

# NP-Anaphora in Modern Greek



NP-Anaphora in Modern Greek:  
A Partial Neo-Gricean Pragmatic Approach

By

Michael Chiou

**CAMBRIDGE  
SCHOLARS**

---

P U B L I S H I N G

NP-Anaphora in Modern Greek: A Partial Neo-Gricean Pragmatic Approach,  
by Michael Chiou

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2010 by Michael Chiou

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1861-5, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1861-2

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .....	vii
Introduction .....	1
Chapter One.....	7
Basic Distribution Patterns of Modern Green NP-Anaphora	
Chapter Two .....	47
Grammar and NP-Anaphora in Modern Greek	
Chapter Three .....	102
The Pragmatic Theoretical Framework	
Chapter Four.....	137
On the Interpretation of Anaphors	
Chapter Five .....	179
On the Interpretation of Empty Categories	
Conclusions .....	217
Appendix A .....	220
Abbreviations	
Appendix B.....	222
List of Symbols	
References .....	223
Index of Names.....	241
Index of Entries .....	243



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge Prof. Yan Huang, who opened the door to the world of neo-Gricean pragmatics and practically set the ground for the development of the ideas analysed in this study. Moreover, I also wish to express my sincere and deepest gratitude to Prof. Irene Philippaki-Warburton for her guidance and advice as well as to Dr George Kotzoglou for his great help and encouragement. In addition, I would also like to thank the PhD students and the academics who provided me with valuable feedback at the various conferences in which parts of this work have been presented. Last but not least, I would like to thank everyone in Cambridge Scholars Publishing who worked on this publication and especially Carol Koulikourdi and Amanda Millar for their support and meticulous working on this project.



# INTRODUCTION

## Setting the scene

The phenomenon of anaphora<sup>1</sup> constitutes a central topic in linguistic theory and research. Among the various types of anaphora, the one that has received the greatest attention and is considered to be the most prominent in the literature is Noun Phrase anaphora (henceforth NP-anaphora). NP-anaphora refers to the relation between two NPs, wherein the interpretation of the one (the anaphoric expression) is - under certain conditions - fixed upon the interpretation of the other (the antecedent). NP-anaphora is a cross-linguistic phenomenon which however is realised differently across languages. To borrow two terms from biology, we can suggest that on the one hand, there is a certain genotype of anaphora which is common to all natural languages and on the other hand, there are various phenotypes, i.e. the observable differences in the realisation of this phenomenon. Within this ambience, NP-anaphora has been the focus of a vast number of competing syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, cognitive and philosophical accounts which try to provide an adequate explanation of the phenomenon.

## The topic of this study

In this book we are going to examine NP-anaphora in Modern Greek. The study focuses mainly on intra-sentential anaphora i.e. anaphora within the limits of sentences. Yet, when necessary, certain discourse aspects of the phenomenon will also be considered. But what exactly is anaphora? It is rather difficult to construct a single definition which would cover the vast range of this phenomenon. A handful of definitions are available in the literature; let us go through some of those definitions. Anaphora is a phenomenon “consisting of the avoidance of redundancy or repetition by the use of a semantically... attenuated expression in a place of the full lexical expression initially used. By virtue of its pairing with the latter as antecedent the attenuated expression repeats the reference or the sense

---

<sup>1</sup> The term ‘anaphora’ (αναφορά) is a loan term from the Greek language which means ‘to carry back’.

which it has already established” (Cornish 1986: 1). A similar definition is provided by Green (1989). Moreover, Wasow (1986) and Lust (1986) define anaphora as the study of pronouns, other proforms and ellipsis. More accurately, Lust (1986: 9) states that “anaphora may be defined generally as the relation between a ‘proform’ (called an ‘anaphor’) and another term (called an ‘antecedent’), wherein the interpretation of the anaphor is in some way determined by the interpretation of the antecedent”. Ehlich (1982: 330) defines anaphora as “a linguistic instrument for having the hearer continue a previously established focus towards a specific item on which he had oriented his/her attention earlier”.

In an earlier study, Chomsky states that anaphora is the relationship of an NP to its trace (Chomsky 1977) relating in this way anaphora with a theory of movement. Levinson (1987: 379) gives a more general and more context oriented definition of anaphora by stating that “anaphora is the phenomenon whereby one linguistic element, lacking clear independent reference, can pick up reference through connection with another linguistic element”. He also notes that anaphora is not a purely sentential phenomenon but it can hold above the sentence level as a property of a larger context (Levinson 1983). Finally, there are other more discourse oriented definitions of anaphora like the one provided by Halliday & Hasan (1976) from the framework of text linguistics. Halliday & Hasan perceive the text as a semantic unit which conveys certain messages and which has to display the property of cohesion. As a result, anaphora is perceived as “a range of surface linguistic means by which texts display cohesion” (Halliday & Hasan, cited in Botley & McEnery (eds.) 2000: 5).

### **Why anaphora?**

The next question which naturally comes up is why one should focus on the phenomenon of anaphora? The answer to this question is twofold: The first part has to do with anaphora as a phenomenon of human language while the second part refers to anaphora specifically in Modern Greek.

