

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

Nikos Angelopoulos & Dominique Sportiche *

KU Leuven & UCLA

December 31, 2020

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 first that previous discussions are subject to a confound as this expression is not always a reflexive. Controlling for this confound and relying on new data surveys, we conclude that when anaphoric, *o eaftos mu* 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 two important conclusions of theirs, namely that this expression cannot be used logophorically and that as nominative subject, it is allowed but in derived subject positions only. This in turn leads to a number of new (theoretical) consequences and predictions: (a) the absence of logophoric usage can be used to determine the domain of application of Condition A independently from the inanimacy criterion used in Charnavel and Sportiche (2016), and yields a picture consistent with its findings, (b) 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*), (c) 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.

*Email contact: n.angelopoulos1@gmail.com, sportich@g.ucla.edu

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 disallowed in adjunct positions, (d) it is - non standardly - allowed as nominative subject. 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 because, first, dative indirect object *o eaftos mu* is in fact allowed. Furthermore, 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*. 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. Pace Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) however, 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.

Regarding the Reflexivization mechanism involved, we argue that reflexives can often be used anaphorically (subject to Condition A) or logophorically (superficially not subject to Condition A). We demonstrate that *o eaftos mu* cannot be used as a logophor. *O eaftos mu* is nevertheless allowed in non-argument positions e.g. adjuncts, or coordinate structures, from where movement is strictly disallowed (pace Anagnostopoulou and Everaert 1999 and Patel-Grosz 2013). This has two consequences. First, 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 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 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 is anaphoric in the requisite sense. In all subsequent sections the ‘reified’ use is controlled away from. In section 3.1, we report new survey data demonstrating that dative *o eaftos mu* is allowed undermining an appeal to SELF incorporation. Section 3.2 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 4 shows that the distribution of *o eaftos mu* in argument and adjunct PPs supports the conclusions of sections 3.1 and 3.2. In section 5, we corroborate Anagnostopoulou and Everaert’s (1999) conclusions that there are anaphoric instances of nominative *o eaftos mu* they are only 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 6 presents arguments that *o eaftos mu* must be bound as a whole (*pace* Iatridou 1988). Section 7 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 (a) requires an antecedent; (b) this antecedent must be local and have a c-commander. 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’ (his nature, his character). 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. 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. S-ti therapeftiki dhiadhikasia, **o eaftos mas** pezi kathoristiko rolo, afu i
In-the therapeutic process, the self.NOM our.GEN play.3SG determining role as the
erminies ke i adidrasis mas pernun apo to filtro ton adilipseon.
interpretations and the reactions ours pass.3PL from the filter of perception
‘During the therapeutic process, our self plays crucial role, as our understanding and reactions go
through the filter of our perception.’
- b. **O eaftos mas** dhimiurghi ena plesio anaforas mesa s-to opio orghanonume ta
the self.NOM our.GEN create.3SG a framework reference within in-the which organize.1PL the
erethismata pu dhechomaste.
stimuli that accept.3PL
‘Our self creates a reference framework in which we organize the stimuli that we accept.’

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 velitioni **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 eafu mas** bori na tis anakalipsi ena psihologhos mono
the more dark sides.NOM the self.GEN our.GEN can na 3PL.F.ACC discover.3SG a psychologist only
meta apo epta sinedhries.
after from seven sessions
‘A psychiatrist can discover the darkest aspects of our selves only after seven sessions.’

And *o eaftos mu* retains the same interpretation as above in cases where it has a non-local antecedent:¹

- (5) Se afti ti fasi, i asthenis kanun kakes skepsis, eno pro_i ehun tin esthisi oti **o**
in this the phase the patients make.3PL negative thoughts while they have.3PL the feeling that the
eaftos tus_i tus egatalipi ke vithizode s-ton fovo.
self.NOM their.GEN 3PL.M.ACC abandon.3SG and immerse.3PL in-the fear

¹ In (5) and (6), the antecedent of the reflexive is the silent subject of the verb, indicated as *pro*.

‘In this phase, the patients make negative thoughts, while they have the feeling that their self is abandoning them and they immerse in fear.’

