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Reflexive and Reciprocal Constructions in Modern Greek

Evangelia Asproudi
Trinity College Dublin

Abstract

This paper examines the various constructions that convey reflexivity and reciprocity in Modern Greek. Modern Greek reflexive and reciprocal constructions are characterized by a considerable degree of overlap between them, in the sense that they are structurally parallel to each other. More concretely, both reflexives and reciprocals in the language can be lexicalized through the addition of the non-active suffix -mai to a transitive verb; moreover, reflexivity and reciprocity can be syntactically realized by means of an active transitive verb followed by a pronominal that is referentially bound to an antecedent. Lastly, pronoun incorporation to a –mai verb constitutes another way of expressing reflexivity and reciprocity in the language, while in certain cases reflexivity/reciprocity is inherently encoded in the semantics of individual verb predicates. The analysis is implemented within Role-and-Reference Grammar; the richness of the data, however, dictates the need for the enrichment of the framework. Specifically, the traditional Role-and-Reference Grammar organization structure is extended through the postulation of additional steps to the semantics-to-syntax derivational process and through the introduction of a feature-based analysis at the semantic level of representation. What is aimed in this way is a more thorough and effective analysis of the constructions under examination.

1. MG Reflexives and Reciprocals: Description

Reflexive and reciprocal constructions are closely correlated in Modern Greek (henceforth MG). At a semantic level, the surface subject of both reflexives and reciprocals in MG encodes not only agentivity, but also affectedness by itself (in the case of reflexives) or by a partner (in the case of reciprocals), which is, in essence, a crosslinguistic property of reflexive and reciprocal subjects (Shibatani 1985, pp.840-841).

Apart from the semantic correlation between reflexives and reciprocals in MG, it should be noted that there is also a considerable degree of syntactic overlap between them. Taking into account that a variety of structures can give rise to a reflexive or a reciprocal reading in MG, it will be illustrated that reflexive structures parallel reciprocal structures in their formation; besides, it is worth noting that reflexivity and reciprocity can be expressed under certain circumstances through the use of the same structure, thus giving rise to a potentially ambiguous interpretation. The discussion will firstly turn to an examination of MG reflexives.

* The contents of this paper are part of my M.Phil. in Linguistics thesis, which was submitted on 29th August 2005 to the Centre for Language and Communication Studies, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland. I would like to express my deep gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Brian Nolan for all his input, support and inspiration; his insightful comments and supportive feedback have been of great assistance to me in the writing of my thesis, making him an invaluable guide throughout. In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Ianthi Tsimpli for generously providing me with a wealth of intuition on the Modern Greek data. All shortcomings remain, of course, my own responsibility.
1.1 MG Reflexives

As Papangeli (2004, p.44) remarks, “at least three constructions in Greek give rise to reflexive reading...”. In the majority of cases, MG reflexives are, following VanValin & LaPolla’s (1997, p.393) terminology, lexical in nature; they are namely morphologically marked by the addition of the non-active1 suffix –mai2 to a transitive verb, thus leading to its detransitivization (1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e). An alternative way of expressing reflexivity involves the prefixation of the reflexive pronoun afto- (‘self’) to a verb that already carries the suffix –mai (Mackridge 1987, p.88) (1f, 1g). Furthermore, a reflexive reading can also arise in MG when an active3 transitive verb is followed by the full anaphoric pronoun o eafios mu ('myself') in accusative case4 that stands in a coreference relation with its antecedent (Tzartzanos 1946, p.239). Sentences 1h and 1i exemplify this structure, which is referred to as a ‘coreference reflexive’ or a ‘plain reflexive’ construction by VanValin & LaPolla (1997, p.396):