Anaphora is one of the most fascinating phenomena of human language since it constitutes a unique and universal property of human language. Every single natural language provides those linguistic means which facilitate the speakers to refer to some entity in the discourse. The understanding of the complexity of anaphora and of the problems which are posed will ameliorate our understanding of the patterns of human language. This explains why anaphora constitutes a central topic in the contemporary linguistic science. Chomsky examines extensively the

phenomenon of anaphora and he considers the part of grammar that deals with anaphoric relations (Binding Theory) to be in the core of a theory of Universal Grammar. Chomsky believes that a thorough examination of anaphora can be a useful tool for the understanding of the nature of the language faculty. Last but not least, it has been shown that the phenomenon of anaphora expands in syntax, semantics, pragmatics and cognition. Thus the study of anaphora can also improve our understanding of the interaction among these components. In a nutshell, the study of anaphora is considered to be an effective way of improving our knowledge of the nature of human language as well as of the human mind.

On the other hand, NP-anaphora in Modern Greek is a challenging topic for research. The pro-drop nature of Modern Greek, the existence of clitic pronouns, the anaphoric expression *o idjos* (the same) and the debate over the existence and the status of PRO among others, make the study of anaphora interesting in its own right.

Furthermore, so far the study of NP-anaphora in Modern Greek has been examined within the framework of generative grammar. This is mainly due to the fact that Modern Greek is considered to be a syntactic language<sup>2</sup> (in contrast to discourse oriented languages such as Chinese, Japanese etc). As a consequence, the description and explanation of NP-anaphora have been based on purely syntactic criteria. The main claim of this study is that a purely syntactic analysis of NP-anaphora in Modern Greek cannot adequately account for the whole range of anaphoric patterns. By contrast, this study will present compelling evidence illustrating that a large portion of the explanation concerning NP-anaphora in Modern Greek can be based on the systematic interaction and division of labour between syntax and pragmatics. In accordance with this rationale, our main hypothesis is that NP-anaphora patterns in Modern Greek can be partially accounted for by the employment of a pragmatic apparatus formulated upon pragmatic principles.

### **Aims of this study**

The aims of this study can be grouped into two main categories, namely, empirical and theoretical. One fundamental objective of the book is to construct the theoretical machinery which will give an adequate account of the empirical data. Therefore, the analysis proposed will provide a more adequate and elegant account for the interpretation of NP-

---

<sup>2</sup> Here and henceforth, the term syntactic language is used to indicate the contrast with discourse-oriented languages.

anaphora in Modern Greek. In terms of the empirical data, the proposed analysis should provide an adequate explanation not only for the well established cases but also for cases which challenge a purely syntactic account, such as contexts in which reflexives and pronouns overlap in reference for instance.

Apart from the objectives at the empirical level there are some theoretical aims as well. This study, based on evidence from Modern Greek, pursues to put forward a more elegant theoretical apparatus for the interpretation of NP-anaphora; more precisely, maintaining the theoretical benefits of Levinson's (1987a, 1991, 2000) and Huang's (1991, 2000a, 2007) neo-Gricean pragmatic models, we shall construct a revised neo-Gricean pragmatic apparatus giving emphasis on the interaction and division of labour between syntactic and pragmatic principles.

## **Research questions**

Following the discussion so far, we can formulate two basic research questions:

- (1) What are the patterns of NP-anaphora in Modern Greek?
- (2) Can NP-anaphora interpretation be partially explained in terms of the systematic interaction of the neo-Gricean pragmatic principles of communication?

Concerning the first question, there will be a complete examination of the patterns of NP-anaphora in Modern Greek including the typology of anaphoric expressions and their distribution. Coming to the second question, after a detailed examination of the generative accounts concerning anaphora in Modern Greek, we will argue that NP-anaphora in Modern Greek can be better accounted for in terms of the systematic interaction and division of labour between syntax and pragmatics.

## **Organization of the book**

The remainder of the book is organised as follows. Chapter one offers a detailed examination of the basic distributional facts of NP-anaphora in Modern Greek. More specifically, based on the Chomskyan typology of NP types, we see how these NPs are realised in Modern Greek. This includes the examination of anaphors such as *o eafios mu* (myself) and *o idjos* (the same), the use and distribution of covert and overt pronominal forms, as well as the distribution of r-expressions. In addition, cases of

distributional overlap between pronouns and reflexives on the one hand and overt and covert pronouns on the other are also examined. Finally, other phenomena related to anaphora such as blocking effects and long-distance binding are also introduced and examined in Modern Greek.

In chapter two there is an up-to-date review of the generative approaches to Modern Greek NP-anaphora. First of all, we spell out the basic tenants of the theory of Principles-and-Parameters along with its two theoretical models, namely Government and Binding theory and its minimalist descendent, namely, the Minimalist Program. Our main interest will be in the cases of anaphors and pronominals. In the category of anaphors we focus mainly on the reflexive *o eaftos mu* and the anaphoric expression *o idjos*. As far as pronominals are concerned, we are going to focus on the distribution and interpretation of full and clitic personal pronouns and their null counterpart, namely, *pro*. In addition, we shall also investigate the case of PRO in the literature. Each review part is followed by an evaluation paragraph which points out the strengths and weaknesses of the theoretical machinery. Apart from the classical generative framework, we also present an overview of Optimality Theory after Burzio (1991, 1996, 1998) as well as Safir's (2004) approach. Finally, the discussion in chapter two is summarized by an overall evaluation which lays out the reasons for the employment of a partial pragmatic reduction of the NP anaphora interpretation.