- (6) 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 eaftho mas** 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.’
- (7) O psychologhos ipe ja tin Maria_i oti meta apo epta sinedhries anakalipse tis
the psychologist.NOM said.3SG about the Maria that after from seven sessions.ACC discovered.3SG the
pio skotines plevres **tu eaftho tis_i**.
most dark aspects the self.GEN her.GEN
‘The psychologist said about Mary that he discovered the most dark 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 eafthos 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 eafthos tu* will guarantee the non-reified/ anaphoric use. And as we will now see, in such case, *o eafthos tu* behaves anaphorically.

2.2 Predicate Restrictions

The assumption that non-anaphoric *o eafthos 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 eafthos mu* in (8) and (9).

- (8) a. O Jorghos_i theori/ siniditopiise oti **o eafthos tu_i** ine endiaferon/ mistirios.
the George.NOM believe.3SG realized.3SG that the self.NOM his.GEN be.3SG interesting mysterious
‘George believes that his self is interesting/ mysterious.’
- b. * O Jorghos_i theori/ siniditopiise oti **o eafthos tu_i** ine psilos/ hodros.
the George.NOM believe.3SG realized.3SG that the self.NOM his.GEN be.3SG tall fat
‘George believes that his self is tall/ fat.’

- (9) a. O *psychologhos* *ipe* *ja tin Maria_i* *oti vriski* **ton eaf_{to}** **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 eaf_{to}** **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.’

(8) and (9) only differ with respect to the grammatical functions of *o eaf_{to} mu*, reflected in the case it receives, nominative and accusative respectively. (8a) and (9a) feature more instances of non-anaphoric *o eaf_{to} 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 *self* or character. In (8b) and (9b), *o eaf_{to} mu* can only be an anaphor. Non-anaphoric *o eaf_{to} mu* is precluded because predicate as *psilos, hodros, hlomos* ‘tall, fat, pale’ cannot be predicated of the abstract entity it expresses. Given this, (8b) and (9b) are ruled out as violations of Condition A because *o eaf_{to} mu* is not locally bound. Now note that in syntactic configurations where Condition A can be satisfied, *o eaf_{to} mu* is entirely compatible with properties of concrete objects, as e.g. being fat or pale. This is illustrated in (10a) and (11a). (10b) and (11b) is consistent with *o eaf_{to} mu* being an anaphor in the previous examples.

- (10) a. O *Adreas_i* *theori* **ton eaf_{to}** **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 eaf_{to}** **tu_i** *hodro*.
 the mother.NOM the Adreas.GEN consider.3SG the self.ACC his.GEN fat
 ‘Adreas’s mother considers himself fat.’
- (11) a. O *Adreas_i* *vriski* **ton eaf_{to}** **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 eaf_{to}** **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 eaf_{to} tu* is indeed an anaphor when the ‘reified’ interpretation is excluded. In what follows, we are systematically controlling away from this reading, concentrating on the reflexive, anaphoric reading.

3 Oblique *o eaf_{to} mu*

We begin with cases in which our empirical findings is inconsistent with some previously reported data which motivated treating Greek *o eaf_{to} mu* as a non standard anaphor.

3.1 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 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 online grammaticality judgment task with 17 participants on 24 randomly ordered sentence items based on a 6-point Likert scale, 6 the best. The questionnaire comprised among other sentences (12a) and (12b) used to test acceptability of plain dative DP arguments and dative *o eaftos mu* respectively.

- (12) a. I Elpidha edhose tis Andromachis ena vivlio.
the Elpidha.NOM gave.3SG the Andromache.DAT a book.ACC
'Elpida gave Andromache a book.'
- b. Meta apo ola osa perase me aftin tin arostia, o Janis apofasise na kani **tu**
after from all that passed.3SG with this the illness the John.NOM decided.3SG na make.3SG the
eaftu tu ena kalo dhoro.
self.DAT his.GEN a good gift
'After all that he went through because of the illness, John decided to give a good gift to himself'

The context in (12b) precludes the 'reified' usage, as one can only give gifts to concrete animate entities. Both sentences were judged as grammatical with an average score 5.69 and 5.4 respectively (out of 6). There were only three speakers (out of 17) who judged (12b) as less good, that is, 4.2 and 4.3 and 4.7 (out of 6). It is noteworthy, however, that for those speakers the plain dative argument too, (12a), was judged as relatively degraded, that is, ≤ 5 .²

	Dative DP argument	
	<i>plain dative</i> : (12a)	<i>o eaftos mu</i> : (12b)
Survey Results	Average=5.69, Standard	Average=5.4, Standard
	Deviation=0.63	Deviation=0.72

Table 1: Dative Anaphors.

