the class of pseudo-cleft constructions discussed e.g. in Sharvit (1999) (see also Sportiche 2017). Sharvit (1999) shows that the connectivity effect observed - *o eaftos tu gimnos* behaves as if it was in the position marked t_k in the transaltion - are specifically due to the properties of the verb *be* which “identifies” this focus with the head of the relative clause, raised from the position t_k. Now if t_k did not mark a position from which total reconstruction under the experiencer was possible, the reflexive would be deviant. Indeed, this prediction is borne out in the following example:

- (x) *To mono pragma pu kani ton Giani_i eksalo ine o eaftos tu_i gimnos
the only thing.NOM that make.3SG the John upset is the self.NOM his.GEN naked
‘The only thing_k that t_k makes John upset is himself naked.’

Modulo this property of *be*, this pattern in fact strengthens the hypothesis that c-command of the reflexive by its antecedent is required.

¹⁵ Throughout, the needed reconstruction of anaphors is total: it must be fully interpreted in the scope of its potential binder to be bindable by it. See footnote 17.

English *himself/herself/yourself* on the other hand do not have a uniform transparent structure and in fact behave like pronouns and unlike DPs with overt nouns, as Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1995) note, citing examples due to Ingria (1982, 65-66) which show they obligatorily precede particles in verb particle constructions (in the absence of strong accent on the pronoun):

- (33) a. Elie turned him/her/you in.
 b. * Elie turned in him/her/you.
- (34) a. Elie turned himself/herself/yourself in.
 b. * Elie turned in himself/herself/yourself.

This means *himself* is headed by *him*, with *self* an adjunct/modifier to *him*. In addition, *yourself*, *herself* *ourselves*,... do not behave like simple possessive DPs, unlike inalienable or idiomatic elements. While a possessed noun can be elided as shown by such sentences as (35a), the noun *self* cannot be as illustrated in (35b)-(35c). This shows that *self* is not simply a possessed noun neither in *himself*, *themselves* as the morphology of the pronouns suggest, but also in *myself*, *yourself*, *ourselves*, *yourselves* despite the morphology (which of course raises the question of the exact internal structure of such items).

- (35) a. You lost your book/way/mind and I lost mine.
 b. * You saw yourself and she saw hers. (meaning herself)
 c. * She saw herself and we saw ours.

We can now attribute the lack of reconstruction for English reflexives to an independent generalization about pronoun movement and reconstruction: quite generally, A-moved (definite) pronouns cannot totally reconstruct (see Sportiche 2005, for discussion). This is illustrated in the following examples:

- (36) a. * He_k seems to $John_k$'s father to be t_k happy. (see also Lebeaux 2009)
 b. * $John_k$ expected him_k to seem to me t_k to be intelligent. Chomsky (1995, 327)

These sentences are all deviant. The first one is a condition C violation. If total reconstruction of the pronoun were possible, the pronoun would have the option of being interpreted only in its trace position and the sentence could thus be binding theoretically equivalent to *it seems to $John_k$'s father that he_k is happy*, which is well formed. Similarly, the second is a Principle B violation. If total reconstruction of the pronoun were possible in the second, the result

would be binding theoretically equivalent to $John_k$ expected that it would seem to me that he_k is intelligent, which is also well formed.^{16,17}

6.4 Nominative *o eaftos mu*: alternative accounts

Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1995) does not adopt a reconstruction approach. First the theoretical context was one in which reconstruction was often assumed to be unavailable for A-movement, an assumption that no longer holds. In addition, it presents the following data in order to exclude an analysis in terms of reconstruction:

- (37) a. O eaftos tu_i tu aresi tu Petru $_i$ / s-ton Petro $_i$.
the self.NOM his.GEN 3SG.M.DAT appeal.3SG the Peter.DAT to-the Peter.ACC
‘Himself appeals to Peter.’
- b. *? Kathe jineka $_i$ tu aresei tu adra tis $_i$.
every woman.NOM 3SG.M.DAT appeal.3SG the husband.DAT her.GEN
‘Every woman appeals to her husband.’
- c. Kathe jineka $_i$ aresei s-ton adra tis $_i$.
every woman.NOM appeal.3SG to-the husband.ACC her.GEN
‘Every woman appeals to her husband.’ Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1995, (20))