The pragmatic framework which will be employed is presented in chapter three. More precisely, chapter three consists of two major parts. In the first one, we will overview the basic pragmatic theories of meaning and communication starting from the classical Gricean program and the theory of conversational implicature and then proceeding to its neo-Gricean developments, focusing mainly on the works of Horn (1984, 1989, 2004) and Levinson (1987a, 1991, 2000). In the second part, we explore how the neo-Gricean pragmatic framework can be employed in the interpretation of NP-anaphora. Here, we will review the works of Levinson (1987a, 1991, 2000) and Huang (1991, 1994, 2000a, 2007). These pragmatic models will be tested against Modern Greek data in a process of evaluation. Finally, we will set the ground for the construction of a neo-Gricean pragmatic apparatus for Modern Greek NP anaphora.

Coming next to chapter four, at first, we address the issue of the status of *o idjos* by employing certain syntactic criteria. Second, we present the neo-Gricean apparatus for Modern Greek anaphora which is the outcome of the discussion so far. A third part deals with the application of the proposed neo-Gricean apparatus to Modern Greek data. Finally, we discuss the set of consistency constraints by examining how they affect the

interpretations which are derived by the interaction of the neo-Gricean pragmatic principles.

In chapter five we account for the interpretation of empty categories. More specifically, we focus on the distribution of overt and covert uses of the pronoun as well as the distributions zero/*o eafos mu* and zero/*o iðjos*. What is more, the potential relationship between mood and the choice between *o iðjos* and a zero is also investigated. Last but not least, we overview the set of consistency constraints which when applied can cancel the neo-Gricean implicatures of co-reference or non-co-reference. These constraints take into consideration aboutness factors, background knowledge, speaker's intentions and grammatical constraints and semantic entailments.

Finally, in the concluding chapter we will summarize the findings of the book and we will present the benefits of the proposed theoretical approach.

## CHAPTER ONE

# BASIC DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS OF MODERN GREEK NP-ANAPHORA

### Introduction

In this chapter we are going to review the basic distributional patterns and facts of Modern Greek NP-anaphora. Under the cover term ‘distributional patterns of anaphora’, two different notions will be included. On the one hand, there is the classification of anaphoric expressions according to their typology and on the other hand, there is the syntactic distribution of these anaphoric expressions. In the first case, (i.e. typology), as the etymology of the word suggests, we deal with the various types of anaphoric expressions. As already mentioned, anaphora is a phenomenon of natural languages and it is expressed by a variety of linguistic forms. Each language codes anaphoric relations in a different way by providing the speakers with an array of linguistic expressions for that purpose. Nevertheless, for practical purposes theorists have grouped these anaphoric expressions into categories based on the common features of their members. Coming now to the distribution of anaphoric expressions, we examine the way these expressions are syntactically distributed in the sentence, i.e. the various positions they occupy in the sentence.

### 1.1 Typology

Anaphora is a quite general notion and it covers a very broad area of research. Consequently, anaphora is expressed in various types including for instance, N- or NP-anaphora, VP-anaphora (which includes other sub-categories), referential anaphora, bound-variable anaphora, discourse or text anaphora and so on (for more details on typology see Mitkov 2002 and Huang 2000a). Henceforth, we are going to focus on NP-anaphora and thus our interest is on the typology and the distribution of NP anaphoric expressions. Our main focus language will be Modern Greek.

For the purposes of this study we are going to follow the typology of NPs as introduced in Chomsky (1981, 1986). In this classification of NPs, Chomsky proposes two polarized abstract features namely [+/-anaphor] and [+/-pronominal]. According to this formalization we end up with four types of NPs as illustrated below:

**Table 1**

	<b>Overt</b>	<b>Empty</b>
[+anaphor, -pronominal]	lexical anaphors	NP-trace
[-anaphor, +pronominal]	pronominals	<i>Pro</i>
[+anaphor, +pronominal]	-----	PRO
[-anaphor, -pronominal]	r-expressions	Wh-trace/variable

In the case of Modern Greek, table 1 can be filled as shown in table 2 below.

**Table 2**

	<b>Overt</b>	<b>Empty</b>
[+anaphor, -pronominal]	<i>o eaftos mu</i>	NP-trace
[-anaphor, +pronominal]	<i>aftos/i/o, ton,tin,to</i>	<i>Pro</i>
[+anaphor, +pronominal]	-----	?PRO
[-anaphor, -pronominal]	r-expressions	Wh-trace/variable

The reflexive *o eaftos mu* fills the overt anaphor position. The personal pronouns (full form and clitics) and *pro* fill the overt and covert pronominal positions respectively. Finally, r-expressions and *wh*-trace fill the overt and covert [-anaphor, -pronominal] position. However, there are two cases which are not clear and thus their position in the table is debatable. First of all, there is a dispute over the existence and the status of PRO in Modern Greek and thus the covert [+anaphor, +pronominal] NP type can be filled with a question mark. In addition, the status of the anaphoric expression *o iðjos* is controversial in the literature and thus it needs to be further investigated.