These results clearly suggest that anaphoric *o eaftos mu* is not immediately precluded in its anaphoric usage. Note

² The low acceptability of dative arguments could be due to independent reasons, such as the fact that the dative belongs to a higher register, which is not immediately available in neither example in (12).

also that dative *o eaftos mu* is also available in naturally occurring contexts, as e.g. (13), found in a google search.^{3,4}

Dative *o eaftos mu* cannot have the ‘reified’ usage in (13), as one’s *self*/personality cannot appear in a mirror.

- (13) ? Arpakse ta klidja tu spitju ke tu aftokinitu ke erikse mia teleftea matia **tu eafu tis**
 grabed.3SG the keys the house and the car and gave.3SG one last look the self.DAT her.GEN
 s-ton kathrefti prin vgi apo to dhiamerisma tis...
 at-the mirror before leave.3SG from the apartment her
 ‘She grabbed the keys of the house and the car and gave one last look at herself in the mirror before leaving
 from her apartment.’

We conclude on the basis of this finding that *o eaftos mu* does not require any special treatment because of its distribution as a dative indirect object and the proposal that SELF noun of *o eaftos mu* undergoes incorporation into verb is in fact strongly challenged by the fact dative *o eaftos mu* is not ruled out.

3.2 Genitive *o eaftos mu*

We now turn to cases as (14) in which *o eaftos mu* is assigned genitive case and is ill formed:⁵

- (14) * O Jannis_i den anexete [ta pedhia **tu eafu 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, ‘picture of DPs’ constitute one of the syntactic contexts in which the anaphoric usage of DP is precluded because the anaphor has no coargument it could be covalued with. If the reflexive is licensed, it can only be as a logophor. And Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999, 110) argues *o eaftos mu* differs from the English reflexive in that it “[...] cannot be used as a logophor.” Given this, the deviance of (14) follows.

First, we indeed agree that *o eaftos mu* is not used as a logophor in Greek. To exemplify, consider the contrast between it and English *himself*. In (15), the logophoric status of the English reflexive is suggested by the fact that it does not require a local c-commanding antecedent (see Bryant and Charnavel forthcoming for additional evidence supporting that in such ‘picture noun’ cases, a logophoric antecedent is required):

- (15) John_i’s campaign required that pictures of himself_i be placed all over town. Lebeaux (1985, 346)

³ Source: <https://www.wattpad.com/745381136-unravel>

⁴ In an informal survey with 9 speakers, (13) was judged as well formed, that is, it was not judged by any speaker as less good than 3.5 in a 5-point Likert scale with 5 the best (average was >3.5).

⁵ Note that throughout this section, only a concrete interpretation of *o eaftos mu* is felicitous.

Since *o eaftos mu* lacks the logophoric usage, it is not surprising that the Greek counterparts of such examples are ill-formed: a local c-commanding antecedent in ‘picture of DPs’ is required, as illustrated in (16).⁶

- (16) a. *O Jorghos_i pistevi oti ta hromata dhen ine kala s-ti fotografia **tu eafu**
the George.NOM believe.3SG that the colors.NOM not be.3PL good in-the picture the self.GEN
tu_i apo to ghamo.
his.GEN from the wedding
‘George believes that the colors are not good in the wedding picture of himself.’
- b. *[I mitera [tu Jani_i]] kremase tis fotografies **tu eafu tu_i** padu s-to
the mother.NOM the John.GEN hung.3SG the pictures.ACC the self.GEN his.GEN everywhere in-the
spiti.
house
‘John’s mother hung the photos of himself everywhere in the house.’

More generally, as shown in (17a), (17b) and (17c), *o eaftos mu* in accusative, genitive and nominative positions systematically resists a logophoric usage with a long distance antecedent.