(37b) and (37c) differ in how the experiencer is realized, a dative DP in the first one, a PP in the second one. The contrast between them is analyzed as a WCO effect and is taken to support the hierarchy below where the experiencer is introduced in two structurally distinct positions depending on whether it is realized as a dative or a PP:

- (38) Dative_{Experiencer} > Nominative > PP_{Experiencer}

Anagnostopoulou and Everaert argue as follows: first, the preverbal subject position in Greek is an A-bar Topic position. In (37c), WCO is obviated because the nominative QP is able to bind from its base position into the PP experiencer which, as shown in (38), is merged lower in the hierarchy. WCO cannot be obviated with a dative

¹⁶ Note that A-bar moved pronouns however can reconstruct: A-bar moved pronouns do not trigger Condition C (or a Strong Crossover effect), viz. the well formedness of the following sentence in English.

- (xi) Him $_k$, John $_k$ thinks that you should invite t_k .

¹⁷ In conclusion, A-moved pronouns cannot totally reconstruct while A-bar moved pronouns may. As an anonymous reviewer points out, it is well known that reconstruction of the theme argument lower than the experiencer is also possible in English, as shown below for pronominal binding (much literature, e.g. Reinhart and Reuland 1991 and Pesetsky 1987 report the same for reflexive binding but do not independently control for the reflexive not being logophoric)

- (xii) The bad grades he_i got worry every student $_i$.

This suggests that the experiencer is merged, as in Greek, lower than the theme, and also rules out the (unlikely) possibility that **Himself worries John* is ill-formed due to differences in how argument structure is projected in the two languages.

experiencer in (37b) because the only position from which the dative could be bound into by the nominative is the preverbal position of subjects. This position being an A-bar position in Greek, such binding yields a WCO effect.

First, the assumption that the preverbal subject is not in, or does not transit through, a high A-position is hard to maintain (see also Oikonomou et al. 2020 for independent arguments from scope that preverbal subjects occupy - or transit through - an A-position). Indeed, it is possible to bind pronouns inside high adjuncts as shown below, something that should not be possible from an A-bar position:¹⁸

- (39) a. Kathe aghori_i troi pio sihna apo tin adherfi tu_i spanaki.
 every boy.NOM eat.3SG more often than the sister.ACC his.GEN spinach.ACC
 ‘Every boy more often than his sister eats spinach.’
- b. *I Maria proskali pio sihna apo tin aderfi tu_i kathe aghori_i.
 the Maria.NOM invite.3SG more often than the sister.ACC his.GEN every boy.ACC
 ‘Maria more often than his sister invites every boy.’

Secondly, certain quantifiers such as negative quantifiers normally resist occurring in an A-bar Topic position in a non-generic context, as in (40a) (cf. Alexopoulou 2009). Yet, they readily occur in a preverbal subject position, (40a).

- (40) a. *Kanenan dhen ton idha cthes.
 no one.ACC not 3SG.M.ACC saw.1SG yesterday
 ‘I did not see anyone yesterday.’
- b. Kanenas dhen me idhe cthes.
 no one.NOM not 1SG.ACC saw.3SG yesterday
 ‘Noone saw me yesterday.’

But even if the preverbal subject position was in an A-bar position, reconstruction of the reflexive would be allowed, since reconstruction from A-bar position is allowed (see previous section for pronouns, and Angelopoulos and Sportiche 2020 for preposed topics). So the argument against reconstruction only rests on the analysis of the contrast between (37b) and (37c). It is attributed to WCO but given that the experiencer can be alternatively realized as a bare dative or as a prepositional dative, the contrast may be due to the slight dispreference for bare datives we observed independently (see also in footnote 7 of section 4.1). And indeed, the contrast between (37b) and (37c) seems fragile. Thus, similar sentences are reported as acceptable in more recent literature:

¹⁸ A reviewer notes that (39b) is possible if the direct object is Clitic Doubled:

- (xiii) *I Maria proskali pio sihna apo tin aderfi tu_i kathe aghori_i.
 the Maria.NOM invite.3SG more often than the sister.ACC his.GEN every boy.ACC
 ‘Maria more often than his sister invites every boy.’

