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1. Two Anaphors

Modern Greek has two anaphors, one of which (ton eafton tou) obeys binding condition A, as predicted, the other of which (o idhios) does not.
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(1) a. Egho idha ton eafton mou ston kathrefti.
    I saw myself in the mirror
    'I saw myself in the mirror.'

    b. *Egho idha ton eafton tis ston kathrefti.
    I saw herself in the mirror

(2) a. O Yanis theli [i Maria na voithisi ton eafton tis].
    John wants Mary helps herself
    'John wants Mary to help herself.'

    b. *O Yanis theli [i Maria na voithisi ton eafton tou].
    John wants Mary helps himself

(3) O Yanis theli [i Maria na voithisi ton idhio].
    John wants Mary helps himself
    'John wants Mary to help him.'

Sentence (1b) is ungrammatical because *ton eafton tis is not coindexed with something that c-commands it. Sentence (2b) is ungrammatical because although *ton eafton tou is bound by Yanis, it is not bound within its governing category. Sentence (3) is grammatical, and the referent of *ton idhio can only be *Yanis. Sentence (3) lacks the ambiguity that (4) has in both Modern Greek and English.

(4) O Yanis theli i Maria na ton voithisi.
    John wants Mary him helps
    'John, wants Mary to help him.'

The referent of *ton 'him' in (4) can be *Yanis or any masculine individual. On the other hand, the referent of *ton idhio in (3) can only be *Yanis.

What is the nature of *o idhios? Since it is [+N], it carries morphological features for gender, number, and case. In (3) it stands in the morphology of [+ male, + singular, + nominative]. Is it a regular pronoun like *him in (4)? No, because unlike *him, *o idhios can only be coreferential with *Yanis, thus avoiding the ambiguity of (4). In fact, *o idhios can never have independent reference. It must always be coindexed with an NP having a specific reference. In other words, semantically it functions like an anaphor. However, unlike *ton eafton tou, which must be bound in its governing category and therefore must always stand in the nonnominative, *o idhios can be assigned nominative case. Compare, for example, the ungrammatical English sentence (5) with the grammatical Modern Greek sentence (6).

1 The word *ton is not a reduced form of *ton idhio, as one anonymous reviewer suggested. But a clitic pronoun. Clitics are very productive in Modern Greek, and they are all identical with the corresponding definite article. Like all lexical items that are [+N] (even proper names), *o idhios must be accompanied by a definite article. The *o and *ton that accompany it are the [+ male, + singular] definite article in the nominative and accusative case, respectively. *ton is not the reduced form of *idhio any more than it is the reduced form of *Yanis in (4).
(5) *John thinks that himself will win.
(6) O Yanis pistevi o idhios tha kerhisi.
   John believes Comp himself will win
   'John believes that he will win.'

Again o idhios can be coreferential only with o Yanis. Sentence (6) would be ungrammatical if the nominative counterpart of ton eafon tou were to replace o idhios. Nevertheless, it is not in a structural sense that the two anaphors appear in mutually exclusive positions. Both can appear in exactly the same environment, but their referents are necessarily different.

(7) O Yanis theli o Costas na voithisi
    John, wants Costas helps
    ton idhio/ton eafon tou.
    himself/himself

It seems, then, that it is the antecedents of o idhios and ton eafon tou that appear in mutually exclusive positions. o idhios gets its reference from the NP it is coindexed with. This NP must be in the same sentence but, unlike the NP coindexed with ton eafon tou, not in the same governing category.

(8) O Yanis aghapa ton eafon tou/*ton idhio.
    John loves himself
    'John loves himself.'
(9) O Yanis theli [(pro) na katalavi
    John, wants(he), understands
    ton eafon tou/*ton idhio],
    himself
    'John wants to understand himself.'

To make the same point clearer, compare (10) and (11).

(10) O Yanis theori [oti o idhios ine
    John considers Comp himself is
    o kalitero ipopsifio],
    the best candidate
    'John, considers that he is the best candidate.'
(11) O Yanis theori ton eafon tou ton
    John considers himself the
    kalitero ipopsifio,
    best candidate
    'John considers himself the best candidate.'

In (10) the governing category of o idhios is the embedded sentence. o idhios is free in it, but at the same time it is bound by Yanis in the matrix clause. In (11) the governing category is the matrix clause. Since himself is bound in it, the anaphor is ton eafon tou.

The above facts all mean that o idhios cannot neatly fit into the binding conditions as they have been defined so far.
Table 1
Setting for binding parameters in Modern Greek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Narrow domain</th>
<th>Wide domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free</td>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td>R-expressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(condition B)</td>
<td>(condition C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bound</td>
<td><em>ton eafen tou</em></td>
<td><em>o idhios</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(condition A)</td>
<td>(condition D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Binding Conditions**

A: Bound in its governing category (anaphors)
B: Free in its governing category (pronouns)
C: Free everywhere (R-expressions)

Although _o idhios_ seems closer to satisfying binding condition B, it does not categorically fall under it. Condition B specifies only where a pronoun should be free, not if and where it should be bound, and, as we have seen, _o idhios_ must be bound by an antecedent NP. In other words, condition B allows pronouns to have independent reference outside the sentence, thereby permitting ambiguity and more than one interpretation of the sentence. In contrast, _o idhios_ never permits ambiguity in that way, since its reference must lie within the same matrix sentence.

Independently of the above considerations, the binding conditions show an asymmetry in their present form: they specify two alternatives for binding within a narrow domain (bound and free within governing category) but only one alternative for binding within a wide domain (free in the whole sentence). What seems to be missing is the option "bound in the whole sentence but free in the governing category" (which we may provisionally call binding condition D). As we have seen, _o idhios_ satisfies both parts of this condition.