- (17) a. *O Janis_i kafchithike oti i vasilisa kalese tin Anna ke **ton eafu tu_i** ja
the John.NOM boasted.3SG that the queen.NOM invited.3SG the Anna.ACC and the self.ACC his.GEN for
poto.
drink.ACC
‘John boasted that the queen invited Anna and himself for a drink.’
- b. *O Vasilis_i ipe oti i vrochi katestrepse tis fotografies **tu eafu tu_i**.
the Bill.NOM said.3SG that the rain.NOM destroyed.3SG the photos.ACC the self.GEN his.GEN
‘Bill said that the rain destroyed the photos of himself.’
- c. *O Pavlos_i duleve se ena panepistimio me ti jineka tu opu fisiki opos **o eaftos tu_i** echeran ipsilis ektimisis.
the Paul.NOM worked.3SG at a university.ACC with the wife.ACC his.GEN where physics like the
self.NOM his.GEN enjoy.3SG high regard
‘Paul worked at a university with his wife where physicists like himself were highly regarded.’

Since the only usage that is in principle allowed by Reinhart and Reuland (1991) in such ‘picture of DPs’ 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. But this prediction is incorrect.

The only cases of genitive *o eaftos mu* discussed in Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1999) are as in (14) 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 (18), where it is a theme argument denoting what the picture represents: here the pictures depict Eleana.

⁶ We did not find speaker variation to play any role in the examples we report in (16).

- (18) 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.’

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 eafos mu* (see Bryant and Charnavel forthcoming for extensive discussion of similar English facts, towards the same conclusions).

We conclude that the correct description of the behavior of genitive *o eafos 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 eafos mu* to be treated differently from English *himself*, as the latter, as is well known, exhibits a similar behavior: *Himself* in DPs is excluded when it occupies the Saxon genitive position (viz. **John likes himself’s pictures*).⁷

4 *O eafos mu* in locative and adjunct PPs

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

- (19) *O Petros idhe ena fidhi dipla s-ton eafu 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 eafos mu* must incorporate to the verb: since adjunct are movement islands, this deviance is predicted. The results of a broader investigation of the behavior of *o eafos mu* in PPs turns out to be inconsistent with their conclusions. Thus, if we consider other adjuncts, they readily tolerate anaphoric *o eafos mu*. This is exemplified in (20) below:

- (20) O vuleftis_i shimatise kivernisi horis **ton eafu 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.’

In such cases, *o eafos mu* must, given the interpretation, be a reflexive anaphor, a conclusion corroborated by the fact that it requires a local c-commanding antecedent:

⁷ 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 (14) (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.

- (21) * [I mitera [tu vulefti]_i] eftiakse kavernisi 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.’

This again speaks 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 two PP cases. Angelopoulos and Bassel (2019) examine in more detail the distribution of Greek and Hebrew reflexive in different kinds of locative PPs. They show that the reflexives of both languages are allowed in some locative PPs but not others. They conclude that the behavior of reflexives in locative PPs is predicted by the standard Condition A and is contingent on the internal structure of the PP in question, namely whether it projects a subject position or not. Specifically, the *without* PP in (21) does not project a subject. The *next to* PP in (20) however does. Consider a sentence such as *Petros saw a snake next to Elena*. If the sentence is interpreted to mean that Petros saw a snake that was located next to Elena, the subject of the PP is (or is controlled by) the DP *a snake*. If the sentence is interpreted to mean that while next to Elena, Petros saw a snake (which was perhaps far away), Angelopoulos and Bassel (2019) argue that the subject of the PP is the event denoting VP *Petros see a snake* (thus meaning ‘the event of Petros seeing a snake took place next to Elena’). If *Elena* is replaced by the reflexive as above, the structural requirements of condition A cannot be satisfied under either structure (in addition to the fact that the second interpretation is rather infelicitous).

Let us as a final note remark 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 (22a), which are well-formed even though movement is blocked. The c-command facts in (22b) suggest that that *o eaftos mu* in this case must have the anaphoric usage.

- (22) 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
 ‘*John’s mother ordered one beer for Ann-Marie and one for himself.’

5 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 both in person and online do not support some 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.

5.1 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 non-anaphoric usage:

- (23) 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 eaftos 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.’