Modern Greek codifies anaphoric relations in a variety of means. Joseph & Philippaki-Warbuton (1987: 72) state that anaphora in general lines can be accomplished by “simple deletion (with no marking on the verb form), deletion with marking on the verb form for the deleted element, the use of personal pronouns, the use of reflexives and finally the

use of empty categories”. Despite the fact that our main focus will be NP-anaphora, in this chapter we are also going to have an overview of some other ways of anaphoric encoding in order to have an overall picture of the phenomenon in Modern Greek. Let us now examine these different types one by one illustrating with some examples.

## 1.2 Marking of reflexivity

The first category, according to the typology presented above, is that of anaphors<sup>1</sup>. Modern Greek has a rich repertoire of different ways of establishing reflexivity. In a nutshell, reflexivity can be accomplished by the use of the reflexive expression *o eaftos mu* (myself), by the reflexive phrases *o idjos* (the same) and *monos mu*<sup>2</sup> (by myself), by the mediopassive morphology of the verb and finally, by the reflexive verbal prefix *afto-*. The status of the anaphoric expression *o eaftos mu* (myself) is rather uncontroversial in the literature. However, in the case of *o idjos* there is a lot of controversy which follows, as we shall see later in our discussion, from its syntactic distribution; Finally, the expression *monos mu* seems to behave like an anaphor yet its distribution has not been the subject of a thorough investigation in the literature.

### 1.2.1 The reflexive *o eaftos mu*

One way of expressing reflexivity is by the reflexive pronoun *o eaftos mu* (myself). This is a typical [+anaphoric] [-pronominal] NP. It is formed by the definite article *o* (the) in masculine gender, the noun *eaftos* (self) and the possessive pronoun *mu* (my) in the appropriate person, number and gender in agreement with its antecedent. The possessive pronoun appears only in genitive case. Moreover, the agreement in number between the noun and the possessive is not necessary, for instance, (*ton eafto-sg tu-sg*) and (*ton eafto-sg tus-pl*). Theofanopoulou-Kontou (1980) notes that *o eaftos mu* has the structural characteristics of NPs. First of all, the article can be separated from the noun by an adjective.

- (1.1) O Janis vrike ton kalo eafto tu  
       the John found the good self-acc him-gen  
       ‘John found his good self.’

<sup>1</sup> ‘Anaphor’ here is the cover term for reflexives and reciprocals.

<sup>2</sup> The literal translation of *monos mu* is ‘me alone’

Moreover, the clitic possessive pronoun can be attached to the adjective, which is more usual.

- (1.2) O Janis vrike ton kalo tu eafto  
 the John found the good him-gen self-acc  
 ‘John found his good self.’

As Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton (1987: 79) observe, *o eafos mu* can occur in various positions in the clause, “more specifically in whatever position a noun phrase bearing the same syntactic relation can occur”. (The listing of categories is from Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 79-83).

### Direct object

- (1.3) O Janis ayapai ton eafto tu  
 the John loves the self-acc his  
 ‘John loves himself.’

### Indirect object

- (1.4) O Janis ekane ena doro tu eafu tu  
 the John made a gift the self-gen his  
 ‘John made a present to himself.’
- (1.5) O Janis ekane ena doro ston eafto tu  
 the John made a gift to the self-acc his  
 ‘John made a present to himself.’

### Copular complement

- (1.6) I Maria ine panda o eafos tis  
 the Mary is always the self hers  
 ‘Mary is always herself.’

### Object of adjective

- (1.7) Jati den ise kalos me ton eafto su?  
 why not are-2sg good with the self-acc your  
 ‘Why are you not good with yourself?’

**Agent in Passive**

- (1.8) O Janis pliyonete apo ton eafto tu  
 the John is hurt by the self-acc his  
 ‘John hurts himself.’

**Object of preposition (simple or complex)**

- (1.9) O Janis milai panda ja ton eafto tu  
 the John speaks always for the self-acc his  
 ‘John speaks always for himself.’
- (1.10) Enðiaferete ja olus ektos apo ton eafto tu  
 care-3sg about everyone except from the self-acc his  
 ‘He cares for everyone but himself.’

“The reflexive does not occur with other locatival complex prepositions, e.g. *\*ðipla ston eafto mu* (next to myself) *\*piso apo ton eafto mu* (behind myself) etc. “(Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 80, Holton et al. 1997).

**Subject**

- (1.11) O eaftos mu ftei ja ola  
 the self-nom my is responsible for everything  
 ‘Myself is responsible for everything.’
- (1.12) O eaftos mu mu ine poli simbaθis  
 the self-nom my me-gen is very likeable-nom  
 ‘Myself is very sympathetic to me.’

