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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 e aftos 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 e aftos 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 e aftos mu* ≠ 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.
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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 tu* 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
   eminies ke i adidrasis mas pernum 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 veltioni *ton eafto mas* tha prepi na apoteli ena anaposasto
   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 eaftu mas* bori na tis anakalipi 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 efta 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 fasti, i asthenis kanun kakes skepsis, eno pro, chun tin esthisi oti *o*
   in this the phase the patients make.3PL negative thoughts while they have.3PL the feeling that the
   *eaftos tus, 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 praghmatopiisi aftu tu taksidju, hriazete na proi 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 apo fous ce eksoterikus paraghodes. release.3SG the self.ACC out.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 psichologhos ipe ja tin Maria, oti meta apo efta sinedhries anakalipse tis the psychologist.NOM said.3SG about the Maria that after seven sessions.ACC discovered.3SG the pio skotines plevres tu eafu tis. most dark aspects the self.GEN het.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 eafos 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 eafos tu will guarantee the non-reified/ anaphoric use. And as we will now see, in such case, o eafos tu behaves anaphorically.

### 2.2 Predicate Restrictions

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

(8) a. O Jorghos, theori/ siniditopiise oti o eafos tu, ine endiaferon/ mistiriros. 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, theori/ siniditopiise oti o eafos tu, 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 psichologhos ipe ja tin Maria, oti vriski ton eafto tis, 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 psichologhos ipe ja tin Maria, oti vriski ton eafto tis, 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 eaftos my, reflected in the case it receives, nominative and accusative respectively. (8a) and (9a) feature more instances of non-anaphoric o eaftos 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 eaftos mu can only be an anaphor. Non-anaphoric o eaftos 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 eaftos mu is not locally bound. Now note that in syntactic configurations where Condition A can be satisfied, o eaftos 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 eaftos mu being an anaphor in the previous examples.

(10) a. O Adreas, theori ton eafto tu, hodro.
the Adreas.nom consider.3sg the self.acc his.gen fat
‘Adreas considers himself fat.’

b. * [i mitera [tu Adrea,]] theori ton eafto tu, 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, vriski ton eafto tu, hlomo simera.
the Adreas.nom find.3sg the self.acc his.gen pale today
‘Adreas finds himself pale today.’

b. * [i mitera [tu Adrea,]] vriski ton eafto tu, 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 eafto 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 eaftos mu

We begin with cases in which our empirical findings is inconsistent with some previously reported data which motivated treating Greek o eaftos 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. Ἐλπίδα ἔδωσε τις Ανδρομάχη τις ἑνα βιβλίον.
    Elpida.gave.3sg the.Andromache.DAT a. book.ACC
    ‘Elpida gave Andromache a book.’

b. Μετά ἀπὸ ολὰ όσα περάσεις, τὸ Ἰάνης ἀπόφασε να κανεῖ τὸν εαυτόν του ἑνα καλό δήμο.
    Meta.apo ola osa perasei me aftin tin arostia, o Janis apofasise na kani tu ena kalon dhoron.
    ‘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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dative DP argument</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain dative: (12a)</td>
<td>Average=5.69, Standard Deviation=0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o eaftos mu: (12b)</td>
<td>Average=5.4, Standard Deviation=0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 eafos mu* is also available in naturally occurring contexts, as e.g. (13), found in a google search.³⁴

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

(13) *Arpakse* ta kli'dja tu spitju ke tu aftokinidu ke erikse mia telefria matia *tu eafu tis* grabbed.3sg the keys the house and the car and gave.3sg one last look the self.DAT her.GEN s-ton kathrefi prin vgi apo to dhiaderisma 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 eafos mu* does not require any special treatment because of its distribution as a dative indirect object and the proposal that SELF noun of *o eafos mu* undergoes incorporation into verb is in fact strongly challenged by the fact dative *o eafos mu* is not ruled out.

### 3.2 Genitive *o eafos mu*

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

(14) *O* Jannis, den anexete [ta pedhia *tu eafu tu*].

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 eafos 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 eafos 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 himselfᵢ 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 eafos 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).

(16) a. * O Jorghos, _pistevi_ oti ta hromata dhen ine kala s-ti _fotografia_ tu _eaftu_ the George.NOM believe.3SG that the colors.NOM not be.3PL good in-the picture the self.GEN tu, 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,) ] _kremase_ tis fotografies _tu eaftu_ tu, padu s-to the mother.NOM the John.GEN hung.3SG the pictures.ACC the self.GEN his.GEN everywhere in-the spiti.
   his.GEN from the wedding
   ‘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, _kafochitheke_ oti i _vasilisa_ kalese tin Anna ke _ton eafto_ tu, 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, _ipe_ oti i _vrochi_ katestrepse tis fotografies _tu eaftu_ tu,.
   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, _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 _eaftos_ tu, echeraen _ipsilis ektrimisis_.
   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, edhikse ti kaliteres fotografies tu eeftu tis, 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 eeftos 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 eeftos 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 eeftos 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").

4 O eeftos mu in locative and adjunct PPs

This section briefly examines aspects of the distribution of o eeftos 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 eefto 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 eeftos 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 eeftos mu in PPs turns out to be inconsistent with their conclusions. Thus, if we consider other adjuncts, they readily tolerate anaphoric o eeftos mu. This is exemplified in (20) below:

(20) O vuleftis, shimatise kivernisi horis ton eefto tu, 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 eeftos 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.
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],] 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 self.ACC his.GEN
    ‘John’s mother ordered one beer for Ann-Marie and one for himself.’
5 Nominative \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \)

We now turn to nominative \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \) which, remarkably, can be anaphoric. In this case, nominative \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \) 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 \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \) into its base position and conclude that the licensing of \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \) 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 \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \) do not require any special treatment.