This is not surprising given that Clitic Doubling can, as is as well-known, obviate WCO with the subject (see Anagnostopoulou 2003 and Angelopoulos 2019 for an account).

- (41) ?Kathe dhaskala_i tu aresi tu mathiti tis_i.
 every teacher.NOM 3SG.M.DAT appeal.3SG the student.DAT her.GEN
 ‘Every teacher appeals to her student.’

Michelioudakis (2012, (82b))

To evaluate the robustness of this contrast, we conducted an informal survey with eleven native speakers of Greek to test whether nominative QPs trigger WCO with clitic doubled bare dative experiencers or not. The speakers were asked to judge the acceptability of the following sentence, using a 5-point Likert scale with 5 the best, in a context where there are different movie creators, and each one likes their own movie.

- (42) Kathe tenia_i tu aresi tu dhimiurghu tis_i.
 every movie.NOM 3SG.M.DAT appeal.3SG the creator.DAT her.GEN
 ‘Every movie appeals to its creator.’

The results are presented in the table below and strongly suggest that nominative QPs do not trigger WCO with dative experiencers (*pace* Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 1995).

	Nominative DP argument
Example	(42)
Survey Results	Average=5, Standard Deviation=0

Table 2: Nominative Anaphors.

These results speak in favor of the hierarchy in (31). In this hierarchy, WCO between a nominative QP and a dative experiencer is obviated via an A-movement step that the first undergoes across the latter, regardless of the dative vs. PP status of the experiencer.

One more question arises about the idea that *o eaftos mu* can undergo reconstruction in light of the following contrast between a reflexive and a pronoun:

- (43) a. I mitera tu_i *(to) peripiithike to kathe pedhi_i.
 the mother.NOM his 3SG.N.ACC took care.3SG the every kid.ACC
 ‘His mother took care of every kid.’
 b. *O eaftos tu_i (ton) peripiithike ton Jorgho.
 the self.NOM his 3SG.M.ACC took care.3SG the George.ACC
 ‘*Himself took care of George.’

(43a) shows that a pronoun contained in a preverbal nominative subject, an agent here (not to be confused with nominative theme *o eaftos mu* discussed in section 6.2), can be bound by a clitic doubled object obviating WCO (cf.

Anagnostopoulou 2003 i.a. and footnote 18). On the other hand, nominative *o eaftos mu* in (43b) cannot be bound by the clitic doubled object. Angelopoulos (2019) proposes that WCO is obviated in (43a) because clitic doubled objects can bind into Spec vP where the agent subject is reconstructed from an middle field A-position to which they move. Bound pronouns and bound anaphors thus apparently crucially differ. This needs to be explained.

Without getting into too much detail, this difference would follow under the approach defended in Charnavel and Sportiche (2020) whereby the *him* of *himself* (and by extension the *tu* of *o eaftos tu*) is not directly bound by the antecedent of the anaphor. Rather this pronoun is one of the two arguments of *self* and the antecedent of the anaphor (here *Jorgho=George*) is first merged as the other argument of *self*, and is thus referentially identified with the pronoun (here *his=tu*) by the head noun *self* - i.e. $self(his, George) \rightarrow his_k = George_k$. This argument is subsequently remerged in the theta position of the antecedent (here it would be the subject of *take care of*). Defending this analysis here is beyond the scope of the present article but it has one virtue: such a derivation prevents an antecedent from ever being thematically lower than the anaphor it binds, since movement cannot be to a lower position, and thereby excludes such examples as (43b). Note incidentally that because the anaphor contains a trace of its antecedent, such derivations require anaphors to totally reconstruct in the examples discussed in section 6.2 (which, as we saw with English anaphors, is not always possible).

7 Clitic Doubling of *o eaftos mu*

Finally, we present a short note suggesting that *o eaftos mu* can be coindexed as a whole with its antecedent, just like what is standardly assumed of anaphors in other languages. This idea was argued against in Iatridou (1988) which considered as evidence the behavior of clitic doubled *o eaftos mu*. We now discuss this analysis and show that her assessment of the behavior of clitic doubled *o eaftos mu* is confounded by one of her premises, namely that Greek clitics have referential import that matters for binding purposes. If instead clitics are expletive in terms of referential import,¹⁹ the idea that *o eaftos mu* is bound as a whole is unproblematic.