In (1.12) the reflexive *o eaftos mu* can occur in such a position but only in the first person singular. So, examples like (1.13) will be ungrammatical.

- (1.13) \*O eaftos tu mu ine poli simbaθis  
 the self-nom his me-gen is very likeable-nom  
 ‘Himself is very sympathetic to me.’

### With nominals

(1.14) I afosiosi tu Jani ston eafto tu ine meɣali  
 the dedication the John-gen to the self-acc his is great  
 ‘John’s dedication to himself is great.’

(1.15) I ayapi tu eaftu tu ton voiθise  
 the love-nom the self-gen his him-acc helped  
 ‘The love of himself helped him.’

In instances like (1.12), the antecedent of the reflexive is either non-overt or it is present somewhere in the matrix clause (Joseph & Philippaki-Warbuton 1987). We can have a non-overt antecedent in the following examples as well:

(1.16) Mu ipe na fero mia efimeriða ja ton Jani ke  
 me-gen said-3sg to bring one newspaper for the John-acc and  
 mia ja ton eafto tu  
 one for the self-acc his  
 ‘He told me to bring one newspaper for John and one for himself.’

(1.17) Ta ðora ston eafto mas ine ta kalitera  
 the gifts-nom to the self-acc our are the best  
 ‘The gifts to ourselves are the best.’

In examples like (1.16) and (1.17) the antecedent of the reflexive is omitted since it is easily implied from the general context.

### 1.2.2 *o iðjos*

A second way of expressing reflexivity is by the use of the anaphoric expression *o iðjos*. As we mentioned in our discussion, the case of *o iðjos* is rather debatable and controversial and there is a dispute over its status in the literature. For the time being, we will discuss *o iðjos* on the assumption that it is a reflexive NP. Its syntactic distribution is rather interesting since it can occupy positions where both reflexives and pronouns can appear. It appears then that *o iðjos* combines referential properties both of pronouns and anaphors and depending on its position it behaves either like a pronominal element or like an anaphoric element. In addition, *o iðjos* cannot have independent reference, which means that another NP must always bind it. More accurately, *o iðjos* behaves like a reflexive in the

sense that it requires an antecedent within the sentence, but unlike pure reflexives such as *o eaftos mu* (myself), the antecedent cannot be in its local domain. *O iðjos* is formed by the definite article and the adjective *iðjos* (same). It forms all three genders in both numbers:

**Table 3**

	<b>Masculine singular</b>	<b>Feminine singular</b>	<b>Neutral singular</b>
Nominative	o iðjos	i iðja	to iðjo
Genitive	tu iðju	tis iðjas	tu iðju
Accusative	ton iðjo	tin iðja	to iðjo

	<b>Masculine plural</b>	<b>Feminine plural</b>	<b>Neutral plural</b>
Nominative	i iðji	i iðjes	ta iðja
Genitive	ton ion	ton iðjon	ton iðjon
Accusative	tus iðjos	tis iðjes	ta iðja

*O iðjos* can be found mainly in two positions, namely it can be in a subject or in an object position. As we will see its distribution affects its referential properties as well.

### Direct object

- (1.18) O Janis<sub>i</sub> ðeli o Kostas<sub>j</sub> na voiðisi ton iðjo<sub>i</sub>  
 the John wants the Kostas to help the same-acc  
 ‘John wants Kostas to help him.’

In (1.19) below, we observe that when *o iðjos* occurs in the object position of a simple clause, *o iðjos* gives an ungrammatical sentence. This fact is an argument against its reflexive nature. However, when in subject positions *o iðjos* can be bound within its own local domain as we will see further down in (1.27) and (1.28).

- (1.19) \*O Janis<sub>i</sub> aypai ton iðjo<sub>i</sub>  
 the John loves the same-acc  
 ‘John loves him.’

### Indirect object

- (1.20) O Janis<sub>i</sub> ipe oti i Maria edose tu iðju<sub>i</sub> ena vivlio  
 the John said that the Mary gave the same-acc a book  
 ‘John said that Mary gave him a book.’

### Object of preposition (simple or complex)

- (1.21) O Janis<sub>i</sub> emaθe oti i Maria aγorase ðoro ja ton iðjo<sub>i</sub>  
 the John learnt that the Mary bought gift for the same-acc  
 ‘John learnt that Mary bought a gift for him.’
- (1.22) O Janis<sub>i</sub> tus iðe olus na fevyun ektos apo ton iðjo<sub>i</sub>  
 the John them-gen saw everyone to leave apart from the same-acc  
 ‘John saw them all leaving apart from him.’

*O iðjos* can potentially occur with other locative complex prepositions but sentences like these sound rather odd to native speakers thus the use of *o iðjos* is marginal.

- (1.23)? I Maria<sub>i</sub> ipe sto Jani oti to vivlio ine piso apo tin iðja<sub>i</sub>  
 the Mary told to the John that the book is behind from the same  
 ‘Mary told John that the book is behind her.’

### In relative clauses

*O iðjos* cannot appear in relative clauses when in object position.