1 Following Embick (2004), Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2004) and Tsimpli (in press-b), the term ‘non-active’ morphology will be used in the present paper to refer to -mai, since it is more compatible with the various structures in which this suffix occurs in MG. –mai occurs namely in passives, anticausatives, middles, reflexives and reciprocals in the language.
2 -mai is a 1st person singular present-tense suffix; the full paradigm of the MG non-active present-tense verbal suffix is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST</td>
<td>-mai</td>
<td>-maste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>-sai</td>
<td>-ste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>-tai</td>
<td>-ndai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 MG active present-tense verbal suffixes are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>-ets/-as</td>
<td>-te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>-el</td>
<td>-ne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The full paradigm of the anaphoric pronoun in accusative case is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ST</td>
<td>ton eafio mu</td>
<td>ton eafio mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ND</td>
<td>ton eafio su</td>
<td>ton eafio sas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>ton eafio tu/ tis/ tu*</td>
<td>ton eafio tus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* masculine/ feminine/ neuter
5 From a semantic perspective, MG reflexives can be either direct or indirect. Direct reflexives (see 1a, 1b, 1c, 1f, 1g, 1h, 1i) are characterized by the volitionality as well as the direct affectedness of the chief participant (Kemmer 1993, p.205), while indirect reflexives denote an action where the agent and the beneficiary are coreferential but distinct entities (Kemmer 1993, p.74). With specific reference to MG indirect reflexives, they express, according to traditional grammarians (cf. Tzartzanos 1946, Tsopanakis 1994), situations where the subject is thought to do something for himself/herself, or to something that s/he owns, through the mediation of a third participant (Tzartzanos 1946, p.240). Indirect reflexivity is syntactically expressed in the majority of cases through the use of –mai verbs (see 1d, 1e). It should be noted, however, that in certain contexts, even morphologically active verbs can have an indirect reflexive interpretation, as illustrated in the following examples:

a. Pigha sto kureio ki ekopsa ta mallia mu.
   go-1sg.past.act. to the-acc.neut.sg. barber and cut-1sg.past.act. the-acc.neut.pl. hair my ‘I had my hair cut at the barber.’ (Tzartzanos 1946, p.245)

b. Ravo ena kostumi.
   saw-1sg.pres.act. a-acc.neut. costume
   ‘I have a costume made.’ (Tsopanakis 1994, p.356)
e. Egrafomai
enroll-1sg.pres.non-act. in the-acc.neut.sg. university
‘I am enrolled in the university.’
(Tzartzanos 1946, p.240)

f. Aftokatastrefomai.
sel destroy-1sg.pres.non-act
‘I destroy myself.’
(Theophanopoulou-Kontou, 1997, p.117)

g. Aftodhiafimizomai.
sel advertise-1sg.pres.non-act
‘I advertise myself.’
(Theophanopoulou-Kontou, 1997, p.117)

h. Dino
dress-1sg.pres.act. the-acc.masc.sg self my
‘I get dressed.’
(Tzartzanos 1946, p.239)

i. Gimnazeis
train-2sg.pres.act. the-acc.masc.sg self your
‘You train yourself.’
(Tzartzanos 1946, p.239)

It is worth noting that the coreference reflexive of some verbs is used only for emphatic purposes (Tzartzanos 1946, p.244, Papangeli 2004, p.45) (2a, 2b), while the same construction constitutes the unique means of expressing reflexivity with deponent verbs6 (2c). An emphatic reflexive interpretation can also be attained through the use of a non-active verb followed by the adjunct adjectival phrase monos/monaxos mu (‘by myself’) predicating the subject (Tzartzanos 1946, p.244) (2d, 2e, 2f). Lastly, it should be mentioned that certain morphologically active verbs, like girizo (‘to turn around’), allazo (‘to change’) and gerno (‘to lean’), can acquire a reflexive meaning without being followed by an anaphoric pronoun (Tzartzanos 1946, p.245):

6 Deponent verbs are verbs that are retrieved from the lexicon with the suffix –mai. The presence of –mai, however, is not associated with an affected surface subject; on the contrary, the surface subject of deponents is fully agentive in nature.
A final point that should be made concerns situations where a –mai verb is used instead of its active counterpart, although the latter could equally well convey a reflexive meaning. Following Theophanopoulou-Kontou (1999, p.152), the preference of –mai over the active morphology –o reflects a higher degree of subject affectedness, which triggers the characterization of such –mai forms as ‘pseudoreflexives’. The verb *skorpizo/ skorpizomai* (‘to spread’) constitutes an example of this –o/ –mai alternation, where the latter verb form encodes greater subject affectedness than the former.