The well-formed instances of clitic doubled *o eaftos mu*, as in (44a), pose an apparent problem if the clitic bears the index of the anaphor and the anaphor as a whole is bound by the subject of the sentence, as illustrated in (44a) again. That is, the clitic which in this case is locally bound by the subject should give rise to a Principle B violation, as in (44b), where, as a bare clitic, it forces disjointness with the subject.

¹⁹ We refer the reader to Tsakali (2006) and Angelopoulos and Sportiche (2020), where this is argued at length by showing that clitics themselves never are relevant for binding theory. One simple French fact discussed therein, namely that accusative clitics can double adjectives as in *Jean le sera, triste* 'Jean it will-be, sad' shows at the very least that such clitics need not be individual denoting.

- (44) a. O Jorghos_j ton_j aghapai [**ton eafto** **tu**]_j.
 the George.NOM 3SG.M.ACC love.3SG the self.SG.M.ACC his.GEN
 ‘George loves himself.’
- b. O Jorghos_j ton_{k/*j} aghapai.
 the George.NOM 3SG.M.ACC love.3SG
 ‘George loves him.’

To avoid this undesirable result, Iatridou (1988) hypothesizes that *o eaftos mu* is not bound as a whole. Instead, she suggests that only the possessive pronoun, i.e. *tu*, is actually bound by the subject whereas the clitic is co-indexed with the whole DP as shown in (45). Under this view, Principle B is not violated when *o eaftos mu* is clitic doubled because the clitic is not locally bound.

- (45) O Jorghos_j ton_k aghapai [ton eafto tu_j]_k.

What is left undiscussed under this analysis is the value of index *k*. Could it in fact be something different than *j*, whether there is clitic doubling as in (45) or not as below?

- (46) O Jorghos_j aghapai [ton eafto tu_j]_{??}.

If it could, there would be no bar in having as well formed an example such as (47) where what is shown as ?? above is determined by a non-local element:

- (47) *O Jorghos_j ipe oti o Adreas_k ton_j perighrafi [**ton eafto** **tu_k**]_j.
 the Jorghos.NOM said.3SG that the Adreas.NOM 3SG.M.ACC describe.3SG the self.ACC his.GEN
 ‘George said that Adreas describes himself.’

But this is of course ill-formed. The intuitive reason is simple: the index of the whole expression *ton eafto tu* must be the same as that of the possessive pronoun *tu*: Adreas is understood to describe Adreas, that is what the direct object of *describe* denotes. And in fact, in all treatments of the make up of pronoun-self anaphors, the lexical properties of *self* are taken to guarantee that the pronoun and the whole pronoun-self expression have the same index (cf. e.g. Sauerland (2013) for a recent version), and both have the same index as the antecedent (a widespread view, but not the only one, taking that *self* is an identity function mapping its possessor onto itself).

If *tu* and *ton eafto tu* necessarily have the same index (*pace* Iatridou 1988), (47) is predicted to be ruled out as an impossible interpretation. This being the case, why isn’t there a Condition B violation in example (44a)? Angelopoulos and Sportiche (2020) argue that clitics are markers lacking the kind of referential import that matters for binding purposes. Thus, (44a) does not require any special treatment as it is from a binding perspective equivalent to cases as (48) where the anaphor is bound directly by the subject.

- (48) O Jorghos_i aghapai [**ton eafto** **tu_i**].
 the George.NOM love.3SG the self.SG.M.ACC his.GEN
 ‘George loves himself.’

Now why is there a Condition B violation in (44b)? Angelopoulos and Sportiche (2020) show that this is due to what the clitic doubles, namely a silent pronoun (*pro*). Quite generally, this illustrates that what matters for the binding theory in general, and for condition B in particular is not the clitic, but the DP doubled by the clitic.