In (23), *o eaftos mu* is anteceded by the cliticized experiencer argument, *mu* ‘to me’ *tu* ‘to him’. Importantly, in its surface position, *o eaftos mu* is not c-commanded by its antecedent in (23) 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 reconstruction.

5.2 Nominative *o eaftos 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.

- (24) **O eaftos tu_i** dhen tu aresi [tu Jorghu]_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.’

Note first that the presence of *jimnos*, *vamenos* ‘naked, painted’ force the anaphoric usage of *o eaftos mu* in this, and subsequent examples in this section. And indeed, the examples below corroborate the hypothesis that the theme, *o eaftos tu*, is bound by the experiencer (as reported in Anagnostopoulou 1999 for similar data) as *o eaftos mu* cannot be licensed with a long distance antecedent, (25a), or a non c-commanding antecedent (25b):

- (25) a. *I Maria_i pistevi oti **o eaftos tis_i** dhen aresi tu Jani jimnos/ vamenos.
 the Maria believe.3SG that the self.NOM her.GEN not like.3SG the John.DAT naked painted
 ‘Myself is not appealing to me naked/ painted.’
 b. ***O eaftos tu_i** dhen (tis) aresi [tis miteras [tu Jorghu]_i] jimnos/ vamenos.
 the self.NOM his.GEN not 3SG.F.DAT like.3SG the mother the George.GEN naked painted
 ‘Himself is not appealing to George’s mother naked/ painted.’

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:

- (26) [_{VP} Experiencer [_{v_{exp}} [_{VP} V Theme_{Target/SubjectMatter}]]]

and that this theme *o eaftos mu* undergoes A-movement into its surface position in (24). Since A-movement can 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. Binding then becomes possible via reconstruction. Class II psych predicates are ambiguously realized either as an eventive predicate or as a stative predicate. In both cases, they select an accusative DP argument interpreted as an experiencer and nominative DP. In the former case, this DP is construed as an agent, in the latter as a theme_{Target/SubjectMatter}. The first construal is expressed with a bare experiencer whereas the latter requires a clitic doubled experiencer (cf. Anagnostopoulou 1999 i.a.):

- (27) a. O Janis enohlise ti Maria (skopima/ me ena bastuni).
 the John.NOM annoy.3SG the Maria.ACC on purpose with a stick
 ‘John annoyed Maria on purpose/ with a stick.’
- b. To kurema tu Jorghu/ o Jorghos *(tin) enohlise tin Maria (*
 the haircut.NOM the George.GEN the George.NOM 3SG.F.ACC annoyed.3SG the Maria.ACC
 scopima/ me ena bastuni).
 on purpose with a stick
 ‘George’s haircut/ George annoyed Maria (*on purpose/ with a stick).’

(adapted from Alexiadou and Iordăchioaia (2014, (13b),(15b))

The verb in (27a) is eventive and the nominative DP is interpreted as an agent. In this case, the verb is compatible with agent and event oriented modifiers such as *skopima* ‘on purpose’ or *me ena ksilo* ‘with a stick’. In contrast, the same verb in (27b) is stative and incompatible with these modifiers (cf. Alexiadou and Iordăchioaia 2014). The nominative DP in this latter case is interpreted as a subject matter or target of emotion. In (28) and (29), if the nominative DP is a reflexive, the sentence is deviant unless the experiencer is clitic doubled.⁸

- (28) a. *O eafos tu_i (jimnos) aidhiaz/ provlimatizi ton Jorgho_i.
 the self.NOM his.GEN naked disgust.3SG trouble.3SG the George.ACC
 ‘*Himself naked disgusts/ troubles George.’
- b. O eafos tu_i (jimnos) ton aidhiaz/ 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.’
- (29) a. *O eafos 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 eafos 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.’

And the well formed examples in (28) and (29), require the reflexive to have a local c-commanding antecedent:

- (30) a. *O Jorghos_i pistevi oti o eafos tu_i (jimnos) tin enohli/ aidhiaz tin
 the George.NOM believe.3SG that the self.NOM his.GEN naked 3SG.F.ACC annoy.3SG disgust.3SG the
 Maria.
 Maria.ACC
 ‘George believes that himself naked annoys/ disgusts Maria.’
- b. *O eafos tu_i (jimnos) tin enohli/ aidhiaz [tin mitera [tu Jorghu_i]].
 the self.NOM his.GEN naked 3SG.F.ACC annoy.3SG disgust.3SG the mother.NOM the George.GEN
 ‘George’s mother is annoyed/ troubled with himself naked.’