On the whole, it has become evident through the discussion in this section that the notion of ‘reflexives’ in MG includes a variety of structures associated with special semantics.
1.2 MG Reciprocals

MG reciprocals are structurally similar to reflexives; specifically, reciprocity is generally expressed by plural –mai verbs ((3))\(^7\). In addition, it should be noted that MG also has two overt markers of reciprocal semantics (Tzartzanos 1946, p.246), which correspond to what Kemmer (1993, p.103) refers to as ‘light’ and ‘heavy’ reciprocal markers. That is, the ancient reciprocal pronoun allilo- (‘each other’) can be incorporated to a non-active plural verb ((4)), or, alternatively, a singular or plural transitive verb is used in combination with the ‘heavy’ reciprocal marker o enas ton allo\(^8\) (lit. ‘the one the other’) ((5)). For emphatic purposes, a structure consisting of a –mai verb followed by the adjunct prepositional phrase metaksi mas/ sas/ tus (‘between (among) us/ you/ them’) is used ((6)). Lastly, it is worth noting that some morphologically active verbs have an inherently reciprocal meaning (Tzartzanos 1946, p.246), as illustrated in examples 7a, 7b and 7c below:

(3) a. Agaliazondai.

hug-3pl.pres.non-act.

‘They hug each other.’

(Tzartzanos 1946, p.241)

b. Tilefoniundai.

call-3pl.pres.non-act.

‘They call each other.’

(Papangeli 2004, p. 100)

c. Antamonomaste.

meet up-1pl.pres.non-act

‘We meet up.’

(Tzartzanos 1946, p.241)

d. Koitaxtikame sta matia.

look-1pl.past.non-act. into the-acc.neut.pl. eyes

‘We looked into each other’s eyes.’

(Mackridge 1987, p.88)

---

\(^7\) Singular non-active verbs may also convey reciprocal meaning when they take a collective noun as subject:

(ii) Tο zevghari filithike.

the-nom.neut.sg. couple kiss-3sg.past.non-act.

‘The couple kissed.’

(Mackridge 1987, pp.88-89)

\(^8\) O enas ton allo is used with masculine subjects. Feminine and neuter subjects require the reciprocal pronouns i mia tin alli and to ena to allo respectively.
(4) a. Alliloipostirizondai.
   each other support-3pl.pres.non.act.
   ‘They support each other.’ (Tzartzanos 1946, p.246)

   b. Allilopeirazomaste.
   each other tease-3pl.pres.non.act.
   ‘We tease each other.’ (Mackridge 1987, p.89)

(5) a. Koitakse o enas ton allo kai
   look-3sg.past.act. the-nom.masc.sg. one the-acc.masc.sg. other and
   xamoghelasan.
   smile-3pl.past.act.
   ‘They looked at each other and smiled.’ (Tzartzanos 1946, p.246)

   b. Plisiazun o enas ton allo.
   approach-3pl.pres.act. the-nom.masc.sg. one the-acc.masc.sg. other
   ‘They are approaching one another.’ (Mackridge 1987, p.89)

   c. Dhe milane o enas me ton allo.
   not talk-3pl.pres.act. the-nom.masc.sg. one with the-acc.masc.sg. other
   ‘They don’t talk to each other.’ (Mackridge 1987, p.89)

(6) Ta adherfakia aghapiondane metaksi tus.
   the-nom.neut.pl. siblings love-3pl.past.non-act among them
   ‘The siblings loved one another.’ (Tzartzanos 1946, p.246)

(7) a. Ine kairos pu xorisan.
   be-3sg.pres. time that break up-3pl.past.act.
   ‘They broke up with each other a long time ago.’ (Tzartzanos 1946, p.246)

   b. Antamosame.
   meet up-1pl.past.act.
   ‘We met up.’ (Mirambel 1988, p.132)

   c. Dhosame xeria.
   give-1pl.past.act. hands
   ‘We shook hands.’ (Tzartzanos 1946, p.247)

---

9 Some verbs require that the reciprocal marker contain a prepositional phrase headed by an argument-marking preposition compatible with each individual verb.
To sum up, reciprocity can be expressed in MG in various ways, each of which is used to encode different semantic underpinnings.