From all this we conclude that there is no independent argument that the anaphor *ton eafto tu* is not bound as a whole and further that if the pronoun *tu* is bound by its antecedent, the whole *ton eafto tu* must be as well. As to why the index on the whole anaphor and the index on its possessor have to be the same, all analyses of the internal structure of say *her-self* from Helke (1971) to and including Charnavel and Sportiche (2020) mentioned in section 6.4 assume referential identity between *her* and *herself* is asserted by the presence of *self*.²⁰

8 Competition and exempt *o eafos mu*

In this last section we briefly discuss logophoric usages of *o eafos mu*. First, recall that in what precedes, we systematically controlled away from logophoric (or reified) usages of *o eafos mu* focusing on anaphoric usages. Whether there are logophoric usages or not thus does not affect our conclusions that *o eafos mu* used as an anaphor behaves like a plain anaphor subject to the standard to Condition A. Note also that logophors have been argued recently to be plain anaphors locally bound, as per Condition A, by a logophoric operator (cf. Charnavel 2019). This suggests that the availability of a logophoric usage does not immediately speak in favor of a special treatment of a reflexive. This said, we did conclude that *o eafos mu* can sometimes be used logophorically, as illustrated in (18a) and (18b). This raises the question of the distribution of *o eafos mu* used logophorically. Addressing this question goes well beyond the goal of this article. Here we merely point out that there is no simple answer to this question. Indeed, a reviewer notes that *o eafos mu* and the expression *o idhjos* are often in complementary distribution, as in the examples below, where the antecedent of *o idhjos* is a logophoric center, an attitude holder in (49a) and an empathy locus in (49b) (cf. Charnavel 2019 i.a.).

- (49) a. O Janis_i kafchithike oti i vasilisa kalese tin Anna ke **ton idhjo_i/* ton**
 the John.NOM boasted.3SG that the queen.NOM invited.3SG the Anna.ACC and the same.ACC the
eafto tu_i ja pote.
 self.GEN his.GEN for drink.ACC
 ‘John boasted that the queen invited Anna and the same/himself for a drink.’

²⁰ Note that the result $[ton\ eafto\ tu_k]_k$ is an i-within-i condition violation but one that is innocuous as it is well-known - cf. e.g. Buring (2005) - that binding constraints apply to presupposed coreference or covaluation, not asserted coreference or covaluation as is the case here via *eafto/self*. This of course does not apply to the reified use of *self*: we get $[ton\ eafto\ tu_k]_m$ $k \neq m$ as the whole DP is not covalued with the pronoun, but denotes the ‘self’ of the pronoun’s referent.

- b. O Pavlos_i duleve se ena panepistimio me ti jineka tu opu fisiki opos o
 the Paul.NOM worked.3SG at a university.ACC with the wife.ACC his.GEN where physicists like the
idhjos_i/* o eafos tu_i echeran ipsilis ektimisis.
 same.NOM the self.NOM his.GEN enjoy.3SG high regard
 ‘Paul worked at a university with his wife where physicists like the same/himself were highly regarded.’

The reviewer claims that *o eafos mu* is not found systematically to have a logophoric usage because *o idhjos*, which is possibly more specified to be bound long-distance, is used instead in these cases (via competition). We think that this is not the case because *o eafos mu* and *o idhjos* are not always in strict complementarity, as would follow from competition; they can often be used in free alternation, as illustrated in (50):

- (50) a. I kampania tu Mitsotaki_i proevlepe oti (i) fotografies **tu idhju_i/ tu eafu**
 the campaign.NOM the Mitsotaki.GEN predicted.3SG that the photos.NOM the same.GEN the self.GEN
tu_i ce tis jinekas tu tha itan se oles tis stasis ton leoforion.
 his.GEN and the wife.GEN his.GEN would be in all the stops.ACC the buses.GEN
 ‘Mitsotakis’s campaign predicted that the photos of the same/himself and his wife would be in all the bus stops.’
- b. O vuleftis_i shimatise kivernisi horis **ton idhjo_i/ ton eafu tu_i** mesa.
 the MP.NOM formed.3SG government.ACC without the same.ACC the self.ACC his.GEN in
 ‘The MP formed a government without the same/himself in it.’
- c. O Jorghos_i mono spania majirevi gia **ton idhjo_i/ ton eafu tu_i**.
 the George only rarely cook.3SG for the same.ACC the self.GEN his.GEN
 ‘George only rarely cooks for the same/himself.’
- d. O Janis_i parighile mia bira ja tin Ann-Mari ce mia ja **ton idhjo_i/ ton eafu**
 the John.NOM ordered.3SG a beer.ACC for the Ann-Mari.ACC and one for the same.ACC the self.ACC
tu_i.
 his.GEN
 ‘John ordered one beer for Ann-Marie and one for the same/himself.’