- (1.24) \*O Janis<sub>i</sub> aγapai tin kopela pu filise ton iðjo<sub>i</sub>  
 the John loves the girl who kissed the same-acc  
 ‘John loves the girl who kissed himself.’

### With quantifiers

When in object position, it cannot have a quantifier as its antecedent.

- (1.25) \*Kaθenas<sub>i</sub> nomizi oti o Janis aγapai ton iðjo<sub>i</sub>  
 everyone thinks that the John loves the same-acc  
 ‘Everyone thinks that John loves him.’

## Subject

In subject position *o iðjos* behaves in a different way. As it will become clear in the examples to follow, subject *o iðjos* can be distributed in environments where it could not as an object.

- (1.26) O Janis<sub>i</sub> ðiavase to vivlio pu o iðjos<sub>i</sub> ixē ayorasi  
 the John read the book that the same-nom had bought  
 ‘John read the book that he himself had bought.’

Here, the sentence is perfectly acceptable despite the fact that *o iðjos* is in a relative clause. *O iðjos* can also appear to be bound within its own clause. Holton et al. (1997) claim that the uses of *iðjos* in examples like the following is just emphatic and not anaphoric. Also Iatridou (1986) argues that in these contexts like (1.27) *o iðjos* is used as an adjective.

- (1.27) Eγo<sub>i</sub> o iðjos<sub>i</sub> piya ke to efera  
 I the same-nom went and it brought  
 ‘I went and brought it myself.’

- (1.28) I iγia tu Kosta<sub>i</sub> afora ton iðjo<sub>i</sub>  
 the health the Kostas concerns the same-acc  
 ‘Kosta’s health concerns himself.’

Moreover, as we observe, *o iðjos* can appear in indirect questions (1.29) and it can support split antecedents (1.30) only when in subject positions.

- (1.29) I Maria<sub>i</sub> anarotiete ti bori na kataferi i iðja<sub>i</sub>  
 the Mary wonders what can-3sg to achieve the same-nom  
 ‘Mary wonders what she herself can achieve.’

- (1.30) O Janis<sub>i</sub> rotise ton Theo<sub>j</sub> an θa peksun i iðji<sub>i/j</sub> ston ayona  
 the John asked the Theo if will play-3pl the same in the game  
 ‘John asked Theo if themselves are going to play to the match.’

### 1.2.3 *monos mu*

Another interesting case is that of the phrase *monos mu* (by myself) which is not considered to be a prototypical reflexive, yet its distribution is similar to the distribution of reflexives. As Thomson (1967) presents it, *monos mu* is a way of expressing the idea of ‘self’. *Monos mu* appears to

be a modifier of the subject which occurs in adjunct positions. It is formed by the adjective *monos* (alone) and the genitive of the personal pronoun in all genders and in both numbers.

- (1.32) O Janis<sub>i</sub> bori na ta kataferi ke monos tu<sub>i</sub>  
 the John can to it make and by himself  
 ‘John can make it on his own.’

- (1.33) Ø<sub>i</sub> monos mu<sub>i</sub> to ekana  
 (I) by myself it did  
 ‘I did it on my own.’

- (1.34) O Janis<sub>i</sub> rotise ti Maria<sub>j</sub> an θa Ø<sub>j</sub> erθi moni tis<sub>j</sub>  
 the John asked the Mary if will (Mary) come by herself  
 ‘John asked Mary if she would come on her own.’

Here, one can argue about the status of this element claiming that it is not a reflexive but rather an adverbial element which indicates manner. *Monos tu* can be bound either by the subject (1.33) or by the object (1.34). As Mackridge (1985) says, *monos mu* can be used in order to disambiguate the content and the interpretation of a passive verb. Consider for example:

- (1.35) Skotoθike moni tis  
 killed-3sg-pass by herself  
 ‘She killed herself.’

In that case, the element of manner is not so obvious since the answer to a possible question ‘how she was killed’ is not *moni tis* (by herself). Nevertheless, it is true that *monos mu* behaves more like an emphatic expression rather than a typical reflexive, like *o eafos mu* for instance, thus it will not be in the scope of our discussion.

### 1.2.4 Long-distance binding

Long-distance binding is a complementary notion to that of local binding. More precisely, in long-distance binding (also referred to in the literature as long-distance anaphora) anaphors allow antecedents outside their local domain.

As already shown, the reflexive *o eafos mu* is a local reflexive and as a matter of fact it is bound in its local domain. Nevertheless, there are cases

in which *o eaftos mu* can function as a long-distance anaphor. Consider the following example:

- (1.36) Mu      ipe      na fero   mia efimeriða   ja   ton Jani      ke  
          me-gen said-3sg to bring one newspaper for the John-acc and  
          mia ja   ton eafto   tu  
          one for the self-acc his  
          ‘He told me to bring one newspaper for John and one for himself.’

As we shall see later in our discussion, the long-distance use of the local reflexive *o eaftos mu* is motivated by other factors such as logophoricity. For the time being though, we keep the local character of the reflexive *o eaftos mu*.