On the basis of the data presented in 1.1 and 1.2, it can be concluded that reflexives and reciprocals are closely related in MG. That is, reflexivity and reciprocity are manifested syntactically in parallel ways. Besides, their correlation is best reflected in the fact that both notions can be expressed through the use of the same non-active verbal morphology. Taking into account that reciprocals are by default plural, it follows that “…Greek displays ambiguities when reflexive verbs are used with plural subjects” (Papangeli 2004, p.164). Examples of sentences that can have either a reflexive or a reciprocal reading are provided in (8) below:

(8) a. Oi kopeles xtenizondai.
   the-nom.fem.pl. girls comb-3pl.pres.non-act.
   ‘The girls are combing *their/ each other’s* hair.’
   (Tsimpli in press-a, p.13)

b. Ta pedhia vrexondan me ta lastixa.
   the-nom.neut.pl. children throw water-3pl.past.non-act. with the-acc.neut.pl. hoses
   ‘The children were throwing water *to themselves/ to each other* with the hoses.’
   (Papangeli 2004, p.73)

Hence, as illustrated in the above sentences, the verbal –mai suffix can be ambiguous between a reflexive and a reciprocal interpretation. The discussion will now turn to a Role-and-Reference Grammar account of MG reflexive and reciprocal constructions.

2. MG Reflexives and Reciprocals: Analysis

On the basis of the description of MG reflexives and reciprocals in the previous section as syntactically and semantically overlapping constructions, it is expected that their derivation within Role-and-Reference Grammar (henceforth RRG) will be accounted for in similar terms. The prediction is namely made that parallel MG reflexive and reciprocal structures are also derivationally similar.

Before turning to a closer examination of each of the constructions in question, a brief presentation of the traditional RRG machinery will be provided. RRG posits a single level of syntactic representation to which the semantic representation of a sentence is directly mapped.
(VanValin & LaPolla 1997, p.21) by means of certain linking principles. Default linking, however, can be overridden in voice constructions, as dictated by the Privileged Syntactic Argument (henceforth PSA) modulation and the argument modulation features. Specifically, the PSA modulation voice allows a non-actor\textsuperscript{11} argument to function as the syntactic pivot of the sentence; given the Actor-Undergoer hierarchy\textsuperscript{12} presented in Figure 1 below, it is usually the undergoer argument that is the primary topical participant in voice constructions, thus functioning as the syntactic pivot. The actor argument, on the other hand, appears in the clausal periphery or is entirely omitted, as postulated by the argument modulation voice (VanValin & LaPolla 1997, p.295).

\textit{Figure 1: The Actor-Undergoer Hierarchy}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textbf{Actor} & \textbf{Undergoer} \\
\hline
Arg of & 1\textsuperscript{st} arg of & 1\textsuperscript{st} arg of & 2\textsuperscript{nd} arg of & Arg of state \\
DO & do'(x,\ldots) & \textit{pred}'(x, y) & \textit{pred}'(x, y) & \textit{pred}'(x) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

[\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{[}= increasing markedness of realization of argument as macrorole}\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{]}}}

With more specific reference to reflexives and reciprocals, RRG bases its analysis of such constructions on the notion of o(bliqueness)-command, according to which an argument x o-commands another argument y in the argument structure list if x precedes y. More concretely, RRG posits the Obliqueness Condition within the Binding Domain which states that “an anaphor must be coindexed with a less oblique member of the same logical structure in the minimal S containing the verb” (cf. Nolan 2000, p.23). In addition, adopting Jackendoff’s (1972) proposal that the antecedent must be higher than the reflexive/ reciprocal on the thematic relations hierarchy, the Role Hierarchy Condition on Reflexivization (and reciprocalization) is posited that is stated as follows:

\textit{Role Hierarchy Condition on Reflexivization:}

The reflexive pronoun must not be higher on the following hierarchy than its antecedent:

Actor > Undergoer > Other

(VanValin 2001-b, p.7)

The analysis of MG reflexives and reciprocals presented below proceeds in accordance with the Obliqueness and the Role Hierarchy conditions; however, it should be

\textsuperscript{10} The disambiguation of sentences like $8a$ and $8b$ can be forced by the choice of adjuncts and contextual factors (Papangeli 2004, pp. 52, 97).

\textsuperscript{11} Note that in ergative languages the undergoer constitutes the default syntactic pivot; thus, in voice constructions it is the actor that is promoted to the PSA position. Yet, MG being an accusative language, reference will be made throughout only to the alterations involved in languages of this type.
noted that this analysis is based on an extended version of the traditional RRG organization structure.