That the two are not in strict complementarity is also suggested by the fact that *o idhjos* is not always possible in contexts where *o eafos mu* is ruled out (cf. 51 modified from 19):

- (51) *O Petros idhe ena fidhi dhipla s-**ton eafu tu/ ton idhjo**.
 the Petros.NOM saw.3SG a snake next to-the self.ACC his.GEN the same.ACC
 ‘Petros saw a snake next to himself/the same.’

9 Conclusion

The paper argued in favor of a standard treatment of *o eafos mu* in terms of Condition A. It distinguished the previously reported two usages of *o eafos mu*, an anaphoric and a non-anaphoric one, and proposed diagnostics to

distinguish them. Using these diagnostics systematically, it showed that anaphoric *o eaftos mu* does not display a behavior that requires special treatment in subject and oblique argument positions, in locative PPs or clitic doubling; anaphoric *o eaftos mu* is allowed as a dative object. This fact together with the observation that obliques are strong islands for extraction were taken to speak against the idea that *self*incorporation is part of the reflexivization mechanism. This conclusion was corroborated in light of data showing that anaphoric *o eaftos mu* is possible in other configurations that block movement, e.g. coordinate structures and adjuncts. As for subject *o eaftos mu*, it was shown that under the anaphoric usage, it is possible in derived subject positions only. The paper argues that Condition A is satisfied via reconstruction. The English reflexive is not allowed in derived subject positions because in contrast to *o eaftos mu*, a run-of-the-mill definite DP, the English reflexive is headed by pronouns which resist reconstruction from A-positions. Lastly, with clitics lacking referential content, clitic doubling does not present any challenge to the idea that anaphoric *o eaftos mu* is bound as a whole, just as is standardly assumed for the English reflexive. *O eaftos mu* only differs from the English reflexive in that it lacks a logophoric usage, a fact that we interpreted as showing that logophoricity is not hardwired in the makeup of anaphors.

References

- Alexiadou, A. and E. Anagnostopoulou (2019). Novel experiencer-object verbs and clitic doubling. *Syntax* 22(2-3), 116–145.
- Alexiadou, A. and G. Iordăchioaia (2014). The psych causative alternation. *Lingua* 148, 53–79.
- Alexopoulou, T. (2009). Binding illusions and resumption in greek. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 57, 34–48.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (1999). On experiencers. In *Studies in Greek syntax*, pp. 67–93. Springer.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (2003). *The syntax of ditransitives: Evidence from clitics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. and M. Everaert (1995). How exceptional are nominative anaphors? A case study of Greek. In L. Nash, G. Tsoulas, and A. Zribi-Hertz (Eds.), *Actes du Deuxième Colloque de Langues & Grammaire*, Department of Languages Sciences, University of Paris 8, pp. 19–32.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. and M. Everaert (1999). Toward a more complete typology of anaphoric expressions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(1), 97–119.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. and M. Everaert (2013). Identifying anaphoric dependencies. *Diagnosing Syntax*, 341–370.
- Angelopoulos, N. (2019). Reconstructing Clitic Doubling. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 4(1).