⁸ In Anagnostopoulou (1999) where similar data with Class II predicates are presented, the non-anaphoric usage of *o eafos mu* is not controlled for. Furthermore, whether or not doubling of the experiencer is required when *o eafos mu* is the nominative argument is not noted.

This pattern of data follows if, as is standard for the eventive case, the agent subject is generated as the highest argument of the VP and is thus not in position to satisfy condition A, when reflexive.

$$(31) \quad [_{vP} \text{ Agent/Causer } [_{v'} v \text{ } [_{vP} \text{ Experiencer } [_{v_{exp}} [_{VP} V \dots]]]]]]$$

In the stative case on the other hand, the reflexive is a derived subject bearing the target/subject matter theta role, basically base generated as in (26). In other words, 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 (29) 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 (29b) is the only one that is accepted by the speakers with a nominative reflexive.⁹

	Nominative DP argument	
<i>O eaftos mu</i>	(29a)	(29b)
Survey Results	Average=1.5, Standard Deviation=0.73	Average=4.7, Standard Deviation=0.45

Table 2: Nominative Anaphors.

These conclusions can be corroborated by 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:¹⁰

- (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
'Her kids annoy every mother.'

5.3 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. For example, in Class II or Class III psych predicates, it can end up being bound by the experiencer. Similarly, binding of a pronoun

⁹ The presence or absence of the predicate, *jimnos*, did not change the judgments of the speakers about binding.

¹⁰ Pronominal binding by the experiencer into nominative theme is also possible in the corresponding Italian constructions (cf. Belletti and Rizzi 1988).

in a nominative DP becomes possible under reconstruction e.g. as in (32b) below the experiencer. On the other hand, agents are standardly assumed to be merged higher than the experiencer, as in (31). Given this, (29a) is ungrammatical because there is no point in the derivation in which the agent is interpreted in the c-command domain of the experiencer. Pronominal binding is not allowed in (32a) for the same reasons.

But if this is correct, why is this that the English counterpart of the Greek nominative anaphors cases are ill formed? This we argue 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 (totally¹¹) 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. 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.

¹¹ Throughout, the needed reconstruction of anaphors is total: it must be fully in the scope of its potential binder to be bindable by it. See footnote 12.

We first need to note a 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 could be 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. 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.

- (37) Him_k, John_k thinks that you should invite t_k.

In conclusion, A-moved pronouns cannot totally reconstruct while A-bar moved pronouns may.

5.4 Nominative *o eaftos mu*: alternative accounts

Anagnostopoulou and Everaert (1995) did not adopt a reconstruction approach. First the theoretical context was one in which reconstruction was often taken to be unavailable for A-movement. In addition, it presents the following data in order to exclude an analysis in terms of reconstruction:

- (38) 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))

(38b) and (38c) 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:

(39) 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 (38c), WCO is obviated because the nominative QP is able to bind from its base position into the PP experiencer which, as shown in (39), is merged lower in the hierarchy. WCO cannot be obviated with a dative experiencer (cf. 38b) because there is no configuration in which it can be bound by the nominative argument. The preverbal position of subjects in Greek being an A-bar position, binding is not possible from the surface position the nominative QP occupies in (38b).

First, the assumption that the preverbal subject position is not, 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 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:

- (40) 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_i more often than his sister_i 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_i sister invites every boy_i.’

Secondly, certain quantifiers such as negative quantifiers normally resist occurring in an A-bar Topic position in a non-generic context, as in (41a) (cf. Alexopoulou et al. 2009). Yet, they readily occur in a preverbal subject position, (41a).

- (41) a. *Kanenan dhen ton idha cthes.
 no one.NOM 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 (38b) and (38c). 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 and report in footnote 2 of section 3.1. And indeed, the contrast between (38b) and (38c) seems fragile. Thus, similar sentences are reported as grammatical in more recent literature:

- (42) ?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 judged the following sentence on the basis of 5-point Likert scale with 5 the best.