At the semantic level, it will be assumed that three steps are involved. Firstly, the retrieval from the lexicon takes place of the appropriate logical structure which contains abstract valency slots. At a next step, the construal of the specific event is achieved by means of full argument specification; and finally, the logical structure gets further modified by its adjustment to construction-specific operations of information packaging. –mai constructions, for instance, will be shown to involve argument deletion or obliqueness, thus resulting in single-argument logical structures, while plain reflexives and prototypical reciprocals will trigger argument coindexation. For reasons of convenience, these three steps at the level of semantic representation will be referred to as LS0, LS1 and LS2 respectively.13

Once LS2 has been specified, it is then realized at the syntactic level. More concretely, at the next step upwards (S1), the linear sequence of the elements of the sentence is represented; yet, no further information will be assumed to be encoded at this step with respect to the sentential elements, their morphological properties being specified at the final overt S2 stage of the derivation. In other words, this two-step syntactic representation is assumed to provide all the information that in the traditional RRG account is conflated in the single morphosyntactic representation postulated.

As a final remark, it should be mentioned that, where necessary, a feature-decompositional approach will be adopted at LS0, in an attempt to represent formally the constraints pertaining to the predicate in each construction and to its arguments. In this way, a more fine-grained description of MG reflexive and reciprocal constructions will be attempted, thus enabling a more succinct capturing of their similarities and differences.

2.1 The Syntax of MG Reflexives

Focusing initially on –mai reflexives, (9 & 10) below illustrates the various steps underlying their derivation:

(9) O athlitis proponeitai.

the-nom.masc.sg. athlete train-3sg.pres.non-act

‘The athlete trains himself.’ (Tsopanakis 1994, p.356)

---

12 RRG postulates two generalized semantic macroroles, Actor and Undergoer, the prototypes of which are the thematic relations of agent and patient respectively (VanValin & LaPolla 1997, p.143).
13 This analysis constitutes, in essence, a more elaborated version of Vihman’s (2004, p.iv) proposal that there are two levels of semantic representation “one in the lexicon, with abstract valency slots, and the other on a construction-specific level, with fully specified arguments”.

This LS0 has two arguments in it, the leftmost one being the actor and the rightmost one the undergoer. At LS1 macrorole specification occurs, with \textit{o athlitis} being mapped to actor and \textit{o eaftos tu} to undergoer. Reflexivity arises in the sense that “…the second participant, the undergoer and object of the sentence, is pointing back reflexively to the first participant, the actor and its antecedent” (Nolan 2000, p.34). Besides, the reflexive reading is enforced by virtue of the fact that both arguments carry the same agreement features. Incidentally, it is worth noting that this reflexivity is well-formed, since both arguments are within the scope of predication of \textit{propono}, and both the Obliqueness and the Role Hierarchy conditions are satisfied. However, M-transitivity\footnote{\cite{VanValin2004}, p.12} is reduced at LS2 from two macroroles to one by means of undergoer suppression. Thus, \textit{o athlitis} surfaces at S1 in its default core-initial argument

\begin{quote}
Following VanValin & LaPolla (1997, p.393), I will assume that reflexive elements “…appear in logical structure in the form that they will appear in the actually realized sentence, case marking aside”. That is, the appropriate person, number and gender features will be present at LS1, while, similarly to other referring expressions, case marking specification will take place at S2.

Note, however, that nominative is chosen as the default case in which nominals derive from the lexicon. On this ground, all nominals in this and the following diagrams will by convention appear at LS in nominative case.

Moreover, the predicate following BECOME at LS2 is the passive perfect participle of the LS1 verb predicate. Hence, \textit{proponimenos} in the above diagram, for example, is the passive perfect participle of the LS1 verb predicate \textit{propono}. Participial predicates will appear throughout in the default nominative masculine singular form.
\end{quote}

\footnote{\cite{VanValin2004}, p.12; RRG employs this term in order to distinguish between its semantically-based
position, while the reflexive interpretation remains intact through the addition at S2 of the non-active suffix to the verb, which “...has no function other than signalling that the actor and undergoer are the same participant” (VanValin & LaPolla 1997, p.395 for Lakhota)\(^{16}\).