Modern Greek, then, seems to have chosen the symmetrical setting for the binding parameters displayed in Table 1.

**2. Ambiguities**

The fact that _o idhios_ does not cause ambiguity problems in sentences like (3) does not mean that it is totally free of such problems. The referent of _o idhios_ in sentence (12a) can be either Yanis or Costa since both can wide domain bind _ton idhio_.

(12)  a. O Yanis ipe  ston Costa [oī i Maria
       John  said to  Costa Comp Mary
       aghapa ton idhio].
       loves  himself
       'John, told Costa, that Mary loves him.'
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b. O Yanis ipe stin Katerina [oti] i Maria
   John said to Catherine Comp Mary
   loves himself
   'John, told Catherine that Mary loves him.'

c. O Yanis ipe stin Katerina [oti] o Costas
   John said to Catherine Comp Costas
   loves herself
   'John told Catherine, that Costas loves her.'

Sentences (12b) and (12c) are unambiguous, however. In (12b) the morphology of ton idhio shows that its antecedent is [+male] and thus can only be Yanis. Likewise, the morphology of tin idhia in (12c) shows that its antecedent is [+female] and thus can only be Katerina.

3. Other Uses of idhios

As we have seen, o idhios appears to be bound outside its governing category but inside the matrix sentence. Cases exist in which condition D does not appear to predict the correct distribution; however, a look at the relevant sentences will clear any doubts in this regard.

One such case is the appearance of o idhios alone and in the matrix sentence.

(13) O idhios pighe sto scholio.
   himself went to the school

However, since Modern Greek is a pro-drop language, I perceive the structure of (13) to be as shown in (14).

(14) pro o idhios pighe sto scholio

In English the anaphoric himself is used as the emphatic pronoun. In Modern Greek it is not the anaphor equivalent to himself (ton eauton tou) that is used as the emphatic pronoun, but o idhios.

(15) O Yanis o idhios pighe sto scholio.
    John himself went to the school
    'John went to the school himself.'

(16) Aftos o idhios pighe sto scholio.
    he himself went to the school
    'He went to the school himself.'

Since o idhios can modify R-expressions and pronouns as in (15) and (16). it is only to be expected that it can also accompany pro as in (13).

There are also cases where o idhios does not have an antecedent in the sentence but cannot be bound by pro either. Its antecedent seems to be provided by the discourse context in
general and not the matrix sentence specifically. In no such case, however, is its use anaphoric. The lexical item *idhios* as an adjective means ‘the same (as . . . )’.

Both (17) and (18) can be answered with the elliptical (19).

(17) Thelete *na milisete ston iatro i*
    (you) want   talk to the doctor or
    stin   nosokoma tou?
    to the nurse    his
    ‘Do you want to talk to the doctor or to his nurse?’

(18) Thelete *na milisete ston iatro pou*
    (you) want   talk to the doctor Rel
    milisate  tin proighoumeni fora i se (you) talk the last
     some     time or to
    kapion  alon?
    somebody else
    ‘Do you want to talk to the doctor you talked to
     last time or to somebody else?’

(19) Theloume *na milisoume ston idhio.*
    (we) want   talk to the himself/the same

In (19) *idhio* modifies a discourse topic, and it can have the meaning both of the emphatic pronoun and of the adjective as in the complete (20) and (21), respectively. The similarities and contrasts between the emphatic and adjectival uses of *idhios* become clearer in these sentences, which differ only in the presence of the article *ton* in (20).

(20) Theloume *na milisoume ston idhio ton iatro.*
    (we) want   talk to the himself the doctor
    ‘We want to talk to the doctor himself.’

(21) Theloume *na milisoume ston idhio iatro.*
    (we) want   talk to the same doctor
    ‘We want to talk to the same doctor.’

Only in its function as an adjective can *o idhios* modify a person or thing that is not provided in discourse but is part of commonly shared pragmatic knowledge. The following can be the first sentence of a discourse.

(22) To kratiko lachio epese ston idhio ya
    the state lottery fell on the same for
triti fora,
    third time
    ‘The same person won the state lottery for the
    third time.’

It seems, then, that whenever binding condition D is ap-

---

2 The fact that an adjective meaning ‘same as’ ‘identical to’ is homonymous with an anaphor is not peculiar to Modern Greek. Note, for example, Spanish *mismo*, French *même*, Dutch *zelf*. 

---
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phatic. The distribution of anaphoric ae idhios is as condition D predicts: in a position bound outside its governing category but inside the matrix sentence.
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In this squib I will discuss some crucial aspects of the syntactic distribution of subjects and objects of active (ergative and non-ergative) and passive sentences in German. This distribution pattern differs radically but systematically from that of English and calls for a theoretical explanation. I will present a theory that attributes the differences between English and German to a minimal parametric difference between the grammars of the languages. Moreover, I will suggest how this parametric difference can be learned on the basis of purely positive evidence. To the extent that these proposals are correct, the data discussed constitute interesting support for the principles of Government-Binding (GB) Theory as a theory of human language competence.¹

1. The German Facts and Generalizations

As shown in (1), the unmarked word order in active declarative subordinate clauses in German is nominative–dative–accusative–verb(s).

(1) weil die Mutter dem Sohn Bücher schenkt
    because the mother the son books gives
    nom       dat     acc

If the order dative object–accusative object is reversed, the accusative may not be indefinite.

(2) *weil die Mutter Bücher dem Sohn schenkt
    because the mother books the son gives
    nom       acc     dat

¹ The data presented in this squib, especially those dealing with the heterogeneous word order and constituency behavior of German subjects, might prove difficult to handle in a phrase structure grammar (see, for instance, Gazdar et al. (1985)), that is, a grammar that does not make use of Case theory and θ-theory to determine word order and constituency.