- (43) 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	(43)
Survey Results	Average=5, Standard Deviation=0

Table 3: Dative 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.¹²

¹² A question arises about the idea that *o eaftos mu* can undergo reconstruction in light of the following contrast:

- (1) 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 (ton) peripiithike ton Jorgcho.
 the self.NOM his 3SG.M.ACC took care.3SG the George.ACC
 ‘*Himself took care of George.’

(1a) 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 5.2), can be bound by a clitic doubled object obviating WCO (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2003 i.a.). On the other hand, nominative *o eaftos mu* in (1b) cannot be bound by the clitic doubled object. Angelopoulos (2019) proposes that WCO is obviated in (1a) because clitic doubled objects can bind from an A-middle field position to which they move into Spec vP where the agent subject is reconstructed. If *o eaftos mu* could be bound by the direct object in (1b), the sentence would be binding theoretically equivalent to *O Jorgchos peripiithike ton eafto tu* ‘George took care of himself’ where the reflexive is the object and is bound by the subject. Bound pronouns and bound anaphors thus crucially differ. This difference follows under the approach defended in Charnavel and Sportiche (2020), somewhat reminiscent of Kayne (2002), whereby the antecedent of an anaphor (here *Jorgcho=George*) is first merged inside the anaphor, is referentially identified with the pronoun (here *his=tu* by the head noun - i.e. *self(his, George) → his_k = George_k* - and is remerged in the theta position of the antecedent (here it would be the subject of *take care of*). Such a derivation excludes an antecedent ever being thematically

6 Clitic Doubling of *o eaftos mu*

Finally, we present a short note suggesting that *o eaftos mu* is bound as a whole just like the well-behaved anaphors of other languages. This idea was argued to be refuted 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 (as argued at length in Angelopoulos and Sportiche 2020), 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.

- (44) a. O Jorghos_j ton_j aghapai [**ton eaf**to **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 himself.’

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 eaf

to 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 eaf

to 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:

lower than the anaphor it binds (since movement cannot lower), thereby excluding such examples as (1b). Note also that this derivation require anaphors to totally reconstruct (which, as we saw with English anaphors, is not always possible).

- (47) *O Jorghos_j ipe oti o Adreas_k dhen ton_j perighrafi [**ton eafto tu_k**]_j.
 the Jorghos.NOM said.3SG that the Adreas.NOM not 3SG.M.ACC describe.3SG the self.ACC his.GEN
 ‘George said that Adreas does not describe 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*. In fact, in every compositional treatment of the make up of pronoun-self anaphors, the lexical properties of *self* guarantee that the pronoun and the whole pronoun-self expression have the same index (the most widespread view is 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 is not *ton eafto tu* as a whole and further that if the pronoun *tu* is bound by its antecedent, the whole *ton eafto tu* must be as well. This leaves open the question of what the exact mechanism is that guarantees that the index on the whole anaphor and the index on its possessor have to be the same, a question we do not address in this short note.

7 Conclusion

The paper argued in favor of a standard treatment of *o eaftos mu* in terms of Condition A. It revealed two usages of *o eaftos 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 *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. Turning to the ill-formed instances of *o eaftos mu* in the so-called *snake*-sentences in locative PPs, the paper showed that they feature Condition A violations because these PPs comprise a subject position and thus, form their own binding domain blocking binding from outside. 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 G. Iordăchioaia (2014). The psych causative alternation. *Lingua* 148, 53–79.
- Alexopoulou, T. et al. (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.
- 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.
- 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 (forthcoming). Effects of creator role on binding into picture noun phrases. In *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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. (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.
- Kayne, R. S. (2002). Pronouns and their antecedents. In *Derivation and Explanation in the Minimalist Program*, pp. 133–166. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Landau, I. (2009). *The locative syntax of experiencers*. MIT press.
- Lebeaux, D. (1985). Locality and anaphoric binding. *The Linguistic Review* 4(4), 343–364.
- 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).
- Patel-Grosz, P. (2013). The principle A problem. *Journal of South Asian Linguistics* 6, 25–50.
- 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.
- 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>.