As for the derivation of *afto-* incorporation reflexives, it is represented in the following diagram:

(11) Aftokatastrefomai.

    self destroy-1sg.pres.non-act

    ‘I destroy myself.’  (Theophanopoulou-Kontou, 1997, p.117)

\(12\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SENTENCE} & \quad | \quad \text{CLAUSE} \\
\text{CLAUSE} & \quad | \quad \text{CORE} \\
\text{CORE} & \quad | \quad \text{ARG} \quad | \quad \text{NUC} \\
\text{ARG} & \quad | \quad \text{NP} \quad | \quad \text{PRED} \\
\text{PRED} & \quad \text{REFL} \quad | \quad \text{V} \\
\end{align*}
\]

S2: \(\emptyset_i\) afto- katastrefomai

S1: \([\text{CLAUSE} [\text{CORE} [\text{PSA} \emptyset_i], [\text{NUC} \text{afto-}, \text{katastro}]]] \)

LS2: BECOME afto- katastrammenos’(\(\emptyset_i\))

LS1: do’(\(\emptyset_i\), [katastro’(\(\emptyset_i\), afto’)])

LS0: do’(x, [katastro’, (x, y, AGR)])

*Katastro* is transitive in nature and, hence, LS0 has two arguments in it. The actor argument is specified at LS1 as \(\emptyset^{17}\), while the reflexive elitic *afto-* takes the undergoer macrorole. Both macroroles are within the binding domain of the verb predicate and are thus linked together.

---

\(^{16}\) Emphatic reflexives (see 2d, 2e, 2f in 1.1) will be assumed to involve the same linking procedures as those just described with respect to the derivation of (9 & 10) above. The only difference between the derivation of non-emphatic and emphatic—mai reflexives is that in the latter, as opposed to the former, an adjunct phrase headed by *monos* is inserted at LS2 which is coindexed with the subject of the sentence.

\(^{17}\) \(\emptyset\) is used to symbolize a covertly realized (i.e. phonetically null) actor. Note that MG is a null subject language, where a phonetically null constituent is licensed in subject position by strong agreement features (cf. Chomsky 1995, p.77).
through a relation of reflexivity. Besides, the Obliqueness and the Role Hierarchy conditions are also satisfied, since the overtly null antecedent is less oblique and higher on the thematic hierarchy than the reflexive afto-. Furthermore, it is worth noting that actor and undergoer are identical in terms of phi-feature specification, which follows naturally from the reflexivity relation that holds between them. Afto- remains overtly present also at LS2; yet, as can be observed in (12), it does not occupy an argument position anymore, thus leaving the null actor as the single argument in the logical structure. As a result, a template with only one argument slot is selected, to which the null actor is mapped at S1. Afto-, on the other hand, is prefixed to the verb predicate; the latter gets at S2 the non-active suffix –mai attached to it, which encodes the reflexive interpretation at the syntactic level “…by interpreting the privileged syntactic argument as both actor and undergoer simultaneously…” (VanValin & LaPolla 1997, p.411). Of course, the presence of afto- enhances the reflexive reading of the sentence.

Turning to MG plain reflexives, the linking operations underlying their derivation are schematically represented in the following figure:

(13) Gimnazeis ton eaf to su.
    train-2sg.pres.act. the-acc.masc.sg. self your
    ‘You train yourself.’ (Tzartzanos 1946, p.239)

(14)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SENTENCE} \\
\text{CLAUSE} \\
\text{CORE} \\
\text{ARG} \quad \text{NUC} \quad \overset{\text{ARG}}{\text{NP}} \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{PRED} \quad \text{NP} \\
\text{V} \\
\end{array}
\]

S2:  \[
\emptyset_i \quad \text{gimnazeis} \quad \text{ton eaf to su}_i
\]

S1:  \[
[\text{CLAUSE} \ [\text{CORE} \ [\text{PSA} \emptyset_i], \ [\text{NUC} \text{gimnazo}], \ [\text{POST-NUC} \text{o eaf tos su}_i]])
\]

LS2:  \[
do'(\emptyset_i, [\text{gimnazo}'(\emptyset_i, \text{o eaf tos su}_i)])
\]