In contrast to the reflexive *o eaftos mu*, *o iðjos* exhibits certain features which resemble those of long-distance binding. Huang (2000a) presents seven distinct cases which involve long-distance reflexivization: a) binding of the reflexive out of an NP, b) out of a small clause, c) across an infinitival clause, d) across a subjunctive clause, e) across an indicative clause, f) across sentence boundaries into discourse and g) across speakers/turns in conversation. *O iðjos* appears to satisfy all these cases apart from a) and c). Let us illustrate with examples:

**(a) binding of the reflexive out of an NP**

- (1.37) \*Tu Jani tu<sub>i</sub> arese to vivlio su      ja ton iðjo<sub>i</sub>  
          the John him liked the book yours for the same  
          ‘John liked your book about himself.’

**(b) binding of the reflexive out of a small clause**

- (1.38) I      Maria<sub>i</sub> ðeori      to vivlio xrisimo ja tin iðja<sub>i</sub>  
          the Mary considers the book useful for the same  
          ‘Mary considers the book useful for herself.’

The case described in c) is not possible since Modern Greek lacks infinitival clauses.

**(d) binding of the reflexive across a subjunctive clause**

- (1.39) *O Janis<sub>i</sub> θeli i kaθiyites na min timorun mono ton iðjo<sub>i</sub>*  
 the John wants the teachers to not punish only the same  
 ‘John wants the teachers not to punish only him.’

**(e) binding of the reflexive across an indicative clause**

- (1.40) *O Janis<sub>i</sub> nomizi oti i Maria tha pistepsi ton iðjo<sub>i</sub>*  
 the John thinks that the Mary will believe the same  
 ‘John thinks that Mary will believe him.’

Finally, *o iðjos* can have an antecedent, which can be located further up from its adjacent clause. This is shown in the examples below:

**(f) binding of the reflexive across sentence boundaries into discourse**

- (1.41) *O Janis<sub>i</sub> ipe oti piye me ti Maria*  
 the John said that went-3sg with the Mary-acc  
*exthes sto aeroðromio. Otan eftasan ston elenxo*  
 yesterday at the airport. When arrived-3pl to the control  
*o ipalilos rotise an tha taksidepsi ke o iðjos<sub>i</sub>*  
 the officer asked if will travel-3sg and the same  
 ‘John said that he went to the airport with Mary  
 yesterday. When they reached the control the employee at the  
 desk asked if he himself is going to travel.’

*O iðjos* can also refer to an antecedent which is more than two sentences back in discourse.

- (1.42) **Ekinos<sub>i</sub>** mono me ton thanato tu ine erotevmenos ki ekini ine  
 eleftheri na traviksi alu ke na niasti ja ti zoi tis. Oli tis eleyan pos  
 kani kala, akoma ke i siniðisi tis. To loyiko malista ine na  
 apomakrinθi afu afto epiθimi ki **o iðjos<sub>i</sub>**.  
 ‘He was in love only with his death and she is free to go wherever  
 she likes and take care of her life. Everybody would tell her that she  
 is right, even her consciousness. Indeed, the right thing to do was  
 (for her) to leave since this is what **himself** wants.’

**(g) binding of the reflexive across speakers/turns in conversation**

- (1.42) - Ise siyuros oti eðoses to vivlio sto Jani?  
           are sure that gave-2sg the book to the John  
           - Ne, to eðosa ston iðjo<sub>i</sub>  
           - yes, it gave to the same

Moreover, *o iðjos* can be bound both by a subject or an object non-locally.

- (1.43) O Nikos<sub>i</sub> rotise to Jani<sub>j</sub> an i Maria<sub>z</sub> tha psifisi ton iðjo<sub>i/j</sub>  
           the Nick asked the John if the Mary will vote the same  
           ‘Nick asked John if Mary will vote for him.’

In these distributions *o iðjos* overlaps systematically in reference with personal pronouns. All these long-distance binding effects will be examined later in our discussion.

**1.2.5 Blocking Effects**

Blocking effects are normally involved in long-distance binding. Huang (1994, 2000a) identifies two main types of blocking effects namely, the Chinese type and the Japanese type. In the first case, all potential antecedents must agree in their  $\phi$ -features. In other words, any intervening first or second person pronoun can block the long-distance binding. By way of illustration, consider the example:

- (1.44) Chinese type (Huang 2000a: 98)  
           Xiaoming<sub>i</sub> yiwei wo<sub>j</sub> bu xihuan ziji<sub>\*i/j</sub>  
           Xiaoming think-1sg not like self  
           ‘Xiaoming thinks that I don’t like self.’

In the case of Japanese, there is the so-called honorific blocking effect; quoting Huang (2000a: 122) a subject which is considered socially superior and which assigns honorification to a predicate can block long-distance reflexivization. Let us illustrate with an example:

- (1.45) Japanese type (Aikawa 1993 cited in Huang 2000a: 122)  
           Masao<sub>i</sub>-ga minna-ni Tanaka-sensee<sub>j</sub>-ga zibun<sub>\*i/j</sub>-no  
           Masao-nom everyone-dat Tanaka professor-nom self-gen  
           kodomo-o o-sikari-ni natta koto-o hanasita.  
           child-acc scolded- [+H] the fact that-acc told

‘Masao told everyone the fact that Professor Tanaka scolded self’s child.’