- Angelopoulos, N. and N. Bassel (2019). Anaphors in space. GLOW Oslo.
- Angelopoulos, N. and D. Sportiche (2020). Clitic dislocations and clitics in french and greek: from interpretation to structure.
- Baker, M. (1988). *Incorporation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Bassel, N. (2018). Anaphors in space. *Unpublished MA Thesis, Tel Aviv University*.
- Belletti, A. and L. Rizzi (1988). Psych-verbs and θ -theory. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 6(3), 291–352.
- Belletti, A. and L. Rizzi (2012). Moving verbal chunks in the low functional field. In L. Brugè, A. Cardinaletti, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, and C. Poletto (Eds.), *Functional Heads: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, Volume 7. OUP USA.
- Bryant, S. and I. Charnavel (2020a). Demystifying picture noun anaphors. In *WCCFL 37 Proceedings*, pp. 1–8.
- Bryant, S. and I. Charnavel (2020b). Effects of creator role on binding into picture noun phrases. In *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, pp. 71–86. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Büring, D. (2005). *Binding Theory*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
- Cardinaletti, A. and M. Starke (1999). The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In H. V. Riemsdijk (Ed.), *Empirical approaches to language typology: Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, pp. 145–233. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Charnavel, I. (2019). *Locality and logophoricity: A theory of exempt anaphora*. Oxford University Press.
- Charnavel, I. and D. Sportiche (2016). Anaphor binding: What french inanimate anaphors show. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47(1), 35–87.
- Charnavel, I. and D. Sportiche (2020). *Self-Anaphors: Analytical Challenges and Paths*. Talk delivered at the University of Leipzig, December 2020.
- Charnavel, I. and C. Zlogar (2016). No Title. In *English Reflexive Logophors*, pp. 83–97. Proceedings of the 51st annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society (CLS51).
- Chomsky, N. (1986). *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use*. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press.
- Despić, M. (2015). Phases, reflexives, and definiteness. *Syntax* 18(3), 201–234.

- Fox, D. (2000). *Economy and semantic interpretation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Helke, M. (1971). *The Grammar of English Reflexives*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
- Holton, D., P. Mackridge, and I. Philippaki-Warbuton (1997). *Greek: A comprehensive grammar of the modern language*. Psychology Press.
- Horrocks, G. (1994). Subjects and configurationality: Modern greek clause structure1. *Journal of linguistics* 30(1), 81–109.
- Iatridou, S. (1986). An anaphor not bound in its governing category. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17(4), 766–772.
- Iatridou, S. (1988). Clitics, Anaphors, and a Problem of Coindexation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19(4), 698–703.
- Ingria, R. (1982). Why english reflexives are pronouns, or, ingria contra helke. *MIT working papers in linguistics* 4, 55–79.
- Landau, I. (2009). *The locative syntax of experiencers*. MIT press.
- Lebeaux, D. (2009). *Where does the binding theory apply?* Linguistic Inquiry Monographs. MIT Press.
- Michelioudakis, D. (2012). *Dative arguments and abstract Case in Greek*. Ph. D. thesis, Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, University of Cambridge.
- Oikonomou, D., F. Golcher, and A. Alexiadou (2020). Quantifier scope and information structure in greek. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 5(1).
- Okada, S. (1998). Reflexive pronouns with split antecedents. *Journal of pragmatics* 30(1), 59–84.
- Patel-Grosz, P. (2013). The principle A problem. *Journal of South Asian Linguistics* 6, 25–50.
- Pesetsky, D. (1987). Binding problems with experiencer verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(1), 126–140.
- Pesetsky, D. (1995). X-zero syntax.
- Reinhart, T. and E. Reuland (1991). Anaphors and logophors: An argument structure perspective. In J. Koster and E. Reuland (Eds.), *Long-distance anaphora*, pp. 283–334. Cambridge.
- Reuland, E. J. (2011). *Anaphora and language design*. MIT Press Cambridge, MA.
- Safir, K. (1996). Semantic atoms of anaphora. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14, 545–589.

- Sauerland, U. (2013). Presuppositions and the alternative tier. In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, Volume 23, pp. 156–173.
- Sharvit, Y. (1999). Connectivity in specificational sentences. *Natural Language Semantics* 7(3), 299–339.
- Spathas, G. (2010). *Focus on Anaphora*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Utrecht.
- Sportiche, D. (2005). Division of labor between merge and move: Strict locality of selection and apparent reconstruction paradoxes. ms., UCLA. Available at <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/000163>.
- Sportiche, D. (2017). Reconstruction, binding and scope. In M. Everaert and H. Van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Volume VI, pp. 3569–3626. Wiley and Sons.
- Sportiche, D. (2020). Constraints on reflexivization. ms. UCLA. Available at <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/005488>.
- Tsakali, P. (2006). *The syntax and acquisition of pronominal clitics: a crosslinguistic study with special reference to Modern Greek*. University of London, University College London (United Kingdom).
- Varlokosta, S. and N. Hornstein (1993). A bound pronoun in modern greek. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 11(1), 175–195.