LS1:  \[
do'(\emptyset_i, [\text{gimnazo}'(\emptyset_i, \text{o eaf tos su}_i)])
\]

LS0:  \[
do'(x_i \ [\text{AGR} \emptyset_i], \ [\text{gimnazo}', (x_i, y_i \ [\text{AGR} \emptyset_i])])
\]
At LS0 both an actor and an undergoer exist for the verb predicate *gimnazo*, which are specified at LS1 as Ø and *o eaftos su* respectively. The reflexive marker *o eaftos su* encodes, in turn, that both arguments share the same reference, thus giving rise to a relation of reflexivity between them. Moving to LS2, the undergoer is still overtly recorded; consequently, Ø and *o eaftos su* are linked to their default positions at S1, the former becoming the PSA and the latter surfacing in the immediately post-nuclear core argument slot. Finally, at S2 accusative case is assigned to the reflexive marker and active morphology is attached to the verb, thus resulting in (13) above.

Lastly, as mentioned in 1.1, reflexivity is occasionally expressed by active intransitive verbs. In such cases, reflexivity is not the result of any syntactic operations; on the contrary, it constitutes an inherent feature of the lexical semantics of individual predicates. Therefore, no special linking algorithm is at work in this case.\(^{18}\)

### 2.2 The Syntax of MG Reciprocals

As will be illustrated in the following discussion, reciprocal constructions are analogous to reflexive ones in terms of logical structure and syntactic representation, and of the underlying linking operations.

Firstly, as regards reciprocal constructions that are built around –*mai* predicates, their derivation proceeds as follows:

(15) Agaliazondai.

`hug-3pl.pres.non-act.`

‘They hug each other.’ (Tzartzanos 1946, p.241)

\(^{18}\) As regards indirect reflexives, their derivation will be treated as being the same as that of their direct counterparts.

With reference to –*mai* indirect reflexives (see 1d, 1e in 1.1), on the one hand, their derivation involves identical linking operations to those involved in the derivation of direct reflexives. The only difference between them lies in LS0 specification; in the case namely of indirect reflexives, the actor argument will be assumed to carry a [-AGENCY] feature that is non-present at LS0 in (10). In other words, what is encoded in this way is that the direct reflexive actor carries a greater degree of agentivity than the indirect reflexive actor.

–*o* indirect reflexives (see a, b in footnote 5), on the other hand, constitute typical transitive constructions. In this respect, they resemble - in linking terms - the plain reflexive in (13 & 14); yet, the undergoer in indirect reflexives is not a reflexive marker and the actor argument bears the [-AGENCY] specification, which are the two properties that distinguish –*o* indirect from plain reflexives.

On the whole then, indirect reflexives are formally differentiated from direct ones by virtue of the LS0 [-AGENCY] feature that is present in the former but not in the latter.
Agaliazo is a transitive verb that takes two arguments at LS0, the actor x and the undergoer y. At the next derivational step, x is filled by Ø and y by the reciprocal marker o enas ton allo, both of which carry the same agreement specification. It is worth noting that the two macroroles are plural in number, thus agreeing with agaliazo that is necessarily marked as plural. In other words, plural agreement marking constitutes an obligatory requirement for the formation of reciprocal constructions. Reciprocity is well formed given that Ø is less oblique and higher on the thematic hierarchy than o enas ton allo. Moving to LS2, the reciprocal marker gets suppressed; hence, a template with the single PSA slot is selected from the syntactic inventory, to which Ø is mapped at S1. The undergoer o enas ton allo is therefore covertly manifest in the syntax through the attachment at S2 of the non-active morphology to agaliazo, which serves to signal that “…any of the initiators of the action, the actors, can also be considered as the endpoint of the action, the undergoers” (Nolan 2000, p.36). Hence arises the reciprocity of (15) above.

19 Similarly to reflexives, the well-formedness of reciprocal constructions will be judged on the basis of the Obliqueness and the Role Hierarchy conditions.
20 The same analysis can be applied to emphatic reciprocals (see (6) in 1.2). Their difference lies at LS2, where in emphatic reciprocals, as opposed to non-emphatic ones, an adjunct metaksi phrase is
With reference to allilo- incorporation reciprocals, their derivation is diagrammed in the following figure:

(17) Allileopeirazomaste.

each other tease-3pl.pres.non-act.