As it becomes clear in the example above, in Japanese the presence of a subject that refers to a socially superior referent (*Tanaka*) tends to block the long-distance binding of the reflexive *zibun*.

Modern Greek does not display any of the above types of blocking effects. On the one hand, the Japanese blocking effect type seems to be out of question since there are not honorification devices of that kind. On the other hand, the Chinese type seems to be irrelevant too since long-distance binding is not blocked by an intervening first or second person pronoun as the following example illustrates.

- (1.46) O Janis<sub>i</sub> iðe spiti su /mu mia fotoɣrafia tu eaftu tu<sub>i</sub>  
 the John saw house your/ my a picture the self his  
 ‘John saw in my/yours house a picture of himself.’

Furthermore, long-distance binding is not blocked by an intervening third person pronoun which bears different gender features from the reflexive.

- (1.47) O Janis<sub>i</sub> iðe spiti tis-3sg-fem mia fotoɣrafia tu eaftu tu<sub>i</sub>  
 the John saw house her a picture the self his  
 ‘John saw in her house a picture of himself.’

Summing up, we can claim that Modern Greek does not exhibit blocking effects. The only case in which blocking effects can potentially hold is when a third person NP intervenes between the long-distance reflexive and its antecedent. Nevertheless, this general pattern is rather sensitive to other contextual factors which seem to play an important role in blocking reference.

### 1.2.6 Reflexivity by other means

So far, we have described reflexivity in terms of the use of NPs. However, for the sake of typological completeness we should mention briefly some other means of expressing reflexivity in Modern Greek which are rather interesting but they are beyond the scope of this study. In Modern Greek a rather frequent way to encode reflexivity is by the mediopassive forms of verbs. As Holton et al. (1997: 480) state the passive forms of some verbs often express reflexivity, “especially when the subjects are humans who have the ability and the interest to carry out the

action described by the verb”. The basic function of verbs in mediopassive form is to indicate that the subject is affected by the action of the verb (Joseph & Philippaki-Warbuton 1987).

### Verbs of bodily care

- (1.48) O Janis *xtenizete*  
 the John combs-3sg-pass (himself)  
 ‘John combs himself.’

- (1.49) O Janis *plenete*  
 the John washes-3sg-pass (himself)  
 ‘John washes himself.’

- (1.50) I Maria *alifete* me krema  
 the Mary spreads-3sg-pass (herself) with cream  
 ‘Mary spreads the cream on herself.’

In all the above instances, reflexivity is expressed by the suffix of the verb form. When a non-reflexive reading of the mediopassive form is intended, it is marked by additional information (Joseph & Philippaki-Warbuton 1987).

- (1.51) O Janis *kurevete* ston barberi  
 the John cuts-3sg-pass (his hair) at the barber’s shop  
 ‘John<sub>i</sub> cuts his<sub>i</sub> hair at the barber’s shop.’

### Verbs of vision

- (1.52) I Maria *kitjete* ston kaθrefli  
 the Mary looks-3sg-pass at the mirror  
 ‘Mary looks at herself in the mirror.’

It should be pointed out though that reflexivity is not identified as a basic function of mediopassive morphology. Therefore, in many other cases the use of a mediopassive verb form does not result in a reflexive reading. Consider the following examples:

- (1.53) O Janis *ayapjete*  
 the John love-3sg-pass  
 ‘John is loved (by the people).’

The meaning of (1.53) is that *John* is loved by other people and not by himself. If the speaker wants to go for the reflexive interpretation then she/he has to use the reflexive NP *o eafios mu* with the active form of the verb.

Finally, the prefix *afto-* (self) can be attached to mediopassive verbs in order to disambiguate the reflexive reading of the verb which otherwise is not self-evident.

- (1.54) O Janis aftopirovoliθike  
           the John self shot-3sg-pass  
           ‘John shot himself.’

- (1.55) Aftosistinome  
           self introduce-1sg-pass  
           ‘I introduce myself.’

Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton (1987) explain that “the prefix *afto-* indicates not where the action ends ...but rather where the action begins, i.e. *afto-* marks the agent as being identical with the patient, the latter being expressed through the personal ending of the mediopassive verb”.

### 1.3 Reciprocals

Reciprocity can be accomplished in the following four ways: By the use of passive morphology, by the verbal prefix *alilo-* (each other), by the reciprocal phrase *o enas ton alon* (each other) and finally by the adjunct reciprocal *metaksi tus* (between/among them).

#### Reciprocity by mediopassive verb form

- (1.56) O Janis ke i Maria filiθikane  
           the John and the Mary kissed each other  
           ‘John and Mary kissed each other.’
- (1.57) O Janis ke i Maria ayapjunde  
           the John and the Mary love-3pl-pass each other  
           ‘John and Mary love each other.’

Generally speaking, in examples like the above reciprocity is expressed by the third person plural of certain verbs expressing love/hate or actions that are motivated from these feelings like *agaljazonde* (hug each other),