5.1 Nominative \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \) at first sight

The following examples illustrate a few anaphoric instances of \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \) in nominative case. As previously, the presence of predicates jimnos/ vamenos ‘naked, painted’ or kodos ‘short’ precludes the non-anaphoric usage:

(23) a. \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \), dhen \( \text{mu} \) \( a\text{resi} \) 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 \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \) \( \text{mu} \) 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. \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{tu} \), \( \text{tu} \) \( \text{fenet} \) 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), \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \) is anteceded by the cliticized experiencer argument, \( \text{mu} \) ‘to me’ \( \text{tu} \) ‘to him’. Importantly, in its surface position, \( o \ \text{eaf}t\text{o} \ \text{mu} \) 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 Belle/tti 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.

    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, pistevi oti o eaftos tis, 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, dhen (tis) aresi [ tis miteras [ tu Jorghu, ]] 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 ThemeTarget/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 themeTarget/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 *( skopima/ on purpose/ me ena bastuni).
    the haircut.NOM the George.GEN the George.NOM 3SG.F.ACC annoyed.3SG the Maria.ACC
    on purpose with a stick
    ‘George’s haircut/ George annoyed Maria *(on purpose/ with a stick).’

(adapted from Alexiadou and Iordăchioia (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 Iordăchioia 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:

    the self.NOM his.GEN naked disgust.3SG trouble.3SG the George.ACC
    ‘Himself naked disgusts/ troubles George.’

    b. O eaftos tuıı (jimnos) ton aidhiazi/ provlimatizi ton Jorghoıı.
    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 eaftos tuıı (jimnos) enohli ton Jorghoıı.
    the self.NOM his.GEN naked annoy.3SG the George.ACC
    ‘Himself naked annoys troubles George.’

    b. O eaftos tuıı (jimnos) ton enohli ton Jorghoıı.
    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 Jorghosıı pistevi oti o eaftos tuıı (jimnos) tin enohli/ aidhiazi 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 eaftos tuıı (jimnos) tin enohli/ aidhiazi [ tin mitera [ tu Jorghuıı]].
    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 eaftos mu is not controlled for. Furthermore, whether or not doubling of the experiencer is required when o eaftos 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.

\[ [\_vP \text{ Agent/Causer} [\_v \_vP \text{ Experiencer} [v_{\text{exp}} [vP V ...]]]] \]

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.\(^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative DP argument</th>
<th>Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{O eaftos mu}</td>
<td>Average=1.5, Standard Deviation=0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29b)</td>
<td>Average=4.7, Standard Deviation=0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, 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, 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 \textit{o eaftos mu} being allowed only as a derived subject can be accounted for under the assumption that \textit{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, \textit{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 (totally\footnote{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.}) 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 eαfτο/σεlf 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.

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).

    b. * You saw yourself and she saw hers. (meaning herself)
    c. * She saw herself and we saw ours.
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 seems to John’s father to be happy. (see also Lebeaux 2009)
     b. *John expected him to seem to me 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’s father that he 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 expected that it would seem to me that he 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, John thinks that you should invite him.

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, tu aresi tu Petru, s-ton Petro. the self.NOM his.GEN 3SG.M.DAT appeal.3SG the Peter.DAT to-the Peter.ACC
     ‘Himself appeals to Peter.’
     b. *Kathe jineka, tu aresi tu adra tis. every woman.NOM 3SG.M.DAT appeal.3SG the husband.DAT her.GEN
     ‘Every woman appeals to her husband.’
     c. Kathe jineka, aresi s-ton adra tis. 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:
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, troi pio sihna apo tin adherfi tu, 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, kathe aghori,  
    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 (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:
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 tenias tu aresi tu dhimiurghis tis,  
    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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Nominative DP argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Results</td>
<td>Average=5, Standard Deviation=0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

(1) a. I miteras tu, *(to) peripiithike to kathe pedhi,*  
    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 Jorgho.*  
    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 Jorghos 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 *Jorgho-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_{tu} = George_{h} - 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

---

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

   the George.NOM 3SG.M.ACC love.3SG the self.SG.M.ACC his.GEN
   ‘George loves himself.’

   b. O Jorghosj tonk/sj 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 Jorghosj tonk 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 Jorghosj 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:

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).
O Jorghosₐₗ ipe oti o Adreas₃ₗ dhen tonₐₗ perighrafi [ton eаfto tuₐₗ].
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 eаfto 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 eаfto 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.

O Jorghosₐₗ aghaπai [ton eаfto tuₐₗ].
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 illustrate 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 eаfto tu* as a whole and further that if the pronoun *tu* is bound by its antecedent, the whole *ton eаfto 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 eаftos mu* in terms of Condition A. It revealed two usages of *o eаftos mu*, an anaphoric and a non-anaphoric one, and proposed diagnostics to distinguish them. Using these diagnostics systematically, it showed that anaphoric *o eаftos mu* does not display a behavior that requires special treatment in subject and oblique argument positions, in locative PPs or clitic doubling: anaphoric *o eаftos 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 eаftos mu* is possible in other configurations that block movement,
e.g. coordinate structures and adjuncts. As for subject *o eafos 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 eafos 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 eafos 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 eafos mu* is bound as a whole, just as is standardly assumed for the English reflexive. *O eafos 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.
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