‘We tease each other.’

(Mackridge 1987, p.89)

(18)

This LS0, similarly to the LS0 in (16) above, has two arguments in it, and the verb predicate carries plural agreement marking. x and y are specified at LS1 as Ø and the reciprocal clitic allilo- respectively. Given the anaphoric status of allilo-[\textsuperscript{21}] and that both Ø and allilo- are in the scope of predication of peirazo, it follows that allilo- is bound by Ø. Thus, both arguments carry the same agreement features, while the Obliqueness and the Role Hierarchy conditions are also satisfied. At LS2 a single-argument logical structure is derived, since allilo- is no longer in an argument position. Consequently, the null actor is mapped at S1 to PSA, the reciprocal clitic being prefixed to peirazo. Non-active morphology is added to the verb at S2 inserted, which is linked to the first conjunct of the logical structure by means of coindexation. This adjunct phrase is then mapped in syntax to a clause peripheral position and attributes an emphatic interpretation to the reciprocity conveyed.
and thus the reciprocal interpretation is encoded at the syntactic level; besides, the presence of allilo- also contributes to the reciprocity conveyed.

Turning now to –o reciprocals that are followed by the heavy reciprocal marker o enas ton allo, (19 & 20) below is illustrative of their underlying semantic representation and of the linking operations deriving their surface syntactic form:

(19) Plisiazun o enas ton allo
approach-3pl.pres.act. the-nom.masc.sg. one the-acc.masc.sg. other
‘They are approaching one another.’ (Mackridge 1987, p.89)

(20)

---

Given the transitivity of plisiazo, which bears plural agreement specification, two arguments are present at LS0. At LS1, Ø is mapped to the actor x and o enas ton allo to the undergoer y argument. In virtue of the reciprocal coreference it signals, o enas ton allo necessarily agrees with Ø in terms of case and phi-features. Besides, reciprocity is well formed since the Ø antecedent precedes the reciprocal marker in the argument structure list and is higher than it on the thematic hierarchy, thus satisfying the Obliqueness and the Role Hierarchy conditions respectively. Moving to LS2, o enas ton allo still occupies the undergoer position and,

---

21 Following the generative tradition, RRG treats both reflexives and reciprocals as anaphoric in nature.
therefore, a template with two argument slots is selected. Ø and o enas ton allo are then mapped respectively to their default core-initial and core-final positions at S1, while the necessary morphological features are added at S2.

Finally, reciprocity constitutes an inherent property of certain morphologically active verbs (see (7) in 1.2); in such cases, however, it is purely lexical in nature and not the result of special linking operations.

3. Summary and Conclusions

On the whole, the discussion in this paper has shown that parallel reflexive and reciprocal constructions can be accounted for in similar terms within Role-and-Reference Grammar. All –mai reflexives and reciprocals were marked by argument reduction at LS2, -mai\(^{22}\) and emphatic ones involving undergoer suppression and pronoun incorporation ones undergoer prefixation to the verb predicate. In –o reflexives and reciprocals, on the other hand, that are followed by ton eafio mu and o enas ton allo respectively, “…the [undergoer] is not understood and covert…but overt and explicitly represented…within the syntax” (Nolan 2000, p.50). Lastly, reflexivity and reciprocity sometimes constitute an inherent part of the semantics of some verbs.

In general, lexical cases aside, all reflexive and reciprocal constructions were found to be well accounted for in terms of the Obliqueness condition within the binding domain, the Role Hierarchy condition and the principles of the Role-and-Reference Grammar framework implicit in the analysis throughout. Of course, this analysis was based on an enriched version of the Role-and-Reference Grammar machinery; that is, the traditional Role-and-Reference Grammar organization structure was extended to include three stages (LS0, LS1, LS2) at the semantic and two stages (S1, S2) at the syntactic level of representation, while a feature-decompositional approach was implemented at the LS level. In this way, a more succinct description and comparison/ contrast of Modern Greek reflexive and reciprocal constructions was aimed at and apparently attained.

\(^{22}\) Here in the restricted sense of reflexives and reciprocals that involve neither an emphatic adjunct phrase nor an incorporated pronoun.
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